

Evaluation of the BERR's engagement of the public and other interested parties in the future of civil nuclear power in the UK

Final report annexes

Diane Warburton
September 2009



Shared Practice
11 Clifton Street, Brighton BN1 3PH
01273 774557
www.sharedpractice.org.uk

Annexes

1	Written and online consultation participants questionnaire analysis	2
2	Regional stakeholder events participants questionnaire analysis	32
3	Site stakeholder events participants questionnaire analysis	57
4	Reconvened stakeholder events participants questionnaire analysis	73
5	Citizens Advisory Board participants questionnaire analysis	81
6	Stakeholder Review Group participants questionnaire analysis	84
7	Development Event participants questionnaire analysis	87
8	Public events participants questionnaire analysis	90
9	Public events observers questionnaire analysis	161
10	Public events facilitators questionnaire analysis	171
11	Interview questions	200

Annex 1: Written and online consultation participants

Evaluation questionnaire analysis

Written: total 685 participants; 144 questionnaires returned = return rate of 21%

Online: total 2,042 participants; 54 questionnaires received = return rate of 3%

Total: 2,728 participants; 198 questionnaires returned = 7% return rate overall

NB All percentages shown to nearest whole number.

1 Have you participated in the Government consultation on the future of nuclear power?

	Written	Online	Combined result
Yes	142 (99%)	54 (100%)	196 (99%)
No	1 (1%)	-	1 (1%)

If yes, please indicate how you participated (tick all that apply)?

	Written	Online	Combined result
Online response to consultation questions	8 (6%)	45 (83%)	53 (27%)
Response to consultation questions via	113 (78%)	5 (9%)	118 (60%)
Letter / email with general views	32 (22%)	5 (9%)	37 (19%)
Public consultation event on 8 September	7 (5%)	-	7 (4%)
Regional stakeholder meeting	4 (3%)	2 (4%)	6 (3%)
Meeting with stakeholders near existing	4 (3%)	2 (4%)	6 (3%)
Other	2 (1%)	-	2 (1%)

All comments

Written:

"Yes. British Energy provided a response to the main consultation questions in the form of a document emailed to the consultation team. BE also responded to the Technical Consultations in writing. BE was also represented at the regional stakeholder event in London, and in all the other regions where we operate power stations or are major employers. In addition, following discussions with the BERR consultation team, stakeholder events were held in the locality of each of our seven nuclear power station sites to which site stakeholder group members and other interested parties were invited. These included representatives from British Energy. We provided comments on the draft materials prepared for the deliberative events, and sent two observers to the deliberative events on 8 September 2007 (in Exeter and Edinburgh)"

Online:

"Also as a non-participating observer at the 8 Sept event in Exeter"

2 Was the purpose of the consultation clear?

	Written	Online	Combined result
Yes	134 (93%)	46 (85%)	180 (91%)
No	4 (3%)	6 (11%)	10 (5%)
Don't know	2 (1%)	2 (4%)	4 (2%)

Comments analysis

- Government had already made up mind / decision had been made / rubber stamp / consultation would make no difference (11)
- exercise was about justifying nuclear (3)
- there were hidden objectives (3)
- no alternatives had been given (3)
- it was good, overall (3)
- action needed now to build nuclear power stations (2)
- the consultation showed that the Government was anti-nuclear (2)
- the process was to get the answer that Government wanted (2)

All comments

Written:

"The distinct impression was of a government stitch up having made up its mind for nuclear plants. The framing of the questions was excellent but you cannot fool an old professional!"

"Nuclear power generation has been endlessly discussed since the 1950s! Stop talking and start building NOW"

"Can't answer questions now, too long ago!"

"Though I really wondered if it would make any difference...or was meant to"

"It depends on whether you mean the supposed purpose or the real one"

"It was very good and informative"

"The govt. had already made it known they are most in favour of NP. The consultation was therefore nothing more than going through the motions!"

"Our point is that nuclear power, existent or planned, has no place in the UK's energy mix, not who could invest in new nuclear power stations"

"The overt purpose was to ascertain public opinion, but the real reason was in order to delay any action towards the building of new nuclear power stations"

"To get the answer the government wanted, by using cynical manipulation of the facts"

"So called consultation was a farce. Government only interested in the business lobby. Decision was pre determined. I intend to actively campaign against any nuclear development and specifically in East Anglia"

"Yes, to rubber stamp the govt's decision to back nuclear power"

"No, the purpose of the consultation was not clear. I know only what should have been on your mind. You should have tried to convince opponents that nuclear is currently the ONLY way we KNOW we can provide reliable power. Nuclear will also provide our energy, without Co2 pollution. Renewables save Co2 only when the wind blows, strongly enough. It requires fossil fuel as backup, see Germany. Nuclear saves C02 all the time"

"Most of the aims were clear enough"

"The government's intention seemed to try to justify adopting nuclear power. It did not provide the opportunity to contrast and compare this with other forms of energy production. It was a mere yes / no"

"The purpose was to get public endorsement of a decision already made – see the title: The Role of nuclear power in a low carbon economy...!"

"It seemed clear that a decision has been made and that despite the consultation, it was a foregone conclusion"

"Although the purpose was supposed to be to consult the public, to me it was to convince the public to agree with the government view"

"The purpose was to go through the motions of consulting, although it was evident from the consultation paper that the government had already come to its conclusions in favour of nuclear power prior to the consultation"

"But also, it was obvious that the government had already made the decision"

"When reading the consultation document I receive the impression that the government did not want nuclear power"

"It seemed determined to promote nuclear power, by fallacious assumptions about market forces and security and by omitting vital information about cost and danger"

Online:

"If the purpose of the consultation was to demonstrate that the government had made up their mind and at no time intended to listened to what the UK populace want, then yes, crystal clear"

"The consultation was branded as being an opportunity to assess whether nuclear is the right option for maintaining energy supplies and reducing carbon emissions, whereas in reality, no other alternatives were presented"

“The purpose of the consultation was very clear - to give perceived legitimacy to a nuclear deal the government has already decided on. The process was in effect pointless the government, as usual, will fail to listen to the people. In the case of Iraq, this government policy has led to hundreds of thousands of innocent people dying. The sad fact is that this could potentially be repeated in the UK if Britain goes ahead with the deeply flawed nuclear option”

“On the surface yes but I fear there were other objective which were not apparent”

“Biased, ill informed, rushed, and judged in court as a flawed, sham of a consultation”

3 Did the consultation document provide enough information for you to contribute fully to the consultation?

	Written	Online	Combined result
Yes	110 (76%)	36 (67%)	146 (74%)
No	21 (15%)	14 (26%)	35 (18%)
Don't know	5 (3%)	3 (6%)	8 (4%)

Comment analysis

- 16 said information good, and there had been plenty
- 10 said information had been biased towards nuclear, was misleading or inaccurate
- 7 said there was too much information, it was too daunting and technical

Points about 'not enough information' on specific topics (some respondents identified more than one issue here):

- not enough on waste - storage, processing and sites (17)
- not enough on costs and economics (10)
- not enough on alternatives to nuclear (10)
- not enough on health hazards, radiation, accidents, emissions (9)
- needed more on disadvantages of nuclear (7)
- more on renewables (7)
- more on risks, especially of terrorism (6)
- more on uranium supplies (4)
- more on CO2 implications of uranium mining and processing (4)
- more on nuclear power would help combat climate change (3)
- more on proliferation (3)
- more on international experience (3)
- more on planning issues (3)

All comments

Written:

“See 5 & 6 overleaf and also 8”

“What it did not provide I had from my lifelong experience in the energy industry. There was no mention of neutron embrittlement of metals used in nuclear plants”

“Document well presented, informative, clear and interesting”

“But – info gained from France on their experience should have been shown”

“It provided too much information – to a lay person it was overwhelming”

“It was difficult for me as a private responder to put my head around this in the whole energy context, including nuclear’s true contribution to Co2 reduction”

“Although I have always been a supporter of nuclear power”

“One or two questions too technical for the undersigned. Delay by government has been too long. Unfortunately (compared with France) we have 400 years of coal. Stocks (France virtually nil) but no method of extraction cheap enough. Lagging in alternatives”

“Too much and too complicated”

“Subject to no reference to the possibility that efforts to use nuclear fusion (not fission) as the power”

“It provided enough for me because I know a lot about NP. For those who don't, it was too ?, it did not make it clear that ? is more ?NP than a power station. A through consultation exercise needed to embrace uranium ? and the dependence of a finite, foreign fuel; waste disposal; ? via plutonium to nuclear weapons; effects of low level radiation etc”

“The information appeared adequate but it was not possible to judge to what extent (if any) that the information was skewed in favour of nuclear energy”

“Very thorough”

“Not enough of the disadvantages”

“Possibly because I had good knowledge of the background?”

“I did have previous knowledge from my employment in the industry and research in the public domain”

“Too technical in places, but irrelevant as I know I do not want nuclear power”

“I had to apply for some of the referenced documents in the consultation document. I also applied for the Energy White Paper but was told it would cost me £50!”

“The real question that needs answering is: What is the point of this utterly sham consultation when the government has already made up its mind?”

“It would however have been useful to have had information on potential suppliers of the nuclear power plants / reactor types etc”

“Please remove me from your files. I don't want to be used to lend legitimacy to this immoral fiasco. What a legacy to our offspring!”

“It was an excellent objective document – unlike the 2003 Energy White Paper”

“Details of safety case for storage of waste fuel on commercial sites. Need to be satisfied on commitment to waste processing and long term storage facility before proceeding”

“I feel that there was insufficient information about the potential of alternative sources (renewables) of energy and possible modification of coal fired energy production to reduce Co2 emission”

“A great deal of information available to me was not in the document”

“The document was complicated and heavy reading for a layman like myself in some areas”

“A lot of information was provided supporting the government's view but information which would not have supported the government's view was sparse or omitted altogether”

“Yes, but the questions were slanted pro nuclear”

“It did not give the information that renewable generation has spells of days, sometimes weeks every summer and winter, when the POWER output is around 5% or less of the installed capacity, including spells of two or three days when it is below 15. See December 07. That can include peak load times see graph attached BWEA web site”

“It did not tell that anticyclones frequently affect the UK in whole or in part, when all wind and wave machines have their output impaired, if not extinguished.”

“I fear you have been misled by reading with insufficient critical care both “The UK Wind Resource” by the Environmental Change Institute of Oxford University (see p5 photocopy attached) and their statement to the House of Lords Science Committee (2004): Renewable Energy: Practicalities, HL. Paper”

“This is evidenced by the statement that the UK aspires to 20% of electricity supplies should come from renewables, p77, without specifying, Energy or Power”

“Should the private sector not come forward with proposals that you favour, what will you do about it? Raise the subsidies? Let the private sector pollute? Let the lights go out? We should be told”

“Again, most of the information was helpful”

“Not enough documented and reasoned arguments against nuclear power, eg. safety / security / waste / cost”

“The: the definite article presupposes that the noun /thing that follows already exists. This is a CLOSED statement. An open question eg: Is there a role..., would have been genuinely consultative Eg. There was no information about waste site locations, which had not been decided, although it was supposed to be key to long term health, safety and security”

“To Hergen Haye Dr. Nuc. Pub. Engagement. Just to thank you for your reply / letter and latest questionnaire”

“There was very little information re hydro possibilities in the UK – no mention at all of the Severn proposition, let alone discussion. No discussion or info re wave / tide or sea current research (known to have been carried out)”

“But not enough RELEVANT information for an OBJECTIVE assessment of the pros and cons of”

“There was not enough detailed information about the greenhouse gas emissions associated with uranium processing. Also there was no mention of the kinds of greenhouse gases which will be required to restore nuclear sites following decommissioning etc”

“Having accessed the responses to the document via the web, it is clear that they come from a very wide spectrum of sources. I believe it would have been helpful if the document had included a basic technical glossary with more information of the UK's present and future electricity requirements; on coal, nuclear and wind power etc”

“It was very pro the nuclear argument”

“There was abundant information”

“It omitted many of the dangers and costs of nuclear power. It omitted any projection of improvements in renewable energy sources”

“Some technical matters could not possibly be fully covered for the layman to answer all questions in a well informed way”

“The consultation document was well prepared, balanced and thorough. It provides a valuable reference document on a wide range of issues relating to nuclear power”

Online:

"No, not on the cost, the complete cost, of nuclear, not on how it will combat climate change, not on health issues, certainly not on the risk of terrorism nuclear invites"

"The consultation documents presented a very selective (and unjustifiably favourable) view of the strengths and weaknesses of nuclear power. Many omissions - a description of the alternatives with their strengths and weaknesses, for example showing how some other countries of comparable population size and prosperity make far higher use of renewable energy resources, and have little if no dependence on nuclear power. The information provided on existing health hazards from radioactive leakages (try asking the Irish Govt!) was lamentably poor. Estimates of the possible risks of terrorist actions against power plants, and against transport of nuclear materials were non-existent. Compare with the highly publicised statements of risks from terrorist activities against air travel. No comment on the linkage between the nuclear power industry and the production of weapons grade nuclear materials"

"The original consultations did not include the films etc now available, just a dry series of formulaic questions designed to produce the answer that was sought"

"But, as I commented at the time, it seemed to be TOTALLY biased towards nuclear power; an impression reinforced by the fact that this is what the Government has decided on! What's the point of a consultation when you've already made up your mind?"

"Can't really comment - if there was more information perhaps I could have contributed more fully"

"However as a professional engineer and statistician, having over 30 years experience in electricity supply which covered reliability engineering, design, economics and financial risk assessment for distribution, transmission, and fossil-fired, nuclear and hydro plants and renewables I already had a great deal of information to hand"

"It did not consider any alternative to nuclear power"

"The information given made it quite clear what the government's view was. Information opposing nuclear power was not given and had to be obtained from other sources"

"No information provided about how nuclear power affects the overall operation of the electricity system"

"The consultation document was misleading and inaccurate, and did not allow for a fair discussion of the questions"

"The information provided was about as partisan and pro-nuclear as could be imagined. No weight was given to any arguments apart from pro-nuclear ones. This is one of the most disgusting aspects of the 'consultation'"

"I would have liked to see an overview of the questions before starting on a lengthy exercise. This would have allowed me to avoid much repetition and provide more succinct answers to each issue"

"The questions on planning changes were suspicious, since they were not specific and disposal was not covered in sufficient detail nor the associated cost and ownership"

"I know that some people found the consultation document and response from daunting"

"See comments below. Also there was confusion between the statement that waste may be kept in situ for up to 100 years to loose radioactivity, and the commitment to a deep geological repository. There is no way a government to commit to doing something in 100 years, so this was very unclear"

"It was biased, and ill-informed. Not giving information on issues, and missing out key information"

4

Did the consultation document provide the relevant information to enable you to contribute fully to the consultation?

	Written	Online	Combined result
Yes	105 (73%)	34 (63%)	139 (70%)
No	23 (16%)	18 (33%)	41 (21%)
Don't know	7 (5%)	2 (4%)	9 (5%)

Comment analysis

- not enough on role of the private sector (3)
- not enough on planning (3)

All comments

Written:

"Limited in proposal"

"There was a lack of thermodynamic information which is, of course, crucial and would demolish the nuclear case"

"Depends on what you mean by relevant!"

"I looked information up elsewhere to write my letter. Couldn't see anything about uranium shortage in the document"

"Over ? of information for lay digestion"

"See previous comment. It was too narrow"

"I liked the way that the document very fairly gave the facts and concerns about other forms of electricity"

"As far as I could tell"
 "It was comprehensive and I believe relevant"
 "Not nearly enough weight was given to the downside of nuclear power. This was criminal"
 "Insufficient attention given to alternatives"
 "The information provided did not look far enough into the future needs for energy which is specific to the UK. We in the UK are blessed with potential primary energy (depleted uranium and plutonium stocks) for over 100 years of electrical energy requirements – zero ? to boot, i.e. generation of reactors immediately, followed by fast breeder reactors and then fusion reactors after 2050"
 "As far as I think for the ordinary layman"
 "Relevant information which would not have supported the government's view was sparse or omitted altogether"
 "No. It didn't detail the full costs, including clean up costs, which were not fully quantified"
 "In the main, yes"
 "The problem of nuclear waste disposal NOW was ignored and therefore the comments on the future in this aspect was ill informed"
 "Information on the mining and transport of uranium omitted but needed to balance argument of clean at point of production. Uranium stocks not mentioned thus sustainability question not fully informed"
 "In so far that it made real problems with the decision clear"
 "A large part of relevant info. Was biased on the subject of carbon emissions from nuclear power plants, re the subject of global warming"
 "But not enough relevant information to compare nuclear with the far more environmentally friendly and much safer energy production from renewables"
 "The document gave considerable background and related information"
 "Also the assumptions about market forces and private industry being the only way, skewed the consultation – especially as it was not noted that nuclear power has needed taxpayers' money"
 "Details provided were somewhat biased towards nuclear, other research would have been more balanced"
 "But I recently attended an IEE paper (Powering the Nation by Ian Burdon – P.B. Power) read 19.2.08 at University of Exeter"
 "Did not partake on any formal consultation, ? been felt from the heart with case of ?? Nuclear Two"

Online:

"There was not enough information on the economics of nuclear. There was insufficient information on how nuclear will help combat climate change, especially taking into consideration the mining and transportation of ore, and the disposal of waste. But then, since the waste disposal issues of our existing fleet of NPS still haven't been solved, that's not surprisingly. There was no comparison with other western countries building a new fleet of power stations... perhaps, again because the evidence, positive evidence isn't there. Only Finland is trying, and they are already 3 times over budget and 3 times behind schedule after only 2 years. There was not enough objective information for people who don't have the time to research the topic to make an informed decision and respond fully"
 "See above. Also - it should have been made clear that there is actually no restriction at the current time on any commercial company applying for consent to build a nuclear power station. Many of those responding to the consultation would have been misled into thinking there is a current ban. The message that is being hidden from the UK general public is that no commercial company has wanted to build such a station in recent times because they are not cost effective. The consultation made it clear that there would be no subsidies for new nuclear, yet the White Paper says in Para 3.52: "Our policy on waste and decommissioning for new nuclear power stations is designed to ensure that operators make adequate arrangements to cover the full costs of decommissioning and a full share of waste management costs. Operators are responsible for decommissioning and waste management costs. If the protections we are putting in place through the Energy Bill prove insufficient, in extreme circumstances the Government may be called upon to meet the costs of ensuring the protection of the public and the environment." In other words there is a subsidy to provide for clean up should the commercial operator fail or be negligent"
 "I also used other means of confirming the information given"
 "But see comment on question 3 above"
 "My experience probably superior to those who set the questions: 40 years in nuclear research/power"
 "I was provided with selected relevant information, more information could have provided a fuller response potentially"
 "It did not consider any alternative to nuclear power"
 "No information provided about how nuclear power affects the overall operation of the electricity system"
 "The document contained information sympathetic to the viewpoint of the nuclear industry, and did not address issues of fuel scarcity over the lifetime of nuclear power, nor to the fact that the co2 emissions associated with the extraction and processing of the fuel are likely to increase hugely over the next 20-30 years"
 "Yes and no. Provided information, which was necessarily relevant as it was about the topic. However, the most relevant information, such as how little of our energy needs are actually related to electricity generation (as opposed to transport, heating etc) was missing"
 "Own independent research required"
 "Could have been more on waste disposal"
 "Reference lack of details on planning, waste & cost ownership"
 "I liked the way that the document very fairly gave the facts and concerns about other forms of energy"
 "I could not find info on the risks from radiation or radioactive waste. Without thorough researched info on this it isn't possible to evaluate nuclear power. If you can, point out where this information was in the consultation documents, if absent, how the consultation could be valid"
 "It did not"

5 Was there anything missing from the information provided?

	Written	Online	Combined result
Yes	46 (32%)	22 (41%)	68 (34%)
No	54 (38%)	17 (31%)	71 (36%)
Don't know	28 (19%)	12 (22%)	40 (20%)

Comment analysis

[comments analysed and added to analysis under Question 3]

All comments

Written:

"Your commitment to landscaping"

"A good knowledge of physics!"

"If nuclear is the (seemingly) preferred power option, there appeared to be no distinction or comparison between fusion (current) or fusion (future/potential) design"

"Neutron embrittlement of metals. Thermodynamic data on thermal efficiency"

"Analysis of foreign (French) experience would be useful"

"No clear picture of waste management or decommissioning, especially since societal ability in future to carry out these tasks is unknown"

"Whilst I am aware of the security of supply issues this I consider was inadequately covered"

"Genuine discussion of alternatives also missing"

"Facilities for storage of high level toxic waste left very vague. Low level waste not the serious problem"

"No reference to what might be the ultimate solution to the energy problem viz nuclear fusion in eventual place of other energy sources, including nuclear fissions – avoiding the problems of danger and waste. I know it is a hard nut to crack but the rewards would be so great and half hearted efforts as of now will not get us there in time"

"The vexed question of waste storage was perhaps not faced bravely enough"

"It was an extremely good summary of the arguments"

"I don't think there was an adequate description of what will happen if we do not have sufficient energy. (People actually lived in Port Mholair (Lewis) without oil, electricity and yes, up to 1970 but not many and not well)"

"This question would best be answered by comparing the consultation document against responses received.

Although that exercise would be pointless in the present context, the outcome should be used as background to other government consultations"

"It didn't stress the question of HMG having to consider, ie. Technical necessity for nuclear power not explained, plus financial and political reasons for doing so"

"Not that I was aware of"

"It was occasionally difficult to evaluate comparative costings"

"The usage of combined nuclear power with pumped storage"

"The need to re process fuel to obtain the maximum energy?"

"With regard to radioactive waste, I understand that a process has been developed in the USA for using this waste in a reactor with the potential for producing more electricity"

"Probably more relevant information about non nuclear alternatives"

"Much of the referenced material"

"A timeline for building. Get on with building 20-30 nuclear power stations and spend more money on fusion technology – less on Trident and futile wars in Iraq and Afghanistan"

"The health impact of the Chernoble disaster. The leaks and breakdowns from British plants"

"Not that I noticed"

"Clarification required on items noted"

"Facts about supply of nuclear fuel – de commissioning of Britain's ability to build and staff new stations could have been skipped?"

"The option to mothball old nuclear reactors for 80-100 years to reduce decommissioning costs to a reasonable level was not offered. The document did not consider the ordering of an initial 40,000 megawatts of identical stations, nor did it consider the refusal of permission to build any further fossil fuel stations and the banning of fossil fuel powered central heating in any new buildings. Also not enough emphasis was placed on the superb safety record of the nuclear industry over the last 50 years"

"Problems of skills shortage – at all levels, now that we have run down our R&D and plant construction staff. Even operating staff do not have PWR experience"

"Information which would not have supported the government's view eg. the case for a UK decentralised energy system and the negative impact development of nuclear power may have on the development of safer and cleaner technologies"

"Not enough on the risks of using nuclear. Not enough on the costs of using nuclear. A balanced view was missing"

"In my view there should have been greater detail on the disposal of waste, in particular with time scales for the waste remaining hazardous ie. literally thousands of years"
 "I would have liked a bit more information concerning bio fuels"
 "The TRUTH was missing"
 "Not enough information about the alternatives"
 "Data which is NEEDED but not yet available – eg. waste site (underground) locations"
 "Missing from the consultation was the hard nosed fact: How was any government going to be able to enforce payment by private companies to fully comply with all waste disposal and eventual decommissioning years and years ahead"
 "Better info about the alternative to nuclear energy, i.e. the wide variety of renewables"
 "The international politics and their potential influence on power supplies in the UK – risk to incoming fuel supply"
 "There was no information on carbon capture or how this was to be achieved or how and where it was to be disposed of"
 "The government's views on breeder reactors as a means of ensuring a longer life for nuclear fuel"
 "A balanced argument"
 "Not that I could see"
 "More information about private sector companies, planning issues, waste disposal sites and costs of disposal, emissions"
 "Information about the dangers, unreliability and finite resource of nuclear power"
 "The information provided in the consultation paper and supporting references was detailed and comprehensive"
 "No graphs of specific costs"
 "Almost no mention of Fast neutron reactors and their ability to make use of waste uranium"

Online:

"The UK government displayed a serious lack of understanding of the potential benefits of nuclear power. Many of my comments outlined additional benefits that the UK government had not considered"
 "A fair and balanced consideration of alternatives available, including energy efficiency, plus analysis of the costs incurred by nuclear from mining to waste"
 "It should have been made clear that there is actually no restriction at the current time on any commercial company applying for consent to build a nuclear power station. Many of those responding to the consultation would have been misled into thinking there is a current ban. The message that is being hidden from the UK general public is that no commercial company has wanted to build such a station in recent times because they are not cost effective. The consultation made it clear that there would be no subsidies for new nuclear, yet the White Paper says in Para 3.52 : "Our policy on waste and decommissioning for new nuclear power stations is designed to ensure that operators make adequate arrangements to cover the full costs of decommissioning and a full share of waste management costs. Operators are responsible for decommissioning and waste management costs. If the protections we are putting in place through the Energy Bill prove insufficient, in extreme circumstances the Government may be called upon to meet the costs of ensuring the protection of the public and the environment." In other words there is a subsidy to provide for clean up should the commercial operator fail or be negligent"
 "Clear information on the serious accident probabilities of nuclear fission, and investment/power supply information on real alternatives including micro generation"
 "It sometimes lacked detail but this was available from other sources"
 "I didn't have enough technical knowledge to be able to judge this"
 "How can I answer this? Vital information MAY have been excluded but I wouldn't know this necessarily"
 "It did not consider any alternative to nuclear power"
 "It did not provide other than biased information"
 "Yes. The web site forgot to mention that my views, along with the majority of the population would not be taken notice of"
 "Little was said of the disadvantages of nuclear power, of the recent study in Germany showing that the closer children live to nuclear power stations the more likely they are to contract leukemia, of the similarities of technology needed for nuclear power generation and nuclear weapons production, of the carbon emissions produced by building nuclear power stations and mining and transporting uranium, of the dangers of terrorist attack on a nuclear power station, of how we deal with huge quantities of yet more radioactive waste when we don't know what to do with that which we already have"
 "No information provided about how nuclear power affects the overall operation of the electricity system"
 "The information was biased and unscientific, and relied for many parts of its content on submissions from the nuclear plant construction, or nuclear fuel cycle production industries"
 "Detailed information about alternatives to nuclear, where the amount of information was extremely small. I can understand why the government wanted to limit this information: to portray nuclear as the only viable option, when this is not the case in the slightest. This is an example of how flawed the consultation was"
 "Planning detail, Waste disposal and waste disposal costs"
 "More references to the wider energy policy and other measures to tackle climate change by government would have helped diffuse some of the criticism I heard others raise that the consultation was too narrow"
 "Implications of Terrorism, Aviation, Nuclear waste disposal, types of Generator"
 "Especially re damage from radiation. I genuinely don't know whether to be in favour or not of nuclear power without this information"
 "Yes. A lot. I'm sure you can refer to Greenpeace's legal paperwork in regard to this"

Were you able to express your views fully in the consultation?

	Written	Online	Combined result
Yes	115 (80%)	41 (76%)	156 (79%)
No	15 (10%)	11 (20%)	26 (13%)
Don't know	4 (3%)	2 (4%)	6 (3%)

Comment analysis

- had written a letter to cover any additional points they wanted to make (7)
- the questions / consultation was biased / leading (5)
- felt their input would be ignored anyway (4)
- had gone outside the wording of the question to put their view (3)
- the questions were limiting (3)

All comments

Written:

"There was very little space in the response form to do this. In addition to 5 (above comments) there perhaps should have been space to drive a case for the coal fired stations, and the inherent financial / security of supplies / waste disposal advantages, disadvantages they now offer"

"I enclose a letter of David King or his replacement"

"But only be departing from the structured questions where necessary"

"I had connections with France since 1953 and knew they were very ahead with NP, hydro, tidal. Severn estuary, difficult in here?"

"I thought the online method was rigged"

"No nuclear power station has ever been completed on time or within budget"

"I noted the above comment briefly – it is a request for an increase in funds for the research and development of controlled nuclear fusion as the only long term solution possibly available in years to come, and only if expenditure internationally was promoted way beyond what is now being expended AND for instance spend in place of NASA experimenting on rockets etc to the stars"

"Yes, to the extent that one can write whatever one likes in a letter. But no because I FELT ? of what I said about other aspects of the NP cycle would be ignored"

"More or less"

"What about free solar power from sun, free wind power, free sea power. No waste to clear away"

"The time available to evaluate responses necessarily limited the size of a response"

"I had to add in comments where issues were not specifically raised"

"Including my comments before"

"Views could be expressed in the afternoon session, but only in small groups and over a very limited time"

"Govt. policy is too lax – you cannot leave everything to market forces. Govt. should take the lead in encouraging nuclear, not just sitting back and waiting. Also they should ACCELERATE decommissioning of old R&D sites to prove to nuclear deniers that that this can be done. The govt. does not recognise the importance of good PR"

"But only by writing a letter rather than completing the response form"

"No, because the questions were all slanted in favour of nuclear power"

"Though a little more space for replies to certain questions would have helped"

"I did my best. Was it read carefully by someone who could understand?"

"I felt I needed to append a written statement"

"The way some of the questions were worded made it difficult to answer"

"Not really. There should have been a choice provided, not nuclear yes /no

Solar power, wind power, tidal power, carbon capture etc. Should have been provided with more alternatives"

"The response form constrained how I could respond. All questions began: Do you agree with the govt.... a bullying linguistic tactic"

"Some of them"

"Views could be expressed, but only to answer questions as asked, thus limited in scope to some extent"

"But that says nothing about the quality of the consultation paper!"

"Sometimes there was not enough time"

"The range of questions gave a good coverage of the issues"

"The facilitator handled things well"

"There was no constraint on the amount of material that could be provided in writing in response to the consultation, and there were plenty of opportunities to contribute at the stakeholder events"

Online:

“But, without wanting to be rude, I don’t know why I bothered because the Government seems to have already made up its mind before this so-called consultation (as, I have to add, it always seems to; e.g. the “consultation” on Incapacity Benefit to which, as a former recipient (before I qualified for my pension) I also contributed extensively”

“Without presenting alternatives to nuclear, an informed decision could not be made and a clear expression of views was therefore not possible”

“The questions repeatedly pointed towards obtaining endorsement for atomic power”

“The stakeholder event was a lobbying exercise by the nuclear industry, and those few people who had opposing views were steamrollered into submission by the quantity of opposition”

“It was a struggle to get past the government’s extremely biased views”

“As the most important questions re damage from nuclear were not addressed as there was no info on damage to life forms including people, I couldn’t contribute my views on this all-important aspect”

“No, and neither was the rest of the country. The fundamental aim to have a decent unbiased consultation was a sham to wedge nuclear power in from the off, pre-decided before the consultation. It missed out key opinions and areas of consultation, and not taking into account most of the science and economic issues”

7 Were the questions to the consultation clear?

	Written	Online	Combined result
Yes	125 (87%)	44 (81%)	169 (85%)
No	7 (5%)	7 (13%)	14 (7%)
Don’t know	-	3 (6%)	3 (2%)

Comment analysis

- the questions were leading / biased (12)

All comments**Written:**

“Whether they were and are relevant is another matter. How do I know they were not loaded?”

“But rather constraining if you simply limited your response to answering them”

“Too wrapped up in jargon”

“The reason for asking them in that form was not stated”

“Many of the questions were far too broad, were asked with far too many words, and did not permit of a Y?N answer without being misleading”

“But there was a lot of repetitiveness”

“To get agreement”

“Except they seemed weighted to produce expected results”

“Question 7 was ref. transportation, but various assumptions were referred to in paras 84 & 85. To me the question did not line up properly with the text”

“And very biased, showing clearly the government’s slant in favour of nuclear power”

“The factors involved were clearly defined”

“One had to unpick the assumptions and challenge these”

“Could have been better”

Online:

“Clearly leading and pro-nuclear, yes”

“I can’t actually remember but I think they were”

“Generally, although I found the questions leading and self-fulfilling”

“But they were the wrong questions”

“Although some questions seemed a little odd”

“Biased questions, framed questions”

8 How easy was it to input your views to the consultation?

	Written	Online	Combined result
Very easy	49 (34%)	22 (41%)	71 (36%)
Fairly easy	63 (44%)	22 (41%)	85 (43%)
Not very easy	11 (8%)	7 (13%)	18 (9%)
Not at all easy	12 (8%)	2 (4%)	14 (7%)

All comments

Written:

“See 5 and 6 above. It was impossible to print extracts from 2 papers I produced relating to supply of electricity, eg 1) May 1972 to Chairman of NCB via the Open University
2) Thesis, November 1977 – for PhD on Electricity/coal/nuclear”

“Provided you departed from the scripted questions”

“Local generation not mentioned, volts loss in national grid a serious waste of energy”

“I just wrote what I thought”

“Will anybody take a blind bit of notice of the views, should any of them be inconvenient – as many will be”

“It required an interest in technical subjects with which I was, fortunately, familiar”

“I wrote a letter but I wanted to attend a meeting. There were none anywhere near me”

“I expressed views I have held for years in favour of nuclear generation of electricity using proven fission technology pending the development of fusion techniques”

“I was not able to download the response form separately from the consultation document”

“Only because I have a good knowledge of power stations and other relevant facts”

“Many issues were complex. Hence easy answers were not really what was needed”

“I can fill in a form but apparently your staff cannot cope with elementary correspondence. Children learn in primary school how to read and write, so what is their excuse? And why do you employ them? The attempt to copy my letter was abysmal”

“For written reply on the response form”

“Should have been more space for comments in writing – we don’t all have computers”

“Very little time was allowed from receiving the consultation package to having to submit completed comments”

“Morning session – very easy. Afternoon session – time to read handouts and express views was very limited”

“Due to questions asked. The immediate requirement (although some 10 years too late) is obviously nuclear but there is also an important future requirement as I have indicated in 4 above which the questions did not take into account”

“This is why I wrote a letter”

“I can write”

“The input of my views was simple, but time consuming. But I feel this was inevitable in order for me or anybody to express their views”

“Either, or, type of questions do not allow proper expression of views”

“It helped to have these sections under: comments”

“But I don’t think any contrary views will be considered”

“Without detailed and to some degree technical knowledge it is not very easy to present a good case for argument. Although to many simple souls common sense would seem the correct answer”

“But the consultation paper contained no provision for commenting on the consultation as a whole, so I had to cram a general comment into a space reserved for other purposes”

“Not at all easy. There was no address given for responses. Also, people were not given the same amount of time to respond in Welsh as for those who wished to respond in English”

“Needed more information”

Online:

“If you have access to a computer, which of course many people still do not have (especially not for the length of time it takes to research, read and answer the consultation - 15 minutes in a library isn’t enough, and internet cafes are expensive)”

“But it took a VERY long time!”

“I initially began my feedback on one computer and subsequently switched to another, and my responses had not been retained, therefore I was unable to comment as fully as I had intended as I had to repeat my input”

“I wanted to know why, 27 years after the House of Commons select committee on energy demanded that the exercise be undertaken, the UK government has still failed to examine the basic question: is it cheaper to save electricity, or to build nuclear power stations. This option never seems to have been considered”

“The online system was very user-unfriendly, which is the reason why I didn’t complete my submission - I gave up early on in the process as it was extremely onerous”

“The word limit could have been slightly longer to allow for more details for some of the questions”

“See above”

“Quite difficult to read all the information on screen before each response box. Text was designed for a printed document rather than a web page. Also hard to see how far through the process one was - I suspect a number of people gave up before reaching Q 16”
 “One uses a keyboard”

9 How easy was it to view the results of the consultation online?

	Written	Online	Combined result
Very easy	29 (20%)	17 (31%)	46 (23%)
Fairly easy	24 (17%)	29 (54%)	53 (27%)
Not very easy	3 (2%)	2 (4%)	5 (3%)
Not at all easy	7 (5%)	2 (4%)	9 (5%)

Comment analysis

- had no access to online facilities / computers (25)
- had not viewed the results (7)
- had not tried to view the results (6)

All comments

Written:

“I have no PC/online facility”
 “The quill pen is mightier than the computer and other electronic fads”
 “Did not go online”
 “Do not have computer”
 “No experience, did not use”
 “I have no computer. I can't afford one due to living on state benefits as a carer”
 “No comment on website which I did not see”
 “Not tried”
 “I didn't do it”
 “Did not go online”
 “I did not try – I can guess the range of arguments and none would/do interest me”
 “Have not done so, but will now do so”
 “No access at time”
 “As still a bit of a Luddite – do not use/view online consultation”
 “I'm not sure how to understand this question, so you may guess my answer from other comments!”
 “No online facility”
 “I don't know”
 “Rather than page numbers for searching the dBase perhaps the initial and second letter might speed searches”
 “No online availability”
 “No access to computer”
 “The telephone number for a hard copy is at premium rates during the day and unavailable out of working hours. It is technically impossible to get an internet connection at the above address, and most inconvenient to visit a local library”
 “Not used, no personal computer”
 “Not used”
 “Not applicable since I am not online”
 “Don't have broadband, BT won't provide”
 “I don't have the internet”
 “I do not have a computer so cannot answer this question”
 “Fair assessment of my views”
 “I am not online but could probably view responses at local library”
 “I am computer illiterate”
 “However, I do not use a computer very often”
 “Not used”
 “Not at all easy”
 “Although not online at home, I used the facilities at my local library”
 “Didn't apply to me”
 “Not replied online”
 “I have not yet looked at the online responses”
 “Didn't try – no access”

"Didn't try"
 "Instant brainwashing, indoctrination machines"
 "That was quite impressive. However, it is evident that the government took no notice of the many excellent arguments against nuclear power"
 "I did not look because you decided, mistakenly, that my contribution was too late"
 "No computer"
 "I have not tried"
 "I haven't got access online"
 "Not online"
 "The loading and indexing of all non-confidential responses to the consultation is to be applauded"
 "Not used"
 "Not online"
 "Not online"
 "Cannot use online, only written out please"
 "I could not see a way to access directly any comment on a particular topic. In particular, that of Fast neutron reactors which I wished to introduce for discussion as a way o making far greater use of mined uranium with consequent benefits to waste management, security of supply, environmental impact of mining etc."

Online:

"A bit confusing, I misunderstood the inclusion of my comments; I expected to find my name in each group referenced"

10 How satisfied are you with the way the consultation was structured overall (including the website)?

	Written	Online	Combined result
Very satisfied	39 (27%)	25 (46%)	64 (32%)
Fairly satisfied	62 (43%)	9 (17%)	71 (36%)
Not very satisfied	13 (9%)	6 (11%)	19 (10%)
Not at all satisfied	14 (10%)	13 (24%)	27 (14%)

Comment analysis

- decision had been made (4)
- could not access the website (3)
- the questions and consultation were biased (2)
- would have like to know who had been involved (2)
- the information had been too wordy and confusing (2)

All comments

Written:

"The impression given was of a stitch up on a pre-determined nuclear bias"
 "This was 10 years overdue leaving Britain at the mercy of foreign (unstable and unfriendly) powers"
 "The Government's presumption in favour, rather showed through. It was not clear to me via the consultation process why the Government's attitude to nuclear power has changed so rapidly"
 "Not familiar with websites. There were 2 consultations in 2 years – must have caused delay"
 "I hope you've gathered that by now"
 "With the parts of it I did follow"
 "As I say above, meetings in cities is NOT enough"
 "No idea – I don't know whether the right kind of people were consulted and whether or not many of the people who responded were biased"
 "Seems ok. Nothing to compare it with. How do you know you consulted a balanced audience?"
 "The process did not allow for the concept of a UK energy mix with no nuclear power"
 "A bit uneasy"
 "We must commence work asap"
 "Considering the enormity of the topic and the magnitude of potential respondents"
 "Obviously designed to put off those against and obviously an exercise that was not going to make any difference to decisions already made"
 "I found it very long and sometimes difficult to supply a reasoned answer. Would have had to have spent a long time on it to respond in full"
 "Can't access the website"
 "Too little time allowed to make some sense of highly technical information"

"I didn't have a website"
 "HMC could never satisfy the likes of Greenpeace"
 "Not covering full range of topics"
 "No computer"
 "Biased questions. Decision already made. Public input ignored"
 "NOT very satisfied. The information was buried in too many words"
 "Taking the various energy comparisons into consideration, I myself found very confusing"
 "Statements before the consultation finished by both Tony Blair and Gordon Brown and the then energy minister seemed to render the exercise somewhat farcical"
 "More importance needed to be placed on urgency to provide adequate power in ten years rather than Co2 reduction"
 "It wasn't a consultation, the decision had already been made"
 "(Excluding website) The consultation re private companies building the running nuclear power stations seems to have gotten too entangled in the global warming question"
 "The questions were slanted towards favouring the nuclear option because of their environmental benefits – rather than security of supply, which is the key issue"
 "Insufficient information (see above) also, the government's pro nuclear bias was too obvious"
 "I think my response to q11 – which was that biofuel and sequestration need a full consultation, at least to the level of this one – is incorrectly allocated to: Need for fuel environmental / assessment / costing! The responses allocated to this category are relating to assessment / costing of nuclear not to a level playing field for other solutions, which have the potential to be environmentally damaging rather than being a positive contribution to the problem"
 "But annoyed by what I considered to be fallacious assumptions and the lack of independent assessments"
 "This consultation was well structured and run by BERR and its sub-contractors. The website was clear and easy to find. It would have benefited from a page of latest news to flag up when additions to the site were made during the process"

Online:

"Deeply unsatisfied and severely disillusioned with the government and consultation process"
 "For the reasons outlined above - the information provided was heavily biased in favour of the nuclear option"
 "I can't really answer this because I'm not sure whether you mean the methods given for people to reply or the way the questions were worded. If the former I would say I was "fairly satisfied" but if the latter it would be "not at all satisfied!"
 "This was less of a consultation than a rubber-stamping exercise, demonstrated by Gordon Brown's announcement that the UK intended to pursue the nuclear option before the consultation was even complete"
 "It was clear from the start that only one conclusion was ever going to be reached"
 "I felt some of the questions were referenced too closely to information provided and were therefore more about supporting the documentation provided than about a wider discussion of nuclear power"
 "It was fine apart from the glaring faults mentioned. However if the information I couldn't find was there and I failed to spot it, please invalidate all my comments above"
 "VERY UNSATISFIED. Completely dissatisfied"

11 How important do you think it is for Government to consult stakeholders and the public on these sorts of issues?

	Written	Online	Combined result
Very important	101 (70%)	47 (87%)	148 (72%)
Fairly important	9 (6%)	4 (7%)	13 (7%)
Not very important	5 (3%)	1 (1%)	6 (3%)

Comment analysis

- only important if decision has not been paid / pointless if the decision had been made (12)
- the public did not have enough knowledge to be able to take part in these consultations (10)
- consultation was only useful if government listened to, took account of and/or acted on the responses they received (10)
- Government should decide / lead on these sorts of issues (8)
- consultation was vital (including for public education) (8)
- consultation had been used as a delaying tactic and Government should get on and make a decision (7)

All comments

Written:

"Probably useless"

"With the understanding that arguments are not ring fenced, and that options/alternatives are featured"

"Read Prof. Northcote Parkinson's book on committee meetings. Then remember it's the odd quality opinion which matters rather than the bleatings of the bureaucratic sheep"

"But – a conclusion has to be made and consultation is being used as an excuse for inaction"

"To establish majority opinion. Minority work at publicity of their negative opinions"

"However it is very difficult to make such a complex subject easy to comment on"

"I think it can be very difficult for many stakeholders and members of the public to understand the huge complexities involved in issues such as these; but equally Government finds it difficult to take a long term approach that these issues require. It is vital that consultees believe that decisions have not already been taken"

"Government is elected to DO the decisions. Unfortunately our infrastructure – well educated in the Arts, is not generally strong in Science and mathematics. Top French people in maths choose their own career and can start near the top"

"But it has to be a GENUINE consultation, not a stitch up"

"Not enough information being brought to the general public. I was a scientific intelligence officer in civil defence in 50s and 60s therefore interested"

"They should just get on and do it"

"I believe it is CRUCIAL, since anything else is seen as smoke and mirrors"

"Technical decisions, such as deciding which form of energy is required to maintain our standard of living, require technical expertise. Public opinion, determined largely by the media, is not necessarily able to judge the merits of the various options"

"This is probably the most controversial issue of our time"

"A government should not need to consult, they should know what is best for the country. They wouldn't consult on how to run a war"

"But the government must decide. Too much time can be wasted consulting. We need to make progress QUICKLY!"

"A democratic government is elected to govern. Citizens can express their views via MPs, letters to the press etc"

"And act on responses following wishes of majority"

"The way we can obtain a better cross section view. Rather than just have pressure groups (the unelected government) dictating and they are NOT always right"

"A difficult question because I feel that only about 20% of the population can understand the reasons for nuclear instead of wind farms etc"

"It is a difficult task as there is much uninformed prejudice about complex issues"

"Always providing one has a confidence that respondees are well informed"

"Public knowledge on these issues would be too limited due to adverse publicity of green parties"

"So far the government has paid far too much importance and reliance upon renewables which can only ever make a truly miniscule contribution to meeting the demand of the electricity grid system"

"But only if they take any notice of people's wishes"

"It helps in that many in the general public know more about the matter than the government"

"At the end of the day the elected government, not the stakeholders, must take the decision"

"It is unfortunate the government felt the need to hold a formal consultation on nuclear power. The government frequently announces new policies / initiatives in many areas e.g. education, health, etc. without embarking on a formal consultation. If, as seems probable, that the proportion of the public that responded to this consultation process proves to be small, what conclusions can be safely drawn from the result? If the response shows a majority against the government's position on nuclear power, would it change its policy?"

"I am concerned that the antis do not swamp the rest of the opinion"

"Get on with it – ignore the Jeremiahs before the earth ignites"

"I think it's a sham"

"So long as it does not delay work any further, already well overdue"

"It was worth consulting on this issue, but there are too many consultations"

"Stakeholders are an integral part of the consultation process. They have views not just on local issues, but have an insight into the overall plans as they interact with all interested parties"

"Government members represent the population as a whole so it is important they should know what the electorate want"

"Provided government genuinely intending to take findings into account"

"It depends what is meant by stakeholders. As far as the public are concerned, not at all. The public are fed false information by organisations such as Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth etc. and are therefore not in a position to put forward rational arguments – sad to say but it is a fact. I experience this from my friends and many acquaintances"

"Vital – public view of nuclear is negative primarily out of ignorance and unfounded fear of accidents. A major effort to disseminate information is essential in a democracy"

"I think it is difficult for general members of the public to form views on the various points and problems, and emphasis should be given to the views of technically qualified organisations and individuals"

"As long as the public's views are not ignored"

"Your consultation paper was an opportunity to ask focussed questions to decide whether the respondent was just airing prejudices, perhaps gathered from uninformed sources, or whatever. That would have given a clue as to what publicity campaign might need to be mounted"

"Although I feel it is very important for the government to consult, I feel also that, in many ways, it is a complete waste of time as I am convinced the government has made its decision irrespective of other views and is just going through the motions. Typically, I do not know of anyone who feels that consultations by the post office regarding closures have any influence whatsoever"

"I cannot over emphasise the importance I attach to consultation. In addition to everything else its education regarding the issue and helping to get people on side"

"Although, judging by the correspondence I had on this matter, before your consultation response form arrived, Mr Gordon Brown and his predecessor, Mr Tony Blair, had already made up their minds on expanding the nuclear programme in this country"

"With so much unvetted and ill informed opinions available to a largely non scientific public, it is perhaps inevitable that anti nuclear (indeed anti science) sentiments can flourish. Consultation is part of the process of ensuring a balanced debate"

"You wouldn't listen to the public in any case. This consultation is meaningless as govt. had already decided on this issue"

"To avoid argument and ignorance in the public domain"

"The government appears to have made up its mind in advance of the consultation, so the value of this exercise seems to be doubtful"

"But should be genuine and open ended"

"But, the response needs to be considered rather than used as a PR exercise or a response to a requirement"

"The depth of involvement of the public and their hopes and wishes on any issue would hopefully be properly considered"

"In this particular case, it was evident that the government had already come to its conclusions about the issues prior to this consultation"

"I don't think the public have a clue what the real issue is, having been indoctrinated into perceiving that wind farms are an option!"

"But I am probably wasting my time because it was decided, mistakenly, that my contribution was submitted too late"

"It was blatantly obvious from the style and content of the responses, that a high proportion of respondents had little or no knowledge of the nuclear industry or modern power generation, and consequently the comments were strongly tempered by emotion"

"Especially as nuclear power is inherently dangerous and was not part of government policy"

"Even as it is, we feel over-ridden by government decisions and confident that even though the public are consulted, decisions have already been made"

"In this case, we believe that the consultation met the requirement in the 2003 Energy White Paper for government to carry out the fullest public consultation before reaching its final decision"

It is important that government gathers a wide range of opinions before reaching decisions on important and potentially controversial matters such as nuclear power, but it must ultimately be for government to make decisions. The cost of carrying out extensive consultations can be high, and consultation on this scale should not be assumed to be desirable in every case

Nevertheless, government should carry out wide consultation on such matters and place significant weight on the findings. The provision of reliable, balanced information to consultees on the issues is key to the success and validity of such exercises"

"There are too few engineers as MPs"

"Very important even if governments claim their action is very important, as it usually is.

But in the last resort, governments have the right to decide but if opposition is strong a referendum or new election is desirable"

Online:

"Too many people do know the truth about nuclear power. Consulting these uneducated people does not help the government move ahead with the construction of new nuclear power plants, which is needed to save the world.

So consultation is great, but not if it delays action until it is too late"

"But only if you intend to follow their wishes. This consultation was a travesty of democracy"

"You appear to have managed to solicit only 949 responses to your survey. The result of which was, on the whole, negative towards new nuclear power. 949 is less than 1.5 times the number of MPs in Parliament. I believe had you obtained wider response you would have received an even more negative result"

"It depends how much notice they take of the responses! See my comment on Q6"

"Governments tends to be swayed by party politics, and not by what is the most cost effective and correct solution to a problem"

"Consultation may be useful to see the public's view of various options about public policy and to test the strength of arguments. On occasion, genuinely fresh ideas may be submitted, but this is probably rare and should not be seen as the main purpose of exercises like this. Government must not use such consultation as a delaying tactic or cover for difficult decisions. It must take those decisions on their merits on the basis of the best knowledge available (largely scientific and economic in the present case), not by plebiscite"

"The government is ultimately there to represent the views of the public and if they right stakeholders are involved, a broad representation of differing views can be considered"

"But only if they do not seek to bias the results by presenting distorted information in the first place"

"However, if they are going to disregard the majority viewpoint, then no, they need not bother"

"But consultation has to be genuine and all sides of the argument given. The successful Greenpeace challenge to the first consultation shows its inadequacies"

“And this is why this consultation is such a travesty, and an injustice for Britain. The consultation was a joke and the government should be forced to hold another, proper, consultation”
 “However I don't believe they had any intention of changing their plan whatever the consultation since they didn't include a for or against clear vote”
 “But elected governments must still make the decisions”
 “This way we can obtain a better cross section view, rather than just have pressure groups (the un-elected government) dictating, and they are NOT always right”
 “Essential due to the impact government decisions have on people's lives”
 “I do think it essential for the public to be consulted. However, I also think this government pays little or no attention to the views of the general public. It is also easily swayed by activist pressure groups: Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth et al!”
 “Trick question. Very important if it influences decisions. If it doesn't as many believe it is disingenuous and a waste of our time and public money”
 “It is very important. Perhaps you can tell me when you actually get around to do this decently”

Lessons for the future

12 Overall, what were the best elements of the consultation that you took part in? Anything specific that worked well? And why?

Comment analysis

- the Consultation Document (15)
- the amount and quality of the information provided (12)
- the website / online (10)
- the best thing was that the consultation had happened at all (9)
- the structure and format (8)
- being invited and taking part (5)
- the report back / being able to view comments (4)
- good to edit online input over time (3)
- structure allowed them to expand on the issues (3)

All comments

Written:

“You must impress on the population that Space Ship Earth is slowly running out of fuel, (gas, oil and coal) with atomic fuel being almost endless in supply”
 “The information that uranium will run out by 2100. As a professional geologist I can confirm this. So nuclear is not a long term solution!”
 “The consultation document itself, helped me respond to the questions and add any views of my own”
 “Best? - Invitation to comment”
 “Good to be consulted and have opportunity to input”
 “I thought the Document was very thoroughly prepared, easy to understand and addressed all my questions”
 “It was clearly laid out the pros and cons of nuclear power as against other forms of energy production. This enabled me to answer the questions fully”
 “It stated the facts clearly on why the government is looking into nuclear power”
 “Well presented for general understanding of key issues”
 “Good, clear English and well laid out consultation document”
 “The chance to have a voice”
 “Allowing us to expand on the issues”
 “The consultation wasn't supposed to encourage questioning if the need to build more power stations. I think the not encouraging questioning worked rather well”
 “Shorter timescale – so that work on nuclear construction can actually commence”
 “I had a chance to have my say”
 “The fact that you have actually replied to my small submission”
 “That it happened at all”
 “The clarity and comprehensive contents of the consultation document The Future of Nuclear Power”
 “Discussion with other people”
 “Those that provided information on the various options for producing energy. Should be part of school curricula”
 “The consultation document properly set out the government's view, and posed a structure of questions to which responses were sought”
 “The wide spectrum of stakeholders considered”
 “It was, if anything, too detailed, in its attempt to be seen to be impartial”

"The format, eg. which such sectors was followed by specific questions which called for specific answers, was excellent"
 "It was interesting to discover the views of other participants"
 "I think it is a mistake to have nuclear power"
 "Opportunities to express nuances on a very complex question"
 "The information book was clear and I thought fair"
 "The meeting on site close to Hartlepool power station to get the views of everyone"
 "I liked the comparisons for alternative energy supplies and how the for and againsts were covered. Written quite well!"
 "It has been an effective exercise"
 "The consultation covered all aspects of nuclear power and asked for opinions on each"
 "I am pleased that HMG has at last shown interest in public approval of nuclear (if they get it!) "
 "All"
 "It was available"
 "But we must not allow any more prolonged consultation to harbinge the start of building new nuclear power stations. The antis have been given too much importance in the past and proven wrong"
 "The format: the statement of intent; argument; question is a well tried technique. It provokes thought for counter argument"
 "Large numbers of people took part in the event. There were groups and the event was in London (central London) and was well organised"
 "There weren't any"
 "Perhaps, someone, somewhere will have read my full contribution; it is probably unlikely to lead to employment"
 "A well written, cogently argued consultation document is a model for future consultations"
 "Detailed analyses were presented on all the important issues related to nuclear power and electrical power generation"
 "Better publicity for the document. I think the forum for replying was good – helped to be focussed"
 "The broad range of the questions raised"
 "All of it"
 "Plenty of technical information"
 "Ignore govt. Take direct action"
 "Produce clear objective papers"
 "Local consultation and what is achievable with local participation. Identifiable cost savings and redevelopment of resources"
 "Overall brief was constructive and informative"
 "The London consultation on 8th Sept was very tightly and efficiently run"
 "The document was supplied free"
 "Document was very clear and easily understood"
 "I suppose the best elements were that in some small way of my participation resulted in the government eventually giving the green light to nuclear power"
 "Logical and well ordered"
 "Provision of a hard copy consultation document and response form. I don't have a computer"
 "None. Leads to a feeling it isn't worth taking part"
 "Well presented information"
 "In this matter we are all stakeholders, and the government should ask and listen, particularly to informed opinion. That may mean you need to inform the opinion"
 "All information appears to have been given, possibly too much, in that reading the full details was very time consuming"
 "I liked the option of submitting a separate letter additional to response to given questions"
 "Nothing in particular"
 "I found the gov't's opinions and conclusions clearly and fairly set out – and therefore supportable"
 "A consultation is a good idea if genuine in practice"
 "The detail in chapters 1 to 13 was well presented and easy to understand"
 "The case for a new generation of reactors is well made – but should have been made 5 years ago at least"
 "Getting the documentation"
 "The balance of the individual groups on 08.09 was very good and led to very full discussion"
 "Public discussion"
 "The admittance of the present lack of forward planning, particularly on waste storage"
 "Even in a consultation which only goes through the motions of consulting, I think it is important for the public to put their views on record"
 "Round table discussions and feedback into plenary"
 "It was well structured"
 "Helped to understand nuclear power"
 "Very well put across"
 "As stated above, the issues were clearly set out and plenty of background and supporting information was given to justify the case being put forward"
 "The large number of questions raised concerning all aspects of nuclear power generation"
 "Having a consultation"
 "I am glad there was a consultation"
 "Being offline, I find it difficult to judge the balance of other respondents' reaction. Also whether dedicated anti nuclear power respondents gave an unrepresentative weighted view"

“The organisation of the day was marvellous. The computerised presentation on the screen was particularly impressive. It gave rapid results of the voting and analysed them”
 “The regional and local stakeholder events were well run, and provided a valuable opportunity to listen to a wide range of stakeholder views”
 “Consultation is essential with unbiased details supplied”

Online:

“The web interface that allowed responses to edited worked very well for me”
 “Best? I suppose it would be the ease of access to the consultation over the internet - although I am unable to comment on how easy it was to gain access to this for those who had no internet access”
 “It was easy to put in responses and return to them at a later date for revision”
 “It was attempted”
 “Just being allowed to take part”
 “I felt that I have taken part in a truly democratic and thorough process. I especially appreciated being given the right to view the overall responses to the individual questions, rather than just being given the numbers”
 “Careful analysis of the pros and cons and a rational explanation of the position proposed by the Government on these various issues”
 “The fact that the consultation was available to all interested persons who could give their views on the problems likely to be encountered”
 “I suppose it gave me the opportunity to give my views - it's always gratifying to have one's views requested - but this, of course, has been spoiled by the fact that, as previously remarked, the Government seems to have made up its mind before it started the "consultation””
 “I was able to put my viewpoint clearly. Whether it would count is another matter”
 “It was useful to view, after the consultation process, how my comments were interpreted and grouped”
 “It is good that consultation occurs at all”
 “The report back”
 “I think it was healthy that Government presented a viewpoint and the basis for it rather than pretending that it is a completely neutral arbiter. Consultees may disagree but government should at least be prepared to state its position. The form suggesting specific questions was helpful, if a little mechanical, but gave a good basis for focusing on the key issues. I could have added more elsewhere if I had wanted to and I see that many of the corporate respondees did indeed do that”
 “I only took part in the on-line consultation. It was fine”
 “The comprehensive reporting back to the participants”
 “Nothing. There is no point in taking part if the minority rule”
 “Easy to partake”
 “Simple online access”
 “I think the 'consultation' was an exercise in PR and was unfair to the principles of democratic governance”
 “Full explanations, & reference to changes in planning”
 “Providing the avenue to submit responses online was very appealing. This allows easier accessibility, especially for people or groups that can't easily be present at other events to voice their opinions”
 “Technical matters ran smoothly”
 “Reasonably clear questions to respond to with well-expressed rationale for the government's preliminary view”
 “Given the range and varying complexity of questions the ability to revisit and revise or add to responses was most helpful”
 “Online access worked well, particularly being able to come back and edit or append entries”
 “Consultation should have been better advertised”
 “The ability to qualify your responses and then to have them comprehensively analysed and classified”
 “I was pleased to see that the Government proposals included many of the ideas that I tried to advance. Indeed the exercise made me think through and firm up on these ideas”
 “Lots of educated input on both sides”
 “Regional stakeholder events were well run, with lots of opportunity for input”
 “I liked the comparisons for alternative energy supplies and how the 'Fors' and 'Againsts' were covered”
 “That there purported to be a consultation is good, how it was structured did not make it easy to partake of. I think those living within 30 miles of existing nuclear plants should be physically given a questionnaire to complete with an on-line option - many with an interest in the Country are not yet on line”
 “Clear questions, ease of access and response, very clearly written”
 “None”

13 What do you think worked least well? And why?

Comment analysis

- it was that the questions and process overall biased / leading (11)
- nothing did not work well; it was all good (8)
- questions had been limiting (6)
- decision already made (6)
- consultation document too long / detailed / complicated (5)
- no debate about alternatives (3)

- it was that Government was still talking, and no action (3)
- 'all of it' (3)

All comments

Written:

- "Lack of space within response form for discussing coal vis-a-vis nuclear, and fusion versus fusion design. If nuclear is to be favoured, it should be on the fusion process"
- "The huge cost to the tax payer of the subsidies necessary to implement the nuclear option"
- "Worst – still talking after 50+ years"
- "Hard to find out that the consultation was happening and how to get involved"
- "It took me a bit of effort and time to answer the questions fully and someone may not have the time or incentive to do this"
- "Government permitted Friends of the Earth to delay nuclear option decision – should have been at least 5 years earlier"
- "I am afraid the old DTI culture persists. On energy, this is an emphasis on large generating plant, and technical complexity. On context, insufficient heed to social issues, or measurements, beyond GDP. This was a DTI, not Govt. consultation, and it showed"
- "Lack of emphasis on the security of supply issues"
- "Any genuine debate on the alternatives, because the government didn't want such a thing"
- "I was satisfied overall"
- "Not enough attention to effects of rising sea level threat to power stations. Cost of sea defence?"
- "Inappropriately pitched to achieve a broad response from the general public"
- "The years that have been lost in consultation, when decisions were required"
- "The narrowness of the exercise, in terms of public meetings and the NP cycle"
- "Local public meeting tended to take all as 1 group – not enough time for smaller discussion groups, though everybody did have an opportunity to have their say"
- "I think many of the people who are genuinely concerned by the future generations and are best informed about the energy needs never even heard of the consultation. Why? Well not everyone was consulted"
- "The consultation document should have more fully acknowledged points of objection which were already well known. The response form should have allowed more space for responses outside the structure of questions"
- "The whole debate should have been given huge, unprecedented amounts of mass media time and coverage, with environmental groups able to present to the public the facts about the scientifically proven dangers of nuclear power"
- "The vote against that (nuclear power)"
- "Complexity of situation that required very complex answers"
- "It was well and carefully written – if in part a little repetitious"
- "The people against nuclear power trying to take over and rule the discussions"
- "Stakeholders meeting could have been structured better and needed more time"
- "I didn't find any problems"
- "The combining of nuclear power with low carbon economy. The question of the use of nuclear power should stand on its own. Low carbon and global warming is a separate issue"
- "It didn't suggest that wind farms are uneconomic and that power stations cannot be started in minutes (when wind drops!)"
- "All"
- "A clear picture of the alternatives"
- "Because of legal challenge to consultation it was too lengthy"
- "This particular format excludes much of individual opinion, whilst relevant to the case, falls outside the intent of the question"
- "Everything worked very well"
- "It is insulting for the contribution of a physicist, written in excellent English, to be so disgracefully distorted so that it makes no sense; some readers might think I even wrote the rubbish myself"
- "Far too much detail repeated many times. I can see why it is necessary to give adequate detail but think it could have been simplified and shortened. Two PhD's I contacted couldn't cope with the length and detail"
- "Difficult to access referenced documents in the consultation document"
- "Some salient issues. For example, the consequences of a non nuclear future were hardly addressed"
- "Not enough time to digest technical information"
- "The size of document which took a lot of reading"
- "Thought it was well done"
- "Some meetings were long winded and personal. Antipathy came to the fore by groups with vested interests. But ? has little to do with local activities, some did not even reside in the area"
- "Clarification of waste(?) storage proposals on commercial sites. Commitment to long term waste storage facility before proceeding. Commitment to waste processing before proceeding"
- "In the afternoon session some of the handouts were fairly lengthy, read out by the facilitator, leaving very limited time for expressing views"
- "No acknowledgement of my written response"
- "Not comprehensive. I was not informed about stakeholder meetings or community groups"
- "To me some of the reading was complicated"

“The consultation document and response form were presented in such a way that unless you had or sought alternative information it was difficult to refute the government’s view”

“My response to question 4, published on your website was not accurate, and recorded that I thought Chernobyl had a good design, instead of a bad design. Transcripts should be accurate and I have written to BERR”

“The biased questions”

“Not much chance to put forward ideas for additional sources of energy, which will be needed alongside nuclear energy, and energy caring ideas”

“It was all too wordy. The important details were buried, and the questions poorly presented”

“Possibly a summary of each chapter could be given”

“The layout of the document could have been simpler”

“Nothing significant. However, the very fact that the govt. (? in my opinion) produces a document entitled: The Future of Nuclear Power, has produced much accusation of bias and cynicism”

“All of it”

“See comment above regarding decision prior to consultation”

“The way questions were formulated, the way info was skewed towards N power”

“The paper work and its questions and facts were weighted”

“The feeling that the government had already decided their decision”

“Insufficient time to respond in Welsh – the Welsh language was not treated on the basis of equality, contrary to the Welsh Language Act. No postal address given”

“Questions put to round table discussions were too simplistic and leading questions”

“I don’t think there was enough information on waste disposal”

“Did not have a computer”

“I don’t really know that the public meetings could contribute much of value in this case”

“I thought it was an excellent document which had been very well researched, well thought out and put together. I have no negative views on it”

“Feeling it would make no difference. The government’s mind is made up”

“I am not convinced the government paid any attention to our submissions and our misgivings about nuclear power”

“The relative isolation of my understanding of the reaction of other participants”

“The Google map provided with the invitation did not even include the venue on it! The arrow pointed to somewhere on the same road but about a mile and a half away (this was not important for me)”

“Considerable effort was put in by government and its consultants in preparing balanced material for use at the deliberative events. BERR was particularly keen to represent the views of the anti-nuclear lobby accurately and recorded video footage of a Greenpeace representative to show at the events. The late withdrawal of Greenpeace and some other groups from participations in the consultation was disappointing. It is not clear why these bodies decided to withdraw, although it appears to have been a deliberate spoiling tactic to attempt to discredit the process”

Online:

“The consultation was structured around questions posed in advance. This made it difficult to introduce concepts that the UK government had not considered in advance, such as the use of thorium fuel, radiation hormesis, and the distributed use of small reactors”

“Heavily biased. Leading questions. The regional public consultation sessions were little more than indoctrination sessions. The consultation was not widely advertised. Many people still do not know that they can take part in things like this. Every one in Britain who uses energy should have been invited personally to take part - through a flyer through their door. Expensive? Hardly, compared to what you’re planning on spending on nuclear”

“The number of questions was dauntingly long and the password protection was cumbersome”

““Some environmental groups”. The dismissive phrases in your films are highly biased and just assume that objectors must be wrong”

“I suspect that only a small number took part mainly pros and against and that the general public does not actively express their views which is a shame”

“I should have liked to see a comparison of cost of a kilowatt of electricity for each of the various possible alternative options for generation to compare with nuclear power”

“I feel that the publicity on the availability of the consultation was poor. There must be many people who would liked to have taken part but did not know of its existence”

“Consultation is an imperative in a democracy. Otherwise, why bother to ask!”

“Some of the supporting information was skewed in favour of a new nuclear programme. This gave the impression that the government had already made up its mind!”

“I think questions were somewhat leading and I think the format of the consultation was fairly exclusive”

“Viewing the contributions was a bit of a maze, but that was inevitable given the kind of answers which were provided (my own included!)”

“This was not a consultation at all, as no alternatives to nuclear were presented”

“It was a pointless exercise, as they majority of the population do not want nuclear power”

“It was clear which answer the government wanted”

“Lack of context of overall electricity system”

“The whole process was flawed and biased, and the arguments put favoured nuclear energy without giving details of concerns, particularly about the co2 emissions of the fuel extraction and processing”

“Lack of early feedback lack of specific government response Complete lack of publicity in the community. (I have spoken to many people interested in the subject who had not heard of the consultation). Despite reading

broadsheets & listening to news bulletins, I only heard about the consultation as a hurried secretarial report at a Womens Institute meeting. I then passed the website on to friends”

“The word limit was a little trying, especially for some questions”

“The actual consultation - misleading and partial information was provided, the government has already made up its mind anyway, and basically there was no point in having this consultation. I feel completely let down by the government”

The web-based response process was long-winded and did not give any indication about how far along the process you had got

“Answering part at a time without seeing the full extent of the questions meant some additional editing out of early comments that subsequently were seen more appropriate to a later question”

“The narrow questions that only referenced the provided documentation and were in danger of simply being about the structure of the consultation document rather than the issues themselves”

“At the start of the process it appeared a very complex process, maybe a summary of the questions that would be asked in advance of entering any responses. However, having done this once there will be no such problem with subsequent responses (assuming there are future ones!)”

“Considering the importance of the issue, I was surprised and disappointed that so few replies were received. Perhaps better publicity and a simpler format would encourage more response to future consultations”

“Waste of time without a vote at the end since it needs to have a measurement”

“The deliberative event was logistically complex and probably not best value for money. Some participants felt that they still had insufficient time or information to make informed judgments. Smaller focus groups or opinion surveys may have been better value to gather this sort of data”

“I didn't find any problems”

“Felt a little constrained by the tightly worded questions allowing limited answers. Many questions elicited the same answer, so one wasn't sure where to place the answer or whether to repeat. But most important was the missing info mentioned above”

“The sham framed questions, the use of biased information to prep people involved in the discussion”

14 Are there any specific lessons about public and stakeholder engagement that you would like Government to take from this consultation?

Comment analysis

- more (especially local) publicity and advertising to get bigger response (12)
- public did not know enough to participate fully (8)
- Government should listen more to the public, including to get beyond green groups (6)
- there should be simpler information provided for some stakeholders (5)
- it was important that consultation should be genuine / open / honest (5)
- it was important that Government continued to engage and consult with public and stakeholders (4)
- it was important to consult earlier, before decisions taken (3)
- Government should focus on listening to expert views (3)
- suggested future consultations should be run by independent bodies (for Government) (3)

All comments

Written:

“Listen to the working population, who don't have the time to attend meetings for/against atomic power”

“There is only one problem to tackle in the nuclear power programme – waste disposal”

“I wish David King had the good manners to reply or even acknowledge my professional letter on the nuclear energy option sent several years ago”

“Yes, consult earlier as self sufficiency in power supply is vital for national security and to protect the population from fuel-poverty due to high prices of gas, oil and electricity”

“Yes, consult the public more on major decisions. don't sit on your laurels because you won the election”

“Yes, cost and feelings about the nuclear waste and what we will do with it. Also more expensive than say coal power!”

“UK nuclear contractors / research disbanded because of 13 above”

“Either grasp the nettle and govern, or consult in a more open way”

“The Government could find out the majority opinion online and thus work out if a referendum is relevant on whatever topic”

“Sadly it will only be those with passion for the issue who will respond. Many of the responses were only partial”

“Not to bother next time they have one”

“Failure to recognise that public attitudes to nuclear issues arises as much from feelings of trust and confidence in politicians, business leaders, scientists etc as in understandings of the technology”

“Less consultation and more decision is sometimes required for the overall good”

“Don't assume your view with your ? at least came out of your public consultation. Otherwise it is a recipe for public cynicism”

"Don't waste time by delaying such consultations - industrial and with the local people around the proposed sites"
 "Very important to have as many local meetings as is practical"
 "Yes. The first duty of government is the protection of the people. This involves making secure the provision of food, freedom etc, including energy. I fear they have done too little too late"
 "The consultation should have been more effectively advertised. Although closely interested in the subject, I became aware of the consultation only by seeing a newspaper advertisement on 6 September 2007"
 "To clear any misconceptions regarding nuclear power"
 "Government must be careful not to give uninformed freaky, pressure groups too much of a platform"
 "Better information for the public about the new safer nuclear plants now available"
 "We should remember fuel (?)"
 "Public consultation should not be reason for delaying decisions – in spite of high court judges"
 "Try to involve more of the public"
 "Keep questions to only a single issue, not like question 1 which is two issues. It is very difficult to answer these type of questions!"
 "To decide how to convince the anti nuclear lobby"
 "A good start!"
 "Try to get it right first time"
 "Those who have not taken part must be assumed to hold an ambivalent attitude"
 "Government and its advisors must seek and obtain advice from the professional engineers who plan, design, install, commission and maintain the ESI. The opinions of other disciplines are interesting sometime, but in general they do not have the wit or wherewithal to carry much weight in the debate"
 "Stop wasting money on huge amounts of paperwork and paying lip service. This is not democracy. I don't believe the majority of the population had any idea this consultation was happening, or contributed to it"
 "The government should be wary of organised pressure groups. In this case Greenpeace seems to have gone into sulking mode and is trying to produce what appear to be trivial and almost pointless reasons for delaying the plans outlined the consultation document"
 "The wider the consultation the wider will be the support for difficult decisions govt. may have to take"
 "Do not exclude any just late replies. Allow for time in the post. If there are /were delays because of industrial action you should allow for force major situations"
 "More in-depth approach to the pros and cons of a case"
 "Allow more time, as has been done with previous public consultations on biomedical ethical issues"
 "This shouldn't be necessary – as the government should take the initiative. They are in power to make decisions"
 "Views on nuclear power tend to be polarised, consultation exercises are unlikely to change this"
 "Local participation should be just that and not a forum for protest. All aspects of any proposals need to be examined (?) not just negatives"
 "A programme of education in the differences between nuclear weapons and nuclear power vis safety for public required. Get public out of the emotional!"
 "This consultation indicated a high level of public concern about hazard, safety and cost of allowing public sector to invest in new nuclear power stations"
 "Keep its promise of a referendum on the Lisbon Treaty"
 "Yes, the government MUST streamline public enquiries on future nuclear power station sites. The public enquiry on Sizewell B lasted 3 years – an absolute disgrace with literally tons of paper produced which the public did not understand, and only lengthened the overall programme unnecessarily. The nuclear installations inspectorate have already set up their systems to minimise licensing time"
 "More advertising about consultation options"
 "Could it be made simpler to the ordinary layman?"
 "The public possibly found it difficult to respond to the consultation document and response form in a meaningful way, due to lack of expertise on the subject"
 "Listen to the public"
 "I only heard of the consultation by chance and applied for participation. More publicity to attract people to apply would be good"
 "H L Mencken said: For every complex problem there is a simple and straightforward solution, that doesn't work. Or as one Electricity Council chairman said: If anyone gives you a simple explanation of electricity supply economics, it isn't true"
 "Brief explanations with many more tightly focussed questions would be easier to answer Y/N, and would make a better job of producing informed questions"
 "Although certainly as regards private individuals, take up will always be low. The proposals could be more widely advertised"
 "I am very doubtful that government will take any notice of the objections raised in this consultation. It is still my opinion that the government are using the proposed new nuclear power stations as a quick fix because of the lack of foresight into our energy needs in years gone by"
 "I have met no one who participated in the consultation, I have however, met several people who have formed opinions via the various media (see above). A balanced debate has not yet been achieved"
 "Yes, but govt. cannot LISTEN to reason, so its pointless"
 "In an area like this decisions should be guided by scientists, environmentalists etc. rather than the politicians"
 "Consider that industry should handle the provision of nuclear power"
 "The proposals for long term waste disposal were lacking in the one major decision. WHERE will it go. I believe that the last conservative administration came to the same conclusion that deep storage was the way ahead, but failed to get agreement on the siting of such a system"
 "Make a commitment to genuine consultation, not just a fig leaf exercise"

“The government must not underestimate the public for whom they work and should undertake consultation on wide basis on controversial topics”

“To be credible, the exercise must be seen to be open ended, NOT a foregone conclusion”

“Hopefully most consultants would be about a less secretive subject than nuclear power”

“In my opinion, a government consultation paper should provide an entirely objective presentation of the relevant issues, and should not show the government’s bias. This consultation paper repeatedly referred to the government’s beliefs. For instance, on page 55 alone, there are four sentences starting with: We believe, which are followed on the next page by two statements: The government believes... As I said in the consultation paper, this government believes too much”

“Pre engagement of the relevant professional institutions (eg. in this case, electrical, mechanical, civil eng.), with a summary of their conclusions as part of the consultation documents”

“It was the government who made the Welsh Language Act, but you do not respect your own laws”

“The government should give a balanced account”

“It’s nice to be asked and to take part in the consultation”

“The provision of adequate power supplies is a vitally important issue but it is a technical one and the public in general are ill appraised on detail, whether the subject is technical, industrial, commercial or whatever. The responses to consultations tend to be therefore more emotive than well reasoned”

“Planning enquiries and public consultation meetings need to be part of the planning process as regarding planning applications for NEW power stations”

“It is necessary to have a wide ranging review where there are a large number of questions covering all aspects of the consultation where members of the public have a chance to disagree if they so desire”

“They should perhaps get outside help in designing the consultation and not make so many assumptions. Put these as questions”

“I would like not to have to waste my time trying to jump through hoops on a website and finally writing it all by hand, unless I have some assurance that the government is consulting me and not just keeping me sweet”

“That issues with pre-determined conclusions are not appropriate for public or stakeholder engagement”

“Whether there should be some facility to publicly react – perhaps regional meetings but only by invitation!”

“The main lesson is that it can be difficult to engage with the public on issues that do not directly impact on them in the short to medium term. It is also very challenging to consult with the general public on technical issues which require some basic understanding of relative risks and science and technology policy. However, public and stakeholder engagement is a key role for government on matters which have long term impacts on society”

“The deliberative events were a major exercise, and must have been costly to arrange and stage. In future, government should consider using smaller focus groups or broader opinion surveys as an alternative to large deliberative events to obtain public opinion”

“Better précis of the issues – too lengthy in the document”

Online:

“When it’s obviously a sham you can’t expect people to participate, but just because people don’t participate it doesn’t mean they don’t have an opinion. The government should realise that people are becoming heavily dissatisfied with a government that ignores what the people want in areas from energy provision to foreign policy and that a change is coming”

“Be more honest”

“I would like the Government to consult earlier in the process ie before they have formed a preferred policy on the issue. I felt the Government had already decided on a preferred option and that the consultation was merely a rubber-stamping exercise”

“Yes, but I would be wasting my breath. The result is an expected response from the UK Government. Ask the people. The people say "NO!". And the civil servants explain how "NO" meant "yes, please””

“Just to continue to engage but more campaigns on the issue”

“I was disappointed that only 2,700 responses were returned. A much wider response should be the aim in any future public consultation on any subject”

“Be honest”

“Yes: either state frankly that it has made up its mind on a specific course of action, and therefore don’t bother with a consultation, or TAKE INTO ACCOUNT the responses it gets to its consultations! Having said that, however, my remarks on this seem to take for granted that the majority of responses, to the Incapacity Benefit consultation as to this one, were in tune with mine whereas of course they may not have been; publicising an analysis of responses would clarify this issue”

“I am pleased that the public have been asked to put forward their views. In my experience it is the anti’s that hog the responses. I am appalled by the so called environmentalists lack of technology”

“Consultation should be more widely available, particularly encouraging the responses of those who may have a strong opinion but may not have normal access to submission procedures or information gathering routes”

“This consultation was quite obviously a sham. The second round of consultation only happened because the government was forced to do it by a court order. It undertook consultation merely as a legal requirement without any intention of taking proper account of the views expressed. A decision to go ahead with nuclear power had quite obviously been made well before the consultation. This means that there is no confidence in this specific consultation and also that future attempts at consultation will be undermined and will have no public confidence or credibility”

“Give the views of those with experience and expertise more weight than those from amateurs, however well-meant”

“Such consultations should be run independently”

“Government should not provide biased and incomplete briefings beforehand; these completely undermine any validity for the exercise”

“The government must enter into Stakeholder engagement with a genuinely open mind. I have taken part in other stakeholder supposed consultations where it became clear that it was a public show and not genuine consultation”

“This consultation was about one element of the energy system, nuclear power, and was presented in isolation from the overall system. This lack of a broad strategic background is a serious weakness, which largely invalidates the consultation in my view”

“Do it properly - hire an independent company with reputable scientists to prepare an informed and unbiased document, and educate the people running the stakeholder workshops properly”

“Much more local publicity needed”

“That consultations must be truly independent. They are not a bureaucratic process that the government has to go through before passing unpalatable laws. They are a fundamental part of the democratic process and have the power to increase meaningful participation in politics. But not if they are done like this one was”

“If the Government wants to engage in this sort of thing then get it right first time, but my view is that Governments are elected to take important strategic decisions on our behalf and that is what they should get on and do without resort to public consultation”

“Better and wider advertising of the whole consultation process so that more people realise they can have a say”

“More forceful argument must be made using opinions of qualified persons like Dr Roger King”

“Yes, do not simply read the responses but act on the majority view”

“Vote Yes, No or Don't Know at the end”

“Keep on talking to the public and stakeholders!”

“I think those living within 30 miles of existing nuclear plants should be physically given a questionnaire to complete with an on-line option - many with an interest in the Country are not yet on line”

“Start with a different consultation: Would you prefer to pay x for renewables and use y% less energy or pay x for nuclear and use... etc ie give the wider population a choice based on real alternatives, with as much objective research as poss to show the implications of the answers. Possibly do this on a regional basis to reflect the energy resources of that area. so those wanting wind can live near it, those wanting nuclear ditto”

“Don't go nuclear you fools. NO SINGLE NUCLEAR POWER STATION HAS BEEN COMPLETELY PRIVATELY FINANCED. There is no current agreed solution for nuclear waste”

15 Is there anything else that you would like to add?

Comment analysis

- there should be no more delays; get on with nuclear power (13)
- no to nuclear (6)
- consultation do not change anything / Government will not listen (3)
- worried about skills shortages (3)
- Government had already decided (3)

All comments

Written:

“Try to get through to the population at large that a solution to the problem of radio active waste will be solved in the future”

“I was asked 20 years ago to join NIREX. I declined on the grounds it was going nowhere. It is still going nowhere!”

“The problem with all this is that there are probably less than 50000 people in the entire country who know enough about it to provide a rational and useful opinion on all this (I am not one of the 50000). What I do see is that the huge and potentially dangerous volume of nuclear wastes must be safely stored BEFORE we generate any more. A decision by the Government must be made and local and NIHBY objections smartly overridden”

“The Government must allow the nuclear physicists to take decisions and then do it, and stop dithering (?)”

“There appeared to be nothing definitive about waste disposal ie. low, medium and high nuclear waste. With the advent of modern ESPs, and the proposed storage underground of waste (coal fired) gases, this is surely preferable to burying nuclear waste hundreds of years, with unknown guarantees and consequences”

“I would urge young taxpayers to emigrate before the bills start coming in”

“My annual income is £10.000 (half the national average) and there are Millions of us – pensioners, disabled and poorly paid etc - it should be the Government's job to ensure secure and affordable energy - only nuclear can do it”

“I hope we don't have the usual British delay before anything happens. Start building NOW!”

“Very important we all realise how nuclear power will affect the environment. The danger it can lead to. More investment into (if needed) coal power, wind, wave, solar etc. It can be done this way!”

“Despite my reservations, the consultation document was easy to use, and I learned from it. I am not a member of any Green organisation and take Mr Monbiot with a large pinch of salt! But I am an ex civil servant”

“It is good to have a voice, especially if the Government is going to listen and not fudge the figures to reflect its own words”

“Please BURY the waste geologically using best practice – French, Finnish? (Finland paid World War One debts to us, before 1940 and could borrow from the USA, because ours were not paid till 206 we had lend lease March 1941. I have no faith in wind power. The windmill bases have to be concrete blasted using enormous energy. Probably end to British coastal beauty”

“Plenty but I shan’t bother because the government won’t pay any attention. I shall just say that I dislike the democratic process being made a fool of”

“Abandoned online response (see 1) and wrote a letter instead. Letter with specific views about energy and security and the likelihood of uranium supplies being exhausted”

“Have the problems of skills shortage and repair of the reactors been taken into account? Nuclear SEEMS an easy answer but something more fundamental is needed if global warming is to be defeated”

“Please hurry up and build these power stations. Renewables are not constant and appealing to people to cut down on usage WON’T WORK. Everywhere you look you see energy wasted by government and council, they should set example ie. street lighting in country areas, not a house in sight!”

“Ask everyday kind of people, we do know you know! Thank you for letting me have my say”

“See my answer to 5 & 6 and in the consultation. I just wish the government would address the possible solution per nuclear fusion – in wartime very difficult problems were solved – eg. the atomic bomb leading to nuclear energy – despite recognition of the barrier of need for huge research at a most difficult time AND in an acceptable time scale. Where is the ambition now by comparison. Nuclear Fusion could (perhaps) be the Answer but not if under researched, under publicised etc.”

“We have some excellent brains in our country, use them!”

“China is trying to secure masses of uranium. Thanks to Major and Clinton who have condoned the Chinese invasion of Tibet in order to steal their deposits of uranium rather than pay for it. China is also trying to secure maximum oil from Africa, Britain must watch this and to ensure British energy requirements, nuclear is the only option”

“Coal and proposed mine in Kent should be banned unless its opencast”

“In note 252, p163, it is said that market does not take into account the need to back up generation capacity. I found no information corresponding to the Danish report of no wind power on 54 days a year, which might persuade people that it is an inadequate method of generation needing much investment in back up”

“Yes, but not here!”

“Highly dangerous substances. Subject to terrorist attack. Increase in traffic on rural areas. Fallout if an accident. Cost to build. 10 Years planning. Building contaminated. Costly waste materials. Fallout in emergency. Area B. Risk to health”

“This questionnaire should have been identified Shared Practice and stated the purpose of the independent evaluation”

“Yes. The general public needs to understand a) the probability of power cuts and when b) the serious consequences. Don’t just talk about lights going out. I am concerned that our power supply is in foreign ownership”

“Government and public acceptance of nuclear power is only part of the problem in building new plants. The economics must be right for private investors also”

“The consultation was well done. However, something of this importance should have merited a referendum as it goes beyond party politics and manifestos, past or future. The issue should have been: Does the public want nuclear power or not. It is impossible to safeguard against the inherent danger of nuclear power itself; the impossible safe storage of waste and the very possible terrorist threats”

“The delay has resulted in several million tons Co2 being sent irretrievably into upper atmosphere”

“I hope we do get a programme of nuclear stations. The idea of the NII is important. It power must be sustained”

“In parallel with the programme to build a new generation of power stations using proven fission technology, successive British governments must support nuclear fusion research which holds out the possibility of virtually unlimited energy without environmental penalties, perhaps in the second half of this century”

“Advertise more in local press – and report results”

“I think the qualifications and experience of individuals taking part in the consultation should be considered. I found that technical people were generally in favour, where non technical people were against, due to unfounded prejudices eg. nuclear power equates to nuclear bombs! See letter”

“There should be a balanced document which showed all the advantages and, more important, the disadvantages”

“In order to avoid diplomatic problems with future suppliers of natural gas (Siberia?) and oil (Iraq?), HMG should quietly tell their critics why nuclear power is essential”

“I had an uneasy feeling that all the information and questions were biased towards when and how, and little, if any, consideration of if, and real information on the many alternatives that are, and are becoming, available”

“I think it is the business of governments to govern. If you are going to consult on nuclear power why not Iraq, wind power etc etc. I don’t think government by consultation is the way to govern”

“The voice suffering (?) minority against nuclear power should not be allowed to disrupt the new build as they did in the past. The supply of electricity is of vital importance to our country and a national emergency”

“I don’t know enough about the response to answer questions 12 to 15”

“The need to proceed is urgent. Further consultations will merely exacerbate the problem. Since there has been no consultation to specifically address planning or legal challenge there may be unwarranted delay”

“See questionnaire No 35”

“I enjoyed the event and would like to attend a similar event in the future (if there is one). I would not mind even if it will be outside London (I can travel outside London). Though, I prefer to attend the one in London”

“The electricity supply industry (ESI), is in severe CRISIS owing to almost complete lack of medium to long term planning subsequent to its privatisation in the early 1990s. Unfortunately the government of 1976 and onward has

not recognised the pronounced lack of proper forward planning and investment in the ESI and the current response is too late”

“Yes, in the light of the decision to go ahead with nuclear power and not address all the other aspects that contribute to global warming and wasting my (tax payers) money, I will NOT be voting Labour again”

“I would like confirmation that your junior clerk has been dismissed and her name published. After all, she put the incomprehensible nonsense out over my name. I would also like to know if anyone in charge of this exercise has read my full letter, which not only includes the answers requested, but also points missed”

“1: It would have been easier if the questionnaire had been sent to us earlier whilst information and responses were fresh in one’s mind. 2: Most of the general public haven’t a clue about nuclear power or about the effect of fuels in detail. They have no scientific background”

“I wish good luck for the government’s nuclear policy! Keep restating the arguments and issues and especially the consequences of doing nothing!”

“Regardless of the result of this consultation, I hope the government will pursue the policies that it judges to be necessary for the UK, ie. to ensure reliable, long term electrical power supplies as economically as possible”

“I was very disappointed to learn in the letter sent to me on 10th Jan 08 that my reply was deemed late; I had posted it 7 days earlier (on morning 4th Oct). That was sufficient time to get to you by 10th Oct”

“The whole exercise demonstrates just how far we have come away from honest government”

“Generally, I believe the consultation was well presented, with all the key issues being addressed”

“Please spend more money on fusion techniques”

“The overall impression was that the government had already decided about this. There was hardly time to respond to the consultation and hardly time for the government to analyse the results”

“Yes – if we didn’t start building nuclear power stations immediately we may run out of electricity as the original power stations should have been on line in 2017, now it could stretch to 2024 – HELP. This is borne out as in Sunday’s Mail on Sunday. There is a shortage of power stations in South Africa which means there are power cuts in Joburg of at least 4 hours a day, and the 1st nuclear power station is not expected until 2010”

“I hope HMG wins any case Greenpeace might bring, which would cause further delay to the climate”

“Some of the documentation provided seemed to have been sanitised and lacked sufficient detail to inform discussion. Time was wasted in securing details. There is sometimes the perception that people from outside the industry are incapable of understanding complexities. This was not true and most SSG members are astute and provide excellent vehicles for local opinion”

“It is clear that a decision in principle had already been made by the government prior to the consultation”

“Make point of the many ? operating in submarines around the world today and safety record, note these are mobile reactors!”

“The consultation also indicated awareness and concern about global warming. The government could promote actions to reduce energy waste”

“HMG should get its finger out before the lights go out”

“I think I have made my views clear in the comments above”

“No place to put forward arguments on generic design assessment, and the imperative for govt. to select the best option and encourage all constructors to adopt a single system – major economies of construction and of training of staff and operational advantages. Experience of France in 1980 is relevant. WE MUST STANDARDISE. This would also reduce time scale of plant coming on stream. All this can be done without appearing to favour nuclear over renewables”

“As with the consultation, I feel this is a pointless exercise. More window dressing, to enable the government to say that they not only consulted the public, but checked that the public was satisfied with the consultation. I was not satisfied that the consultation was genuine, and it added to my disillusionment concerning this government. I would like to know how much taxpayers’ money is being given to Ms Warburton, Mr Ordish and associates for this Evaluation Process too”

“Since returning the consultation form I see some kind of agreement has been formulated with go ahead of some stations. Do not forget we could LOSE at least 25% of our energy at the touch of a button by a foreign power”

“Not happy with the result!”

“If you do it again, include in the start: Public electricity supply itself is a very technical business, and when coupled with renewable energy sources, needs some knowledge of meteorology, economics too. Those for and against believe that their opponents may be lacking in these areas, perhaps misinformed. In order to discover if we need to publish more information in particular areas, we have included some questions we would like you to answer. With decades of experience in electricity supply, I know numerous well qualified and experienced engineers and managers in the business. I do not know one who believes that wind power can do the job, with or without other renewables. Although I know some who would like to lay their hands on Teutonic subsidies. We have been using wind power for hundreds of years, and nobody can solve the problem that arises when someone shoots the albatross”

“I am not convinced the government is really concerned about public opinion generally, ie referendum of European constitution / treaty”

“I have the time, the background and the intelligence to deal with a consultation document of this kind. Not everyone does and there could be value in devising a parallel simpler consultation exercise that might engage a wide spread of people and organisations. The invitation to contribute might well have been publicised more widely”

“We humans may go some way to solving a particular problem, but in doing so we create other ones that are as great or greater to try and deal with. Nuclear waste is the point in questions. Nuclear power may be safe from harmful emissions, but the waste is deadly, taking hundreds of years to neutralize. No one can ever state that nuclear waste is 100% safe however well it is stored. With the added danger of the waste falling into the hands of terrorists, how can we justify expanding our nuclear program? There must be millions of televisions, DVD players

and computers up and down the country on standby, the waste of power is criminal, greater efforts are needed to save more energy, then we would not need so much in the first place”

“The govt. must consult independent scientific opinion on the following for example – Fossil fuel carbon capture – whether capture before or after combustions it will cause massively increased fossil energy consumption
Microgeneration – huge cost, inefficient, seasonally affected CHP – as above plus change all our cities”

“Yes, but what’s the point?”

“I am at a loss to understand why you ask about my gender”

“No more nuclear power stations! An offline network for people who care”

“If the government intends to go ahead with consultations I’d rather they didn’t in situations where the advice of knowledgeable people as under Q14 would be more appropriate. If this is regarded as undemocratic then the dreaded word Referendum comes into play”

“Are we running out of time?”

“I believe there is an over optimistic approach on the ability to produce a new generation of nuclear engineers and scientists within this country. The well publicised closure of university chemistry departments and the failure to attract students into the engineering, physics and mathematics disciplines - ? essential in nuclear engineering, design and operation gives little confidence in the claims made in this document. In any case, any new reactors will almost certainly be of French or American origin. How typical it was for the government to sell Westinghouse to the Japanese”

“The language of the document – presuppositions and assumptions embedded in the title and in the questions was a give away that the decision had already been taken. This actively discourages real participation, because you feel there is no point: Greenpeace, CND etc, indeed withdrew from the exercise”

“As I said in the original questionnaire: The whole exercise was a complete sham and a charade. An alibi to and for the general public. I understand 34 nuke P.S. have already been ordered, and another 16 being considered. Nobody believes any government and leading politicians this past 28 and a half years. PERPETUAL LIARS. Cameron, Blair and Brown’s bringing back Thatcher’s Stop and Search (also protest marches and breaking into the gen. Public households and property). Another sham! All part of the process and building these nuc. Power stations. Why not arrest without A or any warranties the above personnel including Thatcher (who should have sentenced to death late 1980’s – yes! HANGING. Police state. One cannot trust religious politicians from Thatcher to Blair / Brown or MI5 /MI6 / FBI /CIA Chelt. GCHQ and MOSSAD. Still under threat of WW111, not if but when. How many directorships has Thatcher, Major, Brown, Blair and co etc. in this industry and allied industries? UK. USA and Europe? Such as Westinghouse and GE inc’s. The Texas connection, Tony’ cronies – eg The Fellowship of FELLs Fundamental – fanatical fascists. Estimate this so called exercise £25 million. Decision already taken”

“There was no mention of any investigation of reports of leukaemia clusters in the proximity of several French power stations – true or false – of similar types proposed for the UK”

“I object to the use of the word carbon when carbon dioxide is meant. It distorts the problem eg. 4 million tons carbon, when burned completely, produces 10.656 million tons of carbon dioxide (Co2) that a carbon capture plant would have to recover. The carbon capture plant, however, has to handle the flue gases from say a coal fired power plant. If 4 million tons of carbon as coal are burned then approximately 17.5 million tons of dirty flue gases at 200-300 degrees centigrade have to be handled by the carbon capture plant. This is only the start of the problem?”

“I’m pleased to see the government has proposed the start of nuclear power stations”

“On the issue of nuclear power, it is unfortunate that successive governments since the 1970’s have allowed anti nuclear campaigners to influence the vast majority of the public with an inherent fear of anything nuclear. Any government will struggle to make progress unless it is seen as a prime priority to establish a vigorous pro active programme to counteract this fear and assure the public of the safety, security, advantages and even the necessity of nuclear power if carbon emissions are to be controlled”

“Safety of supply is far more important than cost”

“I heard that the consultation was advertised in public libraries but I personally would not have known that it I hadn’t been alerted by concerned NGOs”

“It is a pity that Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth did not see fit to take part. The constant linking of climate change and energy needs seemed to be trying to guide us into the government’s way of thinking”

“Consulting widely on nuclear power is a difficult task, given the complexity of technical issues and the interactions between the policy on nuclear power and other matters including wider energy policy, climate change, radioactive waste management policy and planning reform”

“Support for the idea of consultation especially for technical issues”

“I would like the public participation exercises to be made much quicker. My experience in the highways field is that they achieve very little at very much expense, at great delay and little benefit to my country. My interest was prompted by most helpful response by my Member of Parliament, David Hanson Esq. MP”

“I think it is essential that our power base remains in the hands of this government (the British government, any party!) and not be dependent on foreign powers!”

“I have been aware of the danger of nuclear power since Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I am well aware that nuclear power is different from nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, although I am not a scientist, I have heard and read about the danger of nuclear power over the years. Any nuclear disaster in the future may not affect me but I am deeply concerned for younger people and the danger of nuclear power for them”

“I feel now government has no right to deny ? nuclear power

Letters to the Editor. My passionate belief is in nuclear energy which does not automatically lead to nuclear weapons On this issue I left CND (I have frequently referred to hearing of bombs dropped while on HMS Bonaventure(?), South China sea, August 1946. I have mentioned my views there many times and resigned from CND on the issue. I mentioned my earnest views in 1946, also in my book “Ar Yuprechld(?) yr Haul” (Towards the

Islands of the Sun (?), published in late 1950s. My later interest was normally expressed in terms of the proposed second nuclear power station at Wylfa, Amlwch, where I was born, in the port, in 1920, so am entitled to say YES, YES, YES! to keep our best young on the island

I graduated well in science from 6th form Grammar School, Pen (?) July 1937, when I left to join Board of Trade, Whitehall"

"I am disabled.

I am former DIDTY Met DcTT (?) interested in community and government's rules, law publications RE (?) written" "The government's action seems to be confined to talk so far. In contrast to its active promotion and subsidisation (?) of windmills"

Online:

"More and more this government is aping that of the US, in thrall to big business. Please stop. We're losing respect for our leaders"

"Stop wasting our time with consultations where the decision is already taken!"

"I would have liked to give my views on the issue without having to wade through a long list of complex questions"

"The whole thing was a waste of public money. When Greenpeace challenge you and win in the courts, please stop wasting it and get on with energy conservation and renewable schemes the public - instead of a few vested interests - can support"

"There is a general view - I don't say that it is necessarily justified - that consultations are essentially cosmetic exercises. It stems largely from a common view of this government as essentially duplicitous"

"Overall I was impressed with the depth of information that had been provided for us to make our assessment on.

I have a group of retired friends who have a science background or an interest in science and I passed on this consultation paper to them but this was my personal effort and they would not have known of the consultation if I had not contacted them. Getting to a wider audience is crucial to this sort of consultation. (3 responses from our village of 800 would be respectable - but 2,700 out of a population of 60,000,000 is unacceptable on such an important issue for our future"

"One concern that I have is that as it had been so long since the UK built a nuclear power station it will be difficult to recruit appropriately experienced personnel in the design and construction of new nuclear power stations"

"Not that I can think of; but with regard to the possibility of follow-up interviews I would need more information about what this would entail before I could either agree to it or otherwise"

"The decision to utilise existing nuclear sites was foreseeable and avoids long winded re-evaluation of sites. If only this can be applied to the legal and other issues!"

"I think the decision is wrong, and was a inevitable from the outset - which sort of makes a mockery of consultation. I also believe the decision effectively permits people to shrug off individual and community responsibility for energy issues, which really does defeat the point"

"As a private individual who had contributed quite substantially to the consultation I would have liked to have received a free hard copy free of the eventual White Paper"

"Yes. Nuclear fuel is going to be hard to come by given the amount of power stations planned, thus raising the price sky high in the future. We don't know what to do with the stock piled waste we have already, I am told its stored under Cumbria in concrete. What about the cost of security, in this age what with terrorism the way it is. I am sorry but I see nothing but expensive problems in the future. I am not a happy man"

"This approach should be adopted more often on matters of similar importance"

"It is very sad that DTI/BERR officials appear to have learned absolutely nothing from the errors of their predecessors. This week's announcement was simply a repeat of the Thatcher/ Howell announcement of 8 new PWRs. That ended up after much huffing and puffing with just the one solitary power station at Sizewell: three times over budget, seven years late. History will simply repeat itself. And distract from the more important issue, of delivering all the energy services we require, but using a fraction of the fuel. Everybody knows that is the only sensible way forward (see the 2003 energy white paper). It is just the vested interests are too great to apparently change policy within DTI/BERR"

"Bollocks"

"Despair, and desire for truly open and accountable government"

"Overall, this consultation was run well and I was glad that SEPA could participate"

"The government should publicise such consultations more widely, and also publicise their results. This would help to establish public opinion directly as an antidote to special interest groups, press and television"

"Nuclear power is NOT the answer to Britain's energy needs, and the sooner this is realised, the better"

"Time has been wasted in the past ten years- now the gov. must get on with securing our future, With nuclear power, the great landscapes of Scotland, in particular the DAVA moor and adjacent moors and mountains, and the West country in England should not be devastated"

"Would like to have been involved at an earlier stage in the consultation process, only found out about the process by accident"

"We must know why the specific question is being asked"

"Glad we are getting the chance to respond now freely, with open questions, but would have preferred the chance of dialogue (other than at public meetings) before decisions were made"

"Why is there no ability to look at all the public's responses? Surely it wouldn't take much space seeing as you could easily provide the online ones"

About you

16 Gender

	Written	Online	Combined result
Male	104 (72%)	40 (74%)	144 (73%)
Female	33 (23%)	12 (22%)	45 (23%)

17 Age

	Written	Online	Combined result
16-24	-	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
25-39	3 (2%)	11 (20%)	14 (7%)
40-54	11 (8%)	11 (20%)	22 (11%)
55-65	30 (21%)	16 (30%)	46 (23%)
Over 65	93 (65%)	15 (28%)	108 (55%)

18 Was the response to the consultation from you:

	Written	Online	Combined result
As a private individual	126 (88%)	49 (91%)	175 (88%)
As an academic / consultant	6 (4%)	-	6 (3%)
On behalf of an NGO	1 (1%)	2 (4%)	3 (2%)
On behalf of the energy industry	2 (1%)	-	2 (1%)
On behalf of a trade union	-	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
On behalf of a government dept./agency	-	-	-
On behalf of local / regional government	4 (3%)	-	4 (2%)
On behalf of other business / industry	3 (2%)	-	3 (2%)
Other	8 (6%)	-	8 (4%)

All comments

Online:

"(Though I used to be a co-ordinator for an anti-nuclear power campaign)"

"Private individual with some credibility! D.R. Cockbaine MBE MSc[Eng]. Pr.Eng, C.Eng, FIEE, MANS, MBCS"

"But also Member of Institute of Energy District Councillor of 20 years [then]"

"But see earlier comment and note that 20 years farming organically also gives me an insight into environmental issues"

"I also compiled our corporate response and would be happy to provide some corporate feedback from British Energy on the process"

"Individual and on behalf of young people in a network who are concerned about their future"

19 Are you willing to be contacted for interviews?

	Written	Online	Combined result
Yes	112 (78%)	38 (70%)	150 (76%)
No	26 (18%)	-	26 (13%)

Annex 2: Regional stakeholder events

Evaluation questionnaire analysis

Belfast, 17 September 2007: 10 participants; 10 questionnaires returned = 100%

Birmingham, 26 July 2007: 17 participants; 16 questionnaires returned = 89%

Bristol, 20 July 2007: 30 participants; 26 questionnaires returned = 87%

Cambridge, 27 July 2007: 18 participants; 15 questionnaires returned = 83%

Cardiff, 18 September 2007: 25 participants; 14 questionnaires returned = 56%

Glasgow, 21 September 2007: 44 participants; 22 questionnaires returned = 50%

Leeds, 24 July 2007: 30 participants; 29 questionnaires returned = 97%

London, 13 September 2007: 52 participants; 27 questionnaires returned = 52%

Manchester, 25 July 2007: 62 participants; 54 questionnaires returned = 87%

Newcastle, 23 July 2007: 31 participants; 32 questionnaires returned = 100%

Nottingham, 12 September 2007: 20 participants; 14 questionnaires returned = 70%

Reading, 14 September 2007: 21 participants; 13 questionnaires returned = 62%

Total 360 participants; 271 questionnaires returned = 75% return rate

NB All percentages are calculated against the total number of questionnaires returned, and are shown to the nearest whole number.

1 How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

There was enough time at the meeting to discuss the issues properly	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	2 (20%)	6 (60%)	-	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
Birmingham	1 (6%)	9 (56%)	2 (13%)	4 (25%)	-
Bristol	2 (8%)	18 (69%)	2 (8%)	4 (15%)	-
Cambridge	1 (7%)	12 (80%)	-	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
Cardiff	2 (14%)	10 (71%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	-
Glasgow	1 (5%)	16 (73%)	2 (9%)	3 (14%)	-
Leeds	3 (10%)	17 (59%)	5 (17%)	4 (14%)	-
London	2 (7%)	15 (56%)	2 (7%)	5 (19%)	3 (11%)
Manchester	2 (4%)	30 (56%)	4 (7%)	16 (30%)	2 (4%)
Newcastle	5 (16%)	21 (66%)	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	-
Nottingham	1 (7%)	8 (57%)	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)
Reading	4 (31%)	7 (54%)	-	2 (15%)	-
Combined result	26 (10%)	169 (62%)	23 (8%)	46 (17%)	8 (3%)

There was enough information provided in advance to enable informed input	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
Birmingham	3 (19%)	6 (38%)	2 (13%)	4 (25%)	1 (6%)
Bristol	3 (12%)	18 (69%)	3 (12%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
Cambridge	2 (13%)	6 (40%)	4 (27%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
Cardiff	2 (14%)	9 (64%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	-
Glasgow	7 (31%)	14 (64%)	-	1 (5%)	-
Leeds	5 (17%)	12 (41%)	5 (17%)	6 (21%)	1 (3%)
London	5 (19%)	13 (48%)	5 (19%)	3 (11%)	1 (4%)
Manchester	15 (28%)	24 (44%)	4 (7%)	9 (17%)	1 (2%)
Newcastle	5 (16%)	11 (34%)	6 (19%)	9 (28%)	1 (3%)
Nottingham	3 (21%)	8 (57%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	-
Reading	5 (38%)	5 (38%)	2 (15%)	1 (8%)	-
Combined result	56 (21%)	129 (48%)	39 (14%)	38 (14%)	8 (3%)

All the main issues were covered in the meeting	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	2 (20%)	7 (70%)	-	-	1 (10%)
Birmingham	1 (6%)	6 (38%)	6 (38%)	2 (13%)	-
Bristol	2 (8%)	16 (62%)	7 (27%)	1 (4%)	-
Cambridge	1 (7%)	9 (60%)	3 (20%)	1 (7%)	-
Cardiff	1 (7%)	11 (79%)	-	1 (7%)	-
Glasgow	3 (14%)	12 (55%)	4 (18%)	3 (14%)	-
Leeds	3 (10%)	14 (48%)	9 (31%)	3 (10%)	-
London	3 (11%)	12 (44%)	2 (7%)	10 (37%)	-
Manchester	8 (15%)	28 (52%)	6 (11%)	9 (17%)	1 (2%)
Newcastle	6 (19%)	18 (56%)	4 (13%)	4 (13%)	-
Nottingham	3 (21%)	7 (50%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	-
Reading	6 (46%)	5 (38%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	-
Combined result	39 (14%)	145 (54%)	43 (16%)	36 (13%)	2 (1%)

The facilitation of the meeting was fair and balanced	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	-
Birmingham	7 (44%)	9 (56%)	-	-	-
Bristol	11 (42%)	14 (54%)	1 (4%)	-	-
Cambridge	8 (53%)	6 (40%)	1 (7%)	-	-
Cardiff	3 (21%)	11 (79%)	-	-	-
Glasgow	9 (41%)	11 (50%)	2 (9%)	-	-
Leeds	8 (28%)	21 (72%)	-	-	-
London	9 (33%)	16 (59%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	-
Manchester	20 (37%)	28 (52%)	5 (9%)	1 (2%)	-
Newcastle	18 (56%)	13 (41%)	1 (3%)	-	-
Nottingham	5 (36%)	7 (50%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	-
Reading	7 (54%)	5 (38%)	1 (8%)	-	-
Combined result	108 (40%)	146 (54%)	14 (5%)	4 (1%)	-

The structure of the meeting enabled us to discuss the issues properly	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	1 (10%)	8 (80%)	-	-	-
Birmingham	4 (25%)	9 (56%)	3 (19%)	-	-
Bristol	4 (15%)	18 (69%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	-
Cambridge	3 (20%)	10 (67%)	1 (7%)	-	1 (7%)
Cardiff	4 (29%)	8 (57%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	-
Glasgow	6 (27%)	12 (55%)	2 (9%)	1 (5%)	-
Leeds	4 (14%)	20 (69%)	4 (14%)	-	-
London	8 (30%)	12 (44%)	4 (15%)	3 (11%)	-
Manchester	11 (20%)	27 (50%)	4 (7%)	11 (20%)	1 (2%)
Newcastle	6 (19%)	24 (75%)	2 (6%)	-	-
Nottingham	5 (36%)	7 (50%)	-	2 (14%)	-
Reading	3 (23%)	9 (69%)	-	1 (8%)	-
Combined result	59 (22%)	164 (61%)	23 (8%)	21 (8%)	2 (1%)

All participants were treated equally and respectfully	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	-	-	-
Birmingham	11 (69%)	5 (31%)	-	-	-
Bristol	13 (50%)	13 (50%)	-	-	-
Cambridge	11 (73%)	3 (20%)	1 (7%)	-	-
Cardiff	10 (71%)	4 (29%)	-	-	-
Glasgow	11 (50%)	10 (45%)	1 (5%)	-	-
Leeds	12 (41%)	17 (59%)	-	-	-
London	13 (48%)	13 (48%)	-	1 (4%)	-
Manchester	20 (37%)	33 (61%)	1 (2%)	-	-
Newcastle	19 (59%)	13 (41%)	-	-	-
Nottingham	10 (71%)	4 (29%)	-	-	-
Reading	9 (69%)	4 (31%)	-	-	-
Combined result	144 (53%)	124 (46%)	3 (1%)	1 (0%)	

No single view was allowed to dominate unfairly	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	-	-
Birmingham	8 (50%)	8 (50%)	-	-	-
Bristol	10 (38%)	13 (50%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	-
Cambridge	7 (47%)	7 (47%)	1 (7%)	-	-
Cardiff	6 (43%)	8 (57%)	-	-	-
Glasgow	9 (41%)	8 (36%)	2 (9%)	3 (14%)	-
Leeds	10 (34%)	18 (62%)	1 (3%)	-	-
London	7 (26%)	15 (56%)	3 (11%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
Manchester	16 (30%)	30 (56%)	5 (9%)	3 (6%)	
Newcastle	14 (44%)	17 (53%)	-	1 (3%)	-
Nottingham	5 (36%)	6 (43%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	-
Reading	7 (54%)	6 (46%)	-	-	-
Combined result	105 (39%)	139 (51%)	17 (6%)	10 (4%)	1 (0%)

I was able to raise the issues I wanted to	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	-	-	-
Birmingham	5 (31%)	11 (69%)	-	-	-
Bristol	8 (31%)	18 (69%)	-	-	-
Cambridge	9 (60%)	5 (33%)	-	-	1 (7%)
Cardiff	5 (36%)	9 (64%)	-	-	-
Glasgow	10 (45%)	11 (50%)	1 (5%)	-	-
Leeds	6 (21%)	22 (76%)	1 (3%)	-	-
London	8 (30%)	17 (63%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	-
Manchester	15 (28%)	31 (57%)	4 (7%)	2 (4%)	-
Newcastle	12 (38%)	18 (56%)	2 (6%)	-	-
Nottingham	5 (36%)	9 (64%)	-	-	-
Reading	7 (54%)	6 (46%)	-	-	-
Combined result	95 (35%)	162 (60%)	9 (3%)	3 (1%)	1 (0%)

I will also be participating in this consultation in other ways:	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	-
Birmingham	4 (25%)	7 (44%)	3 (19%)	1 (6%)	-
Bristol	4 (15%)	15 (58%)	7 (27%)	-	-
Cambridge	6 (40%)	7 (47%)	1 (7%)	-	-
Cardiff	3 (21%)	6 (43%)	5 (36%)	-	-
Glasgow	6 (27%)	12 (55%)	4 (18%)	-	-
Leeds	8 (28%)	8 (28%)	10 (34%)	2 (7%)	-
London	12 (44%)	8 (30%)	5 (19%)	1 (4%)	-
Manchester	15 (28%)	31 (57%)	5 (9%)	2 (4%)	-
Newcastle	5 (16%)	18 (56%)	6 (19%)	3 (9%)	-
Nottingham	5 (36%)	8 (57%)	1 (7%)	-	-
Reading	4 (31%)	6 (46%)	3 (23%)	-	-
Combined result	73 (27%)	131 (48%)	53 (20%)	10 (4%)	-

The objectives of this meeting were clear and transparent	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	2 (20%)	-	-
Birmingham	5 (31%)	9 (56%)	1 (6%)	-	1 (6%)
Bristol	6 (23%)	18 (69%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	-
Cambridge	2 (13%)	7 (47%)	5 (33%)	1 (7%)	-
Cardiff	4 (29%)	9 (64%)	1 (7%)	-	-
Glasgow	5 (23%)	15 (68%)	2 (9%)	-	-
Leeds	4 (14%)	20 (69%)	3 (10%)	2 (7%)	-
London	9 (33%)	15 (56%)	-	3 (11%)	-
Manchester	10 (19%)	35 (65%)	7 (13%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Newcastle	5 (16%)	23 (72%)	3 (9%)	1 (3%)	-
Nottingham	6 (43%)	6 (43%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	-
Reading	7 (54%)	3 (23%)	3 (23%)	-	-
Combined result	66 (24%)	165 (61%)	29 (11%)	10 (4%)	2 (1%)

The roles and responsibilities of stakeholders at this meeting were clear	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	-
Birmingham	4 (25%)	4 (25%)	5 (31%)	1 (6%)	-
Bristol	2 (8%)	12 (46%)	7 (27%)	3 (12%)	-
Cambridge	6 (40%)	6 (40%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)	-
Cardiff	1 (7%)	9 (64%)	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	-
Glasgow	3 (14%)	13 (59%)	4 (18%)	2 (9%)	-
Leeds	1 (3%)	14 (48%)	12 (41%)	2 (7%)	-
London	5 (19%)	12 (44%)	5 (19%)	5 (19%)	-
Manchester	2 (4%)	32 (59%)	12 (22%)	5 (9%)	2 (4%)
Newcastle	4 (13%)	17 (53%)	8 (25%)	3 (9%)	-
Nottingham	3 (21%)	7 (50%)	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	-
Reading	1 (8%)	8 (62%)	3 (23%)	1 (8%)	-
Combined result	34 (13%)	139 (51%)	66 (24%)	26 (10%)	2 (1%)

The way the outputs from this meeting will be used was clear and transparent	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	-	1 (10%)
Birmingham	4 (25%)	5 (31%)	7 (44%)	-	-
Bristol	2 (8%)	15 (58%)	5 (19%)	4 (15%)	-
Cambridge	5 (33%)	8 (53%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	-
Cardiff	2 (14%)	9 (64%)	3 (21%)	-	-
Glasgow	2 (9%)	17 (77%)	3 (14%)	-	-
Leeds	2 (7%)	21 (72%)	4 (14%)	1 (3%)	-
London	3 (11%)	12 (44%)	6 (22%)	5 (19%)	1 (4%)
Manchester	4 (7%)	28 (52%)	15 (28%)	6 (11%)	1 (2%)
Newcastle	4 (13%)	20 (63%)	5 (16%)	3 (9%)	-
Nottingham	3 (21%)	8 (57%)	3 (21%)	-	-
Reading	3 (23%)	9 (69%)	1 (8%)	-	-
Combined result	36 (13%)	157 (58%)	54 (20%)	20 (7%)	3 (1%)

The level of influence of the stakeholders at this meeting on Government policy was clear and transparent	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)
Birmingham	2 (13%)	5 (31%)	6 (38%)	3 (19%)	-
Bristol	1 (4%)	16 (62%)	5 (19%)	4 (15%)	-
Cambridge	2 (13%)	6 (40%)	5 (33%)	-	2 (13%)
Cardiff	-	9 (64%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	-
Glasgow	2 (9%)	14 (64%)	6 (27%)	-	-
Leeds	2 (7%)	17 (59%)	8 (28%)	2 (7%)	-
London	2 (7%)	13 (48%)	7 (26%)	2 (7%)	3 (11%)
Manchester	5 (9%)	23 (43%)	13 (24%)	10 (19%)	3 (6%)
Newcastle	1 (3%)	20 (63%)	6 (19%)	5 (16%)	-
Nottingham	2 (14%)	6 (43%)	3 (21%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)
Reading	1 (8%)	7 (54%)	4 (31%)	1 (8%)	-
Combined result	22 (8%)	139 (51%)	69 (25%)	32 (12%)	10 (4%)

BERR will listen to and consider the stakeholder views given at this event	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	3 (3%)	-	-
Birmingham	2 (13%)	7 (44%)	6 (38%)	1 (6%)	-
Bristol	1 (4%)	20 (77%)	5 (19%)	-	-
Cambridge	4 (27%)	5 (33%)	5 (33%)	1 (7%)	-
Cardiff	2 (14%)	8 (57%)	3 (21%)	-	-
Glasgow	5 (23%)	13 (59%)	3 (14%)	-	-
Leeds	5 (17%)	16 (55%)	7 (24%)	-	-
London	4 (15%)	14 (52%)	8 (30%)	1 (4%)	-
Manchester	6 (11%)	28 (52%)	16 (30%)	3 (6%)	1 (2%)
Newcastle	5 (16%)	19 (59%)	8 (25%)	-	-
Nottingham	4 (29%)	8 (57%)	2 (14%)	-	-
Reading	4 (31%)	8 (62%)	1 (8%)	-	-
Combined result	44 (16%)	151 (56%)	67 (25%)	6 (2%)	1 (0%)

The meeting was useful and worthwhile	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	4 (40%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	-	-
Birmingham	7 (44%)	9 (56%)	-	-	-
Bristol	8 (31%)	17 (65%)	1 (4%)	-	-
Cambridge	8 (53%)	7 (47%)	-	-	-
Cardiff	3 (21%)	11 (79%)	-	-	-
Glasgow	15 (68%)	5 (23%)	2 (9%)	-	-
Leeds	11 (38%)	17 (59%)	1 (3%)	-	-
London	15 (56%)	10 (37%)	2 (7%)	-	-
Manchester	21 (39%)	28 (52%)	5 (9%)	-	-
Newcastle	10 (31%)	20 (63%)	2 (6%)	-	-
Nottingham	5 (36%)	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	-	-
Reading	7 (54%)	6 (46%)	-	-	-
Combined result	114 (42%)	138 (51%)	15 (6%)	-	-

Comment analysis

- did not receive / not enough time to read the Consultation Document / briefing papers in advance (6)
- not enough information on specific issues (e.g. safety, costs, transport) (5)
- event too short / could have done with more time / whole day (4)
- good process / well-managed (3)
- not enough opposing views (3)

All comments

Belfast:

“My comments are caused by my only becoming aware of this consultation during the weekend, and in believing it was to be at NICVA (only attended for 10-15 mins of meeting)”

Birmingham:

"Even if we were given full week to discuss we still would have been able to discuss further. The issues are so complex and arguments are never as clear cut as they seem"

"I wasn't able to locate the consultation document on line to find out about the event too late to receive a copy in the post"

"What constitutes a stakeholder"

"Would have been useful to have more background information in advance of the event"

"Wider audience invitation would have been more useful"

Bristol:

"Difficult to fit in all issues in time available. Have reservations about the quality/bias of the provided information"

"Could always have longer time for discussions, but was probably about right and was well facilitated and managed"

"A well staged event"

Cambridge:

"It would perhaps be valuable to provide a consolidated list of people invited to attend – not just those who attended"

"A very good, if belated, attempt to cover the issue. The structure and conduct of the seminar was good and encouraged comment"

"The presumption of new nuclear in the whole consultation is unprincipled and deeply worrying in terms of democracy"

"Immediate objectives ok but decision making process opaque. Incomplete attendee list. Totally unclear. Listen to – yes, give consideration to – no!"

Cardiff:

"Perhaps it would have been useful to discuss more the issue of cost over lifetime, how this relates to price per Gwh and how a liberalised market would respond - and ensuring costs are fully understood, especially relating to waste management and decommissioning"

Glasgow:

"There was a healthy discussion on the ethical view which was worthy but prevented full discussion on some other issues"

"Final slide re conditions missed. Although there were several devil's advocates but no lobby noticeable by absence"

"Wider consultation on the whole energy white paper would be useful"

"Without participation of anti nuclear lobby or representation from Scottish government, feel we missed vital audience"

Leeds:

"More information on health/safety/transport issues would have been useful"

London:

"A thorough consultation – well done"

"Full information on the safety and costs (especially) of nuclear not provided."

"BERR nuclear dept. should not be in charge of this consultation – have vested interest in terms of their key stakeholders in the outcome"

Manchester:

"It is farcical to organise a consultation and then control the presentations/ input. Why not invite Greenpeace to give some other views (Stephen Tindale not exactly unrespectable is former government special advisor). There was insufficient information on different perspectives"

"Consultation process has been very thorough"

"Should/could have been a whole day!"

"Didn't know names or organisations of the speakers – nothing in packs or in slides – or organisations that facilitators represented. Participants badges were unreadable – even round the tables. Many floor speakers didn't identify themselves"

"People simply rehearsed positions already adopted. Some very clear presentations were dismissed as emotive and facts were seen as preferred discourse – but we are dealing in uncertainties"

"The pillars made it difficult to see the screen"

Newcastle:

"Time – it was kept short and to the point, but as ever some of the discussions had to be cut short. Overall, very well managed by our table facilitator"

"Didn't have time to read the bumf"

Nottingham:

No comments

Reading:

"Well done!"

"Thank you"

"The absence of green groups was a disappointment. They would have allowed a more full debate"

2 What were the best / most useful aspects of the meeting?

Comment analysis

- open / useful / dynamic discussions (59)
- to hear / share views / discuss with range of stakeholders (57)
- table discussions (45)
- well structured / conducted / facilitated (19)
- good presentations (12)
- good chance to contribute / give views (11)
- good mix / quality stakeholders (10)
- understanding more about the issues / subject (8)
- tolerance / respect among stakeholders (5)
- finding out more about the wider consultation (5)
- all good / useful (5)
- covered the key issues (3)
- specific discussions on waste (3)
- videos (3)

All comments

Belfast:

- “Opportunity to hear views from a range of stakeholders”
- “Recognising the implications of energy security of nuclear wastes”
- “Not rushed and a chance to contribute”
- “Table discussion was useful”
- “Broad range of contributions drawn from good selection of organisations”
- “Open discussion”
- “Giving stakeholders the opportunity to made their views known”
- “Meeting people”
- “Useful discussion, range of views”

Birmingham:

- “The presentations. Ability to hear both strong pro and anti views on nuclear, which was valuable to provide wide perspective”
- “The wider discussion sessions were particularly useful. Also finding out about the consultation process to date and next steps was very useful”
- “Discussions”
- “Sharing views”
- “Allocated time for both table and group discussions. Organised professionally”
- “Discussion on ethical considerations of disposal of waste”
- “Chance to discuss general views and hear a range of opinions”
- “Short presentations followed by small group discussions”
- “Opportunity to discuss with other stakeholders”
- “The elite nature of the gathering – highly informed and professional people therefore some useful critical points if taken on board”
- “Getting informed about other people’s views”
- “Discussion and feedback”
- “Other views”
- “Good contribution from ?”
- “Debates on individual tables very stimulating and a good way of extracting information”

Bristol:

- “Open discussion”
- “Outlining the key issues for debate between the nuclear and non nuclear communities”
- “Hearing wide ranging views”
- “Opportunity to bring radiation health damage into the nuclear agenda”
- “Meeting different people and sharing views”
- “Hearing diverse views, enable our views to be heard”
- “Well presented and facilitated. Nice approach to both sides of the argument”
- “The planning discussions enabled a wide views to be heard and countered”
- “Hearing the informed views”
- “To listen to the very diverse views on the subject”
- “Overview of consultation process”
- “Dissemination of contrasting views”
- “Good coverage of all issues and good opportunity to discuss and raise issues in public forum”
- “Opportunity to hear the views of others”

“Discussion opportunities”
“Round table discussions”
“Layout to facilitate participation”
“Listening to diverse views”
“Good agenda”
“Lack of early information”
“Introduction to BERR view”
“Well facilitated”
“Views from the industry”
“Discussion session”

Cambridge:

“The opportunity to other views”
“HH was informative as were the two presentations by Stefanie and Emma. The round table debate was respectful and informative”
Well conducted and facilitated – but a huge subject to tackle. The lack of trust in government’s motive and
“Hearing views of academics on energy policy overseas”
“Sharing views with people from various sectors”
“To hear the views around the tables. A good mix and cross section”
“The ability to hear other views and discuss issues”
“Hearing the reason for people’s positions not just the positions”
“Facilitated discussion. I thought BERR did an excellent job”
“Tolerance of views. Opportunity to have one’s views recorded”
“The mix of attendees”
“Hearing all the viewpoints”
“Sensible if narrow debate”

Cardiff:

“Ability to comment in a way that was being directly recorded”
“Table tops were good”
“Open discussion with other people”
“Round table discussion”
“Opportunity to hear different viewpoints and explore various aspects of the topics”
“Table discussions and networking”
“The opportunity to discuss and the information facilitated”
“Discussion format – develop response to identified key questions”
“Being able to discuss in small groups”
“Opportunity to debate issues in a constructive environment”
“Presentations and table discussions worked well”
“To know major points and concerns that the consultation is working on”

Glasgow:

“Open debate, good background discussion”
“I liked the separate small round table session”
“Level of informed discussion with interesting people”
“The information given”
“Structure excellent”
“Discussions – the sub group”
“The bringing together of people who are serious and thoughtful, and who wish to contribute positively to a cheap, friendly, safer future for all, for a very long time”
“An overview of the consultation process and the issues”
“Well presented. Well facilitated. Good cross section of industry”
“Openers of delegates and the debate. Clear respect for opinions”
“Networking opportunity”
“Hearing other points of view”
“The discussion”
“Open discussion and debate”
“Air views”
“Open dialogue with interested parties”

Leeds:

“The presentations did not repeat the consultations document, so reading the consultation beforehand was not a waste of time. This allowed more time for discussions”
“Raised my awareness of nuclear issues/waste and disposal. Excellent facilitator – inclusive”
“Round the table discussion – on a table composed of widely varying views”
“Hearing different views”
“Meeting others with different points of view”
“Contributions from the discussions with others round the table and the feedback from all the tables”
“Format of discussions”
“Discussions at table”

"General update on current thinking"
 "General discussions"
 "More useful than I anticipated"
 "Round tables"
 "Well facilitated"
 "Being able to discuss the issues with other participants present round the table"
 "Knowledge advancement. Issues education, though summary presentations could have been stronger"
 "As somebody with little knowledge of the subject, I am leaving with more"
 "The debates"
 "Listening to other people. Lots of very intelligent people so I now know more about nuclear power"
 "Networking"
 "Learning other views and opinions"
 "Table discussions"
 "Open discussion"

London:

"At least BERR have tried to consult"
 "The round table discussions and the open debate"
 "Videos good, discussion very good"
 "Round table discussion. Good cross section of views"
 "Commitment to the consultation"
 "Round table discussion"
 "Berr briefing"
 "Different views and expertises were exchanged"
 "Facilitated group discussions. S of States speech"
 "The technical information for the lay person"
 "Small groups for discussion"
 "It was open and well structured"
 "Interventions/round table format"
 "Table discussion"
 "A very open discussion, with some lively debate"
 "The round table discussions"
 "Organisation, chairing etc was excellent – everyone could contribute"
 "Discussion at table"
 "Allowing me time to study the paper!"
 "Hearing a broad spectrum of views and opinions addressing the wider debate"
 "Hearing both opposing and positives"
 "Group discussions round the table"

Manchester:

"Good venue. Good facilitators. Open, microphone contributions good"
 "Opportunity for round table discussion"
 "Discussion around the table"
 "Good presentations (notwithstanding comments over)"
 "Good, respectful discussion"
 "The table discussions"
 "Hearing colleagues who argued against nuclear power and New Build whom I had not before
 eg. Unison reps"
 "Dialogue – other views"
 "Round table debate"
 "Meeting people from different organisations"
 "Discussion and facilitation"
 "Time for discussion"
 "There was a good representative sample of views across the industry"
 "Government/BERR presentations"
 "Round table debates"
 "Meeting and discussing views with people with different opinions on the policy"
 "Networking and hearing other's views"
 "Listening to the views of others, for and against"
 "Dynamic forum, people wanted to contribute"
 "Group discussions"
 "Plenary debates"
 "Individual discussions in localised groups"
 "Sharing point of view"
 "Ethics on energy and waste"
 "Opportunity to voice personal opinions"
 "Concentrated. Table discussions very useful and clear presentations"
 "Wide stakeholder participation"
 "Group meetings. Q&A. Information/consultation document"
 "Discussion group"

“Good overview of issue”
“Round table discussion”
“Open discussion”
“Discussion/questions”
“Clear presentations, chance to meet people”
“Speaking to the enemy”
“The debate”
“Good general discussion”
“Intelligent debate and views on all sides. Little dogma”

Newcastle:

“Discussions with other stakeholders”
“Meeting people with the different respective traditional opinions eg. pro nuclear union reps, concerned NGO reps etc.”
“Being able to discuss issues raised and make comments”
“Being able to hold discussions in small groups meant that quality information was forthcoming”
“Future energy provision, impact of future carbon emissions”
“Share different views”
“The interaction in groups and to the whole”
“The range of debate and arguments”
“Being able to discuss the issue sensibly”
“The ability to gauge people’s understanding of the issues concerning the future of the nuclear industry”
“Focus on questions”
“Hearing other opinions/arguments”
“Table discussions”
“The table consultations were also recorded”
“Open discussions with a variety of stakeholders”
“Engagement with DBERR staff”
“Both the presentations and discussion were interesting”
“Discussion and airing of the issues”
“Outline of issues surrounding nuclear energy”
“Table discussions mixing with plenary”
“Variation of views”
“Covered subject well with good all round participation”
“Interaction of participants”
“Mix of people and balance of representation”

Nottingham:

“Very relaxed and small discussion groups meant people were free to talk”
“Hearing views of industry”
“Clear presentation of the issues”
“All good”
“Discussion”
“Mix of reps, films”
“Meeting and hearing people with different views”
“Ability to hear different perspectives”
“Very well facilitated”
“Views from different NGOs”

Reading:

“Being able to discuss the issues with representatives both of industry and the community”
“Discussion time”
“All”
“Input from industry”
“Open discussion, film presentations and excellent facilitating”
“Listening to everyone’s views”
“Thoughtful presentations and discussions”
“Diverse range of views”
“Open debate / open forum”
“Good explanations. Two films throughout”
“Debate from a range of stakeholders. Industry/social/academic”

3 What were the worst / least useful aspects of the meeting?

Comment analysis

- too short / could have been longer / whole day (34)
- information / presentations biased (especially video) (8)
- a few individuals pushed views rather than debating / held the floor / dominated (8)
- none / all was good / useful (8)
- not enough information on specific issues (waste, economics, proliferation, other sources of energy, international experience, uncertainty) (6)
- general lack of information / unanswered questions / poor/unclear information (5)
- not enough anti-nuclear / opposing stakeholders / views (5)
- questions too simplistic /leading / tight (5)
- discussions rushed (5)
- tables should have been more mixed with pro- and anti-nuclear views (5)
- no green NGOs (4)
- could have been longer but half-day was right (4)
- poor / limited presentations (3)
- whole consultation was unbalanced / unfair / biased (3)
- our views will make no difference (3)
- dominated by pro-nuclear views (3)
- dominated by anti-nuclear views (2)
- dominated by industry (2)
- participants stating incorrect / ill-informed 'facts' (2)
- some disputes on facts not resolved (2)

All comments (except comments of “none” which are counted as above)

Belfast:

“Views have to be objective. Inherent suspicion of science does not help. We all want to make the world a “better place to live”

“Worried that Government have changed their stance since 2003”

“Framing of the consultation in that gov has clearly already made a decision on nuclear”

“All aspects were helpful”

“Being late and confused”

“Questions on electricity generation unanswered”

Birmingham:

“All questions were worded far too simplistically, too black and white. It is not just a case of agree or disagree as there are far too many dependencies. Eg. must not marginalise renewable energy sources and must continue to increase behavioural change in terms of energy efficiency”

“Groups round the tables were uneven – one table mainly pro; other mainly anti

Perhaps organising the allocation to tables could be considered”

“Possibly a little rushed for the table discussions”

“Very limited discussion on the economics”

“Limited pool of people to chat with”

“Too short!”

“It was not a public consultation in the normal sense therefore this is obviously the converse of 2 above. Had it been I think a different result would have occurred”

“Excellent organisation”

“Not enough time”

“Mid session breaks (none provided)”

“No ice breaker to get participants comfortable with each other on a table basis

Microphone arrangement cumbersome”

Bristol:

“Perhaps more time may have been useful”

“Presentations were very poor – just reading from scripts, felt steam rolled by nuclear lobby”

“Various participants stating (in some cases) totally incorrect facts which could not really be challenged in an appropriate manner”

“Too many contributors were ill informed on topics like health damage from radiation and costs of the new build”

“Little rushed, antis and pros were not in mixed groups”

“The presentations were a little simplified, however I understand time restricted much detail”

“People bringing their 'bible' and quoting it as facts (ie extremists like me!) ”

“Should nuclear be an option”

“No significant concern”

“Not enough members of the public in attendance”

"A few factual disputes arose (eg someone quoted an IPCC figure for co2 emissions) more definitive data would have been useful"
"Inability to discuss – x table"
"Air conditioning – too cold!"
"Dominated by Max Wallis!"
"Industry repeating hoary myths"
"The anti-voice tends to make unreasoned challenge which has no basis"
"Long questions, views from some!"

Cambridge:

"Length of the meeting was never going to be enough for such a complex issue but was still reasonable"
"There is a sense of an informed discussion with some big facts not clear (I have no easy solution!)"
"The speed- restricting input to some extent but on the other hand, the debate could have raged all day (and night!)"
"The common knowledge that it is difficult to achieve great progress on tackling climate change unless other governments, eg. China/India make significant changes"
"All aspects were useful"
"That the planning of the consultation is so unfair and presumptuous – thus undermining and threatening ones' input"
"Not finishing on time – I have a programme for the day!"
"I had to travel to this event as my local one will clash with a major industry event"
"Formulation of questions for consideration and debate"

Cardiff:

"An absence of any significant anti nuclear comment"
"Could have combined one of the smaller groups and ensured that each group had a mix of participants from different sectors"
"None really but the scope of the ethics debate was necessarily but perhaps unhelpfully restricted"
"Should put more of a pro and anti mix around the table"
"No real coffee break!"
"Too short"
"Quite small attendance – this may have restricted some of the debate, but assisted with facilitated discussion"
"Perhaps the tight boundary of some questions didn't allow some issues to emerge"
"Possibly the lack of attendance of nuclear opponent group"
"Plenary discussions not quite so fluent"

Glasgow:

"Too much stress on ethical/moral aspects of energy mix"
"Perhaps a little more time!"
"Not enough anti nuclear representation"
"Too short"
"The sadness of FOE demonstrators outside the meeting place"
"Narrow views expressed by those not prepared to listen to others. Hearing the many lines in contributors's CVs"
"Poor attendance from politicians. No attendance from Green NGOs. No Scottish Executive attendance"
"Time constraint"
"Shortage of time to finish discussions"
"The Church of Scotland REP being allowed to dominate the discussion"
"Sharing of perceptions"
"Lack of time"

Leeds:

"There is enough to debate for a full day. It would allow the issues to be fleshed out more"
"Brief"
"Time was constrained"
"Not looking at the 2/3 of co2 produced not from electricity generation. Not examining the international context and repercussions. Longer term changes in context which impact. Not having ranges of uncertainty"
"Lack of time to explore some issues in more detail"
"Perhaps the presentations, very general"
"Some data provided was unclear on assumptions made"
"See above. Consultation also seems to have been designed around the emotive issues of climate change and energy security which naturally would lead to support consensus for any thinking individual"
"Poor data. Poor representation of slide"
"The consultation document was issued only a few days before the meeting and it was clear that many participants had not read it"
"Interaction"

London:

"I felt for the CO1 table person as a company person played (well tried) clever tactic of stating their view which got recorded and then gunning for anyone else's views she disagreed with
Not enough time"

"Could have run full day"
 "Video presentation (superficial, and sometimes misleading)
 Non engagement of Greenpeace, FOE etc"
 "Persons opposed to nuclear power dominating the Q&A with their views"
 "Letting some people hog the discussion"
 "Subjective, emotive comments"
 "Very biased official information, mainly by omission"
 "All useful except for the biased videos"
 "Too much time given to extremist negative views"
 "Certain individuals dominating discussion"
 "Too short!"
 "The meeting over ran significantly (poor time management)"
 "The room was cold"
 "Lack of debate/ thought on waste disposal"
 "The propaganda videos! They weren't pitched at an appropriate level for this particular group of stakeholders, but the Chair was obviously aware of this"
 "Could have moved participants round"
 "Too rushed. Presentations not helpful. Full information on negative aspects of nuclear glossed over"
 "Delegates pushing their personal interests rather than addressing the wider debate"

Manchester:

"Generally useful"
 "Not everyone stated who they represented when speaking in open discussion which makes it impossible to answer question 5"
 "Issue of proliferation/safety/ethics of worldwide development of nuclear ignored"
 "Questions posed in structured manner and well facilitated in constructive manner"
 "Leading questions. Tight agenda. Presentations which never even mentioned security. No sense that our views will be considered"
 "Needed a full day"
 "Time limitation"
 "Could have been longer"
 "Lack of time"
 "Lack of time"
 "Not having enough time"
 "Not enough time to debate (but it was important to keep the meeting to 1/2 a day)"
 "None. It all went very smoothly"
 "Final open floor session"
 "Pro nuclear views too polarised and tended to swamp non supporting views"
 "The spectrum of views, necessary but difficult to manage"
 "Insufficient water on tables"
 "Not enough time to fully debate the issues"
 "Industry dominated in an unbalanced way though fully respect vid. Input"
 "Meeting could have been longer even though it was extended"
 "Time limitation"
 "Seemed dominated by pro nuclear"
 "Too short but recognise difficulties in dealing with complex subject"
 "Shortness of time"
 "Presentations (too restrictive)"
 "Whether it will make any difference whatsoever to govt. policy"
 "Time"
 "Shortage of time"
 "By nature could only consider headline issues, rather than depth. No consideration of govt. role"

Newcastle:

"Not a representative audience of the region"
 "Would have preferred a room with natural light"
 "There were no alternatives to the use of nuclear power put forward"
 "Reference to market forces, having influence"
 "Should allocate people to tables to get a more rounded discussion"
 "The paper should have been sent round earlier"
 "Didn't get to meet/learn who else was participating, my table only"
 "Could have had an afternoon session too"
 "Slightly more balance would help"
 "Information was late arriving before the meeting"
 "Bias for nuclear power eg. in presentation, eg CCS is unproven and unreliable yet ignoring negatives of nuclear. Stakeholders seemed disproportionately pro nuclear"
 "Delegates with preconceived thoughts"

Nottingham:

"1/3 to 1/2 of delegates were industry representatives with an obvious preference. Only 7 of the 18 consultation questions were raised. The films were emotive but subtle ie. repeatedly reinforced that only Green groups opposed new nuclear"

"Film clips"

"Format too restricted and time too short"

"The absence of the leading NGOs from the videos and meeting"

"Time didn't need restricting to 1 pm for me"

"Small group / lack of Green reps"

"The fact that a number of organisations would not participate in this event"

Reading:

"Films"

"Parking!"

"Not enough negative views. Being from the nuclear industry I'd have welcomed the opportunity to influence anti nuclear opinion"

"Too much emphasis on securing a yes/no to the questions"

"Lack of time"

"The pull out of green groups. Open and face to face dialogue would highlight areas of agreement and further the consultation process"

4 What was the most important benefit for you and/or your organisation in taking part in this meeting?

Comment analysis

- hearing / understanding others' wide range of views / concerns / knowledge (79)
- increased knowledge of the subject / better informed / clarified thinking (38)
- chance to give / promote my / my organisation's views / being heard (33)
- sharing views / talking to others / dialogue / discussions (19)
- participation / engaging in the consultation / making a difference (15)
- understanding / finding out about Government's views / position (12)
- meeting people / networking / contacts (11)
- briefing for our formal response to the consultation (7)
- finding out about / understanding the process / consultation (7)
- keeping up to date / informed (3)

All comments**Belfast:**

"Gaining an insight into the views of others"

"Hearing a wide range of views"

"Increase of knowledge on a hugely complicated subject"

"Hearing other views"

"Informing opinion to guide council's response to the consultation"

"Greater understanding of the issues"

"I now have more knowledge of the government's intentions in the area of policy"

"Participatory democracy"

Birmingham:

"To assist in preparing our response to the consultation"

"To hear the arguments posed by energy companies and universities. It gave a different perspective other than the public sector view, eg, safety issues"

"Clarifying issues"

"Sharing views"

"Obtain a more rounded view from the stakeholder groups not normally encountered in my professional life/environment"

"Understanding and witnessing the process"

"Just a chance to be heard"

"Learning from others"

"Awareness of others views"

"A realisation of how urgent the matter is and yet how little the checks and balances have been thought through"

"Background information"

"To learn about the process"

"Understanding of broader issues"

“Gauge other peoples’ and organisations’ views outside of the industry and it’s defined roles/view in which you participate”

Bristol:

“To maintain level of being informed on the progress towards new nuclear”
“Understanding of consultation policy”
“Meeting people and a chance to contribute my views”
“More informed view”
“Involvement in the process and the ability to put forward views in support of nuclear”
“The chance to hear other views and points”
“To have confirmed my view that nuclear is essential for the supply security in the future”
“To listen to the government’s views on the future of nuclear power”
“To understand in more detail the respective views”
“Exposure to a variety of views”
“Understand what gov is doing in the process”
“Opportunity to hear the views of others which differed from mine”
“Widening view through discussion”
“Hearing range of diverse views”
“Confirmation of views on all sides”
“Listening to diverse views”
“Learnt a great deal about the issue”
“Hearing the various views expressed”
“Contact with civil servants”
“Reasoned facts and argument prevailed”
“Exchanging views”

Cambridge:

“To state our views and listen to the concerns of others”
“Being invited and having the ability to contribute. I do believe that organisations like EEEGR taking an All Energy view will be vital in playing a part of the sustained communication strategy”
“To get our views across, to hear other groups points to view, and to assess the strength of opposition to nuclear power and their arguments”
“Promote role of planning authorities in sustainable development, particularly suppressing energy demand at all levels”
“Sharing views”
“I have gained knowledge from listening to those with a far better understanding than myself”
“Put forward local government opinion”
“We believe there should be a wide debate properly informed”
“Ensuring a balanced view”
“Dialogue – being able to state one’s views”
“A voice and an opportunity to hear other views and the quality of discussion”
“Getting a useful dialogue”
“Breadth of opinions on offer”

Cardiff:

“Personally and professionally associating with the consultation exercise”
“Providing company input into the decision and consultation process”
“To note the main issues in the overall discussion on energy”
“Better understanding of gov pending policy and input into it”
“Clarification of certain points”
“Meeting stakeholders within Wales”
“To know the plans for the government”
“Opportunity to contribute to consultation from a Welsh perspective on the UK wide issue”
“To have insight into wider concerns relating to the issues”
“To listen to other views”
“Providing a better understanding of the issues involved”
“To be able to express my points on the positive impact of nuclear power generation would have for the country, eventually to secure the required supply in the future, through a clean process”

Glasgow:

“The opportunity to hear a wide range of backgrounds on a very important topic”
“Involvement in a most important process”
“Putting some views across. Meeting old friends!”
“Opportunity to listen to wide range of arguments”
“The process”
“Opportunity to share views”
“Getting the opportunity to hear a wide range of views from the participants”
“To hear the range of views, especially from the representatives of industry, local government, commerce and the house of commons”

“Permit me to brief councillor on the issues”
“Hearing views first hand”
“That the process is ongoing and can be seen as such”
“Gaining a deeper understanding of all the issues/perspectives offered by all those taking part”
“Hearing other points of view”
“Discussion”
“Knowledge”
“Informed discussion”

Leeds:

“Hoping that the views expressed in the room will be taken note of”
“Assessing government’s current mindset re nuclear power and its next steps”
“Listening to a variety of views”
“To hear a range of views”
“Hearing different views”
“Will illuminate our response to the consultation on the white paper on the future of nuclear energy”
“Chance to hear views/meet interested parties”
“Networking”
“Learning”
“Able to discuss and consider complex issues in depth”
“To obtain the views of others and express opinions”
“Contact and view of government”
“Sector knowledge”
“Having the voices of young people supported by myself, supported and listened to”
“We were allowed to clearly represent the views of young people to whom this issue primarily concerns”
“That people listened to us even though we are teenagers”
“Engagement”
“Education”
“Appreciation of the depth and complexity of issues involved”
“Sharing of views with key stakeholders”
“Meeting people”

London:

“To hear a wide range of views. To hear what NGOs were missing (did not happen)”
“Hearing the views of other stakeholders”
“Sense of argument on both sides”
“Getting the cross section of views”
“Contributing to the process”
“Awareness raising”
“Information”
“Talking to other interested parties”
“Highlighting issues pro and con”
“The facts I learnt about the issues involved”
“Wealth of information”
“Listening to others”
“Exchange of very diverging views”
“Discussion at the table”
“I enjoyed it!”
“Learn more info about range of views”
“An opportunity to discuss the topic and become aware of other issues raised/an opportunity to take part in discussions and share ideas with others”
“Aiding me with respect to the consultation response”
“A greater understanding of the range and spectrum of issues involved in New Build”
“Hearing other opinions. Feeling confidence in openness and transparency of consultation process”

Manchester:

“Networking, maintaining our current knowledge of the debate”
“Ability to exchange views with contributors with a wide diversity of views”
“Listening to views”
“Hearing a range of views although some – ie how renewables can meet baseline group was not covered”
“Opportunity to participate in raising and discussing the key issues”
“Gauging opinion”
“Being able to be part of consultation”
“To come along to hear more of the government case for nuclear energy”
“More knowledge”
“Opportunity to hear the views of others”
“Being able to listen to all views”
“Understand the level of support for nuclear power”
“Hearing others”
“It enables us to get across our company’ personal perspective and also listen to the views of others”

"Get ideas around their ideas and do more than the website submission"
 "Having a mixed opinion group"
 "Making the view of my body put forward in an open forum"
 "Hearing different views"
 "Although I attended on behalf of a SSG it would be incorrect to say I represented it as the timescale was far too short to engage/harness views"
 "Participation in a stimulating/positive event"
 "Info on government plans and other stakeholder views"
 "Personal rather than organisational views expressed. Companies reluctant to get involved in political discussions"
 "Gaining more confidence that govt. is finally working up to the necessity of an Energy Policy"
 "Being able to make a difference on such an important issue"
 "Listening to the wider views"
 "Information gathering, gauging the views of the public"
 "Highly relevant to local debates and stimulated ? and how to respond"
 "General debate, and getting a cross section view on the energy mix"
 "Understanding government proposals and future policy"
 "Chance to input"
 "Interaction and listening to others views"
 "Contacts"
 "Hearing other views"
 "See 2" "Briefing"
 "Opportunity to discuss issues with other organisations"
 "To provide support for new nuclear build in the UK"

Newcastle:

"To be able to input our view into the consultation"
 "To remind people of my organisation's position on nuclear power"
 "Being able to put views across"
 "Listening to the learned institution"
 "Having some input in what we believe is one of the most important issues of our time"
 "Update on the nuclear policy"
 "Identifying what support/concerns are part of the debate"
 "Understanding the wider argument"
 "Broadening my understanding of the debate"
 "Economic impact of nuclear power, sustainability, engagement with SME"
 "Being able to represent my membership and community"
 "We had the opportunity to voice our opinion"
 "Met a new mix of people"
 "Having our input"
 "First hand observation of widely varying opinions, perspectives"
 "At least initially our views are being listened to"
 "It was essential for me/us to participate in the national debate"
 "More knowledge on the subject to help form opinion"
 "To be part of the consultation in the UK was important"
 "Information gathering"
 "Finding out more about the various issues concerned with current and future nuclear energy"
 "Process awareness"
 "Getting the views from the wider range of organisations"
 "Understanding how others view our industry"

Nottingham:

"Listening and talking with a wide group"
 "Clarifying issues"
 "A greater understanding of the wide range of issues associated with the future of nuclear and potential new build"
 "Opportunity to make an input"
 "Overview of current states of new build NP and views of other delegates"
 "To express my views on this very important and difficult issue"
 "Making the effort to get completely up to speed"
 "Getting other views from other organisations"
 "Good range of stakeholders"
 "To raise the issues and gain others' views"

Reading:

"Further understanding of key issues"
 "Chance to put point of view and respond to other views"
 "As an SSG chairman it was good to hear views from other area"
 "Wider understanding of the issues"
 "To hear and respond to others' views. To listen to what others have to say"
 "Everyone involved"
 "Interesting discussions"

“Useful to gain insight into thinking of other stakeholder groups”
 “Opportunity to hear other views to test arguments”
 “Hearing other opinions”
 “Becoming aware of the big picture and seeing both sides”

5 Were the relevant stakeholder interests represented at the meeting?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Belfast	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
Birmingham	8 (50%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)
Bristol	18 (69%)	2 (8%)	4 (15%)
Cambridge	7 (47%)	6 (40%)	1 (7%)
Cardiff	6 (43%)	2 (14%)	4 (29%)
Glasgow	6 (27%)	9 (41%)	4 (18%)
Leeds	11 (38%)	2 (7%)	12 (41%)
London	11 (41%)	6 (22%)	5 (19%)
Manchester	26 (48%)	8 (15%)	14 (26%)
Newcastle	17 (53%)	5 (16%)	7 (22%)
Nottingham	5 (36%)	7 (50%)	2 (14%)
Reading	7 (54%)	4 (31%)	1 (8%)
Combined result	127 (47%)	54 (20%)	58 (21%)

Comment analysis

- not enough greens / NGOs (26)
- shame green groups pulled out / absented themselves (13)
- needed local government / planners (10)
- needed more anti-nuclear / opposing views (7)
- did not know who participants were so cannot judge / wanted to know (5)
- too many industry (4)
- not enough energy companies (3)
- not enough politicians / councillors (3)

All comments

Belfast:

“Not a wide range of participants”
 “More scientists and Green activists”
 “Not sure who else was in the room – seemed to be no political representation”
 “Very low attendance”

Birmingham:

“Should there be councillors here as well?”
 “Defra (radioactive substances division and climate change divisions)
 DCLG (local planning policy
 LAs (local authorities and local strategic partnerships)”
 “Faith groups”
 “Hard to say because I don't know who and who was not invited. No rep from distributed energy industry or renewables or CHP for example”
 “Some more local authority and environmental/civic groups could have attended”

Bristol:

“Seemed to be strong over representation of nuclear interests”
 “No one from eg. Low Level radiation campaign, no one from NHS oncology, NHS children's hospices, no one from Primary Care Trusts”
 “(Yes) because of mixed participation – but not clear if people were representing views of specific stakeholders”
 “I would like academic arguments to be confined to experts forum”
 “Unclear, but a stronger scientific presence would have helped to oppose assertion (dubious) ”

“General public, academia perhaps, energy/non nuclear sector, finance companies”
“Planners”
“Local government. NFLA”

Cambridge:

“See my comments overleaf. It is clear that not attending this event will not prevent any individual or organisation from participating in consultation”
“Many NGOs and EERA missing”
“Local authorities mute – in a most sinister way Suffolk country council”
“GERA, Renewables East Parish Associates, RDA – EEDA, Environmental Resources panel members, RTAG”
“Eastern Region planning bodies, Eastern Region renewable bodies, National Grid, Energywatch and other consumer bodies”

Cardiff:

“Any nuclear lobby (or at least any vocal representation/input by it)”
“More representation from large energy consumers. Were they invited but just didn’t turn up? What does this say about their involvement in the consultation?”
“No significantly anti views expressed. This may be a fair representation but some would have sharpened the debate”
“To some extent”
“Not much representation from local or devolved government, trades unions or environmental groups”
“I think nuclear opposition group”
“Not clear who attended”

Glasgow:

“Green representation was not represented by their own action. However, does this add weight to their challenge on the effective consultation process”
“Greenpeace etc”
“Anti nuclear view but this was their own decision not the fault of BERR, disappointing”
“Green lobby/enviro regulators”
“Greens deliberately”
“There was no significant input from the Green/Environmental interest group”
“Environmental NGOs”
“Green NGOs. Scottish Exec.”
“All the green parties”
“Anti nuclear views”
“Friends of the Earth”

Leeds:

“Having no nuclear power station in the area resulted in no site stakeholder representative which would have made a great contribution to the discussion”
“DEFRA, Environment Agency”
“Friends of the Earth”
“The meeting was short and very general. With my background I need a much more analytical approach”
“I am a supporter of nuclear power, but note that few opponents were represented”

London:

“Pity NGOs did not come. From the list of people seemed to be an imbalance – who else apart from NGO were invited and declined?”
“Some anti groups chose to boycott”
“Absence of Greenpeace, FOE etc”
“Frustrating that green groups have pulled out”
“Not all foreign stakeholders representing front end of fuel cycle”
“Military connection not really considered. Other countries’ experience”
“However, the absence/withdrawal of the leading NGO was disappointing, and symbolic of their undemocratic ways”
“NGO withdrawal means narrower range”
“Some Green NGOs”
“Green NGOs should have been here – I think it is cowardly of them to pull out and not share their views with us”

Manchester:

“See question 5 answer”
“Nuclear Decommissioning Authority”
“The Energy companies that may invest were not present”
“The meeting was weighted with representatives from the industry”
“Very valuable in gauging opinion as part of the consultation process”
“It was an open invite. If they didn’t turn up they missed out”
“As point 3 – too many pro nuclear stakeholders”
“All stakeholders were represented but numbers were skewed towards nuclear industry organisations”
“More balance from non nuclear sector would have been helpful to strengthen alternative views put forward”
“Jo Public off the street”
“Far too many reps from nuclear industry”

Newcastle:

“Too many quasi govt. bodies. No representatives of the three main political parties – the Green party was present for one example “

“Although I believe stakeholders were here, should local authorities have been invited?”

“People with a financial interest in having new build would have a conflict of interest and this should be disclosed”

“Good balance of participants”

“Hardly anyone from community/voluntary sector of NGOs”

“No views from supply companies”

“Bidders for the Sellafeld PBO. Sellafeld Site ? co”

Nottingham:

“I think that the industry already has a strong access route in the consultation and care should have been taken to fill this event with organisations without an obvious vested interest

“FOE (?) and Greenpeace”

“Disappointing that green groups felt unable to participate in this meeting”

“Environmental groups”

“Relatively small involvement of NGOs”

“Disappointing that Greenpeace withdrew”

“Greenpeace and FOE boycott is simply unhelpful. Rather undemocratic of them”

“Greenpeace”

“But pity FOE decided not to take part”

“Regulators. NGOs”

“Perhaps more LA”

“Green organisations”

Reading:

“Pity FOE and Greenpeace chose not to come”

“Apart from “greens” absenting themselves”

“Green groups”

“Green campaigners”

“Environmental groups – but I understand why they weren’t present”

“Anti nuclear lobby - as mentioned”

6 Do you have any other comments?

Comment analysis

- good / excellent / enjoyed it / thanks (23)
- well-organised / facilitated (19)
- need wider debate (4)
- want to know more details about who was invited / involved (4)
- do more of them / want to participate again (3)

All comments**Belfast:**

“Exceptionally well facilitated. Very impressed with the commitment to even handedness”

“Would like to be informed about the progress of the consultation and policy decision”

“Very well facilitated”

“Please can we do this again”

Birmingham:

“It is part of a much wider debate about the future of energy and our ATTITUDE towards USE.

We must re-engage in LOCAL energy PLANNING.

This needs to be discussed more directly with CLG in context of Local Energy Planning”

“I only found out about the event on Friday, 20th July. How were people targeted and invited and perhaps a wider audience should have been considered”

“Basic document was flawed in particular in not recognising ? urgency of international action. No economic data deserving the name. No level playing field for alternatives such as coal CCS”

“Possibly a more up to date delegate list as not all attendees were recorded”

“I was pleased to be involved and found the session interesting and informative”

“I am still not sure how real public engagement with the issue will take pace nor of the role of Private Public responsibilities with respect to future liabilities and insurance”

“Very good!”

“We could have been told how many Vendors (sic), P.182 consultancy doc. have entered phase 1 as the closing date was 22/6/07. Also how they were canvassed – public ad or old boys net? This would give transparency and firm up some parts of the doc. that express uncertainty”

Bristol:

“Very professionally organised and facilitated stakeholder meeting.
Please note that these are my personal views”
“Very well facilitated”
“It is difficult for members of the public to understand nuclear power so specialist consultations might be better”
“A useful and worthwhile debate”
“Like the table facilitator”
“Found it useful and constructive and informative”
“Room was quite cold”
“Please use more local representatives ie SSG”

Cambridge:

“A very valid attempt as part of a very difficult objective”
“I would like to participate in future events. HH should present to the ESPN Regional Group (all regions represented in one hit!)”
“Please take our concerns into consideration. It is not necessary or essential to go down the nuclear route and leave its horrendous legacy to be faced for thousands of years”
“Enjoyed the day”
“Well run meeting but discussion questions did not tackle real issues”

Cardiff:

“A genuine hope that government will listen to responses from consultation”
“On balance a worthwhile exercise from the point of view of attendees”
“Good meeting”

Glasgow:

“The meeting was conducted professionally, openly and fairly. Discussions and debate was informed and relevant”
“The consultation document posed far more valuable questions which perhaps would get addressed at these meetings. Does it rely upon online response to these more detailed questions”
“I shall be submitting some security questions separately”
“Very well organised and prepared. Hergen Hay was very good – clearly spoken and well informed”
“More Council reps.”
“No mention WDF/incineration/or waste to energy”
“Excellent workshop”
“BERR should be working more proactively to encourage the Scottish government to participate in the dialogue”

Leeds:

“The meeting was not advertised very well. It was lucky that I found out about it”
“Reference question 5 – it was difficult to judge what the relevant stakeholders interests were. But the discussion covered a wide variety of views. Although I thought energy intensive industry users were a bit thin on the ground”
“Enjoyable”
“Energy production is just one aspect to co2 production and climate change. The whole issue needs to be considered alongside international perspectives and possible repercussions”
“Nice venue. Just the right amount of time”
“Need to demonstrate robustness of support data”
“Excellent facilitation by Hergen”
“The Briefing consultation was very poor. The underlying assumption (eg economic, demand growth, energy conservation etc) were not stated. No attempt was made to show, in a factual and measured way, what the alternatives were”

London:

“Thought event logistics done well and facilitation was very balanced, open and professional”
“Very good facilitator overall”
“Government policy to be developed on what they, their civil servants and advisors, believe are in the best”
“It is the role of governments to govern!”
“Excellent!”
“The refusal of BERR to release key primary document to individuals and NGOs has ruined objectivity of the consultation”
“There was too little evidence of representation of other countries’ experience”
“Well done, especially getting the Minister to speak”
“Thank you”
“Table discussion should be encouraged following plenary interventions”
“Didn’t feel the session would greatly help govt. in their decision making process”

Manchester:

“Skills were not addressed or raised”
“The consultation (both the document and presentations) are quite leading towards agreeing to new nuclear build”
“Nothing about the finance. Why is it so expensive – how could it become feasible economically? How would government be able to address these issues?”

“Good, interesting and well run event”
“Useful, open exercise”
“Very professional and well done. Could have been all day event”
“Nothing today has convinced me that there is any case for new nuclear build”
“Interesting to note that nobody questioned the concept of climate change – taken as read”
“Too short”
“Interesting to know how people were selected. I came only because our SSG invitee, the secretary and employee of Springfields, thought it more appropriate he open invite to members”
“My feeling is that the decision has already been made and new build nuclear is going ahead. The debate has been set up in such a way that the result was almost pre ordained”
“Good effort by BERR”
“More discussion time required (whole room debate). Govt. should provide a clear energy policy with a mix of supply, based on good reasons, rather than leaving it to the market place”
“Thanks”
“Good, well organised meeting”
“Questions were closed – Challenges – there could be 5 challenges (+price, skills, safety)”

Newcastle:

“Apart from the poor representation of the audience make up – the event was good. The material to read arrived on Friday afternoon, for a Monday morning meeting – this was not acceptable”
“Get on with it”
“Other voluntary/statutory groups would have been interested in attending”
“I think we should aim to create the market for nuclear power as soon as possible to protect supply in the short, medium and long term”
“Excellent presentation”
“Excellent facilitator”

Nottingham:

“Well organised, informative and useful event”
“Underlying assumptions of the government’s paper distort the discussion – no opportunity to challenge assumptions”
“Thank you”
“Excellent event”

Reading:

“Worthwhile effort and could consult fully and engage”
“Meeting very well facilitated”
“Well facilitated, really glad I came”
“It was a pity that more anti’s were not able to attend”

Annex 3: Site stakeholder events

Evaluation questionnaire analysis

Bradwell, 3 October 2007: 10 participants; 10 questionnaires returned = 100%

Dungeness, 20 August 2007: 27 participants; 22 questionnaires returned = 81%

Hartlepool, 30 August 2007: 37 participants; 29 questionnaires returned = 78%

Heysham, 17 August 2007: 30 participants; 24 questionnaires returned = 80%

Hinkley, 15 August 2007: 22 participants; 18 questionnaires returned = 82%

Hunterston, 25 September 2007: 23 participants; 16 questionnaires returned = 70%

Sizewell, 31 August 2007: 26 participants; 25 questionnaires returned = 96%

Torness, 26 September 2007: 24 participants; 21 questionnaires returned = 86%

Wylfa, 27 September 2007: 66 participants; 35 questionnaires returned = 53%

Total 265 participants; 200 questionnaires returned = 75% return rate

NB All percentages are calculated against the total number of questionnaires returned, and are shown to the nearest whole number.

1 How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

There was enough time at the meeting to discuss the issues properly	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bradwell	1 (10%)	8 (20%)	-	1 (10%)	-
Dungeness	1 (5%)	9 (41%)	4 (18%)	8 (36%)	-
Hartlepool	5 (17%)	14 (48%)	3 (10%)	6 (21%)	1 (3%)
Heysham	4 (17%)	10 (42%)	5 (21%)	5 (21%)	-
Hinkley	2 (11%)	15 (83%)	-	1 (6%)	-
Hunterston	1 (6%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	9 (56%)	2 (13%)
Sizewell	1 (4%)	12 (48%)	2 (8%)	10 (40%)	-
Torness	5 (24%)	10 (48%)	2 (10%)	4 (19%)	-
Wylfa	6 (17%)	19 (54%)	3 (9%)	4 (11%)	2 (6%)
Combined result	26 (13%)	99 (50%)	21 (10%)	48 (24%)	5 (3%)

There was enough information provided in advance to enable informed input	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bradwell	3 (30%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	-	1 (10%)
Dungeness	-	2 (9%)	8 (36%)	11 (50%)	1 (5%)
Hartlepool	1 (3%)	13 (45%)	6 (21%)	8 (28%)	-
Heysham	5 (21%)	4 (17%)	9 (38%)	5 (21%)	1 (4%)
Hinkley	1 (6%)	9 (50%)	6 (33%)	2 (11%)	-
Hunterston	1 (6%)	7 (44%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)	3 (19%)
Sizewell	-	11 (44%)	5 (20%)	9 (36%)	-
Torness	6 (29%)	9 (43%)	3 (14%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)
Wylfa	4 (11%)	14 (40%)	6 (17%)	7 (20%)	3 (9%)
Combined result	21 (10%)	73 (37%)	47 (24%)	47 (24%)	10 (5%)

All the main issues were covered in the meeting	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bradwell	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	-	-	-
Dungeness	3 (14%)	14 (64%)	2 (9%)	2 (9%)	-
Hartlepool	3 (10%)	21 (72%)	2 (7%)	3 (10%)	-
Heysham	3 (13%)	13 (54%)	6 (25%)	1 (4%)	-
Hinkley	4 (22%)	13 (72%)	1 (6%)	-	-
Hunterston	3 (19%)	6 (38%)	4 (25%)	3 (19%)	-
Sizewell	3 (12%)	15 (60%)	5 (20%)	2 (8%)	-
Torness	5 (24%)	16 (76%)	-	-	-
Wylfa	11 (31%)	14 (40%)	7 (20%)	2 (6%)	-
Combined result	39 (20%)	118 (59%)	27 (14%)	13 (7%)	-

The facilitation of the meeting was fair and balanced	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bradwell	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	-	-	-
Dungeness	11 (50%)	11 (50%)	-	-	-
Hartlepool	11 (38%)	17 (59%)	1 (3%)	-	-
Heysham	11 (46%)	13 (54%)	-	-	-
Hinkley	4 (22%)	12 (67%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	-
Hunterston	4 (25%)	10 (63%)	2 (13%)	-	-
Sizewell	10 (40%)	15 (60%)	-	-	-
Torness	9 (43%)	11 (52%)	-	-	-
Wylfa	11 (31%)	18 (51%)	3 (9%)	2 (6%)	-
Combined result	77 (39%)	111 (55%)	7 (4%)	3 (2%)	-

The structure of the meeting enabled us to discuss the issues properly	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bradwell	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	-	-	-
Dungeness	3 (14%)	13 (59%)	4 (18%)	2 (9%)	-
Hartlepool	8 (28%)	14 (48%)	1 (3%)	6 (21%)	-
Heysham	6 (25%)	13 (54%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	-
Hinkley	5 (28%)	13 (72%)	-	-	-
Hunterston	1 (6%)	7 (44%)	3 (19%)	3 (19%)	1 (6%)
Sizewell	6 (24%)	12 (48%)	3 (12%)	4 (16%)	-
Torness	7 (33%)	11 (52%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	-
Wylfa	7 (20%)	19 (54%)	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	1 (3%)
Combined result	46 (23%)	109 (55%)	17 (9%)	21 (11%)	2 (1%)

All participants were treated equally and respectfully	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bradwell	9 (90%)	1 (10%)	-	-	-
Dungeness	10 (45%)	12 (55%)	-	-	-
Hartlepool	15 (52%)	13 (45%)	1 (3%)	-	-
Heysham	15 (63%)	9 (38%)	-	-	-
Hinkley	9 (50%)	8 (44%)	1 (6%)	-	-
Hunterston	6 (38%)	9 (56%)	1 (6%)	-	-
Sizewell	10 (40%)	15 (60%)	-	-	-
Torness	15 (71%)	6 (29%)	-	-	-
Wylfa	19 (54%)	15 (43%)	-	-	-
Combined result	108 (54%)	88 (44%)	3 (2%)	-	-

No single view was allowed to dominate unfairly	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bradwell	9 (90%)	1 (10%)	-	-	-
Dungeness	7 (32%)	14 (64%)	1 (5%)	-	-
Hartlepool	10 (34%)	17 (59%)	2 (7%)	-	-
Heysham	14 (58%)	8 (33%)	2 (8%)	-	-
Hinkley	5 (28%)	13 (72%)	-	-	-
Hunterston	2 (13%)	6 (38%)	3 (19%)	4 (25%)	1 (6%)
Sizewell	8 (32%)	13 (52%)	2 (8%)	-	1 (4%)
Torness	13 (62%)	6 (29%)	2 (10%)	-	-
Wylfa	13 (37%)	14 (40%)	4 (11%)	2 (6%)	-
Combined result	81 (41%)	92 (46%)	16 (8%)	6 (3%)	2 (1%)

I was able to raise the issues I wanted to	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bradwell	5 (50%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	-	1 (10%)
Dungeness	7 (32%)	14 (64%)	1 (5%)	-	-
Hartlepool	9 (31%)	19 (66%)	1 (3%)	-	-
Heysham	10 (42%)	12 (50%)	2 (8%)	-	-
Hinkley	3 (17%)	15 (83%)	-	-	-
Hunterston	3 (19%)	12 (75%)	1 (6%)	-	-
Sizewell	7 (28%)	14 (56%)	3 (12%)	-	-
Torness	11 (52%)	9 (43%)	1 (5%)	-	-
Wylfa	10 (29%)	16 (46%)	6 (17%)	1 (3%)	-
Combined result	65 (33%)	114 (57%)	16 (8%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)

I will also be participating in this consultation in other ways (e.g. online)	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bradwell	4 (40%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	-	-
Dungeness	2 (9%)	16 (73%)	4 (18%)	-	-
Hartlepool	5 (17%)	12 (41%)	10 (34%)	1 (3%)	-
Heysham	7 (29%)	11 (46%)	4 (17%)	2 (8%)	-
Hinkley	2 (11%)	7 (39%)	5 (26%)	1 (6%)	-
Hunterston	1 (6%)	10 (63%)	4 (25%)	-	-
Sizewell	4 (16%)	11 (44%)	6 (24%)	3 (12%)	-
Torness	8 (38%)	6 (29%)	6 (29%)	1 (5%)	-
Wylfa	10 (29%)	17 (49%)	5 (14%)	-	-
Combined result	43 (22%)	93 (47%)	47 (24%)	8 (4%)	-

The objectives of this meeting were clear and transparent	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bradwell	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	-	-	-
Dungeness	7 (32%)	13 (59%)	1 (5%)	-	-
Hartlepool	10 (34%)	13 (45%)	3 (10%)	2 (7%)	-
Heysham	6 (25%)	15 (63%)	3 (13%)	-	-
Hinkley	6 (33%)	12 (67%)	-	-	-
Hunterston	5 (31%)	6 (38%)	4 (25%)	1 (6%)	-
Sizewell	7 (28%)	12 (48%)	4 (16%)	2 (8%)	-
Torness	9 (43%)	12 (57%)	-	-	-
Wylfa	11 (31%)	20 (57%)	1 (3%)	-	-
Combined result	65 (33%)	109 (55%)	16 (8%)	5 (3%)	-

The roles and responsibilities of stakeholders at this meeting were clear	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bradwell	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	-
Dungeness	4 (18%)	10 (45%)	5 (23%)	2 (9%)	-
Hartlepool	5 (17%)	19 (66%)	3 (10%)	1 (3%)	-
Heysham	5 (21%)	14 (58%)	4 (17%)	1 (4%)	-
Hinkley	1 (6%)	12 (67%)	4 (22%)	1 (6%)	-
Hunterston	2 (13%)	8 (50%)	3 (19%)	3 (19%)	-
Sizewell	5 (20%)	11 (44%)	6 (24%)	2 (8%)	-
Torness	5 (24%)	13 (62%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	-
Wylfa	11 (31%)	9 (26%)	6 (17%)	7 (20%)	-
Combined result	40 (20%)	100 (50%)	35 (18%)	20 (10%)	-

The way the outputs from this meeting will be used was clear and transparent	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bradwell	4 (40%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	-
Dungeness	4 (18%)	13 (59%)	3 (14%)	2 (9%)	-
Hartlepool	7 (24%)	17 (59%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	-
Heysham	5 (21%)	15 (63%)	4 (17%)	-	-
Hinkley	3 (17%)	12 (67%)	3 (17%)	-	-
Hunterston	3 (19%)	9 (56%)	4 (25%)	-	-
Sizewell	5 (20%)	16 (64%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	-
Torness	6 (29%)	15 (71%)	-	-	-
Wylfa	7 (20%)	18 (51%)	7 (20%)	-	-
Combined result	44 (22%)	119 (60%)	26 (13%)	7 (4%)	-

The level of influence of the stakeholders at this meeting on Government policy was clear and transparent	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bradwell	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)	-	1 (10%)
Dungeness	4 (18%)	10 (45%)	7 (32%)	1 (5%)	-
Hartlepool	5 (17%)	15 (52%)	6 (21%)	2 (7%)	-
Heysham	4 (17%)	11 (46%)	5 (21%)	4 (17%)	-
Hinkley	3 (17%)	11 (61%)	4 (22%)	-	-
Hunterston	3 (19%)	6 (38%)	6 (38%)	1 (6%)	-
Sizewell	4 (16%)	13 (52%)	3 (12%)	4 (16%)	-
Torness	5 (24%)	15 (71%)	1 (5%)	-	-
Wylfa	10 (29%)	16 (46%)	5 (14%)	2 (6%)	-
Combined result	40 (20%)	101 (51%)	40 (20%)	14 (7%)	1 (1%)

BERR will listen to and consider the stakeholder views given at this event	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bradwell	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	2 (20%)	-	-
Dungeness	6 (27%)	13 (59%)	1 (5%)	-	-
Hartlepool	6 (21%)	16 (55%)	6 (21%)	-	-
Heysham	3 (13%)	13 (54%)	7 (29%)	-	-
Hinkley	3 (17%)	13 (72%)	2 (11%)	-	-
Hunterston	4 (25%)	6 (38%)	6 (38%)	-	-
Sizewell	1 (4%)	17 (68%)	5 (20%)	1 (4%)	-
Torness	7 (33%)	12 (57%)	2 (10%)	-	-
Wylfa	9 (26%)	15 (43%)	8 (23%)	1 (3%)	-
Combined result	42 (21%)	110 (55%)	39 (20%)	2 (1%)	-

The meeting was useful and worthwhile	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bradwell	7 (70%)	2 (20%)	-	1 (10%)	-
Dungeness	12 (55%)	10 (45%)	-	-	-
Hartlepool	12 (41%)	16 (55%)	1 (3%)	-	-
Heysham	11 (46%)	12 (50%)	1 (4%)	-	-
Hinkley	7 (39%)	11 (61%)	-	-	-
Hunterston	3 (19%)	8 (50%)	3 (19%)	-	-
Sizewell	6 (24%)	16 (64%)	3 (12%)	-	-
Torness	12 (57%)	9 (43%)	-	-	-
Wylfa	10 (29%)	18 (51%)	4 (11%)	1 (3%)	-
Combined result	80 (40%)	102 (51%)	12 (6%)	2 (1%)	-

Comment analysis

- good process / well managed / useful (7)
- not enough opposing views (2)
- hijacked by closed minds (2)

All comments

Bradwell:

"Poor attendance meant that no attendee held any anti nuclear views. It really needed at least one anti-nuclear perspective"

"(Information) provided too late to evaluate properly"

"Well handled without haste or pressures!"

Dungeness:

"Excellent chairperson"

Hartlepool:

"Information provided but not enough time to assimilate it ahead of meeting"

"I was not prepared – expecting a simple presentation – this was clearly a consultation heavily biased to nuclear power"

"I suppose I was aware of the consultation but had not looked at the doc/website in advance – I guess I was therefore coming to the presentation blind"

Heysham:

"Not enough time available for final topics"

"The presenter stated that this meeting was not a referendum, but one of a number of meetings to provide info about public opinion to the government. Will the government be influenced by it or has the"

"Useful meeting!"

"A well structured meeting which I enjoyed"

Hinkley:

"An interesting and worthwhile airing of views and concerns, but the meeting lacked the input from the anti nuclear brigade"

Hunterston:

"It would have been nice to introduce people and who they represented"

"Pity to be hijacked by people with closed minds"

"Some attendees hijacked the time - prevented equal coverage of some important issues"

"No real discussion at my table, multiple conversations but no real debate"

Sizewell:

"Could have discussed issues over whole day, but with expert up front it was well worthwhile. Many thanks"

Torness:

"Booklet on the future of the nuclear industry in the UK arrived too late to be properly considered"

"Much more interesting meeting than initially envisaged. Good level of audience participation"

"More time would have been useful"

Wylfa:

“Excellent presentation”

“No real discussion – opinion was polarised from outset. Different groups pushing differing agendas. The timing was wrong, i.e. when to hold this consultation”

“It is essential to build another nuclear power station at WYLFA”

2 What were the best / most useful aspects of the meeting?

Comment analysis

- to hear / share views / discuss with range of stakeholders (with diverse views) (36)
- open / useful / dynamic discussions (33)
- well structured / conducted / facilitated (12)
- information provided / informative (12)
- good chance to contribute / give views / all views listened to / everyone had chance to speak (10)
- good presentations (7)
- understanding more about the issues / subject (7)
- all good / useful (4)
- covered the key issues (3)
- good mix / quality stakeholders (2)
- BERR facilitating (2)
- local community reps (2)

All comments

Bradwell:

“Openness and clear discussion between all present“

“Open discussion”

“Open forum”

“Group discussion”

“Hearing the opinion of informed people”

“I learned a lot about other people’s views and also more detail about things like safety. I feel I have a much better knowledge on the subject now”

“Broadening knowledge”

“Safety and waste”

Dungeness:

“Open discussion after the plenary sessions”

“Understanding the government process”

“Open discussion”

“A chance to voice views”

“I now have clearer views etc”

“The principal speaker, clarity of presentations”

“Bringing together varied groups”

“Clear presentation”

“Good opportunity to share opinions”

“The chance to raise most issues”

“Insight into process of consultation”

“Insight into the issue”

“It’s a start”

“Being a lone anti nuclear person I was able to express my views”

“Presentations and table discussions”

“Openness”

“To be able to air views”

Hartlepool:

“Info provided at meeting and additional sources identified”

“See how government are satisfying the need for an open and honest consultation”

“A good number of different points of view were expressed. There was no attempt to stifle discussion”

“Open discussion”

“Having time to focus on issues”

“Having representatives from BERR facilitating the meeting – having a good representation from the local community”

“Explanation as to the way forward”

“No strong feeling about any aspect”

“Very informative”

“Being asked my views”
“Let everyone speak”
“All beneficial”
“All views listened to”
“Information”
“Discussion and facilitation of views expressed”
“To understand the government preliminary views and the consultation process”
“The combination of mixed views”
“Discussing around issues”
“Hearing the opposing views and arguments”
“Hearing views from many different people”
“Discussions/views on nuclear energy for the future – pros and cons”
“Variation of views expressed/discussed”
“Information gathering”
“Gaining overview of nuclear views”
“The debate was best”

Heysham:

“Meeting/hearing from other S/Hs, putting human face to DBERR”
“Opportunity to get our views formed”
“Meeting other people, getting facts and figures”
“Clear presentation, and open discussion and good response to some difficult questions”
“Getting a full picture of range of points and opinions”
“Having widely advertised, very few people came (to give any negative views) and many gave strong”
“Information and discussion”
“Getting an appreciation of other people’s views”
“Discussion”
“Group discussions and Q&A, plus the documentation”
“Awareness of all the issues, their impact on nuclear power/climate change”
“The structure”
“Finding out about the process of approving white papers and all other information about nuclear”
“Clear and open facilitation. Well structured focus on main points and opportunity for comment/input focused on those”
“Ability to discuss the issues with a good mix of other interests around the table”

Hinkley:

“Hearing from experts and people with a policy background”
“Shared views of others and new information received”
“Open discussion”
“Group discussion”
“Whole meeting was informative and useful”
“People had chance to give their opinions. Good group discussions”
“General discussion”
“All aspects”
“All very useful”

Hunterston:

“The facilitator – bright guy!”
“Open discussion”
“Way presenter controlled a difficult meeting”
“Discussions”
“Excellent chairman”
“Information”
“Table discussion”
“Presentation”

Sizewell:

“Hearing opposing views of the minority taken fairly and squarely by speaker and made worthwhile (i.e. answered well)”
“Ability to expose the limitations of the debate – it should be about energy, not nuclear”
“Wide variety of contributions”
“To hear points of view. An excellent meeting”
“There was an unbiased presentation with opportunities to raise and challenge points”
“The combination of well informed participants and some very different viewpoints”
“Very good facilitation”
“Good facilitation that sparked a good discussion around the issues”
“Hearing views of other local stakeholders”
“Ability to share views with others around the table”
“Listening to others views”
“Discussion time”

"Hearing the diversity of views"
 "Info. Debates round table"
 "Exchange of views in a largely calm and rational atmosphere"
 "The table discussions"
 "Range of views and balanced control of meeting"
 "How the diverse opinions were allowed to flow in positive useful debate"
 "Hearing the views of opposition which were not really valid"
 "A different (mostly) group to Cambridge. It was clear that if the govt. through consultation had taken a positive view, others in the debate had a clear negative view"
 "To gain a better understanding of the issues concerned"
 "Hearing views of those attending. Having process for consultation explained"
 "Exchange of opinions with others"

Torness:

"The manner in which it was conducted"
 "Good level of debate"
 "Summary of nuclear consultation"
 "The new information from BE staff"
 "General discussion – presentations"
 "Wide debate on issues"
 "Information and participation"
 "Round table discussion with members of nuclear industry present"
 "Involvement of people from the local community"
 "Best use was made of the available time"
 "Discussion round the table"
 "Open dialogue"
 "Explanation of energy mix"
 "Open discussion"
 "Stakeholder articulation of views"
 "Able to discuss issues in an open supportive environment"
 "Better understanding of others' views"

Wylfa:

"Listen to other views and the opportunity to put over my own"
 "Face to face contact"
 "Openness. Balanced views. Speaker's knowledge"
 "Opportunity to hear a rounded opinion"
 "Provision of government backing"
 "Diverse as well as well informed views"
 "Not enough time for break out sessions as a lot of interest"
 "Openness"
 "Freedom of speech"
 "Good debate"
 "Open and honest approach by all"
 "Cross sectoral debate"
 "Information"
 "Every view was given an opportunity to be aired"
 "Questions"
 "I came into possession of the consultation document"

3 What were the worst / least useful aspects of the meeting?

Comment analysis

- too short / could have been longer / whole day (24)
- a few individuals pushed views rather than debating / held the floor / dominated (14)
- not enough information in advance / not enough time to read information before (13)
- none / all was good / useful (6)
- not enough anti-nuclear / opposing views (4)
- discussions rushed (4)
- not enough local community people (3)
- participants stating incorrect / ill informed 'facts' (3)
- poor attendance (2)
- introductory presentations too long (2)

All comments

Bradwell:

- “Finished too early but even so I feel all points were adequately answered”
- “Would have liked more time”
- “Limited attendees from local community”
- “The number present”
- “Part of the introduction – too long, considering those attending would have likely had an awareness of this”

Dungeness:

- “Lack of time to discuss”
- “The presentation was too simple”
- “Shortage of preparatory briefing”
- “Time constraint, lack of pre briefing material”
- “Half time”
- “Not enough time!”
- “Bit rushed for a complex subject”
- “Lack of time for Q&A / discussions”
- “Not long enough”
- “Inevitably, lack of time for in depth discussion – but appreciate practical limitations of the event”
- “The hot water for tea was warm!”

Hartlepool:

- “Too few local residents present to forward views adequately”
- “Too restricted, needed to be more out in the community”
- “Not enough politicians present (including MP)”
- “Not really enough time”
- “Overpowering individuals”
- “The views of an anti nuclear member of the audience”
- “No strong feeling about any aspect”
- “Not enough time”
- “Time”
- “Not enough time”
- “Question session a bit too long”
- “Not enough time for discussions as personal views were required”
- “Limited information given in some areas”
- “Not sufficient prior information provided”

Heysham:

- “Questions seemed framed to get required Yes. Short of time on most issues”
- “Dominated by nuclear industry and pro nuclear lobby”
- “No problems with it”
- “Slightly rushed”
- “Not enough time to consider everything”
- “It was held on a working day, so it limited many people’s ability to attend”
- “The first questions (the easiest and most obvious to agree with) were given too much prominence and not enough time for the second set”
- “No biscuits”
- “Nothing negative”
- “None that I can think of”
- “Benefits and pros for nuclear power presented first. Concerns were very briefly addressed and not with enough time/depth”
- “Limited time. Lack of comfort break”
- “I expected more people to attend due to the importance of this subject”

Hinkley:

- “Group discussion”
- “Distribution of delegation at table”
- “No anti nuclear representation”
- “I would like to hear the presentation more clearly”
- “Insight into local community views”
- “Lack of negative views”

Hunterston:

- “Some of the participants”
- “Dominating persons / sometimes in my opinion with incorrect facts”
- “The hijack re public meeting”
- “Domination by people with closed minds!”
- “Lack of time to discuss waste disposal”
- “Filibuster!”

“Over representation by one segment of audience”
“Domination by 1 group in trying to hog the questions. This was very tactfully dealt with”
“Lack of time”

Sizewell:

“Knowing it is part only of a huge and complex picture”
“Lack of time”
“Not enough time”
“I do not think there were any worst/least aspects”
“When the debate turned to the process instead of the subject”
“Over dominance by very strong views and not pressed to give alternatives”
“It would have been extremely useful to have received the consultation document in advance”
“All ok”
“ ‘Future of nuclear power’ should have been available 14 days before the meeting”
“Too little time”
“Belief that little notice will be taken of views expressed”
“Structure of questions based on availability (or lack of) information”
“A bit more time for debate would be useful”
“Introduction a little long”
“Did not see report in advance”
“Maybe – anti lobby – although a minority view had more air time”
“Felt there was a need for wider info on total energy problem, to put nuclear pros/cons into context”
“Perhaps reinforced the challenge of debate on such a complex subject with no clear right answer. Most useful comment made at table about electricity used in transport and therefore increasing role for electricity generation”
“Feeling out of my depth, not knowledgeable enough about the issues concerned, but on the plus side now feel a greater need to find out more”
“More time to consider detailed issues would have been useful”
“Filling in forms like these”

Torness:

“Perhaps more time could have been given to discussing the issues”
“Not many anti nuclear views”
“Representation wasn’t broad enough”
“Not enough prior information”
“It would have been more useful to have pre reading earlier”
“Waste was not a specific question”
“No real representative of contrary views”
“Time frame”

Wylfa:

“All well behaved”
“Some uneducated and inaccurate opinions against nuclear as part of the blend”
“Discussion was not restricted to the consultation questions, so no definite feedback could be gained”
“Individuals leaving mid meeting and not hearing full debate”
“Lack of objectivity of most vociferous attendees!”
“Over domination on specific issues relating to power use”
“Lack of debate”
“Some people who like the sound of their own voice”

4 What was the most important benefit for you and/or your organisation in taking part in this meeting?

Comment analysis

- hearing / understanding others' / wide range of views / concerns / knowledge (39)
- increased knowledge / awareness of the subject / better informed / clarified thinking (23)
- chance to give / promote my/my organisation's views / being heard (14)
- opportunity for participation / engaging in the consultation / able to contribute (12)
- information (11)
- understanding / finding out about Government's views / position (9)
- meeting people / networking / contacts (4)
- finding out about / understanding the process / consultation (4)
- chance to take information back to community / others (4)
- implications for future planning (2)
- all of it (2)
- consensus (2)

All comments

Bradwell:

- “Understanding other delegate’s views”
- “It gave me a chance to update my views and hear the latest government thinking”
- “As both a community member and local public employee (fire officer) to be enabled to participate in a future proposal”
- “Better understanding of the issues”
- “Clarifying a few questions in the consultation document”
- “See question 2”
- “Ability to understand future policies!”
- “.Future horizon scanning for LA emergencies planning”

Dungeness:

- “To take back information to residents”
- “Looking at how future consultations on new build might impact on the role of and demands on SSG members”
- “Information”
- “All of it”
- “Chance to input local view”
- “Useful information”
- “Awareness of the degree of thought already committed to this issue”
- “Awareness of future plans”
- “Gained understanding”
- “Talking to the opposition in a civilised way”
- “Range of views expressed”
- “To hear other people’s views”

Hartlepool:

- “Separating myths from facts”
- “Raising the issues”
- “Judging progress towards new build”
- “I was here as an individual rather than representing Stockton Council”
- “? open discussion”
- “From my point of view, listening to the concerns and issues raised by the public. As a BE employee I am privileged to know the stringent safety methods and processes etc. that are in place”
- “Involvement in the process and being able to interject with security aspects of the discussion”
- “Understand the feelings of local people”
- “Understanding nuclear energy”
- “To see and hear different views”
- “I am a local Councillor where I live in Hartlepool, as I also work at Hartlepool power station, all beneficial”
- “Being able to contribute”
- “Future planning”
- “Listening to local community representatives’ views”
- “Listening to local views against national developments/considerations”
- “Meeting with other stakeholders”
- “To put views forward”
- “Finding open views from all areas”
- “Hearing the view of the government and being able to take this to pass on to other parties”
- “Again, it made me realise how many differing views there are on the subject. Also it enhanced my understanding of the considerations around nuclear power”
- “Gathering of knowledge/clearer understanding of views of differing sides of the argument”
- “Information gathering”
- “Overview of opinions”
- “To best understand the process and probability of securing replacement of Hartlepool power station”

Heysham:

- “Talking to British Energy as well as DBERR”
- “Hopefully putting a different view”
- “Info”
- “The ability to give a brief input on the future of nuclear in the future to our members”
- “Understanding key issues raised by local participants”
- “I have now got a copy of the consultation document to study”
- “To hear (clarity) about key issues to people”
- “Increased knowledge of current debates”
- “Learning and understanding other views on this nuclear subject”
- “See question 2”
- “Listening to a wide variety of views on the issues involved”
- “More awareness about question 2”
- “Opportunity for direct comment/input concerning the consultation process and issues around key discussion points”

“Consultation”
“Awareness of the issues raised through the consultation”

Hinkley:

“An improved knowledge of the issues surrounding nuclear energy”
“As item 2”
“Learning more about NP”
“Taking on board the views of other representatives in the local community as well as the official DTI line”
“More NGOs/opposing views needed”
“Information supplied and opportunity to speak to BE and others”
“To put the point of view of the Bridewater town council, i.e. safety issues”

Hunterston:

“Information”
“Learn the full spectrum of issues and concerns”
“Chance to express views in our group”
“Divisive nature of people’s reactions to waste”
“Sharing views”
“Face to face understanding of depth of feeling on specific issues”

Sizewell:

“Being here and hearing views (feeling informed and listened to)”
“Explaining my position viz CoRWM”
“Listening to others”
“To listen and learn”
“Better understanding of the consultation process”
“Interaction with viewpoints as per 2”
“Learning”
“Taking soundings from others”
“Getting/reconfirming my view on how local people feel about nuclear energy”
“Hearing that the government has not made its mind up yet in favour of new nuclear build”
“Increasing knowledge”
“Hearing a range of views”
“Widening my personal knowledge of the issue”
“Being part of the continuing event”
“To hear views”
“As in 2 above”

Torness:

“The information provided and the opportunity to contribute to the consultation process”
“To hear others views”
“To understand more about nuclear debate”
“Information”
“Information”
“Opportunity to ensure balanced debate take place”
“Broad consensus of approval for N power”
“Participation”
“Being available to participants should they wish”
“Clear questions to put back to my community”
“Able to put views across”
“Ability to express views”
“Able to state view”
“Hearing others’ perspective”
“Understanding of future energy mix and nuclear is positive”
“Networking”
“Understand real stakeholder views”
“To learn more about the future of nuclear power”
“An interest in the local feelings”
“Understanding nuclear”

Wylfa:

“Getting my views over”
“Learning more of the government’s policy”
“Chance to make my views known”
“Hearing a strong consensus for nuclear locally”
“To observe the futility of the so called consultation process”
“Information gathering”
“Listening to the views of others”
“Information received first hand”
“The fact that this discussion was at WYLFA was highly positive”

"Opportunity to participate"
 "Future of nuclear power"
 "Receiving a wide opinion of Anglesey residents"
 "Improved understanding of the issues"
 "The information that was presented by the main speaker"
 "Listening"

5 Were the relevant stakeholder interests represented at the meeting?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Bradwell	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)
Dungeness	14 (64%)	1 (5%)	3 (14%)
Hartlepool	20 (69%)	2 (7%)	4 (14%)
Heysham	10 (42%)	2 (8%)	8 (33%)
Hinkley	4 (22%)	5 (28%)	4 (22%)
Hunterston	7 (44%)	1 (6%)	5 (31%)
Sizewell	20 (80%)	-	4 (16%)
Torness	11 (52%)	4 (19%)	6 (29%)
Wylfa	19 (54%)	3 (9%)	6 (17%)
Combined result	110 (56%)	19 (10%)	43 (22%)

If not, who was missing and/or should not have been there?

Comment analysis

- not enough greens / NGOs
- not enough local community / residents / public (7)
- needed more anti-nuclear / opposing views (2)
- * Defra should have been there (2)

All comments

Bradwell:

No comments

Dungeness:

"More NGOs/interest groups would be welcome"
 "Greenpeace, CND and National FOE people"

Hartlepool:

"See answer to question 3"
 "Too nuclear power biased"
 "I assume so"
 "91.000 population in Hartlepool along"
 "Some of the local authorities were not represented"
 "Government view only"

Heysham:

"Someone from Defra to talk on ?"
 "Local environmental groups: FOE, Greenpeace"
 "More local population and NGOs would have been welcome"
 "More university members"

Hinkley:

"Probably too many people with a vested interest in nuclear"
 "No anti nuclear. One or two local councillors may have helped in this regard"
 "Opinion was passed that some representatives/NGO chose not to attend"
 "NGOs"
 "NGOs"
 "Safety"

Hunterston:

“The public at large”
 “NII, DEFRA, SEPA”

Sizewell:

“More public, more opposition, simpler data and questions”
 “Views of young people, more lay people. Understand wider consultation will take place in future but not sure why this interim consultation”

Torness:

“More community residents”
 “Green viewpoint”
 “Did not know who everybody was so can't comment”
 “Not enough green groups”

Wylfa:

“As ethics is a main consideration, the lack of any presentation of an alternative ethical position (i.e. conservation)”
 “More local people and those whose future on Anglesey is important”

6 Do you have any other comments?

Comment analysis

- good / excellent / enjoyed it / thanks (10)
- well organised / facilitated (8)
- need Government to get on and make a decision (6)
- needed more on other issues (3: 2 said waste; 1 said security)
- needed more time / too short (3)
- should have publicised the meeting better (2)
- one group dominated (2)
- do more of them / want to participate again (2)

All comments**Bradwell:**

“Get more of the general public on board about the nuclear issues and not just as a sideline of Co. generation”

Dungeness:

“More such meetings are needed as this progresses”
 “I found it worthwhile”
 “I would like some discussion or research on uses of nuclear waste”
 “Why was I the only person against nuclear power. What is being done to engage more like me to get a better idea of all opinions – I am not a professional, 90% of attendees were”

Hartlepool:

“It would have been informative to discuss these issues at the Neighbourhood Consultative Forums prior to the meeting to obtain a wider view and also to publicise the question more widely”
 “When and how are the community/citizen consultations to be held – due to location in power station with power station staff rather biased”
 “The anti nuclear view of those teaching our children does need to be addressed”
 “A good open meeting”
 “Presentational material was very good and necessary – but the event was too short for effective table discussion”
 “The main question I would like answered is whether the New Build would be afforded the same security measures that are presently provided by the power station guards and the CNC. Referring to the critical national infrastructure and the Threats to it from terrorism”
 “Thank you for an open discussion/view and not a political/slanted dictatory display”
 “Very well organised morning”

Heysham:

“Hi Diane”
 “Good speaker”
 “More meetings of this type are necessary to keep the public informed. I would suggest the format of presentation recently used at Heysham to the Lancaster & District chamber be adopted as this was very well received”
 “Meeting was incredibly interesting and very well compared”
 “Well facilitated”
 “Good venue”

Hinkley:

“A pop in centre away from the site and closer to local towns would be beneficial and reflect a wider view of the local community”
“Overall insight”

Hunterston:

“Too rushed, 1/2 day at least”
“Good to consult!”
“More public information on meetings and date of meetings”
“One group tended to dominate proceedings”

Sizewell:

“Very talented presenter, encouraging, well informed, commanding respect, and very pleasant atmosphere in which to discuss issues”
“Lack of transparency on figures used (can't see how nukes will increase security of supply – we import) lack of time to investigate”
“The debate strayed into areas not covered by the scope of this review and was used to showboat various anti nuclear issues. The record will not show the true feelings within the room!”
“The government can do better!”
“Key point is that this consultation is about retaining the Option of nuclear power. It is utilities that will choose to build nuclear/fossil/renewables etc”
“Very well chaired”
“HH is a very pragmatic and skilled chair for such meetings (based on being in two events)”
“Would have been useful to have the consultation doc. beforehand so I could at least form some opinion before the meeting”

Torness:

“By and large very pleased with the meeting”
“Consultation document should have been made available online rather than sending out paper wasting tombs!”
“Well presented, well run, professional”
“Good meeting”
“Very effective meeting”
“Well facilitated!”

Wylfa:

“Nuclear should have a major role in the energy mix of baseload. Cutting energy needs / use must be a priority as must development of renewables – especially tidal power which is a constant eg. Marine Current turbines”
“Excellent”
“Go forward with nuclear as part of the blend for the sake of the UK!”
“I do not consider this meeting to be reflective of the views of the public of Anglesey”
“Lets move on quickly with new nuclear build”
“WYLFA B should progress on a fast track planning basis”
“WYLFA has the skills to run a nuclear power station”
“Meeting totally unnecessary – the government should make sure we have sufficient power supplies which are secure and get on with it. I have no connection with power generation but having lived near WYLFA throughout it's life, I don't mind another one”
“Government indecision and poor leadership in pressing ahead with other EU countries regarding treating nuclear waste”
“It's time the government came to a decision. WYLFA has the necessary skills”
“As a member of the general public I was unaware of this meeting until the day before it happened and so was unable to prepare properly. It should have been publicised more widely and sooner”

Annex 4: Reconvened stakeholder events

Evaluation questionnaire analysis

London, 19 February 2008: 46 participants; 39 questionnaires returned = 85% return rate

Manchester, 7 February 2008: 50 participants; 32 questionnaires returned = 64%

Total of 96 participants; 71 questionnaires returned = 74% return rate

NB All percentages are calculated against the total number of questionnaires returned, and are shown to the nearest whole number.

1 How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

The purpose of the consultation overall was clear	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
London	14 (36%)	20 (51%)	3 (8%)	1 (3%)	-
Manchester	16 (50%)	12 (38%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	-
Combined result	30 (42%)	32 (45%)	5 (7%)	2 (3%)	-

The extent of the potential influence of the consultation on Government was clear	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
London	6 (15%)	23 (59%)	6 (15%)	3 (8%)	-
Manchester	9 (28%)	14 (44%)	6 (19%)	2 (6%)	-
Combined result	15 (21%)	37 (52%)	12 (17%)	5 (7%)	-

There was enough relevant information provided for me to contribute fully	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
London	10 (26%)	25 (64%)	2 (5%)	1 (3%)	-
Manchester	6 (19%)	17 (53%)	5 (16%)	4 (13%)	-
Combined result	16 (23%)	42 (59%)	7 (10%)	5 (7%)	-

I was able to express my views fully in the consultation	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
London	14 (36%)	17 (44%)	5 (13%)	2 (5%)	-
Manchester	11 (34%)	18 (56%)	2 (6%)	-	1 (3%)
Combined result	25 (35%)	35 (49%)	7 (10%)	2 (3%)	1 (1%)

I was satisfied with the way the consultation was structured and run overall	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
London	10 (26%)	22 (56%)	3 (8%)	2 (5%)	1 (3%)
Manchester	13 (41%)	11 (34%)	4 (13%)	2 (6%)	2 (6%)
Combined result	23 (32%)	33 (46%)	7 (10%)	4 (6%)	3 (4%)

I found taking part in the consultation useful and worthwhile	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
London	1 (11%)	23 (59%)	2 (5%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
Manchester	12 (38%)	16 (32%)	1 (3%)	-	3 (9%)
Combined result	13 (18%)	39 (55%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)	4 (6%)

It is important for the Government to consult stakeholders on these sorts of issues	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
London	20 (51%)	17 (44%)	1 (3%)	-	-
Manchester	22 (69%)	9 (28%)	1 (3%)	-	-
Combined result	42 (59%)	26 (37%)	2 (3%)	-	-

All comments

London:

"A well researched, clear and forthright report"

Manchester:

"Important to keep it going and not leave for years!"

2 Have you read *Meeting the Energy Challenge. A White Paper on Nuclear Power?*

	Yes	No	Don't know
London	36 (92%)	3 (8%)	-
Manchester	25 (78%)	7 (22%)	-
Combined result	61 (86%)	10 (14%)	-

Comments analysis

- started to read it but not finished (5)
- plan to read it (2)
- confirms decision was a foregone conclusion (2)
- it is good / clear (2)
- It is comprehensive / detailed (2)
- it is not very reader friendly / very long (2)

All comments

London:

"It is a little repetitive! Not always clear why government reached decision given. Strength of public opposition e.g. reprocessing waste"

"The most thoroughly full consultation I've been involved in"

"Good, detailed, useful; but inadequate sense of urgency"

"Partially"

"Not completely finished!"

"I've read part of it so far!"

"It could be more clear on the influence that the consultation had on the W.P. provisions"

Manchester:

"Seems to confirm that the government had every intention to introduce new nuclear power regardless of the massive opposition"

"But I intend to"

"Have started reading it – it is long!"

"In part"

"But I intend reading it"

“Clearly presented and balanced”

“Comprehensive but indigestible, not reader friendly”

“Appendix A25 says local generation will repair losses. Why therefore are we planning to import wind power from north of Scotland”

“Cannot comment on this form”

“It depends on the def”

“There is an assumption among the stakeholders (I believe) that the nuclear consultation was a foregone conclusion – I don’t think enough was done to challenge this”

2 How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements about how the results of the consultation have been used?

The Government has listened to stakeholder views	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
London	11 (28%)	19 (49%)	5 (13%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
Manchester	9 (28%)	15 (47%)	4 (13%)	1 (3%)	2 (6%)
Combined result	20 (28%)	34 (48%)	9 (13%)	2 (3%)	3 (4%)

The Government has taken account of stakeholder views	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
London	8 (21%)	15 (38%)	10 (26%)	2 (5%)	2 (5%)
Manchester	9 (28%)	14 (44%)	5 (16%)	2 (6%)	2 (6%)
Combined result	17 (24%)	29 (41%)	15 (21%)	4 (6%)	4 (6%)

Differences between stakeholder views and the Government’s plans have been clearly explained	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
London	6 (15%)	19 (49%)	10 (26%)	2 (5%)	-
Manchester	5 (16%)	17 (53%)	4 (13%)	3 (9%)	2 (6%)
Combined result	11 (15%)	36 (51%)	14 (20%)	5 (7%)	2 (3%)

The results of the consultation have taken the debate on these issues forward	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
London	7 (18%)	25 (64%)	3 (8%)	-	2 (5%)
Manchester	9 (28%)	16 (50%)	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	-
Combined result	16 (23%)	41 (58%)	6 (8%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)

Comment analysis

London:

“Is there too much talk?”

“Concerns about skills shortage in nuclear power, cannot leave energy security to market forces, impression I got from the presentation”

Manchester:

“Purpose of consultation was not to seek genuine debate but to give appearance of having listened. Yet decisions had been made that pre-empted the conclusion – foregone – to pursue new nuclear plants. So I feel we have been part of a government public relations exercise, engineered to give the desired result”

“In favour of the plan to new build N power. Even the wording of this questionnaire is ambiguous”

“Good to talk, but time to deliver!”

“Not enough on comparative risk assessment”

4 Were the relevant stakeholder interests represented at today's event?

	Yes	No	Don't know
London	27 (69%)	5 (13%)	7 (18%)
Manchester	17 (53%)	7 (22%)	7 (22%)
Combined result	44 (63%)	12 (17%)	14 (20%)

Comment analysis

- too many pro-nuclear / those with vested interests in nuclear / nuclear industry (3)
- too many business / industry interests (2)
- shame NGOs did not get involved (2)

All comments

London

"Probably, but I have no adequate means to assess this"

"Yes, but not all"

"It's a shame the NGOs do not get involved but still criticise"

Manchester

"No. Predominantly attended by people with vested interest in nuclear power"

"Over emphasis on business views"

"Of those who attended"

"Too high a proportion of nuclear industry represented"

"Both industry and NGOs"

"Imbalance towards private sector / nuclear industry"

5 How satisfied were you with the way today's event was structured and run?

	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Not very satisfied	Not at all satisfied
London	14 (36%)	22 (56%)	2 (5%)	-
Manchester	13 (41%)	16 (50%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
Combined result	27 (38%)	38 (54%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)

Comment analysis

London:

No comments

Manchester:

"Occasional patronising tone was very off-putting"

"Needed longer on Future"

"Enjoyable and easy to listen to"

6 What was the most important benefit for you and/or your organisation in taking part in today's event?

Comment analysis

- finding out about the consultation process / how it worked / progress (12)
- hearing / understanding other stakeholders' views / concerns (9)
- understanding next steps (8)
- understanding / finding out about Government's views / position (7)
- chance to contribute / give my views (4)
- hearing / understanding concerns about waste (4)
- good presentations / answers (2)

- hear support for new build (2)
- networking / contacts (2)

All comments

London:

“To hear key next steps and learning points for BERR”
 “Gaining an appreciation of the complexities”
 “Update businesses on progress”
 “Seeing the result of the consultation process”
 “To see a summary of the White Paper process and outcome”
 “Hearing the comments and emphasis on waste issues”
 “Useful feedback on familiar process and next steps”
 “Most important benefit was listening to the still diverse views but still having the overall impression of support for the inclusion of nuclear”
 “Supporting New Build”
 “To see where departmental thinking is, so as to advise Christian groups in England”
 “Getting a better feel of the way forward?”
 “Listening”
 “Provided further background to progress”
 “Hearing the diversity of opinion expressed”
 “Possibly getting my disagreement across”
 “To see how things will move forward”
 “Further information and participation”
 “Good insight into political processes”
 “Linking legacy waste and replacement build. Identifying regulator resource issues (age profile and skills group)”
 “Data gathering on the next stage”
 “Consolidating my understanding on the process to date in going forward”
 “Hearing and assessing others views”
 “Good feedback”
 “Hearing feedback on the process from other interested parties”
 “Register concerns about first generation clean up”
 “Understanding the views of others”

Manchester:

“To hear others’ views”
 “Greater clarity on govt. action and proposals”
 “Learning consultation process did engage many people”
 “Some reassurance re comment consider”
 “Networking / nuclear debate update”
 “To see how deep the self interest and business interest has influenced this debate”
 “Increased understanding on how this is all going to more forward – the fruition”
 “Excellent presentations and good panel answers to questions”
 “First hand view of government policy”
 “To hear a balanced discussion around the White Paper proposals”
 “Understanding government’s view and those of proponents and opponents”
 “Hear and contribute”
 “Information on progress and evaluation of my organisations role in this process”
 “Can make comments”
 “Hearing DBERR statements”
 “Information, networking, Q&A”
 “Demonstration of support for new nuclear build”
 “Effective communication on nuclear issues that I was unaware of”
 “Learning more about the way government and the industry are colluding in promoting nuclear power”
 “Satisfied that there has been a thought through and excellent consultation”
 “Further clarification of the issues”
 “Education: about the next steps – actions coming out of the White paper”
 “Understanding of future market opportunities for industry”
 “Accountability / reporting back to our members”

7 Has being involved in this event made any difference to what you think about nuclear power and/or the Government's stakeholder engagement process?

	Yes	No	Don't know
London	16 (41%)	23 (49%)	-
Manchester	10 (31%)	21 (66%)	-
Combined result	26 (37%)	44 (62%)	-

Comment analysis

- still in favour of new build (7)
- impressed with consultation process (4)
- understood consultation process better (2)

All comments

London:

- "Impressed by the video of deliberative events and quality of discussion"
- "Government now supporting nuclear energy – but is package sufficient to attract potential investors"
- "I already believed the government has handled the consultation process very well"
- "I have seen a very open democratic process being used to good effect"
- "Some signs of urgency are emerging"
- "It reinforces the policy decision made"
- "It has confirmed / reinforced my views"
- "But not too much"
- "I have been impressed by the process"
- "Need NP"
- "The industry participates widely – others?"

Manchester:

- "I did not feel that the issues raised were answered. The White Paper simply said they had been considered"
- "I now believe the case to be worse than I thought and that there is a bias pro industry / pro build and has excluded the chance of our informed contributors"
- "Much improved clarity and understanding on where the govt. is coming from – and heading, and how"
- "I am a committed supporter of nuclear power"
- "Much in favour"
- "I am a committed supporter of nuclear power"
- "Pro nuclear"
- "Very supportive beforehand, supportive thereafter"
- "Made me a stronger opponent of nuclear power"
- "I'm converted already! (expect conversion from a Christian)"
- "The benefits and limitations of the engagement process – some people clearly not satisfied"
- "I was not aware of the extent and scope of the engagement with stakeholders and the public"
- "I spent 25 years in a highly satisfying and safe nuclear industry"
- "Understand engagement process better"

8 What specific lessons about stakeholder engagement would you like the Government to take from this consultation overall?

Comment analysis

- do more of these consultations / continue (4)
- need to get on and take action (4)
- ensure earlier / better engagement with environmental NGOs (3)
- get it right first time / do future consultations as fully as this one (3)
- do more on waste (3)
- need to provide better / more information for the public (3)
- listen (3)
- need stronger lead from government on these sorts of issues (2)

All comments

London:

- "If we provide more information people can make informed decisions rather than purely emotional ones"
- "Stakeholders do make a constructive contribution to the debate"
- "The need to deal with legacy waste at Sizewell A"
- "Understand how powerful a challenge decision making can be – JRs"
- "It is a thorough way forward for very controversial views. However, too expensive for most policy issues"
- "Get it right first time"
- "What a very small percentage of the population responded"
- "To do it is a positive step that encourages engagement"
- "Promoting how safe, secure and reliable nuclear"
- "A need to hurry up because time is short for improving mix for electricity supply"
- "Get on with the process of replacement build"
- "Clear polling statements"
- "To allow time for consultation"
- "Look at issues raised and not just document them"
- "Communicate better and more openly"
- "This is an emotive issue. A stronger lead is required"
- "Not relying on the market and addressing the skills gap properly"
- "Once its done, move on and make decisions"
- "Possibly more explanation of the interaction of various consultations and bills"
- "Consult coupled with clear decision making"
- "Decision time"
- "It was worthwhile"
- "The evaluation (when it appears!) will need to be transparent and thorough"
- "The informing and educating is vital"

Manchester:

- "Listen and explain in very simple terms"
- "The need to inform ALL stakeholders, not just those involved with the industry, that it is happening. Provide people with FULL information, not just the government gloss"
- "Do future consultations as in depth as this one"
- "Much more objectivity in white paper essential"
- "Not to stage-manage them"
- "Keep pushing the transparency; you cannot communicate with the public too much; how you intend to step up such communication, broadening it to the younger generation (and the future stakeholders)"
- "Need to improve public awareness further on the issues. Marketing of the UK plc strategy is very weak. This is too important to communicate in customary ways and intensity"
- "Engage earlier with environmental campaign/anti nuclear groups. There seems to be a perception that environmentalists are not listened to. Even if they are"
- "Consider how to deal with Greenpeace / FOTE withdraw from consultation"
- "Continuation of the dissemination of information is important in keeping people engaged in the debate"
- "Highlight waste, 1 types, 2 volumes, 3 handling"
- "When the antis know that they have lost the argument they will not participate"
- "Listen to their comments"
- "Provide more leaflets for the public on energy issues"
- "Focus on main priorities"
- "Removes from NGOs the ability to claim they have not been consulted with effectively"
- "Keep consulting"
- "That they should listen properly and respond with true care for their citizens and the citizens of the planet including indigenous people in Australia and Canada"
- "Making sure the limitations of the process are clear at the outset"
- "Listen to concerns about waste"
- "Keep greens on board or process loss credibility"

9 Is there anything else you would like to add?

Comment analysis

- excellent process (2)

All comments

London:

“It’s pleasing to see that eventually the government has bitten the nuclear bullet”
 “The above will assist the support of Sizewell and SCC & SCDC”
 “Leave options open, learn from the past”
 “Congratulations on holding events such as this, many wouldn’t!”
 “Need for leadership to keep the lights on”

Manchester:

“Also went to almost all site events”
 “Excellent consultation process”
 “How do you intend to demonstrate that government thinking – and actions, remain integrated and joined up. Irrespective of the source of electricity generated, we are still throwing away 2/3 – 3/5 of the heat generated; we need to do something about that, other countries (Germany and Sweden) are”
 “Consultation process is transparent but how did stakeholder input actually inform decision making process. How is nuclear White paper any different due to consultation? This is not as transparent”
 “The slide on page 8 of the presentation in relation to safety fails to point out that safety is underpinned by mature and experienced operators supported by a mature and experienced industry, it is not just about protection, regulation and sanctions”
 “Public perception needs to be engaged”
 “Impact of climate change not addressed fully”
 “My intense dissatisfaction”

10 Have you attended a previous stakeholder event as part of the Government’s consultation on the future of nuclear power?

	Yes	No
London	29 (73%)	9 (23%)
Manchester	25 (78%)	5 (16%)
Combined result	54 (77%)	14 (20%)

Please indicate the location of the event attended:

	London	Manchester
Belfast	-	-
Birmingham	-	4 (13%)
Bristol	4 (10%)	-
Cambridge	4 (10%)	-
Cardiff	2 (5%)	-
Glasgow	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
Leeds	1 (3%)	2 (6%)
London	6 (15%)	-
Manchester	1 (3%)	15 (47%)
Newcastle	2 (5%)	1 (3%)
Nottingham	2 (5%)	1 (3%)
Reading	1 (3%)	-
Other: Sizewell	1 (3%)	-

Annex 5: Citizens Advisory Board participants Evaluation questionnaire analysis

Three meetings in June and August 2007

Total 10 participants; total of 8 completed questionnaires returned (80%)

NB All percentages are calculated against the total number of questionnaires returned, and are shown to the nearest whole number.

1 How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Please tick ONE box in each line	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
There was enough time for me to say everything I wanted to say	5 (63%)	3 (37%)	-	-	-
I would have liked more information in advance of the meetings	-	1 (12%)	1 (12%)	5 (63%)	1 (12%)
The way the materials were presented was not biased in any way	1 (12%)	7 (88%)	-	-	-
All members of the CAB were treated equally and respectfully	6 (75%)	2 (25%)	-	-	-
No single view was allowed to dominate unfairly	2 (25%)	6 (75%)	-	-	-
I am clear about how the results of our meetings are collected and used	2 (25%)	5 (63%)	1 (12%)	-	-
I believe those drafting the materials will listen to and consider our views	4 (50%)	4 (50%)	-	-	-
I understood what was expected of our group all through the process	4 (50%)	4 (50%)	-	-	-
I understand how our work fits into the wider public consultation	4 (50%)	3 (37%)	1 (12%)	-	-
I learnt something I did not know before	8 (100%)	-	-	-	-
Attending these meetings has helped me think more clearly about the issues	7 (88%)	1 (12%)	-	-	-
I changed my views as a result of attending these meetings	2 (25%)	1 (12%)	2 (25%)	3 (37%)	-
I enjoyed taking part	7 (88%)	1 (12%)	-	-	-
I am more likely to get involved in public consultations in future as a result of attending these meetings of attending this one	4 (50%)	4 (50%)	-	-	-

2 How important do you think it is to involve the public in discussing these sorts of discussions on government policy?

Very important	Fairly important	Not very important	Not at all important
8 (100%)	-	-	-

3 How satisfied were you with the meetings?

Please tick the relevant box for each statement	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Unsure	Not very satisfied	Not at all satisfied
The way the materials were presented to the group at each meeting	5 (63%)	3 (37%)	-	-	-
The way the meetings were structured and run	8 (100%)	-	-	-	-
Overall satisfaction with the process	7 (88%)	1 (12%)	-	-	-

4 What were the best aspects of the meetings?

Comments

- "Having a structured informative discussion. It was good to hear lots of different views"
- "Discussions and debating"
- "Listening to views of others. Learning new facts"
- "Interaction of the group"
- "The way they were led and how opinions were shared and respected by all involved"
- "The location - easy to get to; the quality of the refreshments; the clarity of the presentations"
- "Learning about new issues and feeling that what was said was listened to and used for evaluation"

5 What were the worst aspects of the meetings?

Comments

- "None"
- "Some info was hard to take in and have an opinion on"
- "Feeling I really was uninformed and ill read beforehand"
- "Timing"
- "The meeting room temperature was too hot; I would have preferred an earlier start to the sessions"
- "None that I can think of. Learnt a lot from other people"

6 What was the most important benefit for you personally in taking part in these meetings?

Comments

- "Having interaction on a difficult subject. Enjoyed very much."
- "Getting the info on the topic and being more informed"
- "The learning curve"
- "Learn the advantages / disadvantages and the importance of nuclear power and global warming"
- "I felt as though my contributions were helpful and worthwhile"
- "Being able to learn more about the subject; being able to hear other people's viewpoints"
- "The groups' opinions were listened to and included in evaluative materials"

Some information about you

7 Gender

Male	Female
3 (37%)	5 (63%)

8 Age

16-24	25-39	40-54	55-65	Over 65
1 (12%)	5 (63%)	1 (12%)	1 (12%)	-

9 Would you describe yourself as:

White British	White other	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Other
5 (63%)	-	1 (12%)	2 (25%)	-

Annex 6: Stakeholder Review Group participants Evaluation questionnaire analysis

London 13 July 2007

Total 14 participants; total 14 questionnaires returned (100%)

NB All percentages are calculated against the total number of questionnaires returned, and are shown to the nearest whole number.

1 How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
There was enough time at the meeting to discuss the issues properly	2 (14%)	8 (57%)	0	4 (29%)	0
There was enough information provided in advance to enable informed input	3 (21%)	7 (50%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
There was enough time before the meeting to review the draft materials	0	0	3 (21%)	8 (57%)	3 (21%)
All the main issues were covered in the meeting	5 (36%)	7 (50%)	2 (14%)	0	0
All the main relevant stakeholder interests were represented at the meeting	0	12 (86%)	2 (14%)	0	0
The facilitation of the meeting was fair and balanced	11 (79%)	3 (21%)	0	0	0
The structure of the meeting enabled us to discuss the issues properly	4 (29%)	9 (64%)	1 (7%)	0	0
All participants were treated equally and respectfully	13 (93%)	1 (7%)	0	0	0
No single view was allowed to dominate unfairly	5 (36%)	7 (50%)	2 (14%)	0	0
The objectives of the meeting were clear and transparent	2 (14%)	9 (64%)	3 (21%)	0	0
The roles and responsibilities of stakeholders at the meeting were clear	3 (21%)	9 (64%)	2 (14%)	0	0
The way the outputs of the meeting will be used was clear and transparent	2 (14%)	7 (50%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	0
The level of influence of the stakeholders on the drafting of the materials was clear and transparent	2 (14%)	6 (43%)	6 (43%)	0	0
Those drafting the materials will listen to and consider stakeholder views	4 (29%)	7 (50%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	0
The meeting was useful and worthwhile	8 (57%)	6 (43%)	0	0	0

If you strongly disagree with any of these statements, please say why:

"Stimulus material was sent so late that I did not have time to read much ... and some if not much was alarming"

2 What were the best / most useful aspects of the meeting?

Comment analysis

- Hear a range of views: 3 (21%)
- Opportunity to shape materials: 2 (14%)
- To give own views / have say: 2 (14%)
- Facilitator flexibility to change agenda to respond to new issues: 2 (14%)

All comments

"Developing the framing of the questions to be put to deliberative consultation"

"Good group of contributors; no grandstanding"

"Open exposure to range of views and opportunity to shape and improve materials"

"Think it was open and fair-minded"

"The structure of discussions: responding to Hywel's suggestion. The verve! The participants really being up for it"

"A welcome opportunity to contribute to the preparation for the deliberative events"

"Meeting participants were open and frank in views"

"Mix of views"

3 What were the worst / least useful aspects of the meeting?

Comment analysis

- Needed materials earlier to prepare: 5 (36%)

All comments

"Minor excursions into analysis of detailed points"

"Would have liked to know detailed comments wanted in writing in advance"

"Didn't really get into details of issues, but this may be ironed out if document is redrafted to take into account issues of 'conditionality'. Need to know that OLR will effectively take these on board. Its high risk not coming back to this group with a 'new' document"

"I would have liked to talk about the contents more"

"Sometimes the nuclear debate was being run - rather than how to inform folk at events"

4 What was the most important benefit for you personally in taking part in this meeting?

Comment analysis

- To contribute knowledge and views: 4 (29%)
- Understanding how the events / public consultation will proceed: 4 (29%)
- Helping to shape the draft documents / events: 2 (14%)
- Hearing other views: 2 (14%)

All comments

"Hearing very different perspectives from my own"

"Chance to contribute to important process"

"Working with Greenpeace, BERR and EDF and understanding where they are coming from... and being able to influence OLR events"

"Useful to meet with wide cross-section of stakeholders"

5 Were the relevant stakeholder interests represented at the meeting? If not, who was missing and/or should not have been there?

Comment analysis

- Yes: 9 (64%)
- Missing:
 - Local government
 - User interests e.g. large industrial users
 - David Lowry
 - Dave Elliott (OU)
 - Planning experts

6 Do you have any other comments?

"A good constructive process"

"High quality of inputs made in a constructive manner. BERR officials clearly receptive to differing viewpoints"

"V. well facilitated meeting, with useful discussion and outputs. Feel like have had an influence. General consensus view emerged on approach"

"Excellent facilitation"

"I just hope that OLR are up to the task of putting our collective thoughts into redrafting documents"

"Thanks. Really hope we can have a further role as a group, otherwise 80% of potential value will be lost"

"Mammoth task. Unnecessary government haste. Waiting for waste consultation would have helped. Brown's comments should have triggered (consultation) restart"

"Process worked well - but end result will be the judge"

"I hope that there will be adequate time to properly assimilate the information and input from the group.

Timescales appear too compressed"

Annex 7: Development event participants Evaluation questionnaire analysis

Slough, 14 August 2007

Total 30 participants; 30 completed questionnaires returned (100%)

NB All percentages are calculated against the total number of questionnaires returned, and are shown to the nearest whole number.

1 How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
There was enough time at the meeting to discuss the draft materials properly	11 (37%)	18 (60%)		1 (3%)	
I would have liked more information in advance of the meeting	5 (17%)	11 (37%)	4 (13%)	9 (30%)	
The way the discussion was run and structured was fair and balanced	8 (27%)	20 (67%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	
The way the materials were presented in the meeting was fair and balanced	3 (10%)	22 (73%)	1 (3%)	4 (13%)	
All participants were treated equally and respectfully	17 (57%)	13 (43%)			
No single view on the issues was allowed to dominate unfairly	13 (43%)	16 (53%)	1 (3%)		
There was a good mix of people	12 (40%)	15 (50%)	2 (7%)	1 (3%)	
I understand clearly the purpose of this meeting	13 (43%)	17 (57%)			
I understand clearly how the results of this meeting will be used	10 (33%)	16 (53%)	4 (13%)		
I understand clearly how this meeting fits into the wider public consultation	12 (40%)	17 (57%)	1 (3%)		
I was able to discuss the issues that concern me	14 (47%)	15 (50%)		1 (3%)	
I learnt something I did not know before	20 (67%)	9 (30%)		1 (3%)	
Attending this meeting has helped me think more clearly about the issues	13 (43%)	17 (57%)			
The meeting was well-structured and well-run	10 (33%)	18 (60%)	2 (7%)		
The meeting was worthwhile and I enjoyed taking part	7 (23%)	21 (70%)	2 (7%)		
I believe those drafting the materials will listen to and consider our views	2 (7%)	25 (83%)	3 (10%)		
It is important to involve the public in discussing these sorts of issues of government policy	20 (67%)	9 (30%)	1 (3%)		
I am more likely to get involved in public consultations in future as a result of attending this meeting	7 (23%)	19 (63%)	4 (13%)		

2 Overall, how satisfied were you with the way this meeting was structured and run?

Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Not very satisfied	Not at all satisfied
15 (50%)	13 (43%)		

3 What were the best aspects of the meeting?

Learning	9 (30%)
Other views expressed	5 (17%)
Group discussions	4 (13%)
Information	4 (13%)
Videos	4 (13%)

Comments

"Balanced information"
 "Broader view regarding the nuclear [and] alternative sources of energy"
 "Learning about nuclear power - I didn't have a clue before this"
 "Time given to discuss every aspect of the discussion topic in addition to the way the table discussions were led by the facilitator"
 "Video clips ... precise, clear info"
 "Meeting and hearing the views of different people"

4 What were the worst aspects of the meeting?

Day too long	11 (37%)
Repetition	6 (20%)
Lunch	5 (17%)
Mistakes in start time	2 (7%)
Lots to read / handouts too long	2 (7%)

Comments

"Learning that nuclear power may be the only option"
 "We talked about some topics over and over - too much time"
 "Length of time to acquire information"

5 What was the most important benefit for you personally in taking part in this meeting?

Understanding wider / energy issues	9 (30%)
Learning more	6 (20%)
Information on nuclear power	2 (7%)

Comments

"Learning why government are considering nuclear power and what the opposing views are"
 "Learning about the energy systems"
 "Up to date info"
 "Better understanding of the issues"
 "Expanding my knowledge"
 "To have my say and to feel that I will contribute to the issues in hand"

6 Is there anything else you would like to add?

Comments

"Enjoyed it!"

"Happy to attend again"

"I hope our views are listened to"

"I think the researchers on the day done really well but I felt that some info, like on other energy, was not fully explored and felt some questions were worded in a way that would provoke a certain answer"

Annex 8: Public events participants

Evaluation questionnaire analysis

Belfast, 8 September 2007: 74 participants; 72 completed questionnaires returned = 97%

Cardiff, 8 September 2007: 84 participants; 84 completed questionnaires returned = 100%

Edinburgh, 8 September 2007: 91 participants; 91 completed questionnaires returned = 100%

Exeter, 8 September 2007: 84 participants; 83 completed questionnaires returned = 99%

Leicester, 8 September 2007: 147 participants; 140 completed questionnaires returned = 95%

Liverpool, 8 September 2007: 77 participants; 75 completed questionnaires returned = 97%

London, 8 September 2007: 160 participants; 149 completed questionnaires returned = 93%

Newcastle, 8 September 2007: 159 participants; 138 completed questionnaires returned = 87%

Norwich, 8 September 2007: 80 participants; 78 completed questionnaires returned = 97%

Total 956 public participants; total 910 completed questionnaires returned (95%)

NB All percentages are calculated against the total number of questionnaires returned, and are shown to the nearest whole number.

1 How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

There was enough time overall to fully discuss the issues properly	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	31 (43%)	36 (50%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)	-
Cardiff	16 (19%)	57 (68%)	4 (5%)	7 (8%)	-
Edinburgh	24 (26%)	45 (49%)	7 (8%)	12 (13%)	3 (3%)
Exeter	23 (28%)	50 (60%)	3 (4%)	6 (7%)	1 (1%)
Leicester	41 (29%)	70 (50%)	14 (10%)	11 (8%)	3 (2%)
Liverpool	18 (24%)	37 (49%)	8 (11%)	11 (15%)	1 (1%)
London	40 (27%)	73 (49%)	13 (9%)	18 (12%)	3 (2%)
Newcastle	33 (24%)	70 (51%)	10 (7%)	23 (17%)	4 (3%)
Norwich	16 (21%)	39 (50%)	6 (8%)	15 (19%)	1 (1%)
Combined result	242 (27%)	477 (52%)	68 (7%)	104 (11%)	16 (2%)

The amount of time spent on each topic was fair and balanced	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	25 (35%)	44 (61%)	2 (3%)	-	1 (1%)
Cardiff	14 (17%)	55 (65%)	9 (11%)	4 (5%)	-
Edinburgh	19 (21%)	45 (49%)	10 (11%)	15 (16%)	2 (2%)
Exeter	22 (27%)	48 (58%)	8 (10%)	3 (4%)	2 (2%)
Leicester	27 (19%)	91 (65%)	10 (7%)	8 (6%)	3 (2%)
Liverpool	14 (19%)	46 (61%)	7 (9%)	7 (9%)	1 (1%)
London	29 (19%)	83 (56%)	15 (10%)	16 (11%)	4 (3%)
Newcastle	18 (13%)	82 (59%)	16 (12%)	18 (13%)	4 (3%)
Norwich	18 (23%)	40 (51%)	5 (6%)	12 (15%)	3 (4%)
Combined result	186 (20%)	534 (59%)	82 (9%)	83 (9%)	20 (2%)

The way the meeting was run was fair and not biased	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	15 (21%)	28 (39%)	13 (18%)	13 (18%)	3 (4%)
Cardiff	16 (19%)	32 (38%)	16 (19%)	15 (18%)	5 (6%)
Edinburgh	15 (16%)	33 (36%)	15 (16%)	20 (22%)	7 (8%)
Exeter	19 (23%)	27 (33%)	22 (27%)	11 (13%)	3 (4%)
Leicester	31 (22%)	52 (37%)	27 (19%)	20 (14%)	9 (6%)
Liverpool	11 (15%)	36 (48%)	9 (12%)	14 (19%)	3 (4%)
London	22 (15%)	59 (40%)	36 (24%)	25 (17%)	5 (3%)
Newcastle	13 (9%)	36 (26%)	39 (28%)	34 (25%)	16 (12%)
Norwich	13 (17%)	21 (27%)	21 (27%)	16 (21%)	7 (9%)
Combined result	155 (17%)	324 (36%)	198 (22%)	168 (18%)	58 (6%)

All the main issues were covered	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	19 (26%)	33 (46%)	10 (14%)	6 (8%)	4 (6%)
Cardiff	18 (21%)	29 (35%)	17 (20%)	17 (20%)	2 (2%)
Edinburgh	13 (14%)	34 (37%)	20 (22%)	20 (22%)	3 (3%)
Exeter	15 (18%)	41 (49%)	13 (16%)	13 (16%)	1 (1%)
Leicester	29 (21%)	51 (36%)	27 (19%)	27 (19%)	6 (4%)
Liverpool	15 (20%)	23 (31%)	18 (24%)	14 (19%)	4 (5%)
London	13 (9%)	56 (38%)	32 (21%)	37 (25%)	10 (7%)
Newcastle	13 (9%)	43 (31%)	24 (17%)	40 (29%)	16 (12%)
Norwich	9 (12%)	32 (41%)	12 (15%)	17 (22%)	7 (9%)
Combined result	144 (16%)	342 (38%)	173 (19%)	191 (21%)	53 (6%)

I was able to say everything I wanted to say	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	30 (42%)	38 (53%)	4 (6%)	-	-
Cardiff	29 (35%)	42 (50%)	3 (4%)	7 (8%)	-
Edinburgh	28 (31%)	60 (66%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	-
Exeter	38 (46%)	41 (49%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)	-
Leicester	52 (37%)	74 (53%)	7 (5%)	6 (4%)	-
Liverpool	29 (39%)	40 (53%)	4 (5%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
London	44 (30%)	87 (58%)	11 (7%)	3 (2%)	2 (1%)
Newcastle	33 (24%)	87 (63%)	6 (4%)	10 (7%)	2 (1%)
Norwich	21 (27%)	51 (65%)	2 (3%)	4 (5%)	-
Combined result	304 (33%)	520 (57%)	41 (5%)	33 (4%)	5 (1%)

The facilitator encouraged everyone to participate fully	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	46 (64%)	24 (33%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	-
Cardiff	48 (57%)	34 (40%)	1 (1%)	-	1 (1%)
Edinburgh	55 (60%)	34 (37%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	-
Exeter	56 (67%)	26 (31%)	1 (1%)	-	-
Leicester	88 (63%)	49 (35%)	1 (1%)	2 (1%)	-
Liverpool	49 (65%)	23 (31%)	1 (1%)	-	-
London	89 (60%)	54 (36%)	4 (3%)	1 (1%)	-
Newcastle	71 (51%)	63 (46%)	2 (1%)	2 (1%)	-
Norwich	42 (54%)	34 (44%)	1 (1%)	-	-
Combined result	544 (60%)	341 (37%)	13 (1%)	7 (1%)	1 (>1%)

All participants were treated equally and respectfully	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	49 (68%)	21 (29%)	1 (1%)	-	1 (1%)
Cardiff	50 (60%)	31 (37%)	1 (1%)	-	-
Edinburgh	59 (65%)	32 (35%)	-	-	-
Exeter	59 (71%)	24 (29%)	-	-	-
Leicester	85 (61%)	51 (36%)	2 (1%)	-	1 (1%)
Liverpool	51 (68%)	24 (32%)	-	-	-
London	92 (62%)	53 (36%)	1 (1%)	-	-
Newcastle	78 (57%)	60 (43%)	1 (1%)	-	-
Norwich	41 (53%)	36 (46%)	-	1 (1%)	-
Combined result	564 (62%)	332 (36%)	6 (1%)	1 (>1%)	2 (>1%)

No single view on the issues was allowed to dominate unfairly	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	37 (51%)	32 (44%)	-	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Cardiff	32 (38%)	41 (49%)	8 (10%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Edinburgh	36 (40%)	44 (48%)	7 (8%)	3 (3%)	1 (1%)
Exeter	47 (57%)	32 (39%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	-
Leicester	56 (40%)	66 (47%)	11 (8%)	3 (2%)	1 (1%)
Liverpool	26 (35%)	39 (52%)	4 (5%)	5 (7%)	1 (1%)
London	60 (40%)	70 (47%)	8 (5%)	7 (5%)	2 (1%)
Newcastle	45 (33%)	68 (49%)	12 (9%)	6 (4%)	5 (4%)
Norwich	28 (36%)	36 (46%)	8 (10%)	6 (8%)	-
Combined result	367 (40%)	428 (47%)	60 (7%)	33 (4%)	12 (1%)

There was a good mix of people	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	43 (60%)	28 (39%)	-	-	1 (1%)
Cardiff	43 (51%)	35 (42%)	4 (5%)	2 (2%)	-
Edinburgh	50 (55%)	37 (41%)	3 (3%)	-	1 (1%)
Exeter	40 (48%)	37 (45%)	2 (2%)	4 (5%)	-
Leicester	70 (50%)	62 (44%)	7 (5%)	1 (1%)	-
Liverpool	38 (51%)	31 (41%)	5 (7%)	-	-
London	64 (43%)	67 (45%)	10 (7%)	4 (3%)	2 (1%)
Newcastle	54 (39%)	74 (54%)	6 (4%)	3 (2%)	2 (1%)
Norwich	31 (40%)	44 (56%)	2 (3%)	1 (1%)	-
Combined result	433 (48%)	415 (46%)	39 (4%)	15 (2%)	4 (>1%)

I understand clearly the purpose of this event	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	35 (49%)	32 (44%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Cardiff	37 (44%)	36 (43%)	10 (12%)	-	1 (1%)
Edinburgh	36 (40%)	40 (44%)	9 (10%)	5 (5%)	1 (1%)
Exeter	36 (43%)	40 (48%)	7 (8%)	-	-
Leicester	55 (39%)	71 (51%)	11 (8%)	2 (1%)	-
Liverpool	26 (35%)	40 (53%)	7 (9%)	2 (3%)	-
London	57 (38%)	69 (46%)	17 (11%)	3 (2%)	1 (1%)
Newcastle	43 (31%)	67 (49%)	21 (15%)	6 (4%)	1 (1%)
Norwich	33 (42%)	42 (54%)	3 (4%)	-	-
Combined result	358 (39%)	437 (48%)	88 (10%)	19 (2%)	5 (1%)

I understand clearly how the results of this event will be used	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	19 (26%)	33 (46%)	12 (17%)	4 (6%)	2 (3%)
Cardiff	27 (32%)	25 (30%)	25 (30%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)
Edinburgh	25 (27%)	38 (42%)	19 (21%)	5 (5%)	3 (3%)
Exeter	24 (29%)	34 (41%)	20 (24%)	5 (6%)	-
Leicester	31 (22%)	59 (42%)	38 (27%)	6 (4%)	4 (3%)
Liverpool	11 (15%)	25 (33%)	29 (39%)	9 (12%)	1 (1%)
London	30 (20%)	58 (39%)	47 (32%)	9 (6%)	5 (3%)
Newcastle	25 (18%)	63 (46%)	29 (21%)	19 (14%)	3 (2%)
Norwich	17 (22%)	41 (53%)	12 (15%)	7 (9%)	1 (1%)
Combined result	209 (23%)	376 (41%)	231 (25%)	67 (7%)	20 (2%)

I understand clearly how this event fits into the wider public consultation on nuclear power	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	22 (31%)	28 (39%)	15 (21%)	5 (7%)	-
Cardiff	15 (18%)	43 (51%)	22 (26%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Edinburgh	23 (25%)	44 (49%)	18 (20%)	4 (4%)	1 (1%)
Exeter	23 (28%)	38 (46%)	17 (20%)	4 (5%)	-
Leicester	27 (19%)	80 (57%)	24 (17%)	6 (4%)	2 (1%)
Liverpool	9 (12%)	37 (49%)	23 (31%)	4 (5%)	-
London	26 (17%)	73 (49%)	36 (24%)	8 (5%)	4 (3%)
Newcastle	18 (13%)	71 (51%)	28 (20%)	15 (11%)	5 (4%)
Norwich	13 (17%)	46 (59%)	15 (19%)	4 (5%)	-
Combined result	176 (19%)	460 (51%)	198 (22%)	51 (6%)	13 (1%)

Attending this event has helped me think more clearly about the issues	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	40 (56%)	21 (29%)	4 (6%)	5 (7%)	1 (1%)
Cardiff	33 (39%)	38 (45%)	6 (7%)	4 (5%)	-
Edinburgh	28 (31%)	52 (57%)	6 (7%)	3 (3%)	-
Exeter	33 (40%)	45 (54%)	2 (2%)	3 (4%)	-
Leicester	58 (41%)	76 (54%)	3 (2%)	-	-
Liverpool	30 (40%)	34 (45%)	6 (8%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)
London	69 (46%)	68 (46%)	3 (2%)	5 (3%)	-
Newcastle	40 (29%)	84 (61%)	5 (4%)	7 (5%)	-
Norwich	27 (35%)	47 (60%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	-
Combined result	358 (39%)	465 (51%)	37 (4%)	32 (4%)	2 (>1%)

I learnt something I did not know before	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	39 (54%)	26 (36%)	6 (8%)	1 (1%)	-
Cardiff	36 (43%)	38 (45%)	4 (5%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)
Edinburgh	33 (36%)	48 (53%)	5 (5%)	5 (5%)	-
Exeter	34 (41%)	46 (55%)	-	2 (2%)	1 (1%)
Leicester	68 (49%)	66 (47%)	3 (2%)	2 (1%)	1 (1%)
Liverpool	37 (49%)	36 (48%)	-	2 (3%)	-
London	75 (50%)	63 (42%)	3 (2%)	5 (3%)	1 (1%)
Newcastle	51 (37%)	75 (54%)	8 (6%)	4 (3%)	-
Norwich	32 (41%)	40 (51%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)	1 (1%)
Combined result	405 (45%)	438 (48%)	32 (4%)	26 (3%)	5 (1%)

The event was worthwhile and I enjoyed taking part	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	44 (61%)	23 (32%)	3 (4%)	-	1 (1%)
Cardiff	43 (51%)	38 (45%)	2 (2%)	-	-
Edinburgh	39 (43%)	45 (49%)	5 (5%)	2 (2%)	-
Exeter	38 (46%)	42 (51%)	3 (4%)	-	-
Leicester	65 (46%)	70 (50%)	2 (1%)	1 (1%)	2 (1%)
Liverpool	35 (47%)	31 (41%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	-
London	70 (47%)	67 (45%)	7 (5%)	4 (3%)	-
Newcastle	48 (35%)	77 (56%)	11 (8%)	-	2 (1%)
Norwich	32 (41%)	41 (53%)	4 (5%)	1 (1%)	-
Combined result	414 (45%)	434 (48%)	38 (4%)	9 (1%)	5 (1%)

I think the Government will listen to and consider the public's views	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	11 (15%)	14 (19%)	31 (43%)	10 (14%)	6 (8%)
Cardiff	5 (6%)	13 (15%)	44 (52%)	15 (18%)	7 (8%)
Edinburgh	8 (9%)	14 (15%)	43 (47%)	16 (18%)	9 (10%)
Exeter	5 (6%)	24 (29%)	37 (45%)	11 (13%)	5 (6%)
Leicester	14 (10%)	26 (19%)	64 (46%)	26 (19%)	9 (6%)
Liverpool	4 (5%)	20 (27%)	38 (51%)	9 (12%)	3 (4%)
London	15 (10%)	33 (22%)	75 (50%)	22 (15%)	2 (1%)
Newcastle	7 (5%)	19 (14%)	68 (49%)	28 (20%)	16 (12%)
Norwich	5 (6%)	11 (14%)	43 (55%)	13 (17%)	6 (8%)
Combined result	74 (8%)	174 (19%)	443 (49%)	150 (16%)	63 (7%)

I am more likely to get involved in public consultations in future as a result of attending this event	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	32 (44%)	34 (47%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)	-
Cardiff	37 (44%)	35 (42%)	11 (13%)	1 (1%)	-
Edinburgh	36 (40%)	43 (47%)	8 (9%)	4 (4%)	-
Exeter	35 (42%)	40 (48%)	7 (8%)	1 (1%)	-
Leicester	54 (39%)	71 (51%)	8 (6%)	5 (4%)	2 (1%)
Liverpool	41 (55%)	30 (40%)	4 (5%)	-	-
London	63 (42%)	59 (40%)	19 (13%)	4 (3%)	-
Newcastle	48 (35%)	75 (54%)	14 (10%)	-	2 (1%)
Norwich	24 (31%)	47 (60%)	7 (9%)	-	-
Combined result	370 (41%)	434 (48%)	81 (9%)	17 (2%)	4 (>1%)

Comment analysis (196 comments)

- wanted more information / on alternatives / other options / opposing views (82)
- event / information biased / misleading / directed (63)
- good / enjoyable / interesting event / well organised / facilitated (27)
- Government already made up mind / tick box exercise (15)
- participants not representative of public (4)
- questions / information repetitive (6)
- rushed / not enough time for discussion (5)

All comments

Belfast:

"I feel that there was a bias toward nuclear"

"Research was not evidence based, and was biased in promoting nuclear energy, other aspects or ways of generating electricity was not explored"

"Would have liked a less biased view, seemed more like a sales pitch than being given full facts on all the risks"

"More input from Greenpeace and other opposing organisations"

"Not enough facts and figures on other industries"

"There was a lot of repetition of ideas and topics"

"Very informative and enjoyable day, many thanks"

"It was good fun, everyone was nice and also I learnt a lot of new things and I was able to make up my mind about nuclear energy"

Cardiff:

"Felt the questions were biased in favour of nuclear power and very manipulative"

"Biased questions"

"Very biased"

"The discussion sessions could have been structured. Many of the main points seemed to have been repeated throughout the sessions"

"Very meticulous questioning on similar sub-categories"

"Our facilitator did a good job"

"Table facilitator did an excellent job"

"I would have liked a few more facts"

"Surely the decision has already been made"

"A pleasant group of people who all participated"

Edinburgh:

"Too much focus on positives of nuclear, very little regarding renewable energy initiatives. Information at times was vague and could be construed as misleading. Definitely leaning towards nuclear fuel as the favoured alternative or primary choice, which I do not believe it to be!"

"Facts presented in a biased way toward nuclear industry. Incomplete without full [representation] of green sector – made whole experience very unbalanced"

"I felt facts/figures were in short supply. Questions were a bit loaded to elicit a positive response"

"I felt the event was very biased, with the alternative to nuclear power not being discussed or fully outlined. I feel I was unable to make an informed decision without all the facts"

"The questions lead to a certain conclusion. Different questions would have led to different answers"

"Too much information for one day"

"Time constraints stifled some debates and discussions"

"Too much info and no time to read and properly digest facts. Unbalanced facts"

"While I felt that there was enough time to discuss the issues raised, I do not think there was enough context – such as overall approach to energy consumption etc. Also no alternative strategies to energy consumption were presented"

"I feel we were not given full energy options and were ramrodded into choosing between CO2 and nuclear, rather than looking at ALL options!"

"It has been made clear that the decision to open new nuclear power stations has already been made. Therefore, I see no clear purpose in this event"

"Not sure what will come of this, government seem to have decided already, I am concerned that they will use the info from this consultation selectively to support their viewpoint"

"Certainly increased my awareness of the benefit of nuclear power"

"Hotel was good. Enjoyed myself"

"Questions were badly written, grammar not correct. No cross section of population. Not ONE person from ethnic minority/no lower class"

"Unsure about overall weighting given to public opinion when the government make the decision"

Exeter:

"I would have liked some information on other options as regards energy production, e.g. windpower"
"Not enough time devoted to alternative energies, question was either nuclear or global warming, too simplistic and loaded"
"What about the £500 million investment in nuclear fusion? Not even mentioned as a possible alternative"
"Insufficient information on impact of energy efficiency measures on the debate"
"I enjoyed taking part but would like more info"
"There should be more information!"
"I believe my day was a sales pitch to get us to buy into nuclear power and didn't give enough info about other sources"
"The day was biased in favour of nuclear energy"
"The information given was somewhat biased and one sided, putting forward the idea that nuclear power is the only option, needed more about other alternatives"
"Whilst an open discussion was held, the whole day was geared towards a pro nuclear approach, and the final question also leaned this way"
"Thought provoking"
"An excellent day, well run, excellent information, well done"
"I am disabled and found people kind and considerate towards me"
"Hardly any ethnic minority present"

Leicester:

"Some poll questions were misleading and ought to have been worded better"
"Admin could be a bit better. Facilitator seemed biased and we were unable to hear him clearly"
"I would have preferred a balanced view on all available/possible energy sources available in the UK. The view presented was that nuclear energy is the only option so the questions asked – answered were biased"
"I felt that the questions asked in the poll were biased in their wording and could/may be used by the government as an inaccurate reflection of the people's true opinions"
"Way meeting was run was fair but questions loaded!"
"Not fully balanced"
"Not enough was said on the dangers and the cons of nuclear power. Safety is an issue, ie terrorism, human error and natural disasters. I feel the government will do what benefits them and not necessarily take in views of the public. I have learnt a lot, however I don't feel there was enough emphasis on different sources of power other than nuclear"
"More statistics on certain things, and a lack of detail hindered certain decisions. A lot of repetition of questions and ideas"
"Please do not keep repeating the same questions over and over again"
"Some of the issues and responses became a little repetitive!"
"Overall very interesting to listen to many views"
"Good venue, ideal balance of participants, can I do another one?"
"I felt that the information sessions, video and input from the facilitator were really good"
"Quizzing us before providing the answers seemed a pointless waste of time. Much more info about renewable alternatives was needed, as the bias towards nuclear fuel was off-putting"
"More information on costs need to be given"
"We did not always have time to read the whole handouts. Asking the facilitators to read highlighted parts means not all information was absorbed (as lots left out). Only showed video on environment issues late in the day"
"I think the whole business was overlong and rather drawn out"
"Safety is the main issue for me, I'm happy nuclear power is going to help! But for how long and what else other than that we've heard today have you come up with?"
"None"

Liverpool:

"More actual figures to compare energy sources would have been useful in decision making"
"More information about nuclear waste and dealing with it specifically would have also been useful"
"Really wish an informed/high profile member of Friends of the Earth/Green Party was here"
"I feel the information given was extremely one sided and very little attention was given to alternative energy sources"
"Very little was mentioned and nothing discussed about the possibilities of renewable energy sources. Therefore I feel it was biased"
"I do not feel that other options were given in respect of energy production"
"A greater input from anti nuclear groups would have been a welcome addition"
"I think we need to hear more than one side of the argument"
"I felt that we were driven to believe that we have no other option but nuclear power"
"I think the government have thought a lot already about climate change and the future of energy production and have already decided upon building more nuclear power stations – but I do fully agree with this as renewable energy can only be a token gesture"
"I hope the government will listen to our views and concerns. It seems that the government has already made up its mind to go ahead with nuclear power replacement so was the event paying lip service?"
"There was only a small number of the younger generation and this topic is about the future, therefore feel more the younger generation should have been involved"

"Could have been younger people here, especially 15-40 years. Quite a few senior citizens"
 "There should be a lot more younger people involved in this process"
 "Provide more information to the general information – education!"
 "More public awareness is essential"
 "After consulting all ministers from all the UK events, I hope that the government will take all our views on board on behalf of a section of the general public"
 "The facilitator was great (Elizabeth Davies)"
 "Lindsay, our facilitator, was very good at drawing in the discussion when we were moving off point or out of time"
 "An enjoyable yet serious event"
 "The room was a little cold and there wasn't much space for others to walk past. The food was varied and the breaks were spread out well. Also the news crew were late. I feel the points covered were clear and very strong. I enjoyed my time"
 "Too much repetition of facts"
 "None"
 "A very complex issue to cover in depth in a day"
 "Too cold!"
 "This has been a public relations exercise, not a consultation"
 "Before I came to this event I didn't know anything about the discussions. But I'm more clued up and more aware"

London:

"With regard to main issues covered, I would have liked to learn more about renewable sources, especially solar power"
 "Although the pub quiz was fun at the beginning I felt it used up time which was needed in the afternoon when we were engaged in the important discussions. I would have appreciated more facts and figures on all topics – especially the alternative viewpoint. Also the box needs to be bigger!"
 "Instead of a pub quiz more time could have been allocated for more discussion and more information"
 "I feel that there should have been more information on the renewable energy"
 "I would have liked more statistical information"
 "Very well run event, however, I would have like a more in depth look at new, renewable sources as an option"
 "The films should have made clearer what type of renewable sources the govt. wants to use alongside NP. Not enough on degradation of nature"
 "I felt that the topic of renewable energies such as bio diesel and water, which are part of the debate, was not covered sufficiently"
 "Insufficient scientific data, many questions unanswered"
 "In order to make a fair judgment on the issues we needed information IN DETAIL about the views of organisations that are opposed to nuclear power development. The absence of the views of the Sustainable Development Commission, who think nuclear is not necessary, was an especially serious omission"
 "I thought this was a fantastic event and a great way to increase public awareness and prompt debate. The only things I felt were missing were experts on the topic and objectors to form the opposition for the debate"
 "The views of the environmental bloc, the renewable options and the alternatives available should have been much more closely examined"
 "The topics and information given was somewhat selective, channelling one into the arguments of building more nuclear power stations"
 "The questions were very specific and often worded in such a way to channel towards a particular answer. I would have appreciated time to talk about the wider issue of energy in a more broad sense"
 "I felt the answers were written first and the questions made to elicit the required answer"
 "A lot of the questions were repetitive and the structure too tightly channelled. The summarisations don't reflect the range of opinions that were brought up. Lots of people from the Chester area!"
 "The government's view seemed to dominate. I would have liked more/better relevant statistics/info"
 "Some of the presentations were slanted, some questions did not reflect the previous discussion. Our facilitator was excellent and made the event happen except for bringing out the quiet ones"
 "They wanted us to support nuclear all along, I think that was quite clear and it was biased"
 "I think this was a directed discussion and I'll be interested to see what impact it has on policy"
 "I felt it a bit biased towards nuclear"
 "Would of liked more fact-based information so I could make a comfortable, educated decision. Some of the voting seemed a little loaded on the answers"
 "The questions were solely focussed on our private companies providing nuclear power. Government direct participation in such a strategically important set of facilities and ultimate responsibility is an issue"
 "Excellent organisation and preparation of event"
 "A well organised and insightful public debate"
 "Excellent facilitator, Laura"
 "Commendable exercise – however always difficult to trust government"
 "The event was arranged rather like a public awareness programme but it was very helpful to understand the critical issue being faced and I hope the conclusions are used to the advantage of the general public"
 "I enjoyed meeting very much but found hard as a disabled person but I received a lot of kindness and help"
 "Overall it was a good debate"
 "I would like to attend such events in the future"
 "Perfectly run consultation with a brilliant hostess (Caroline Davey)"
 "It seemed to be a foregone conclusion. Not sure why we came"

"Regrettably one cannot eliminate a continuing tinge of cynicism that this may be paying lip service to public consultation, validating decisions already made"

"The whole issue was an important one, BUT the presentation was biased (heavily) to make us agree with the government decisions, which have clearly already been reached i.e. this was just window dressing"

"The info was produced by government, and was unfair, biased and hardly objective. I tend to think the exercise was just PR (hot air) for the decision, I believe, will have already been made to pursue nuclear"

"Much too repetitive. Same questions discussed in every session"

"Rather a lot of repetition"

"Looking at the group who have attended the event, I am unsure as to whether they are a representative sample of the UK population"

"Why was everyone from Chichester? Poor random selection. The person next to me went to my school. The results clearly won't be used"

"Though few are able to institute a policy, we are all capable of judging it. (Popper, The Open Society and Its Enemies) PS. We now live in different times"

"I have learnt today that high level/low level radioactive waste has not been disposed of underground and is thus a major safety risk to all. Before thinking about building new plants the government need to address the issue that both low/high level waste still poses a risk to society"

"I don't feel as though all participants contributed. At least 2 people on the table said nothing all day!"

Newcastle:

"The event was biased consisting of leading questions and no discussion of alternative options such as renewables"

"The issues we had were rarely the ones being pressed by the questions we were asked"

"Too dominant on one side of the issue"

"This was not a consultation. The government believe giving participants a free lunch and forcing on us their opinions will make us become pro nuclear power. Its dishonest and disgusting behaviour"

"I feel the information provided was biased in favour of nuclear power"

"I enjoyed this event and felt group discussions were open and fair. Excellent facilitator, information was biased"

"I feel the information we were given was biased, and mainly one sided, I would have liked more balanced information to ensure an informed decision"

"I now understand why the green groups saw this as not consultation but a public relations stitch up. This is not what I conceive of as consultation, it was a propaganda exercise"

"We were not told of any of the HAZARDS of nuclear power!"

"Too biased"

"There seemed to me to be an obvious skew in favour of nuclear. Non nuclear alternatives not considered"

"Info and questions were very repetitive – kept asking similar questions – I think this was an attempt to get us to say we agreed with new nuclear power stations"

"Questions and information supplied were clearly designed to direct our opinion towards nuclear power"

"I am very concerned about the unbalanced argument presented by the organisers and how our opinions will be used"

"I thought was very biased in pushing my view of nuclear for a long term"

"Very one sided presentation of the anti nuclear argument. This made the group more cynical as the day wore on and less supportive of the nuclear option"

"A real lack of the whole picture. It was difficult for the facilitator to record our comments accurately"

"It feels like this decision has already been made and we were not given much information on alternative viewpoints"

"Not enough information on alternative sustainable energy"

"Not enough information on where storage might be"

"Was a pity that no environmental group opposed to nuclear power participated"

"I don't feel that this was a consultation and a range of views were not expressed re e.g. renewable energy lobby, Greenpeace, those for and against etc"

"With lack of evidence and views from anti nuclear groups within consultation, I believe it was slightly pro nuclear"

"The sheets were repetitive and I'm disappointed that the Green groups did not participate in the event"

"I feel more details could have been given on renewable energy and environmental groups' opinions"

"Unfortunate other parties not involved ie Greenpeace"

"I feel that we were not given enough relevant information on certain topics i.e. findings from France, why is Germany having a U turn on nuclear power?"

"More time and information needed"

"Not all issues were covered in depth re COST consequences of different energy supplies"

"I feel the consultation would have been more beneficial if there had been a for and against debate. Also, instead of feedback, a question and answer would have been more fair"

"There wasn't enough cons about nuclear energy, and not enough pros on renewable energy"

"I wish there had been more information on renewables to make choices more informed"

"Interesting day. Started in a leisurely way and then got more and more rushed. Cut down on material (lots of repeats) or increase time"

"I think there should be more scope to the meeting than just for/against nuclear power but also some say into its implementation"

"All our table had very similar views (pro nuclear). Would have been more interesting to argue/discuss points with people of opposing views"

"There was not a good mix of people. It would have been good to see more 16-24 year olds – the future of our country. It would have been good to see more representatives from ethnic minorities too – very under represented"

"Conflating climate change and energy security with nuclear was confusing. Nuclear is vital in its own right as fossil fuels run out. Climate change and security can only be effected if nuclear replaces fossil fuel"

"Change the music!"

"I think that the facilitator had far too much reading of documents in a short space of time. Saying that he did a very good job and got all our table involved in the discussion"

"I agree with government views and I want to??"

"Like to say thank you to staff for looking after me"

"The facilities were excellent"

Norwich:

"I found myself getting increasingly cross as even though I was slightly pro nuclear at the beginning, the way the event was worded was misleading and biased"

"The bias was not the fault of the organisers but the agenda given to them. The alternatives were not given equal emphasis. I am unsure how the results will be used as the polling questions were too simple"

"The information was very biased towards nuclear power"

"I think you should have given different points of view, NOT just 'FOR' power plants"

"I feel that the information was one sided, even though Greenpeace etc didn't turn up we didn't have enough numbers from both sides"

"Very much weighted towards N power, not enough info on renewable power. Hopefully we will be listened to in the bigger picture, not just round this table!"

"I feel the government may be biased as already have a view"

"Information, videos, handouts were severely biased towards nuclear power – what would have been needed would have been the thorough presentation of opponents of nuclear power and their energy policies, excluding nuclear power – very leading and biased presentation. Also, information was too centred on nuclear power – would have needed information about renewables to receive a thorough picture of discussion. A lot of information was really repetitive and shallow, rather than deep and detailed"

"There was not enough information about possible other options such as increased use of renewables"

"There were not enough informations regarding other options of producing electricity"

"Not enough information on alternative energy sources"

"Facilitator did a very good job"

"Facilitator good – clear questions and fair – everyone got a chance to speak"

"Our table was split in opinions so therefore it was difficult to get across all views because of group voting"

"Didn't like having to wait 50mins on arrival, having been asked to arrive at 9.00 prompt in letter"

"Interesting, relevant but very repetitive"

2 What did you think of the information that was provided for this event (information before the event, information sheets at the event, the video, answers to questions)?

I would have liked more information in advance of the event	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	17 (24%)	37 (51%)	3 (4%)	11 (15%)	4 (6%)
Cardiff	16 (19%)	33 (39%)	13 (15%)	21 (25%)	-
Edinburgh	20 (22%)	53 (58%)	6 (7%)	11 (12%)	-
Exeter	18 (22%)	38 (46%)	12 (14%)	14 (17%)	1 (1%)
Leicester	25 (18%)	80 (57%)	9 (6%)	26 (19%)	-
Liverpool	20 (27%)	29 (39%)	6 (8%)	19 (25%)	-
London	38 (26%)	63 (42%)	15 (10%)	29 (19%)	-
Newcastle	60 (43%)	58 (42%)	10 (7%)	10 (7%)	-
Norwich	12 (15%)	41 (53%)	4 (5%)	20 (26%)	1 (1%)
Combined result	226 (25%)	432 (47%)	78 (9%)	161 (18%)	6 (1%)

The information provided covered the main different views on the issues	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	10 (14%)	38 (53%)	13 (18%)	6 (8%)	5 (7%)
Cardiff	10 (12%)	42 (50%)	12 (14%)	16 (19%)	2 (2%)
Edinburgh	7 (8%)	42 (46%)	17 (19%)	19 (21%)	5 (5%)
Exeter	7 (8%)	47 (57%)	14 (17%)	10 (12%)	2 (2%)
Leicester	14 (10%)	79 (56%)	14 (10%)	26 (19%)	6 (4%)
Liverpool	7 (9%)	41 (55%)	9 (12%)	14 (19%)	2 (3%)
London	10 (7%)	72 (48%)	23 (15%)	32 (21%)	7 (5%)
Newcastle	9 (7%)	46 (33%)	27 (20%)	38 (28%)	16 (12%)
Norwich	8 (10%)	36 (46%)	12 (15%)	13 (17%)	8 (10%)
Combined result	82 (9%)	443 (49%)	141 (15%)	174 (19%)	53 (6%)

The information provided was fair and not biased	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	4 (6%)	24 (33%)	24 (33%)	9 (13%)	10 (14%)
Cardiff	7 (8%)	31 (37%)	19 (23%)	18 (21%)	7 (8%)
Edinburgh	4 (4%)	26 (29%)	26 (29%)	25 (27%)	9 (10%)
Exeter	9 (11%)	28 (34%)	23 (28%)	19 (23%)	3 (4%)
Leicester	12 (9%)	44 (31%)	40 (29%)	27 (19%)	13 (9%)
Liverpool	8 (11%)	19 (25%)	23 (31%)	19 (25%)	4 (5%)
London	9 (6%)	57 (38%)	39 (26%)	34 (23%)	6 (4%)
Newcastle	3 (2%)	31 (22%)	43 (31%)	39 (28%)	20 (14%)
Norwich	8 (10%)	28 (36%)	18 (23%)	17 (22%)	7 (9%)
Combined result	64 (7%)	288 (32%)	255 (28%)	207 (23%)	79 (9%)

The information provided was accurate and reliable	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	4 (6%)	30 (42%)	30 (42%)	7 (10%)	-
Cardiff	7 (8%)	24 (29%)	43 (51%)	5 (6%)	-
Edinburgh	5 (5%)	23 (25%)	43 (47%)	12 (13%)	6 (7%)
Exeter	7 (8%)	37 (45%)	33 (40%)	6 (7%)	-
Leicester	9 (6%)	44 (31%)	70 (50%)	10 (7%)	5 (4%)
Liverpool	7 (9%)	18 (24%)	45 (60%)	1 (1%)	2 (3%)
London	9 (6%)	51 (34%)	71 (48%)	10 (7%)	3 (2%)
Newcastle	6 (4%)	39 (28%)	75 (54%)	12 (9%)	6 (4%)
Norwich	8 (10%)	24 (31%)	37 (47%)	7 (9%)	2 (3%)
Combined result	62 (7%)	290 (32%)	447 (49%)	70 (8%)	24 (3%)

I understood and could use the information provided	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	11 (15%)	51 (71%)	7 (10%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Cardiff	16 (19%)	53 (63%)	11 (13%)	-	1 (1%)
Edinburgh	7 (8%)	60 (66%)	18 (20%)	3 (3%)	-
Exeter	13 (16%)	62 (75%)	8 (10%)	-	-
Leicester	21 (15%)	101 (72%)	14 (10%)	2 (1%)	-
Liverpool	12 (16%)	54 (72%)	8 (11%)	-	-
London	29 (19%)	98 (66%)	14 (9%)	3 (2%)	-
Newcastle	21 (15%)	99 (72%)	14 (10%)	3 (2%)	-
Norwich	15 (19%)	54 (69%)	7 (9%)	1 (1%)	-
Combined result	145 (16%)	632 (69%)	101 (11%)	13 (1%)	2 (>1%)

There was enough information to enable me to contribute fully	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	14 (19%)	39 (54%)	6 (8%)	9 (13%)	2 (3%)
Cardiff	16 (19%)	42 (50%)	12 (14%)	12 (14%)	1 (1%)
Edinburgh	14 (15%)	45 (49%)	15 (16%)	12 (13%)	3 (3%)
Exeter	10 (12%)	51 (61%)	13 (16%)	7 (8%)	1 (1%)
Leicester	19 (14%)	68 (49%)	28 (20%)	19 (14%)	4 (3%)
Liverpool	11 (15%)	45 (60%)	10 (13%)	6 (8%)	2 (3%)
London	21 (14%)	66 (44%)	17 (11%)	35 (23%)	3 (2%)
Newcastle	14 (10%)	62 (45%)	26 (19%)	28 (20%)	6 (4%)
Norwich	11 (14%)	39 (50%)	13 (17%)	10 (13%)	5 (6%)
Combined result	130 (14%)	457 (50%)	140 (15%)	138 (15%)	27 (3%)

I felt able to ask questions to clarify anything I did not understand	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Belfast	25 (35%)	40 (56%)	3 (4%)	4 (6%)	-
Cardiff	28 (33%)	45 (54%)	3 (4%)	4 (5%)	1 (1%)
Edinburgh	19 (21%)	63 (69%)	1 (1%)	7 (8%)	-
Exeter	19 (23%)	58 (70%)	4 (5%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Leicester	46 (33%)	80 (57%)	4 (3%)	8 (6%)	1 (1%)
Liverpool	24 (32%)	43 (57%)	2 (3%)	5 (7%)	-
London	43 (29%)	88 (59%)	5 (3%)	5 (3%)	4 (3%)
Newcastle	40 (29%)	80 (58%)	4 (3%)	10 (7%)	3 (2%)
Norwich	25 (32%)	43 (55%)	5 (6%)	5 (6%)	-
Combined result	269 (30%)	540 (59%)	31 (3%)	49 (5%)	10 (1%)

Comments analysis (175 comments)

- wanted more from those opposing nuclear power / information on alternatives / other options (63)
- information was leading / biased (26)
- wanted more information / facts and figures / statistics / evidence (21)
- no experts / anyone available to answer questions (10)
- * it was good / useful / informative (9)
- not an expert so cannot judge the information (5)

All comments

Belfast:

"Views of opposing organisations were not provided although they were invited i.e. Greenpeace, so this was not fault of facilitators but the views concerns or ideas of Friends of the Earth etc. would have given a more balanced view"

"Needed more info from different options"

"The questions were manipulated to giving the answer always direct @ nuclear energy, no opportunity to discuss renewable energy and no facts about the risks of nuclear energy"

"I felt that the information given was one sided; other organisations involved did not voice their opinions"

"Views of other interested parties were excluded or get virtually no mention"

"Not enough facts and figures on other industries"

"Information seemed biased in favour of using nuclear energy and was at times misleading"

"Everything was covered and I was able to answer questions after every topic as I understood"

"Very good"

"A little bit repetitive and drawn out"

Cardiff:

"There could have been more information on the question of renewables instead of the question – should there be nuclear or not?"

"Not all issues were presented, particularly the alternatives such as CHP"

"I feel that more information should have been discussed on renewables"

"I would like info on renewable versus N.P. as cost"

"I would have liked to hear the views in detail of anti-nuclear groups in order to consider both sides. More pro info was provided"

"It would have been more informative to have more details from opposing parties ie Greenpeace"

"More statistics required - present and future"

"More info on nuclear before event for preparation to think and respond"

"Would have preferred more in depth papers"

"Not enough time to digest the handouts before discussion started"

"Needed more time to consider some of the issues"

"Facilitator very helpful"

"We had an excellent facilitator"

"Some info seemed contradictory?"

"All information received was concise"

"Felt that the Gov has already to a great extent made their mind up. Questions were biased"

"A lot of the information was clouded with statistics that could be interpreted in a different way"

"The acoustics in the hall made it difficult for me to hear much of the input from others"

Edinburgh:

"Felt the government position was pushed through the info and was trying to convince us"

"Information was too dense and difficult to take in all at once, and as said before was biased towards the use of nuclear power"

"I believe we were pushed towards agreeing with nuclear power"

"Many statistics did not match up and were contradicted. When questions were asked to speaker they went unanswered"

"Sources not often specified"

"The incorrect pie chart was scary, was any other info similarly mistaken?"

"Not enough about other non nuclear options. Too much explanation that nuclear would go ahead – particularly in second half, as questions were about what conditions etc."

"More information on different types of energy generation should have been provided (biomass, renewable etc)"

"No one to ask questions in terms of information gathering"

"Would have liked to have had more information before the event"

"There should be similar ones on the renewable sources"

"Most informative"

"Why did the Green parties refuse to attend or put forward their POV [point of view]?"

Exeter:

"We were not given any information on costs to be revisited on the public or any other way to dispose of waste, or research in 20 years for our own independent source of energy"
"There was no pre-meeting information except the original letter and map"
"Would have liked a bit more information but generally satisfied"
"Views of groups against nuclear power should have been included"
"More information needed on the topic!"
"More information needed about how other countries handle this issue, how government proposes to handle waste and regulate industry"
"Very good day to follow"
"Good quality handouts"
"Really enjoyed and was very informative"
"An informative day"
"I thoroughly enjoyed it"
"How do we know the info is correct as no information or research done by ourselves beforehand"
"How am I supposed to know the info was accurate and reliable if I haven't researched the topic beforehand"

Leicester:

"We had lots of questions that could not be answered. All our group said we needed another session where we were provided with the answers to our queries before being asked to vote so we have the whole information we wanted to enable an informed decision"
"No additional information provided other than that on sheets. Annoying repetition of questions to the table"
"Although we could ask questions, the information to answer them was not available"
"Lack of information from opposing parties, some scientific details about nuclear power would have been useful"
"Would have been fairer if an organisation opposing nuclear energy had presented their views themselves"
"Not enough quantitative information and seemed biased"
"Felt information was lacking on causes of global warming. This is a situation that has happened before in history, not just CO2"
"There was not enough information on other options for me to agree with nuclear power and any effects that may occur"
"More information about the risks, size and longevity of proposed nuclear waste"
"Coming to the debate with little prior information meant I hadn't formed an opinion. I have no way of knowing if the data was correct"
"The information provided was accurate and reliable – I have put unsure because I'm not the professional and I don't know"
"Overall this was good, however there were some discrepancies"
"Good"
"Just felt the questions were repeated throughout the day"
"No information given beforehand"
"Have all points of view been raised and covered"

Liverpool:

"Needed more info from green groups to counterbalance the need for nuclear power"
"There was little information about the specific dangers of geological waste disposal, or sufficient information on alternative energy sources"
"Again, very little was mentioned as to why we cannot use renewables rather than nuclear. I feel statistics are always dependent on who conducted the survey and whether it is the required results"
"I would have liked discussion on all energy sources not just nuclear power"
"While I do not feel literature was biased I do feel alternatives to nuclear were dismissed swiftly – but I see why and do ultimately agree with why"
"Perhaps we were not given enough information on the non renewable sources"
"Were the views of anti nuclear groups fully represented?"
"More balanced view with renewables and cost comparison nuclear/others"
"Vagueness of info relating to volume, radioactivity, level of danger of the waste. Therefore difficult to give a full informed vote on some aspects"
"More information prior to the event / at the beginning of the day would have clarified a lot i.e. definitions of nuclear power – where statistics came from"
"I would have liked to be sent prior information by post for brief background information"
"I would have liked more information before the event to have had a more informative view"
"I would have liked some information before we came to this event so I would have been prepared"
"Some of the assumptions upon which the handouts etc were based were not impartial"
"I was unsure as to whether the information provided was designed to encourage agreement with nuclear power"
"I felt that the government's view was being supported – all opposing views were only articulated in order to be contradicted. It could have been more detailed and fair"
"Biased view of like it or not nuclear power is the only option"
"More information would include other countries' consumption and use of nuclear fuel"
"I would have liked more information on the viability of other sources of energy. I would like to know how other states propose to tackle climate change. What are the Germans, Belgians doing if they are not building new nuclear reactors?"
"Group was really friendly which helped a lot"

"I believe it was a good idea to turn up with little knowledge so that discussions could be taken up blindfolded and more interaction from everyone made the day more fulfilling and better knowledge of nuclear energy was given"
"I will certainly go home and do more research as at the moment I can only follow the advice on the handouts"
"The facilitator helped to keep an even balance of views without adding any bias"
"I wasn't listened to, was rushed, I was made to feel what I'm saying wasn't important"

London:

"Not enough information from anti nuclear organisations"
"I would have liked to have more info from other groups who are not in favour of nuclear energy. Also more info on renewable energies"
"Not enough information on the environment from environmental conservationists. More facts and figures about nuclear radiation and renewable energy. Any research to the effect (?)"
"I would have liked to have heard different opinions on the matter, other than those with ties to the nuclear energy industry"
"More from environmental groups"
"More information on other options should have been on the table"
"I would have liked to be informed more of CO2 reductions from no more fossil fuels and how other safe methods of getting electricity are being developed"
"Felt that info provided was lacking to a degree on nuclear power info and more so on other options – without which it was very difficult to make conclusive decisions"
"No first hand views about alternatives"
"There was a great deal of supportive information for the nuclear argument but not a particularly balanced view on the other alternatives. There was a feeling that we were being channelled to give particular answers"
"There was no opportunity to broaden the answers – designed for participants to agree"
"It was as unbiased as a rigged football match!"
"Very biased towards voting for nuclear power, not enough information on research into other options"
"The balance of viewpoints was absent. Also the "Government believes...don't you?" angle for 'permitting' the nuclear industry to build was biased"
"I thought the questions were loaded towards atomic power"
"There was not a nuclear expert present to ask questions of"
"The information was lacking in varied areas of opinion. Any questions asked could not be answered by facilitators, so answers given were other's opinion and may not be based on true information"
"Different views were mentioned but not supported by figures/stats. I could ask the question but didn't get the answer"
"Could have benefited from experts on site to answer questions"
"[Could ask questions] But answers were unsure or not forthcoming"
"We relied on the facilitator to summarise – we should have had material in advance. We needed material written by groups/academics/independent people"
"Not enough information and when information was there it was very vague"
"Some of the scientific facts that we needed to inform our decisions were missing e.g. details of the practicalities involved in nuclear waste disposal"
"Insufficient scientific data, many questions unanswered"
"Some of the facts presented need to be more properly researched. For example, your handouts stated between 29 and 58 million tonnes of CO2 is saved through the use of nuclear energy – there is a very large gap between the two numbers"
"I felt that certain figures were ambiguous and 5-13% is not accurate"
"The information did not provide base facts i.e. how dangerous is the waste – new power plants the waste could be three times as strong – How strong is that? Three times more than what?"
"It left me more with a question as to how else to fuel the economy and the enormity of the task at hand"
"There are so many unanswered questions. How do the government intend to ensure security of supply? Yes CO2 emissions will be reduced by new plants, however there is an increase of higher radioactivity"
"I'm not an expert in the field of nuclear energy, therefore unable to judge whether the information provided was fair and unbiased"
"I would have liked to do more research regarding about the nuclear power as in this way I am more confident to answer the questions being asked during the discussion"
"The news reported how the government's document was inaccurate – J Hutton had to backtrack because document initially gave impression a decision had already been made"
"The day was too limited in its outlook compared to the facts on renewable energy"
"Thank you to our team leader, Marcia, for being encouraging and patient"
"This has given me an understanding of nuclear energy"

Newcastle:

"More needed. Greater info about risks of nuclear energy and renewable capacity required"
"We needed more information and views from those not favouring the nuclear option"
"Should have been more info on renewable energy, sources, eg comparisons of energy generated etc"
"The green/environment pressure groups should have been represented...But I realise they wouldn't want to be part of attempted brainwashing"
"More info on the workability of renewables as an alternative to nuclear"
"The nuclear option was the only real option that was discussed. How do the renewable options compare i.e. how many sites (eg wind turbines) required to produce 4% of the electricity?"

Not all questions could be answered as little information available on alternative source of renewable energy re CO2"

"I have felt that the decision to allow (nuclear) energy companies had already been given the go ahead and that the questions were worded in a way that manipulated our answers in favour of these nuclear energy companies"

"I was surprised there was not more input from Green Lobby"

"I don't feel that this was a consultation and a range of views were not expressed re e.g. renewable energy lobby, Greenpeace, those for and against etc"

"Not enough information on alternatives, sources of renewable resources or alternative arguments"

"The event was biased consisting of leading questions and no discussion of alternative options such as renewables. How can I decide when I know nothing on the viability of renewables vs. nuclear?"

"There was a feeling that the day was guided in one direction. This created a perhaps cynical response. Other parties, options, were not raised which also restricted final opinion"

"I found the information very biased in favour of establishing more nuclear power stations. Very little information given on the views from those AGAINST nuclear power"

"This info was biased and purely engineered to gain positive response towards nuclear"

"Only one set of views was presented. It was, for example, laughable that the alternative views presented were given by a TV rep working in the nuclear industry, the CBI and the nuclear industry rep, only the renewable energy rep could properly be called alternative"

"Debate biased towards nuclear energy being the only alternative"

"Too much one sided for nuclear power. Alternative energy should be more discussed"

"As per earlier comment re bias"

"More information should have been provided on the government's plan and case studies such as France's experience"

"Information provided covered all areas of concern – BUT how decisions were arrived at were not transparent. On many occasions opinions were offered- not evidence based!"

"Level of base load was unclear. Also why nuclear only for base load if France has 80% nuclear"

"Again not enough relevant information. I feel that decisions have already been made and this has just been an event to tick the boxes"

"Huge gaps in information provided"

"No breadth to information"

"Definitely information before event??"

"Please don't use two part questions"

"The facilitator did an extraordinary job, given the diverse nature of conversations and did well to keep us on track"

"Little repetitive in nuclear aspects"

"Too much information to absorb in a short period and then comment and answer questions back"

"I agree with government views"

Norwich:

"The information was superficial and biased questions towards saving the planet and nuclear being the only option. More on SDC and Greenpeace would be better"

"There was not enough information about possible other options such as increased use of renewables"

"Sources of information may have been useful, including scientific survey"

"More info on other energy sources required"

"Felt the info provided was biased and selective and limited. Generally in favour of more nuclear energy"

"The videos were biased towards the government's decision – always taking the opposition's arguments at face value then countering them as though intending to push the government pro nuclear view. The papers included no references which renders them completely invalid and unreliable as an information source. No consideration was given to alternative technologies, nor to the fact that nuclear energies were unsustainable and alternatives must be found in the near future anyway"

"I could not feel sure that information given was absolutely reliable or unbiased"

"Need more information for both arguments for and against"

"Very much weighted towards N power, not enough info on renewable power"

"See above, information was repetitive and too shallow, far too biased, not giving enough place to alternative, opposing views and strategies to tackle climate change and energy security without nuclear power. ...see on handout – where sustainable development commission was only mentioned but no details given"

"Information sources not quoted, therefore its accuracy is debatable, some was wrong or was leading"

"There was no informed expert to ask clarification of facts on the information sheets"

"I asked for information as to why France was for nuclear power plants and why Germany has chosen not to build any new power plants, I was not given any"

"Again, mostly relevant but at times repetitive"

3 How much did you trust the information you were provided with?

To what extent did you trust the information you were given <u>overall</u> ?	Completely	Mostly	Unsure	A bit	Not at all
Belfast	10 (14%)	42 (58%)	12 (17%)	8 (11%)	-
Cardiff	6 (7%)	49 (58%)	19 (23%)	8 (10%)	1 (1%)
Edinburgh	5 (5%)	45 (49%)	24 (26%)	13 (14%)	3 (3%)
Exeter	6 (7%)	60 (72%)	14 (17%)	3 (4%)	-
Leicester	12 (9%)	80 (57%)	32 (23%)	12 (9%)	2 (1%)
Liverpool	6 (8%)	52 (69%)	13 (17%)	-	1 (1%)
London	10 (7%)	103 (69%)	26 (17%)	8 (5%)	-
Newcastle	6 (4%)	81 (59%)	34 (25%)	13 (9%)	4 (3%)
Norwich	9 (12%)	44 (56%)	19 (24%)	5 (6%)	1 (1%)
Combined result	70 (8%)	556 (61%)	193 (21%)	70 (8%)	12 (1%)

To what extent did you trust the information <u>on climate change</u> ?	Completely	Mostly	Unsure	A bit	Not at all
Belfast	17 (24%)	42 (58%)	10 (14%)	2 (3%)	-
Cardiff	10 (12%)	41 (49%)	23 (27%)	7 (8%)	2 (2%)
Edinburgh	16 (18%)	46 (51%)	21 (23%)	5 (5%)	2 (2%)
Exeter	11 (13%)	51 (61%)	16 (19%)	5 (6%)	-
Leicester	14 (10%)	73 (52%)	33 (24%)	15 (11%)	3 (2%)
Liverpool	15 (20%)	37 (49%)	16 (21%)	5 (7%)	-
London	25 (17%)	88 (59%)	22 (15%)	8 (5%)	2 (1%)
Newcastle	21 (15%)	63 (46%)	34 (25%)	15 (11%)	5 (4%)
Norwich	12 (15%)	49 (63%)	11 (14%)	4 (5%)	2 (3%)
Combined result	141 (15%)	490 (54%)	186 (20%)	66 (7%)	16 (2%)

To what extent did you trust the information <u>on UK energy security</u> ?	Completely	Mostly	Unsure	A bit	Not at all
Belfast	9 (13%)	41 (57%)	12 (17%)	10 (14%)	-
Cardiff	13 (15%)	37 (44%)	22 (26%)	9 (11%)	1 (1%)
Edinburgh	10 (11%)	34 (37%)	32 (35%)	12 (13%)	1 (1%)
Exeter	11 (13%)	52 (63%)	14 (17%)	5 (6%)	1 (1%)
Leicester	15 (11%)	71 (51%)	32 (23%)	11 (8%)	3 (2%)
Liverpool	6 (8%)	40 (53%)	19 (25%)	5 (7%)	1 (1%)
London	18 (12%)	79 (53%)	38 (26%)	8 (5%)	1 (1%)
Newcastle	12 (9%)	71 (51%)	41 (30%)	9 (7%)	2 (1%)
Norwich	9 (12%)	43 (55%)	17 (22%)	6 (8%)	3 (4%)
Combined result	103 (11%)	468 (51%)	227 (25%)	75 (8%)	13 (1%)

To what extent did you trust the information on the need for nuclear power in the energy mix?	Completely	Mostly	Unsure	A bit	Not at all
Belfast	16 (22%)	35 (49%)	13 (18%)	6 (8%)	2 (3%)
Cardiff	10 (12%)	38 (45%)	20 (24%)	9 (11%)	6 (7%)
Edinburgh	9 (10%)	40 (44%)	23 (25%)	8 (9%)	4 (4%)
Exeter	18 (22%)	43 (52%)	17 (20%)	4 (5%)	1 (1%)
Leicester	16 (11%)	75 (54%)	35 (25%)	8 (6%)	4 (3%)
Liverpool	7 (9%)	42 (56%)	10 (13%)	9 (12%)	4 (5%)
London	16 (11%)	60 (40%)	48 (32%)	18 (12%)	2 (1%)
Newcastle	15 (11%)	60 (43%)	35 (25%)	22 (16%)	5 (4%)
Norwich	11 (14%)	23 (29%)	26 (33%)	9 (12%)	9 (12%)
Combined result	118 (13%)	416 (46%)	227 (25%)	93 (10%)	37 (4%)

To what extent did you trust the information on waste?	Completely	Mostly	Unsure	A bit	Not at all
Belfast	5 (7%)	36 (50%)	20 (28%)	7 (10%)	3 (4%)
Cardiff	10 (12%)	27 (32%)	30 (36%)	10 (12%)	5 (6%)
Edinburgh	8 (9%)	25 (27%)	26 (29%)	24 (26%)	7 (8%)
Exeter	7 (8%)	47 (57%)	17 (20%)	10 (12%)	2 (2%)
Leicester	14 (10%)	55 (39%)	38 (27%)	22 (16%)	7 (5%)
Liverpool	2 (3%)	27 (36%)	30 (40%)	8 (11%)	6 (8%)
London	9 (6%)	47 (32%)	50 (34%)	32 (21%)	7 (5%)
Newcastle	7 (5%)	50 (36%)	36 (26%)	32 (23%)	13 (9%)
Norwich	5 (6%)	32 (41%)	18 (23%)	13 (17%)	10 (13%)
Combined result	67 (7%)	346 (38%)	265 (29%)	158 (17%)	60 (7%)

To what extent did you trust the information on safety and security?	Completely	Mostly	Unsure	A bit	Not at all
Belfast	7 (10%)	34 (47%)	19 (26%)	7 (10%)	5 (7%)
Cardiff	10 (12%)	27 (32%)	30 (36%)	10 (12%)	6 (7%)
Edinburgh	8 (9%)	30 (33%)	27 (30%)	20 (22%)	5 (5%)
Exeter	8 (10%)	41 (49%)	21 (25%)	11 (13%)	2 (2%)
Leicester	13 (9%)	62 (44%)	39 (28%)	15 (11%)	8 (6%)
Liverpool	4 (5%)	32 (43%)	27 (36%)	5 (7%)	5 (7%)
London	11 (7%)	58 (39%)	45 (30%)	27 (18%)	3 (2%)
Newcastle	8 (6%)	51 (37%)	45 (33%)	23 (17%)	10 (7%)
Norwich	6 (8%)	35 (45%)	17 (22%)	12 (15%)	8 (10%)
Combined result	75 (8%)	370 (41%)	270 (30%)	130 (14%)	52 (6%)

Comment analysis (115 comments)

- information was biased / misleading (29)
- not enough / wanted more / concerns on waste (19)
- not enough information generally / wanted more facts and figures / details (14)
- not enough / wanted more on safety (6)
- wanted information from a non-government source / do not trust government sources (8)
- sources of information not specified / referenced / attributed (5)

All comments

Belfast:

"Need to know more on waste disposal"

"I am still unsure about what it is going to be done with the waste and also we didn't hear about any alternatives from Greenpeace"

"I do not believe that CO2 contributes towards climate change"

"I felt hoodwinked into believing nuclear energy is the only option"

"Much more information and facts as these important issues were omitted"

Cardiff:

"While I generally trusted the info and facts given I'm mindful of the possibility of omission of detail that doesn't fit the argument being put forward"

"The information was VERY biased and did not offer similar info on other options – leading presentations"

"I think the information was probably accurate but worded in a biased way aimed at influencing opinions and containing significant omissions"

"More detail on how the waste would be stored, e.g. type of material, methods of containment etc"

"Waste issues were very unclear – amount and particularly disposal/storage"

"Hardly any info on waste"

"I felt the videos could have had more content on the above topics"

"Information was very sparse so difficult to comment in any meaningful way"

"Climate change was taken as gospel and I am not convinced"

"A lot of the information was clouded with statistics that could be interpreted in a different way"

"Vague in places"

"We never heard anything about near misses on the security issues"

Edinburgh:

"I am a sceptical person with a mistrust on government provided, information anyway. More independent information would have been advantageous and received well. I felt the leaning towards nuclear energy was unfair"

"Some info omitted/not factored in"

"The question of waste storage was not fully addressed"

"No mention of low and medium waste. The new proposed plants will still produce them?"

"Not convinced about need for nuclear as no clear picture of future energy mix was outlined - I was less convinced about the need for nuclear as a result of not knowing more context"

"Would have liked more of a comparison to use renewable. I felt that the questions asked were leading to a future in nuclear energy. There must be a more reliable/cleaner energy source"

Exeter:

"What are the government's safety storage for waste, what are the long term results, how will this affect house prices in storage areas, where will the areas be?"

"Not a lot of info on the high risk wastage"

"Not sure about the facts presented on future stocks of uranium. One sentence indicated enough for the lifetime of the nuclear power station, the sentence below seemed waffle"

"Plenty of information supplied, videos good"

"I have no other source of info to compare"

"Info seemed to be biased towards nuclear as the only option - needed more alternatives"

"Info on some key issues was missing"

Leicester:

"The focus was to lead towards acceptance of government's initial view on nuclear power"

"Government are BIAS! Only tell them what they want you to hear"

"Would have been fairer if an organisation opposing nuclear energy had presented their views themselves"

"I'm never too sure who to trust when it comes to dumping rubbish"

"I do not believe that nuclear power (radioactive waste) should be stored at any cost when we have the knowledge to become a self sufficient country without the aid of nuclear power"

"More information about waste "

"I would have liked more scientific evidence to have been included too"

"The way the statistics were provided was ambiguous and did not show the whole story"

"I felt it was presented honestly and openly"

Liverpool:

"As it was to make us sway towards nuclear power I found that the handouts were very biased and at times quite confusing"

"All/many questions were already weighted in the light that nuclear power is a given not an option which is wrong and I think this is why green groups opted out of this consultation today"

"Sceptical upon the info because I feel it's the statistics that match those required and is biased"

"I believe a slant will have been on this information we have been supplied with and questions and statistics given to us to produce a reaction they want"

"There seem to be a lot of arguments for as opposed to against. Would like to read views from Greenpeace etc"

"There should have been speakers who were for and against nuclear power as I feel we were given a one sided view"

"How would safety be upheld in transportation of waste – discussion focused mainly on actual nuclear power plant"

"Not sure about information provided regarding waste/security/ safety. Obviously not in the government's interest to remind us of any problems/lapses in past"

"Quite sceptical on some information. Would have liked more stats and facts on waste disposal etc"

"More information on waste storage and treatment and safety and security and the implications where private industry is involved would have been useful"

"The way waste is dealt with is a major concern but I think this can happen in a way that will help the debate"

"I would like to state that I fully trust government action, but due to recent foot and mouth outbreak originating in a govt. lab due to cost cutting and poor maintenance of drainage, I am unable to"

"Similarly, the lack of an opposition meant that although all figures and facts were credited they are all from government acceptable sources – or appear to be, because no facts were offered by an opposing voice. So I took everything with a pinch of salt"

"How long is a piece of string?"

"None"

"Too much information to deal within short space of time. And then expected to answer questions when you haven't heard or read what's going on"

London:

"Not enough thought on what will happen to radioactive waste especially what the next generation will do next"

"The issue of waste needs much more attention in terms of LONG TERM impact on environment, not only next 10-50 years"

"Would have liked to have heard more on energy security and waste in particular"

"There were bias and even some contradictions in the information provided. Some information was also glossed over. For example statistics on volume of waste did not present any information on radiation levels of the waste material which makes the statements hard to properly quantify (refer handout 7)

"Not enough information on waste"

"The long term implications for waste storage 2 times the length of recorded human history were not addressed. At all"

"Waste and security are difficult and complex issues, impossible to cover properly in a short session like this. A public information campaign may be helpful"

"There was not info on waste"

"The information on all above issues could have been enhanced with case studies and examples of how the industry had reached more facts and figures would have been welcome"

"There was not enough information on these matters"

"Lack of trust came from not having the info we needed"

"Lack of specific facts and figures was a problem. Statistical comparisons are no use unless you knew the base point"

"Would have been helpful to have more facts and figures please"

"Again a lot of the information did not have a base figure to compare against"

"Some corroboration given by videos but as always, information can be spun to fit the particular point of view of the authors"

"Selective, biased and pre determining"

"Information seemed rather one sided. Enormous focus on CO2 emission reduction but that is not the only reason for considering new nuclear power sites – too much emphasis weighting to environmental issues – while very important, they are an easy target following the continuing climate change coverage in the media"

"Lack of key info and arguments from non energy Dept. sources against nuclear"

"We could have done with some factual information from a non government source"

"I think the issues of safety were an issue all day and the private sector involvement elusive"

"Nuclear energy has not been used for long enough for us to know the risks. For something to be unsafe for thousands of years is terrifying"

"Difficult to judge if we were given a balanced view without reading around the topic"

"I found that the statistic of nuclear power and wind power giving and same amount of CO2 rather strange"

"Fairly"

"Independent body should be set up to monitor, regulate and ensure safety and security of nuclear energy operations"

"Re security of materials – no mention of lost, missing or unaccounted for nuclear materials. No mention of the dependence of the UK nuclear weapons industry or a functional civil power industry"

"Information seemed true"

"The disadvantages of nuclear power outweigh the advantages in the long run but it should still form part of the mix"

"I do not believe the government when they want to follow a course of action"

Newcastle:

"Again, opposing opinions should have been more thoroughly represented"
 "The information was one sided and was not sufficiently backed up with facts, figures and possible alternatives"
 "As the information and statistics given were biased in favour of nuclear energy, I found it very difficult to trust this information"
 "Info may be true but stated in a biased fashion"
 "I felt the information was one sided, promoting benefits of nuclear energy"
 "Info/videos etc – selling nuclear and at the beginning of day was in favour. However, due to very biased info presented it made me a bit cynical"
 "Not enough balanced information on alternative argument or data"
 "The repetitious nature of the questions was infuriating. The lack of figures, data, representatives, from renewable resources was very unhelpful"
 "The information should have been presented in a manner that allowed easy comparison and gave a better range of choices"
 "Not an issue of trustworthiness of info given, but absence of important info"
 "I could trust the information – but more was needed"
 "If nuclear power is to be a main provider do we have enough information on several issues!"
 "No information was really given regarding waste management/ maintenance etc. How secure is nuclear if we still have to import the URANIUM"
 "I will always worry about nuclear waste being stuck in the ground for 1000s of years"
 "There should have been more info on the waste"
 "There are no reassurances that can be given that would cover risks lasting for thousands of years"
 "Safety was not discussed as fully as I would have liked"
 "I agree with nuclear energy"
 "A farce"
 "Hard to tell really but really biased info would be spotted by some people"

Norwich:

"Not referenced in many cases. Most sources were sound bites/snapshot of government agencies and opinions. Limited alternative views were presented"
 "As above, there were no REFERENCES and the information was presented in a biased pro nuclear view"
 "Difficult to know as not comprehensive. Needed more references"
 "The lack of information from other groups led to distrust"
 "There was no real mention of the full list of sources of uranium versus sources of fossil fuels (it was implied fossil fuels were all bad and uranium all good – e.g. Australia and Canada)"
 "I could not feel sure that information given was absolutely reliable or unbiased"
 "Had no way of knowing how accurate anything was as we had nothing to compare it to"
 "The area on waste/safety was not explicit enough and did not cover long term implications"
 "Had done previous reading"
 "The future is unknown. There are no guarantees from whatever source"

4**Has being involved in this consultation process made any difference to what you think?**

	Yes	No	Don't know
Belfast	50 (69%)	16 (22%)	6 (8%)
Cardiff	53 (63%)	26 (31%)	4 (5%)
Edinburgh	52 (57%)	28 (31%)	7 (8%)
Exeter	54 (65%)	20 (24%)	3 (4%)
Leicester	97 (69%)	29 (21%)	9 (6%)
Liverpool	49 (65%)	17 (23%)	6 (8%)
London	105 (70%)	26 (17%)	10 (7%)
Newcastle	81 (59%)	42 (30%)	8 (6%)
Norwich	42 (54%)	25 (32%)	8 (10%)
Combined result	583 (64%)	229 (25%)	61 (7%)

Comment analysis (515 comments)

- learnt more / clarified thinking / thought more / more aware (210)
- learnt more about nuclear power (51)
- learnt more / made me think about climate change / own energy use (49)
- views changed / reinforced (more pro-nuclear) (55)
- views changed / reinforced (more anti-nuclear) (53)
- made me (more) worried / raised new questions about nuclear power / waste etc (22)
- need to / want to / will find out more (16)
- want to see more emphasis on alternatives / renewables (13)
- affected by hearing other people's views (7)
- views changed / reinforced (unspecified) (5)

All comments

Belfast:

"It has helped me gain knowledge on different energy sources which I did not know about previous to today"
"Understand the difference between nuclear energy and fossil fuel energy and the crisis situation between UK is currently in"
"I am better informed"
"How dependent we are on outside energy sources"
"Made things clear"
"More informed and can now be more comfortable in making decisions"
"Knowledge"
"Better understanding of issue"
"I know more about it"
"Now that we start to understand what its all about"
"Clarified issues. Made me think about the various issues and will be interested in reading how things progress"
"Much more aware of relevant power issues and the state of the planet"
"More understanding of the problems"
"Given more information than I had before"
"Better informed"
"Made me realise how important energy is"
"I was quite passive before, however I will take a greater interest in the future and I am now quite happy about the use of nuclear energy"
"More positive about nuclear, better informed"
"The level of individual energy consumption and CO emissions was higher than I expected and helped confirm the need for nuclear energy"
"More education today means my fears of nuclear power have slightly diminished"
"Am a lot more aware of nuclear energy and more happy about it"
"Pro nuclear power, unsure before"
"I support nuclear energy more"
"Realise need for nuclear energy as no option"
"I have realised that in the long term nuclear power is the answer until we find other options"
"There is really a need for nuclear power, to ensure our future supply of energy"
"We need to reduce CO2 emissions. Nuclear power to secure future energy"
"I think nuclear is the energy of the future"
"Made me think more about energy I use and how to reduce wastage"
"Made me aware of climate change and importance of saving electricity"
"Think more about energy usage and the use of nuclear energy"
"Personally I will be more willing to reduce my CO2 emissions"
"How I think about using electricity and fossil fuels"
"Thinking about future resources"
"Information on CO2 emissions and global warming"
"This event has furthered my knowledge of nuclear energy"
"Increased my awareness around nuclear power. The future: steps the gov. need to take"
"I am more aware of nuclear energy"
"Came out knowing more about nuclear energy"
"No other choice"
"Before the event I already realised that future UK energy needs but we depend on an agreed level of nuclear"
"Nuclear only part of the solution. Disposal of waste frightening. Dig a hole and put waste in it"

Cardiff:

"By being better informed and more aware of the complexities"
"Thought more about the issue"
"It has focussed my thinking"
"More awareness of government issues"
"I feel I now have a more balanced view on the issues involved and the opinions of others on this subject"

"Received relevant information to make an informed decision"

"Given me an awareness of some of the wider issues around nuclear energy. And only nuclear is being considered"

"I have a greater awareness of the concerns and worries of people generally over this issue"

"More informed on energy in UK"

"Know a lot more about carbon emissions"

"I am more aware of its issues"

"Being more knowledgeable about nuclear energy"

"More understanding"

"Learnt new aspects"

"Given me stronger opinions"

"Open my eyes and mind"

"Have more understanding of issues"

"Open my mind"

"When I arrived today I knew very little about the subject. The word Nuclear makes me nervous. After reading subject matter and discussions I have formed an opinion. I am no longer in the dark!"

"I understand now that energy mix is important for the UK"

"Opened my eyes and made me more welcoming to nuclear power"

"I was a lot more against nuclear, now I feel that for the moment it is essential"

"More sympathetic to nuclear power"

"I've changed to pro nuclear"

"I now support nuclear energy"

"I have changed my views on nuclear power. I have more knowledge on how it is beneficial to us"

"I have come to accept NP might be used but I have less faith in the government consultation process as having any effect"

"Makes me realise nuclear may be the only way to go, not just the easiest option"

"Has made me more opposed to nuclear power"

"Made me more sure that I do not want nuclear energy. If its such a good option why such a biased and brainwashing conference"

"More anti nuclear"

"I have more doubts about the benefits of nuclear energy"

"I thought nuclear power was fine – wrong!"

"I feel more strongly against nuclear power"

"It still confirms my original views and I wish to be more informed on this topic"

"I was for nuclear energy before attending this event although I now have a more informed opinion"

"It changed my view on the nuclear power and the waste"

"I know that nuclear energy has to be thought of as an option to make the country's electricity secure"

"Heightened my level of concern. Will try to cut down on personal energy use and encourage others to do the same"

"My confusion has shifted"

"I think the government just wanted people to agree with what was said, but we did not have the opportunity to disagree"

"Because I was told what the government wanted"

"Best be in possession of ALL the facts before coming to conclusion"

"Allowed to be able to express a better opinion on the subject"

"It's good to know that the general publics opinion counts and hope that it is counted"

"Can see how focus groups work"

Edinburgh:

"Although I do feel more informed"

"Better understanding of nuclear energy"

"More info – key facts very interesting. Certainly generally more thoughtful"

"It has helped me to understand the whole energy issue, and also form an opinion"

"It has made me more aware of the need for our own energy supply"

"Have more definite views now"

"Better informed"

"Has made me more aware of areas within energy supply but not necessarily turned my head completely"

"I think I understand more about the issues involved"

"I came here without an opinion and leave with one"

"Some bits have caused more deliberation"

"Made me think about the issues"

"Made me more aware of the issues"

"On nuclear vis a vis non-nuclear"

"It made things clearer"

"More knowledge of what we were discussing"

"A more informed view"

"I now see the bigger picture"

"I understand that the matter is more urgent than I believed"

"More aware of nuclear energy now"

"Gave me a better insight to energy"
 "A clearer understanding – and not only in regard to my views and knowledge but also in regard to those who are strongly opposed"
 "Given more information to act on"
 "I am now more pro nuclear energy although still cautious"
 "I realise nuclear will be a necessary power"
 "I think there should be more nuclear power"
 "In the system that government should produce a correct and positive initiative on nuclear power production in the UK"
 "It has made no difference to my opinion of nuclear energy being dangerous, but it has made me more sceptical of the government and the information provided"
 "Strongly disagree with nuclear"
 "Clarified my concerns about nuclear power as a result of the information being polarised towards encouraging me to support nuclear as only option!"
 "I now strongly oppose nuclear power, before I was only unsure"
 "Has made me think about the issues in terms of participating in and contributing to wider implications/issues about climate"
 "I will think more about how I use my electrical equipment"
 "Unsure of the storage of waste is safe"
 "In consideration of the production of noxious toxic waste for the benefit of humanity"
 "I feel even more strongly that we should start investing in research and investigation into renewable resources NOW instead of playing the 'its too late to do that' card. In X many years we will be in this position again"
 "It has made me question the information provided on nuclear energy"
 "The talk among the group was very varied and interesting"
 "It seems to me, given the information that results may not be a true perception of the public's view"
 "Reversed as it seems there is not an option anymore"
 "I got the opportunity to say what I needed to say"
 "The overwhelming necessity to decide NOW to replace our existing nuclear power stations"
 "It has made me realise I have stronger green views on this than I thought"

Exeter:

"I am now far more aware"
 "More informed on the facts"
 "Definitely better armed with more substantial information"
 "Although I feel much more fully informed"
 "I learnt a lot more from information provided and the comments of everyone on the table"
 "Much more aware of the difficulties involved"
 "A lot more knowledge"
 "It has been an eye opener on all points in question!"
 "Given me a broader outlook and answered some questions"
 "Wider overall view of the problems"
 "I hadn't previously thought about the issues"
 "Opened my eyes to things I didn't think about"
 "I have learned a considerable amount about our power sources"
 "I know more than before – the event opened my eyes"
 "I am more aware of some issues that I was not previously"
 "Have much more knowledge of what is involved in this important topic"
 "Understanding the amount of energy we use"
 "A greater understanding has enabled me to understand the options available"
 "Made me more aware of the need to address the future energy supply and evaluate CO2 emissions"
 "It has informed me of what nuclear power provides but has not convinced me of its validity as an energy source"
 "Understand the need for nuclear power more and its implications"
 "More informed on nuclear power, positively"
 "It's made me aware of nuclear power, which I didn't understand as much as I do now"
 "Realise how much of an issue nuclear power can be"
 "Realise the security and strategic importance of nuclear power"
 "Just more aware of the issues involved in the nuclear debate"
 "I feel more aware of nuclear issues and the need for nuclear power in the future"
 "More knowledge of nuclear aspects, more knowledge of government strategies"
 "I have a stronger opinion on nuclear energy"
 "I feel I have more questions that I have not thought about before"
 "Yes it has put slight doubt in my mind"
 "Safety and security I am not sure of it"
 "I was strongly for nuclear power after the discussions – still for it but less convinced"
 "Probably now I am better informed (though not necessarily from both sides of the argument) I am more concerned about the issue of nuclear energy"
 "I feel less inclined to nuclear power"
 "A little less supportive in view of the fact that the solution is short term, c 60 years"
 "Reduced my confidence in the need for nuclear slightly, increased my reservation especially re waste control"

"I feel I have got a lot out of the discussions around the table. It has made me more aware of the need for alternatives to fossil fuel"

"More in favour of alternative sources of energy"

"Made me more concerned about development of renewables with government encouragement"

"More resolute in my approach to issue on global warming and the need for everyone to be involved"

"Still unsure"

"Still quite undecided but have info to mull over"

"I now realise we have no choice but to go ahead with nuclear power"

"Have become more open minded and to respect the views/opinions of others"

"Concerned about private ownership – possible different/foreign country"

"Being able to publicly express my views on the future"

"I thought it would be much more unbiased"

"Nuclear energy seems to be a fait accompli"

Leicester:

"Gave me more food for thought"

"I now know what nuclear energy is and what raw materials are used and where they are sourced from"

"It's given me a better knowledge of what is happening around us in the world today"

"More aware of the path the government is taking"

"I have learnt a lot. I came in without an opinion and have now formed one as a result of this day"

"I feel much more informed but still have many unanswered questions. It has enabled me to focus views on the issues"

"Unaware how relatively short term the supply of uranium was and the impact on the future of nuclear energy supply"

"Do not know current source of uranium am more reassured of security and supply"

"I have more knowledge about what happening out there, then what had before"

"Understand greater need for energy source in very near future"

"I now have a more informed opinion"

"More aware of need for new power sources"

"Have understood much about the topic"

"Some concerns dealt with. Others (new ones) raised"

"The planet, climate control and the state of our country"

"It is a subject I had not considered and it has given me much food for thought"

"Want to find out further information about the subject"

"Not really but was thought provoking and I will go away to consider in more depth"

"I have realised how hard it is to weigh up the two sides and come to a conclusion. The issues are more complex than I thought"

"More understanding of the need to look at sources of energy"

"I know more about nuclear as we discussed and watch all day"

"Didn't really have any views before on nuclear energy"

"Understand more about the implication of the nuclear benefit and hazards"

"Allowed me to consider wider issues, take into account different perspectives. And add to and improve the knowledge I already had"

"When I came I thought nuclear was an inevitable thing which I didn't approve of. Now I'm not sure it is inevitable"

"I understood more"

"Got to know more about nuclear power"

"It's made me feel quite strongly about nuclear power"

"Around the security of nuclear power – the safety of waste procedures"

"A new look at the way OUR fuel problems will be sorted out"

"When I first came to this event I had a completely different opinion, but now I am clarified"

"Made me think more!"

"Energy is a global problem"

"Before attending the event I was neither for or against further nuclear energy generation. I now have formed an opinion"

"Understanding what nuclear power is and the implications"

"Have a more open mind on other energy issues and some other views on climate"

"Made me more aware of the overall issues"

"I now know the effects"

"More needs to be done to fully explore harnessing natural resources and to ensure that each individual and industry reduces their use of energy"

"The consultation showed how many people are biased towards nuclear energy for no good reason"

"I now know more about nuclear energy and the impact on the environment"

"Only that I feel now know a little more about a subject which beforehand I thought I knew nothing"

"I am now more aware of the issues pertaining to climate change and nuclear energy"

"The importance of lowering CO2 emissions"

"Given me more information on specific topics i.e. climate change and energy"

"I am going to check that more electrical appliances in my home are switched off when not in use"

"How global warming will affect us"

"Saving energy"

"To be more careful with domestic usage"

"It has raised concerns about nuclear energy of which I was previously unaware, and has added to reservations I had"

"Made me think more on the subject of safety and storage of nuclear waste"

"I agree the need for nuclear power but unsure about waste"

"60 years benefit and 1000s of years of waste, not worth it!"

"I am more concerned about the nuclear waste issue"

"I am probably more opposed to nuclear energy than I was before"

"I now know and understand a lot more about nuclear power energy and feel that I can debate this important area. However my concerns remain the same"

"I think I am more reticent in voting for nuclear power than I was this morning"

"More negative towards nuclear power"

"On arrival I agreed with nuclear power in principal with the waste and disposal being a concern. After reading all the literature I am now against nuclear power as reassurances cannot be given"

"I did not know that multi companies were being asked to build the power stations. Before I was for nuclear power now I am not so sure"

"I am probably more sceptical of the future of nuclear power"

"Reinforced views on disadvantages of nuclear power"

"That profit will come first before safety of consumer. Other sources have not been tried and tested to full extent"

"More concerned about global warming, need for education re fuel economy, need for sustainable resources. More concerned about profit versus well being of present and future population, due to risk of nuclear power"

"More resigned to continuation of nuclear power. Now ADAMANT that private sector must not be involved"

"It has confirmed more my views that nuclear power is the way forward. I have also decided that a mix between nuclear and renewables is important"

"I was dead set against it because I thought it was really bad but now I know its not too bad I suppose it will have to do. But I'd still prefer renewables"

"Removed any doubts that nuclear energy is a good source of energy for the future"

"Leaning towards nuclear"

"Understand the need to proceed down the nuclear route"

"It's made me want to find out more and to gain a greater understanding of the subject matter"

"Need to look into issues in a more involved manner before I can make a judgement"

"I believe that renewable energy should be given as much importance as well as the development of new nuclear plants"

"A mix of energy generation is required - including renewables"

"Fearful that this is the only option the government are considering for the future of energy production"

"Convinced it is a way for the government to sell to the public a decision they have already made"

"It helped me to listen and understand other people's views"

"I know that this topic should be taken more seriously and consequently should not be the next step to helping climate change"

"Better outlook on things I take..."

"By taking public opinion – gets wider opinion"

Liverpool:

"The realisation that energy is running low, more safe options must be found"

"How much we rely on energy for the future that the government wants the views of the British public"

"It has made me to start thinking more about what energies and wasting"

"A participant has made me aware of toxic nature of uranium mining. Nuclear energy only 18%. Unclear quantities of radioactive waste"

"I have found out more about the way energy has been produced in the UK and percentages of each source"

"This consultation has made me think more thoroughly about energy mixes"

"Statistically an eye opener"

"I will now be more aware of how important it is to protect our environment. A more informed aspect to power generation"

"It has given me the understanding on the subject to make up my own mind about this particular issue. And I am now more aware of future plans"

"More information provided on the day was surprising and offered a challenge to previously held views"

"It made me more aware"

"It has made me think about nuclear power and the pressing need to address our hunger/need for energy"

"Before this event I did not fully understand about nuclear energy – therefore I could not make an informed opinion, now I think I can"

"Made me more aware of nuclear energy, how it affects the public"

"More aware of nuclear energy"

"Didn't really think about nuclear energy in the past"

"Didn't know a thing about nuclear power. Learnt about positives and negatives"

"More informed about the subject of nuclear energy"

"I didn't understand the use of nuclear power"

"Prior to attending the conference I had limited insight into nuclear energy"

"I have learnt a lot more than I knew before on nuclear energy"

"It has been beneficial in increasing my general knowledge of nuclear energy"

"Made me consider my own energy requirements and use"

"I now feel far more aware of climate change and the need to find an alternative power"

"To switch off everything at night. Think before you use electric"
 "I have learned about people's views on the particular topic of CO2 emissions"
 "The importance to reduce CO2 emissions"
 "Made me question how much energy I use and how nuclear waste is disposed of and worry of the radioactiveness"
 "There is a definite need for non CO2 production of energy"
 "Now have a balanced view on nuclear energy. Aware of the pros of nuclear energy and aware not quite as many negatives as first thought"
 "Wasn't sure previously about nuclear energy but realise that ultimately, unless renewable energy sources play a greater role in providing energy, we will need SOME nuclear power plants (not unlimited number though!)"
 "I am more inclined to be supportive of nuclear power but am less confident about waste than I was before (I had not really considered it before)"
 "I was more against nuclear power in that I thought it contributed to climate change. I did not know carbon emissions were so low. This fact alone for me is enough to agree with the government"
 "I am reassured in terms of security from terrorism attacks. Generally I didn't hear anything to quell my fears but I grudgingly accept the need for nuclear"
 "I feel much more positive about nuclear energy and would wholeheartedly support it"
 "I am more for nuclear power now rather than against"
 "I am now more in favour of nuclear energy because of the low CO2 emissions"
 "I feel much more confident in saying nuclear energy is good idea to contribute in generating electricity for UK, taking in account benefits and drawbacks"
 "It has made me more concerned than I was before I attended the event"
 "I have more concerns now, as do others"
 "I am very concerned about the need for renewables. I think they will be delayed in their need application of this"
 "I do not want nuclear power in any shape or form. It is not fair to give a (toxic) legacy to the future generation"
 "I strongly feel that nuclear power/energy is not the right way forward because of the fatal/long term risks involved"
 "I am even more uncomfortable about nuclear energy"
 "Before I was on the fence with nuclear power but now I am definitely opposed to it"
 "Yes the way the government have been using nuclear power for 50 years"
 "More confident in the energy supply"

London:

"Aware of carbon emissions and how to prevent it and nuclear waste issues"
 "I feel I have been on a rollercoaster ride and my views have changed throughout the day. I have learnt so much and have had a lot of questions answered"
 "More thought and consideration for the future"
 "I've learnt a lot"
 "I did not know anything on energy before today, and now I do"
 "I didn't think much about it before but now I feel more aware of the issues and I will be looking for more info"
 "It clarified the urgency of the situation and shocked me"
 "Made me think for myself"
 "I shall be much more aware of articles/info in the media and will read future articles, books with renewed interest"
 "The pros and cons of nuclear power"
 "Still feel I need more info but appreciated very much being involved"
 "More informed"
 "Because I have more information therefore can make a more balanced opinion of the topic"
 "I could compare what were the different opinions and suggestions and I have the different thought"
 "I feel I have a more informed view on the whole subject, but equally I am concerned that the national debate is supplying selective information. I would like a balanced view for and AGAINST the subject"
 "Had no previous knowledge. Now a lot more aware of need for an alternative source of power"
 "Made me see I had to balance pros and cons and decide – there is no risk free option"
 "Well, I am now better informed"
 "More informed"
 "The information given has helped me to understand more fully the need for varying energy sources"
 "Hadn't really considered our future energy needs before, didn't realise that our energy sources were quite so short lived"
 "Given me more information"
 "Helped me understand more of what is happening and what should be done for our future generations"
 "It has brought the issue of renewable energy to the fore"
 "Have learned a lot"
 "Better understanding regarding current energy issues"
 "Greater understanding of safety concerns in place. Targets and reliance on imports in future"
 "More panicked/aware of shortage of energy needs in near future
 In many ways"
 "Made more fully aware of the urgency for a decision on future energy supplies"
 "Made me appreciate the need for more research into renewables and the need for disinterested science in public policy"
 "It enabled me to tune in to the issues and to open my evaluation process. I feel I am still evaluating"
 "Clear my mind"
 "Helped focus my arguments for the continued reduction in CO2 emissions"

"Made me rapidly pro renewable energy and change in behaviour of individual, industry and what we think we NEED in terms of energy usage"

"I plan to be more careful as to the way I treat my domestic appliances"

"Better informed, more aware of renewables, more worried about climate change"

"Its made me more aware on how much energy I use and how many issues there are around nuclear power"

"I feel I understand the seriousness of the issue of cutting down CO2 emissions. I feel personally the general public need to be more aware (provided info we have been given today) of what is at stake, i.e. terrorism, location of plants, evidence about reasons behind the idea"

"I understand more about energy and can now have a view on nuclear power"

"To be able to make an informed decision about nuclear energy for the future"

"More aware of how much energy we waste and also learnt a few benefits of nuclear energy"

"It has informed me on nuclear energy but I am worried about having only ONE SIDE of the story = the case FOR nuclear energy"

"I got more knowledge about nuclear power and other energy sources and about the government views regarding energy security"

"I have always looked at the negative aspect of nuclear power but today I have learnt that it also has its advantages. I now know more about energy mix in the UK"

"I informed lot about nuclear power"

"I have become far more involved in trying to understand nuclear energy and now wish to learn more"

"I know more about nuclear power"

"It has made me think more deeply on nuclear power"

"Made me more convinced of the necessity of a properly run nuclear power industry"

"I was totally unaware of the nuclear energy business, now know more"

"Afford me the necessary information and education on the subject – nuclear energy"

"I have become more aware of nuclear power etc"

"I have learnt more about what nuclear power is and what some of the benefits and disadvantages are"

"I know more about nuclear energy"

"It has given me more of an insight into nuclear energy"

"More sceptical of nuclear power"

"It's given me more of an insight to energy, nuclear power – raised awareness and encouraged me to look into it"

"I understand nuclear energy more"

"I didn't know anything about nuclear power before, I do now"

"I am more aware of the problem and reasons for and against nuclear power"

"Storage of waste material"

"Worried about nuclear waste"

"Agreed with nuclear power to some extent but raised new questions"

"I came into the consultation with no strong opinion either way. I left against the idea of having nuclear power stations in the UK"

"I have more doubts about nuclear energy than I did before"

"Made me a bit more sceptical about nuclear power, but at the same time has reinforced my more favourable viewpoints"

"I am slightly more nervous about nuclear power"

"I was almost pro nuclear fuel before, now I am not"

"It has actually made me reconsider our need for large scale nuclear power sources. I still believe the benefits outweigh the risks but it is a closer call than I originally thought"

"Confirmed my overall opinion that NE is not worth the risks"

"I feel the more I have learned today, the less I am confident in nuclear energy. Today I am against it"

"MORE sceptical, particularly of the government and the clarity of its strategic thinking"

"Strengthened my resolve in deciding AGAINST nuclear"

"I would have considered myself to be very anti nuclear before this consultation, but I now see that whilst I still do not agree with this method of energy production, I see why it is necessary"

"I am slightly more for the argument of using nuclear energy, with certain conditions"

"I am more pro nuclear than before"

"I am pro it now"

"I remain in favour of nuclear power because of the need for secure energy but I will give much more consideration to aspects such as waste disposal"

"I came firmly committed to new nuclear power stations"

"Nuclear is possibly, maybe, possibly a short term option"

"Impressed by some of the ideas and analysis of group participants"

"To see other people's opinions"

"It was interesting to hear other points of view that helps to balance the argument"

"Finding out people's questions/views I hadn't thought about"

"Not really, I think the decision has already been made"

"See the need for future other sources of energy"

"Maybe the government does want to hear from the people!"

"I want to look at renewable energy to compare them"

"Security in the provision of electricity, hitherto taken for granted"

"I've learnt more but it has also meant that I feel the need to go away and look into the subject further"

"It made my views and worries feel like they were listened to"

"Have an opinion on that matter and feel I need reassurance from the government"

"I feel slightly heartened that the government might listen. Please don't treat this as a lip service exercise"
"Because it involved many of us so is valid"
"I know now that general public has some say in government decision"
"It has actually changed my point of view"
"Reinforcement of ..."
"Advantageous to all and cheaper than travelling to the moon"
"Generally fair"

Newcastle:

"Informative in general as I knew very little about the issue"
"It has given me the chance to learn more about nuclear energy, albeit a biased view!"
"Slightly more aware of energy situation"
"Clarified views"
"More known about reasons government wants to pursue nuclear option"
"Has given me a wider picture on what is happening globally"
"In aspects of how nuclear power works and CO2 levels"
"Made me realise how much energy we, as a country, use"
"Understand more about energy and their sources"
"It has made me think more about the subject and consider the issues in more detail"
"More aware"
"Having more information could clear your mind"
"I was completely naïve before, now feel I have a good opinion of what it is all about"
"Made me think about the bigger picture and now I can contribute in saving energy and the alternatives"
"Has made me realise that we could be facing a crisis!"
"Able to generate additional view and considerations – open to other views and gained a broader picture"
"Now appreciate security of supply as an issue"
"I am aware of issues I didn't previously think or know of"
"Many more points to consider"
"Very informative about different issues"
"More aware"
"I was undecided before, now I am anti nuclear and committed to energy saving"
"I am even more ANTI nuclear power"
"I started the day feeling more positive about the inclusion of nuclear power in the energy mix. I ended the day feeling quite cynical about the future of nuclear energy"
"Was quite open, did not feel able to form an opinion on info I have. From this I believe nuclear is the wrong decision"
"I came with an open mind. I am now convinced that the nuclear option is not viable"
"I am more against nuclear energy"
"Unsure. Came in totally in favour but no longer"
"When day started – was pro nuclear energy. When day finished – now don't know"
"Has made me disagree"
"Actually slightly undermined my support for nuclear slightly"
"More biased towards nuclear energy for the future"
"I understand that we do need nuclear power for to cut down on CO2 and I did not think that before today"
"Believe that nuclear power is more required/likely"
"It has pushed me toward a nuclear energy, however, I feel another energy source needs to be found so the earth will be more sustainable"
"It's made me realise there is little alternative to nuclear power"
"Given me a chance to listen to other people's views and therefore making my own views more positive"
"More certain about nuclear power, feel safer about it"
"I was not of any strong opinion before the consultation process. However, after the day I felt very strongly that alternative ways of generating energy/electricity had neither been fully explored or represented"
"I now want to see a more holistic approach to energy, electricity production, CO2 reduction and conservation/reduction of energy use"
"I have reviewed my opinions and now feel that this is a fait accompli, but would like to think that safety and renewable resources would be given as much attention as nuclear"
"I was quite for the overall necessity of nuclear energy replacement but now I am quite sure that other avenues should be explored as well"
"It has made me more aware of wider issues and grey areas in the debate on nuclear energy so I feel my views are more founded in evidence than previously"
"I realise many more implications of nuclear power"
"I had limited knowledge on nuclear energy before, and now I can base my opinion on mainly fact"
"Having listened to lots of fors and againsts I have changed my opinion about nuclear energy"
"I changed my trust in the nuclear debate"
"More info on nuclear power"
"It has created more questions than answers so I will be looking into this in more detail"
"Made me more concerned about nuclear power"
"Feel more unsure about how safe waste is disposed of"
"It has made me question more things"
"I would now like much more information to make an informed decision"

"I will pay much more attention to this subject in the future and continue to question the issue of waste management in nuclear power"

"I need to know more about the storage of nuclear waste"

"Will need to research/read more"

"Before I was very pro nuclear. Now I only want nuclear power run by the government and not a company"

"I now believe nuclear should be a last option as it is a short term fix with consequences for future generations"

"I think nuclear power is needed even though I don't like the idea"

"I was relatively well informed before arriving"

"Excellent way to inform public about topical political issues, but of course very expensive!"

"Did not take into account the fact that we have had nuclear for 50 years at start of conference"

"Urgency is required to complete N power for the future"

"The questions were biased"

"More cynical – agenda pre ordained, questions and info deliberately guided a response"

"Very good"

"No comment"

"Waste disposal"

"Fast fix"

"But think government have made a decision and will go their way regardless"

"Nice to know that government takes notice of the public"

Norwich:

"It enabled me to look at the whole picture"

"It has strengthened my views re the level of concern re future energy security and needs of the UK in the future and the urgency with which this must be addressed"

"But feel more informed"

"I hadn't thought much about it before due to lack of information and awareness"

"Brought to life issues I had not considered"

"More aware of supplying our future energy supplies"

"I understand the issue more fully and am able to form an opinion"

"The security and long term issues"

"Made me more aware of the situation"

"I understand my own views more thoroughly"

"Only in considering the subject more widely"

"More understanding on the need for sustainable energy sources"

"A knowledge of the necessity to look at the need for other sources of energy"

"I am now of the opinion that we must explore all options before leaving a harmful legacy for future generations"

"I now think, more than I did before, that nuclear power is wrong and should not even be considered"

"Before today I did not have any strong opinion on nuclear energy. Now I strongly disagree with it"

"I was all for nuclear until today. I think it is ok for short term"

"Less pro nuclear – require more info about renewables and hydro"

"The way in which I see nuclear power and fossil fuels"

"I am more aware on the understanding of nuclear power"

"A slightly clearer view of nuclear"

"It has opened my mind and I have gained knowledge on nuclear power/energy source within the UK"

"NP is clean but the waste is dirty"

"That nuclear power has benefits but if there was a different source of energy that would be better than putting waste in the ground"

"Nuclear is not renewable energy. I will endeavour to turn off more lights!"

"How much CO2 is in the air and we need to look at other ways of energy"

"CO2 emissions is at the heart of the nuclear argument but not all emissions can be reduced by nuclear; gas and fuels are significant also in reduction"

"Made me think and want to make a difference"

"CO2 and nuclear waste"

"The need for further information before making a final agree/disagree decision"

"Will consider the issues further"

"I want to find out more"

"I want to know more about renewable sources"

"Would like to read more about nuclear energy"

"Made me more cynical (but of the process rather than government)"

"No longer totally disagree with nuclear but still have major reservations for long term"

"Still not sure nuclear is the way forward, the argument is quite balanced"

"Changed my mind completely"

5 What do you think about the influence that this event will have on Government?

To what extent do you think public views <u>should</u> influence Government's decision?	A great deal	Quite a lot	A bit	Not much	Not at all
Belfast	32 (44%)	23 (32%)	12 (17%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)
Cardiff	42 (50%)	20 (24%)	13 (15%)	5 (6%)	3 (4%)
Edinburgh	56 (62%)	20 (22%)	8 (9%)	3 (3%)	-
Exeter	46 (55%)	21 (25%)	5 (6%)	3 (4%)	2 (2%)
Leicester	85 (61%)	30 (21%)	11 (8%)	7 (5%)	1 (1%)
Liverpool	44 (59%)	19 (25%)	8 (11%)	3 (4%)	-
London	72 (48%)	54 (36%)	16 (11%)	4 (3%)	-
Newcastle	76 (55%)	31 (22%)	16 (12%)	8 (6%)	-
Norwich	40 (51%)	23 (29%)	5 (6%)	7 (9%)	1 (1%)
Combined result	493 (54%)	241 (26%)	94 (10%)	43 (5%)	9 (1%)

To what extent do you think public views <u>will</u> influence Government's decision?	A great deal	Quite a lot	A bit	Not much	Not at all
Belfast	3 (4%)	11 (15%)	27 (38%)	22 (31%)	8 (11%)
Cardiff	3 (4%)	13 (15%)	27 (32%)	29 (35%)	10 (12%)
Edinburgh	3 (3%)	9 (10%)	33 (36%)	32 (35%)	9 (10%)
Exeter	4 (5%)	13 (16%)	29 (35%)	21 (25%)	9 (11%)
Leicester	9 (6%)	24 (17%)	38 (27%)	47 (34%)	15 (11%)
Liverpool	2 (3%)	6 (8%)	34 (45%)	31 (41%)	-
London	9 (6%)	25 (17%)	67 (45%)	36 (24%)	8 (5%)
Newcastle	3 (2%)	11 (8%)	52 (38%)	49 (36%)	13 (9%)
Norwich	3 (4%)	8 (10%)	26 (33%)	30 (38%)	8 (10%)
Combined result	39 (4%)	120 (13%)	333 (37%)	297 (33%)	80 (9%)

Comment analysis (154 comments)

- decision has already been made / this is a box ticking exercise (48)
- would like to think influence / 'hopefully' will influence (17)
- cynical / sceptical / no guarantee Government will listen / public input will not make any difference (14)
- Government / experts should decide / lead (5)

All comments

Belfast:

"Feel government has probably already made up their minds to go with nuclear power"
 "I think this was a token gesture on a matter already decided"
 "Public views ought to be informed, value of day if so"
 "I think the government really makes its own mind up"
 "Most questions were biased with a positive bias for nuclear power"

Cardiff:

"It appears the decision has been made and the conference has been set up to sway opinion in the government favour to use and tell all the public - this is the opinion of the people"
 "I felt that the government has already assured that nuclear power will play a large part"
 "I feel it is a foregone conclusion and was only brought to bear by Greenpeace"

"The questions we answered were biased towards a positive outcome. Therefore the government will use those responses. Much of what was discussed was not addressed in the main questions"
"Most of the info was in favour of nuclear power"
"Judging by historic events the government may only listen if it wants to"
"I think there should be public forums /public awareness sessions from time to time"
"Public view is obviously important but the public need to be made fully aware of all the issues involved prior to giving their input"
"Very much concerned about the government will not take note of planning issues and because of the danger of nuclear will not place them where energy is most needed – e.g. Millennium Dome!"
"Depends if an election is due"
"Job of government to respond if public trust government / they will trust decision of nuclear power"
"Other renewable sources should have been discussed as alternatives"

Edinburgh:

"By the reports it seems they have already made their minds up"
"The decision is already made because there is insufficient time to delay the building of nuclear power stations"
"Think they have decided anyway. Even if every single person said they wanted no more nuclear energy plants, it would not make a difference they'd still be built"
"Not sure or convinced that this is not a paper exercise. Scottish public have some intelligence on this issue and are desperate to contribute in partnership with the government"
"Sounds like it's a done deal already"
"I think the government's mind was made up pre conference"
"This is just a PR exercise"
"These decisions will probably be made, regardless of what the public feels"
"Still think political expediency has a great deal of influence"
"Told our views would count, prove it"
"Would like feedback on the results"
"Depends whether the event was to test public opinion or see what arguments and approach is the best to put through government policy most painlessly"
"Only if they listen though"

Exeter:

"Decision has already been made"
"A done deal"
"The government appear to have already made their decision"
"Historically the government will do what they want at the end of the day"
"A pious hope"
"I think the government should listen if there is any doubt, more information put out in a clear way"
"Government sometimes needs to make hard decisions which are not popular!"
"Unfortunately, due to previous bad management of our government I do not have any confidence in politicians"
"I believe this needs to happen"

Leicester:

"Questions were phrased to back up the governments established opinion"
"I believe the government has already made the decision and that this is just an exercise to help the government market the decision and provide spin for the public"
"I honestly think the decision has already been made and although I don't like it very much, I cannot see a better solution at the moment"
"I think the decisions have already been made, and they are driven by the government to tick the box on target without taking a long term and more balanced view"
"I hope our views will influence as they are accountable to us!"
"I hope it will have quite an influence on government policy. It was good to see a government minister present and on video"
"Speaks for itself"
"We need to feel more confident and be able to trust the info provided"
"I feel that public consultation is done to appease the public than gather useful information"
"The government will do what they want and not the British people"
"Improvements must be made to the infrastructure of the country to enable the population to reduce its reliability on cars – improved public transport systems"

Liverpool:

"I believe the government and power companies have already decided, and this type of event will merely influence how government SPINS its discussions"
"Questions were loaded as if the decision has been made"
"I feel the government has made its decision and is simply testing the reaction of the public"
"I feel they have already made their decision to use nuclear, they are just finding out people's concerns"
"On many levels I think the government has made its mind up on whether or not to use nuclear power. The event was essentially pointless"
"As nuclear energy SEEMS to be the only main option I think it is inevitable"
"I think they've already made their minds up – we're just part of fulfilling their promises to listen to the public"

"I think the government has pretty well made their decision and this is part spin and part lip service on the issue"
 "Hopefully, think about other options"
 "I would like to think the government will take into considering the views from those present at the talking energy event"
 "I'd love to think that this would have an influence on government decision but I'm quite sceptical"
 "I hope the government will listen to our views"
 "Look at EU referendum – not a good track record in giving people an input"
 "The government will have the final say in my opinion. They may listen but they will make their own mind up"
 "I don't think our opinion will really count for much. The government will follow whatever they want"
 "Public only get biased information as the government only give the pros and not the cons of situations"
 "I think its very one way"
 "The government is meant to lead, to govern. I'm not sure how useful such consultations are"
 "I hope that government decisions are not taken on the basis of being popular, rather on the basis of the best possible options for the good of the country"
 "I would like to be kept informed on the stages the government goes through to them making the ultimate decision"
 "Past experiences dictate that event such as this one are usually ignored. NEED FEEDBACK!"
 "Ask Gordon Brown"
 "Please government, give us a max electricity/power meter so people have to use less power – giving you more time to invest in more sustainable energy sources, not only wind and sun"
 "I think it would be beneficial for the government to access this information to more of the general public to give them peace of mind on issues of nuclear energy"
 "It was very useful"
 "The government may have to make a decision that the public disagrees with but this can be overcome with wider information"

London:

"I get the impression that the decision has already been made!"
 "The government seems to have already made up its mind"
 "It seems the decision has already been made. Questions were given to manipulate answers towards nuclear fuels"
 "I feel the government has already made a decision on this issue and our views will most likely be selectively taken into account when it suits the government"
 "The primary result of the event will be to provide ammunition to help the government sell their policy"
 "I think they have already decided to go nuclear"
 "I felt that the way it was presented, the government has already decided to go ahead, but wants to know people's fears"
 "The government has decided that it needs nuclear power (I agree) but this meeting is a softening up process with loaded questions"
 "The government has decided that it needs nuclear power (I agree) but this meeting is a softening up process with loaded questions"
 "I hope all our views will be taken into account and my cynicism is unwarranted"
 "A lot I hope"
 "Hopefully this event was not just a formality"
 "I would appreciate if the government weigh the views of the public and make positive decision"
 "It would be really wonderful if the Report of this event can be seen in future policy re nuclear energy and indeed renewable energy"
 "I would very much hope that the public opinion is passed on directly to government. It is of great importance that the nation are not mislead – that they are giving their views to be heard and not merely going through the motions of a debate"
 "I hope I am not just being optimistic! This was a great day for feeling valued as a citizen"
 "Hopefully much"
 "No guarantee that the government will listen to these views"
 "I felt that the government was trying to force an answer that was only nuclear and not about alternatives"
 "Even if the politicians were to listen, the civil servants aren't"
 "Participatory democracy my backside"
 "Because the government will do what they want"
 "I think public on the whole are cynical about how much policy is influenced. I'd be interested to see what happens as a result of this"
 "The government should provide strong leadership"
 "It should be left to the EXPERTS"
 "At the end of the day I feel MPs should vote/make decisions after listening to their electorate"
 "The issues today should be made very public"
 "I would like the government to develop integrated policies, linking all aspects of energy with international issues. Not have double standard, share/ educate emerging nations etc"
 "One of the drawbacks of our political system means that long term decisions are often avoided, downplayed or delayed, such as nuclear fusion"
 "Which is why information is needed"
 "Public views should only be taken into account if they are based on all the available information"
 "Difficult to assess the influence, as the topic is very diffuse and difficult to focus"

"The Minister promised!"
"Pay attention to the views of the people please – industry and the unions are VESTED INTERESTS, I speak for my child and his to come"
"Vested interests and political donations may carry more weight"
"There should surely be a public binding referendum"
"It is well and good for the govt. to go nuclear to reduce CO2 emissions. But more than this the govt. should invest heavily in educating households to cut out waste of energy by cutting off appliances when not in use and lower the temperature of central heating by a few degrees. Also govt. should invest in renewable energies"
"I think it would be in the government's best interest to address and think about questions raised in the event today"

Newcastle:

"Never really assumed this would feed in any serious way into government policy – realise government has clearly already made mind up"
"I felt a decision on nuclear generation via private firms had been made and this was an exercise to confirm that"
"The whole event seemed based on how the government should implement nuclear power stations, not whether they should"
"From the information given, I feel that the government has already made up its mind on the question of nuclear energy"
"As the government has already made a decision WHAT'S THE POINT OF ASKING US!"
"I feel that decisions have already been made"
"But think government have made a decision and will go their way regardless"
"It seems the decision has already been made and information gathered will be used to merely reassure the public"
"Government will listen only to the info they want to hear. If government hear right decision they will listen"
"Do we have any influence on anything?"
"The bias in the information we were given gives me no confidence that my views will be listened to"
"I don't believe all our views will be taken into account"
"Quite cynical about how this feedback will be portrayed by the government"
"I think we should have been given more options"
"I think we are expected to trust the government's judgement – which is pragmatic BUT I think these decisions should be transparent. An open debate with all sides represented would have been much more useful"
"There are many questions unanswered, especially around nuclear waste and private companies becoming involved. A fair debate would iron out these issues"
"Would have been good to hear about other power sources in more depth to at least have something to compare against"
"I would like to be proved wrong on the above"
"I hope that my views will make the government understand how the public feel about the planet"
"Would like to think that the government listens to public opinion"
"Opinions are important but so are all the facts. No one has all of them and the media isn't always a reliable source"
"Feel opinions of experts should count for more, BUT concerns of public should be addressed"
"Time will tell if I'm right!"
"Very disappointed that Greenpeace pulled out of its contribution to the information we received"
"Private industry would not be future focused for safety of the future with considerations of ... to consider??"
"The event was one sided for nuclear energy"

Norwich:

"I recognise the point of the event is that regardless of the opinions gathered the government will use this to legitimise its decision saying – we have listened to your views – even if we have completely disagreed with its policy"
"The decision has been made"
"It appears the government has already decided that we need to increase our N power"
"Feel that the government have already decided"
"I hope it has a big impact but my fear is that the gov will hear what it wants to hear and just simply go ahead regardless"
"I would like to think that the government will listen but will form a definite view using ALL the information available to it"
"I would like to think the government could be influenced more by public opinion"
"The government disagrees with the majority of the public and does precisely what it wants to do (often for money)"
"I'm not sure as to how much our government learns from the general public"
"Not really able to check/verify that the public is listened to"
"INFORMED public views should influence government decisions"
"This affects everyone in UK and therefore should be discussed much more openly with the general public and younger environment – schools, colleges etc"
"Some decisions are expert decisions to be taken after consultation of experts, but democracy strengthened by these events"

6 How satisfied are you with the influence you feel this event will have on Government?

	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Not very satisfied	Not at all satisfied
Belfast	5 (7%)	35 (49%)	28 (39%)	4 (6%)
Cardiff	4 (5%)	36 (43%)	33 (39%)	10 (12%)
Edinburgh	2 (2%)	34 (37%)	42 (46%)	8 (9%)
Exeter	5 (6%)	35 (42%)	29 (35%)	7 (8%)
Leicester	6 (4%)	67 (48%)	53 (38%)	9 (6%)
Liverpool	5 (7%)	35 (47%)	30 (40%)	2 (3%)
London	13 (9%)	77 (52%)	48 (32%)	7 (5%)
Newcastle	8 (6%)	56 (41%)	47 (34%)	20 (14%)
Norwich	3 (4%)	34 (44%)	33 (42%)	5 (6%)
Combined result	51 (6%)	409 (45%)	343 (38%)	72 (8%)

7 Overall, how satisfied are you with the way this event was structured and run?

	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Not very satisfied	Not at all satisfied
Belfast	51 (71%)	18 (25%)	3 (4%)	-
Cardiff	48 (57%)	31 (37%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)
Edinburgh	38 (42%)	47 (52%)	2 (2%)	-
Exeter	51 (61%)	23 (28%)	3 (4%)	-
Leicester	77 (55%)	56 (40%)	2 (1%)	-
Liverpool	41 (55%)	30 (40%)	2 (3%)	-
London	73 (49%)	62 (42%)	9 (6%)	2 (1%)
Newcastle	58 (42%)	56 (41%)	13 (9%)	4 (3%)
Norwich	34 (44%)	38 (49%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)
Combined result	471 (52%)	361 (40%)	39 (4%)	9 (1%)

8 How important do you think it is for the Government to involve the public in discussing these sorts of issues?

	Very important	Fairly important	Not very important	Not at all important
Belfast	57 (79%)	12 (17%)	2 (3%)	1 (1%)
Cardiff	73 (87%)	8 (10%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Edinburgh	70 (77%)	15 (16%)	2 (2%)	-
Exeter	68 (82%)	8 (10%)	1 (1%)	-
Leicester	119 (85%)	14 (10%)	-	2 (1%)
Liverpool	63 (84%)	11 (15%)	1 (1%)	-
London	123 (83%)	20 (13%)	3 (2%)	-
Newcastle	107 (78%)	20 (14%)	3 (2%)	1 (1%)
Norwich	65 (83%)	7 (9%)	2 (3%)	1 (1%)
Combined result	745 (82%)	115 (13%)	15 (2%)	6 (1%)

9 What were the best aspects of the event?

Comment analysis (633 comments)

- talking to others / exchange of views / listening to others (161)
- well organised, well structured, well facilitated event (140)
- good discussions / debate (117)
- information / learning / knowledge (102)
- good mix of people / diversity of views (51)
- polling / voting (51)
- taking part / contributing / influence (45)
- meeting new / nice people (43)
- chance to give own opinions / have say (32)
- good / useful information / presentations (31)
- venue, food etc (31)
- everything / all of it (19)
- good / enjoyable / interesting (14)
- pub quiz (6)

All comments

Belfast:

"Gaining the knowledge of what nuclear energy is all about"

"Info provided"

"Introductory polls and concluding polls showing how info today has educated whole group"

"New Information. Having the opportunity to discuss my hopes, concerns"

"Chance to learn more"

"Learning about nuclear energy. I had little info on it. Listening to others opinions"

"Brought to my attention the urgent need to develop another energy source"

"Learning about energy use"

"The information and our table"

"The amounts of information given which helped us form a balanced opinion"

"Learning things I didn't know"

"Awareness of the vast issues concerning the major decisions which have to be made"

"Making you think of the future of energy"

"I enjoyed the group discussions and getting to hear about everyone's opinions on the issues raised"

"The opportunity to discuss my views with a wide range of people and to listen to the views of others"

"Everyone got to get their opinions across"

"Digesting information and listening to the views of others"

"Listening to other people"

"Listening to the views of other participants"

"Hearing the views and opinions of the people involved"

"Lunch! No seriously, the information was not unbiased (in my opinion) but useful and not too one sided. The interaction with others and exchange of ideas stimulating"

"The range of people"

"Friendly and open discussion of topic"

"Discussions"

"Open discussion"

"A full and frank discussion"

"Table discussions"

"Table discussions"

"Talks"

"Table discussions"

"Talking about the way nuclear power will work"

"The discussions around the table"

"Organisation, facilitation, atmosphere, structure"

"Efficiency of presentation and polling software"

"Event management, information, variation, entertaining, interesting. Hospitality"

"A great sense of social introduction"

"Well run, pleasantly run, made to feel welcome"

"Well organised and managed"

"Run efficiently – queries answered quickly and well"

"I was given the opportunity to have my say"

"Being able to speak your mind"

"Did not know what to expect initially and found the whole day informative and enjoyable"

"No aspect was poor"

"All of it"

"All"
"All aspects contributed – the discussions, videos etc"
"All aspects were interesting"
"Meeting new people"
"Meeting a great range of people and discussions"
"Meeting new people"
"Meeting and discussing issues with other members of the public"
"Pub quiz"
"The food at lunchtime"

Cardiff:

"Meeting people and sharing views and opinions and gaining a better knowledge of nuclear energy and alternatives"
"Meeting with other people and share views"
"Table discussions and feedback sharing between tables, voting system and [?]"
"Discussions with a variety of people"
"Talking to an interesting group of people with different backgrounds and experiences to myself"
"Speaking with our facilitator and group"
"The ability to debate the issues with others and to take in their views"
"The tolerance to each other of people on tables of people with different and opposing views"
"The opinions of the day"
"Hearing other peoples views"
"Hearing others views"
"Having the opportunity to spend a day discussing a single topic in an organised and disciplined environment. Hearing other peoples views and learning how they arrived at them"
"A good mix of opinions"
"Discussions between a wide range of people from all walks of life"
"There was an eclectic mix of people and many views"
"Meeting new people with different opinions and discussing them maturely. Working as part of a team – and lunch!"
"Finding out other peoples views"
"Ability to see other peoples point of view"
"Exchange of views"
"Efficiently run. Good facilitation and presentation"
"General structure and the running of the event was excellent"
"Variety between given handout, polling questions, nice environment"
"Think it was very well done, hope some of government will take note of the outcome"
"The technology was impressive"
"The structure of the meeting was well planned I enjoyed discussing both sides of the question"
"Good group conduct/ information clear if scarce"
"Well organised and a very good format"
"That after we were asked for an overall answer to the main questions, we were asked if there were any conditions we should impose"
"Very well organised, facilitated, time used well"
"Discussions went clearly where the important issues were"
"The opportunity to learn more and put your views forward"
"Attaining all the information on the issue, having the free will to discuss it and come to a fair, balanced conclusion"
"Learning more about nuclear energy"
"Plenty of info on all the main issues"
"Informative"
"Frances and all the info given"
"Information"
"Learning more on nuclear power"
"Information"
"Being shown things that I didn't know and understanding more on nuclear"
"Table discussions on information given to me"
"Discussing the issue of the day"
"Small groups and large group feedback + cake"
"Debate"
"Discussions"
"Table discussion"
"Discussing issues around the table"
"Meeting people"
"Meeting people"
"The people"
"Good company"
"Meeting some real nice people"
"Coffee and tea"
"The breaks for coffee"

"Lunch"
"Hospitality"
"Discussions/polls/pub quiz"
"The poll and table discussions"
"Voting by keypad"
"Involving members of the public and soliciting their views"
"The opportunity to open up a public discussion and debate"
"Don't know"
"So open"
"All aspects"
"Freedom to express personal views"

Edinburgh:

"The discussions were interesting and I feel I learnt not just from the materials but from other people in the group"
"Lots of refreshments! And I liked the discussion time to share info and views"
"Hearing range of views"
"Engaging in debate. Sharing views, opinions. Turning people on to politics and government. Excellent"
"Awareness of the general concern expressed by the participants – the quality of that concern and how it was articulated"
"Meeting others who expressed opinions similar and were willing to discuss and move views without confrontation"
"Being able to express views and discuss amongst varying other opinions around the table"
"Round table discussions"
"Learning others' opinions on the subject of nuclear energy"
"Hearing the views of others"
"Hearing views of others"
"Stimulating opinion"
"The info and feedback from other participants"
"The ability to discuss individual opinions somewhat"
"Listening to other people's views"
"Organisation, clear speaker"
"Opinion leader ran a very smooth, successful day. Very impressive"
"The organisation and in particular the electronic organisation were first class"
"Good presentation skills. Excellent choice of attendees"
"The way it was conducted"
"Presentation"
"Facilitator neutrality"
"All well organised. A bit short dinner break"
"Well run, good debates"
"Organisation very good. Information very good"
"Good all round representation of differing views"
"The opportunity to have a cross section of views on important issues for our future"
"The discussions from various age types on the future of nuclear energy"
"Good mix of people to discuss their points of view, covered most of the country just at my table"
"Good mix of people and views"
"The variety of views, opinions and people involved"
"Great cross section of people with varying views which led to thorough debate"
"The chance to debate different views"
"The general discussion on the subject"
"Free speech"
"Open discussion"
"The participation"
"Taking part"
"Getting involved in current affairs"
"Opportunity to participate"
"Information otherwise unknown"
"Being given information I didn't have"
"Learning more about nuclear power"
"Provision of information"
"Information – [?]"
"Information I didn't know"
"The polls"
"Polling"
"The poll questions"
"Having a chance to put your view over even if I think the government has already made up its mind"
"A chance to air my views and vote on issues which will affect the future"
"Being able to give your opinion by voting on issues"
"Good facilities"
"Hotel was good and a nice trip down"
"Company"

"Meeting others who were worried about nuclear energy"
"Exercises!"
"Going home"

Exeter:

"Chance to hear and share knowledge and views"
"Team interaction and listening to the views of others"
"Hearing people's points of view"
"Getting people's opinions (even if I don't think government will listen)"
"Interchange of views"
"Meeting a wide range of people and views"
"Listening to others and getting feedback when needed"
"Being able to discuss, comment with other people"
"Meeting and discussing with a cross section of the public on a very important issue"
"Interaction with other people. Hearing their ideas and interpretation"
"Meeting nice and interesting people"
"Cross section of opinion, led well by facilitators. Interesting debates and opinions changed"
"A diverse range of discussion from a wide mix of people"
"Very efficiently organised and run"
"We were very well looked after. Company good. No bias towards age"
"The organisation"
"The co-ordinator"
"It all ran smoothly. Helene was lovely, made it very enjoyable. Friendly people"
"Very well run and organised"
"Well run, meeting new people and their views, educational"
"Well organised, good venue, decent food, fun to use the keypads with instant feedback"
"The table event manager, clear and helpful"
"Well organised, informative evening"
"Professional presentation"
"Discussion, debate, polls"
"Discussion, well facilitated and structured"
"Discussions, the different views and contributions"
"Small group discussions"
"Discussion rounds chasing everybody to give their views"
"Talking about it"
"Discussions, poll votes"
"Table discussions"
"Discussions"
"Group discussions and voting"
"Learning about what we are doing to our planet"
"Information, giving the public a chance to understand and have an input"
"Having the knowledge I didn't have before"
"Being made aware of issues"
"The information given on our energy requirements"
"Handouts clear and easily read. Facilitator very informative. Videos instructive"
"The quality of info and the way it was run"
"Answered questions I needed to know"
"Was given a fair view of the discussion"
"Plenty of info, discussions, cross section of people"
"The information given and the videos"
"The discussions with other members of the public. Your opinions being listened to"
"The general atmosphere of wanting to be part of the future and future generations"
"Ability to contribute"
"Teamwork and everyone's opinion considered"
"It was very interesting to be part of this consultation. I really felt like we might actually help to make a difference.
Thanks"
"The polling"
"The food"
"Very interesting, great table co-ordinator"
"Format was the same throughout so hard to comment. Getting tables to feedback provided variety"

Leicester:

"Structure, facilitator, polling"
"Gillian Hall was an excellent facilitator who kept the group focused and I felt at ease putting forward my views"
"Very well presented, kept everybody interested the whole day"
"Good table facilitator. Good structure"
"Well organised"
"Very formal and well run"
"The way it was organised"
"That a lot of different methods of presentation were used and informative and followed up"

"Well organised"
 "Good group dynamics and presentation"
 "The organisation"
 "Presentation"
 "General organisation"
 "Politeness and friendly and it was very well organised"
 "Presentation"
 "It was interactive with a good mix of activities. I was very interested in the interactive voting technology"
 "It was run very well"
 "Whole event well organised"
 "Well structured but too long"
 "The ability to discuss different views and opinions of others"
 "Listening to the mix/balance of the people/public that I met at the event"
 "There was a lot of excellent input from the various members of the group, which was excellently managed by Simon"
 "Group discussions. Meeting people and listening to their views"
 "Meeting other people and hearing their views"
 "Hearing the opinions of others"
 "Good mix of people, good round the table debates"
 "Round table"
 "Table discussions"
 "Discussion and sharing of views and ideas"
 "Informative chat and discussion, and polling our views were interesting and made it more fun"
 "Meeting other people on my table and discussing the issues raised"
 "Hearing other people's opinions"
 "The discussions and different views"
 "Talking"
 "Open discussion"
 "The discussion on the table and the videos"
 "Great discussions"
 "Meeting new and different people and hearing their views"
 "Points raised that I wasn't aware of before and hearing other people's views"
 "Hearing others views and concerns"
 "The comments from various attendees"
 "It was good hearing other people's views and it's made me think a lot more"
 "Acknowledgement that our time was of value. Venue and intentions to come! Learning more about a major issue and verifying opinions"
 "It encouraged deeper thought on the subject"
 "Learning things about nuclear power, as I now realise how much it affects me!"
 "The statistical facts given to us in order for us to discuss the topics"
 "(Re waste) and more detailed information and education/analysis of the information; people are still unnecessarily scared by the radioactivity"
 "Learning about nuclear energy and its effects of CO2 emissions. Discussing with others about the need for N energy"
 "Ability to vote and learn"
 "Information given and state of things to come in our country"
 "Awareness about an issue that was otherwise not very important"
 "The information provided was extremely good"
 "Getting to know something I did not know before and meeting new people"
 "Learning more about nuclear energy than I did already and being able to express my own views and listen to other people's points of view"
 "I have learnt a lot regarding this topic and now feel able to make an informed choice"
 "Learning new information"
 "Being involved in discussion and realising the implications of nuclear/or lack of nuclear energy"
 "The overall practice of learning more about what's what"
 "Lunch. Learning new things"
 "Although we have not been given all info on other options I think that the info given on nuclear power was full and useful even though I don't agree"
 "A wide and varied sector of population"
 "A good mix of people present"
 "Good method for addressing the problem. Good balance of people"
 "The mix of people from obvious different backgrounds"
 "The mix of people on each table and presentation, though slightly biased"
 "Meeting new people"
 "Meeting new people with different views"
 "The company!"
 "Meeting some really interesting people. Getting to hear all the various differing views. Well catered for"
 "Meeting a variety of people"
 "Meeting a good cross section of people"
 "Voting system and agenda and selection of candidates"

"Polls"
 "Poll questions"
 "Polling questions"
 "Everything"
 "All of it was good"
 "Everything. It was a worthwhile experience"
 "Everything, involvement with the event and the good humour it was conducted with"
 "All well done"
 "The opportunity to take part and have my say"
 "Being allowed the time to put forward my views"
 "Able to make my own point at the table"
 "Giving my opinion"
 "At least I felt I had a chance to voice my opinions and the chance to meet new people"
 "Hope the replies carry weight"
 "Making friends with people. Feeling that I can influence important decisions for now and the foreseeable future"
 "Being in a position to try and influence the government's policy on energy"
 "New experience"
 "About the waste de-commissioning"
 "Everyone took an active part in discussion"
 "The repetition of the questions"

Liverpool:

"Well run event, good variation in activities which kept concentration levels high. Information supplied was well delivered and flowed well in the day. Information supplied appeared well balanced and unbiased"
 "The presentation and set up on the day"
 "The patience of the facilitator"
 "The hospitality"
 "Very well organised, good time frames of discussion and videos helped to keep topic interesting and discussion lively"
 "Well structured, varied day. Good opportunities to express opinions in small groups. Interesting to hear other people's views!"
 "How well organised it was"
 "Relaxed, informal atmosphere"
 "Although a serious subject, it was handled with humour. Light hearted attitude which wasn't detrimental to the subject matter"
 "Very well and professionally run. Good presentation"
 "It was well run by all concerned and I thoroughly enjoyed the day"
 "Easy for everyone to follow, well organised"
 "Given a chance to discuss in small groups and individuals voice their opinions – learning from each other's knowledge"
 "The opportunities to hear so many different points of view"
 "Mix of views, apart from one's own"
 "Discussing and learning how people feel"
 "Listening and understanding the views of others which are important to us ALL"
 "Balanced views on the subject"
 "A good mix of people – age, background, experience. It was very interesting and informative to hear a wide range of views"
 "There were lots of different people and views were aired fully. The polling meant each person's voice was heard as well as group discussion feedbacks"
 "The views of all members round the table and open forum"
 "The exchange of information"
 "Bringing our attention to needs and dangers"
 "Informative exercise"
 "Learning about energy sources and discussing them with others"
 "Informative, being able to put views across to others but in the great scheme of things I wasn't able to [put them to] the government directly"
 "It made me think!"
 "I feel I have learnt a lot and been able to put my feelings and thoughts to the group"
 "All the information I was given and to be made aware of the earth and the environment"
 "My understanding of everything"
 "To be made aware of nuclear power and to obtain a greater understanding"
 "Learning about future plans to reduce CO2 emissions"
 "The quiz and the knowledge I gained"
 "The formative detail and all the things I learned"
 "Learning about nuclear power and about the waste"
 "The info gained"
 "Lots of discussion time. Polling in real time good. Actually being able to have a say!"
 "Discussing different issues with different people"
 "It was good to discuss the issues with other people with other and different views"
 "The discussions and the pub quiz"

"Table discussions"
 "The good natured discussions"
 "Group discussions. Very informative"
 "Having your say, even if the government won't listen"
 "The non biased view on nuclear energy. The opportunity for me to give my views. The way the event was professionally run"
 "Being able to put my opinion across, knowing my opinion matters"
 "Good use of electronic presentation hardware"
 "The video information. Feedback instantly from poll questions"
 "The voting buttons"
 "Voting and discussions"
 "Using the polling system was new and exciting. Also fact that I am, as everyone else, getting reimbursed for my travel is good"
 "Giving people the chance to come together and voice their opinions openly and freely which is not a regular thing"
 "Being a part of an important decision the government need to make"
 "Involvement, sharing views. Feeling like you're making a difference. Meeting people of all backgrounds"
 "Lunch, money, technology and meeting new people and being able to discuss issues of concern"
 "Lunch"
 "The whole of it was very informative and enjoyable"
 "All of the event was enjoyable"

London:

"Well paced and organised. Talking to other people about climate change"
 "Everyone knew what they were doing. Confident facilitator, good time keeping"
 "Brilliant organisation"
 "Nicely spaced breaks"
 "Well run. Information was clear and we all contributed"
 "The organisation, information on statistics and the food!"
 "Good facilitator. Reasonably well run event although more time would have been good. Perhaps a two day event"
 "Planning and communication"
 "Very well organised. Stimulating. Democracy in action"
 "Organisation, food, facilities, facilitation"
 "Well run, organised"
 "Friendly organisation"
 "Interactive nature/short/punchy not dry and talked to"
 "Organisation of the event could have been better but the event ran very well apart from the lack of information and on hand experts"
 "Friendliness and organised"
 "Good organisation. Very good facilitator. Interesting people"
 "The facilitator was impartial and extremely professional"
 "Presentations. Food and refreshments. Enjoyable table debate"
 "Good equal opportunities for participants"
 "Organised well – physically. Material good/ facilitator efficient"
 "Structured – videos, discussion, voting"
 "Good facilitator"
 "Each and every participant was involved. Polling questions made it more interesting as well as helped to increase knowledge"
 "Hearing other people's views"
 "Polls, pub quiz, meeting people with varying views and debating these"
 "The opportunity to listen to other people's point of view and then compare it with yours before making conclusions"
 "Hearing other peoples' views"
 "Hearing the views of others"
 "Exchange of views"
 "Food, money, talking with members of the public"
 "I was able to discuss issues and find out what others thought. Good to hear a variety of informed opinions"
 "Being able to discuss your views"
 "Round table discussions and polling questions"
 "The group participation and the food"
 "Debate"
 "Table discussions"
 "Being involved in discussions is always beneficial"
 "Doughnuts. Good conversation"
 "Round table discussions where everybody could express their views"
 "The round the table discussions were highly insightful"
 "The group discussions – great fun"
 "Discussion at all levels"
 "Thought and discussion"

"The stimulating debate and the manner in which they were run"
 "Group discussion"
 "The round table discussion and the tea"
 "Discussions with fellow participants and facilitator – oh and the smoothies"
 "Round the table discussions and debate"
 "Set up with facilitator and round table discussion was good. Combination of video, polling and discussion also good"
 "Discussion with group and facilitator"
 "Our table 17 was a perfect team and Sarah Parfitt was great"
 "Open discussion"
 "The table discussions after each video"
 "Discussions"
 "Meeting and discussing the issues, feeling involved in a very small way"
 "Discussing issues with different people who had individual views"
 "Discussions with other participants"
 "Discussion"
 "Discussions. Quiz. Recorded film"
 "To meet and discuss with wide range of people"
 "Broad spectrum of people involved, although a long day – the little touches (chocs) were appreciated"
 "The wide and varied opinions of other members of the public, together with an educative day for me!"
 "Hearing diverse views across the table and from different age groups"
 "Wide variety of views"
 "Meeting various types of people"
 "Mixture of people"
 "The range of people selected to attend"
 "Meeting other people"
 "Meeting people. Our team leader was very good"
 "Meeting new people and discussing ideas"
 "A chance to meet new people"
 "Meeting others"
 "Meeting people, taking part"
 "Friendly participants"
 "Learning what the government are planning on doing"
 "Feeling informed, hearing other people's views. Hoping that what I think will make a difference to what the government decides"
 "A great opportunity to learn and debate important issues that I have not previously thought of. A great overall event"
 "Getting more informed about what's involved in the future supply of electricity"
 "Being made aware of the environment and nuclear energy and how it works"
 "Understanding the sheer scale of the problem we have and coming up with questions about the government's posed solution. We need an alternative"
 "Videos. Handouts. Somebody leading each group to get discussion going. The discussions, being heard, the group, the food"
 "Clear delivery of information and general core of people attending"
 "New information, listening to others. Lunch"
 "Video and table discussion"
 "Health and safety, nuclear waste management"
 "Some video information and table discussions"
 "Information overall"
 "More information on the climate change effects and impending depletion of renewables"
 "Having my opinions listened to"
 "To be treated as a knowledgeable/valued member of the public"
 "An opportunity to have a say"
 "That we were involved at all!"
 "My views taken into consideration"
 "Considers the views of people from all walks of life and cross section of the community"
 "Giving opinions, discussions, polls, seeing results"
 "Attendance of MP Malcolm Wicks – he was here to listen to number of public views"
 "The fact that we were asked to come and valued as real contributors all day – it was excellent"
 "To see the government ask for our views"
 "Opportunity for views and opinions to be expressed byway of group discussion and polls"
 "Polling"
 "The polls. Everyone could have their say"
 "The polling and the pub quiz"
 "Lunch! The table mediator"
 "Everything"
 "All of it"
 "Pub quiz and polling questions"
 "Enjoyable and intensely interesting"
 "Good"

"Thank you for making it fun!"
"Interesting and informative"
"I think economics will rule"

Newcastle:

"Hearing other people's views"
"Listening to views of other members of the public"
"To listen to other's points of view"
"Fair views opinionated by all members of table. Good table facilitators, very useful"
"Airing my views, and listening to the views of others: DEBATE"
"The open discussions, getting other points of view"
"The opportunity to exchange informed views and debate issues with other people"
"Other views and discussions"
"Time set aside to be able to discuss an important issue with a range of opinions"
"Finding out what other people think"
"Hearing that the majority held the same or similar views to myself"
"The chance to air one's views and listen to others"
"Hearing all sides without there being any arguments"
"Hearing everyone else's opinions"
"Friendly interaction of people with differing views"
"Views and opinions aimed by all – great forum for debate"
"Getting other views on subject, pros and cons"
"The arrangements made for getting to and from the venue were excellent"
"It was a well organised event with a good mix of people"
"It was fun, and well organised"
"Technology used"
"Very well organised. All needs catered for – food etc. Small tables with facilitator very good idea. Very good technology, very balanced selection of people – male/female, young/old etc"
"Very well organised. Easy to understand info and document. Nice to meet people"
"Its organisation, varied activities, lively discussion"
"Well run and flowed very well with a good use of a variety of learning tools"
"The clarity of speaker/chair. The different mix of people. The completely informal run of the event"
"The organisation"
"The way it was organised"
"Good facilitators – and at least an attempt to garner public opinion"
"Good group discussion lead to clear ideas being expressed"
"Interesting to see how these things are run and to meet other people for discussions"
"The chance to discuss issues in small groups"
"Table discussions"
"Discussion around the table"
"Round table talks"
"Round table discussions"
"Good debate. Very well organised"
"Discussion with other members of public"
"Table discussions"
"Table discussions"
"Discussing nuclear power"
"Table discussions"
"The mix of people at the table"
"The cross section of the public that participated"
"Meeting people of similar views, and being able to express honest opinions"
"Hard to say really. But was more interesting than anticipated and nice to meet new people"
"Meeting other people and gaining the views from a variety of people from different backgrounds"
"Meeting a good cross section of people and listening to other people's views and being able to discuss these"
"Meeting a variety of people and learning different points of view"
"Meeting others with similar views"
"Interesting, educative"
"Very informative even though all aspects were NOT explored"
"Learning about things I didn't know"
"It was great fun and informative"
"Putting thought into an issue I wouldn't normally think about in depth"
"The education I have gained. Friendly and welcoming atmosphere. Felt well looked after"
"Highly educational"
"Finding out more info and getting views of other people"
"Polling, discussions"
"Polling"
"Voting on the issues"
"Polls"
"Polling"

"A chance to voice opinions. Also good hospitality and a chance to meet others. The exercise was a good idea to wake us up"
 "Being able to put your point over"
 "Being able to put my point of view across"
 "Lunch!"
 "Food"
 "The food was nice"
 "Sandwiches"
 "Food"
 "Involving public on such an important issue, table discussions allowed everyone to express their views"
 "Participation in public discussion of national issues"
 "Involvement"
 "All information was very clearly put forward"
 "Video stimulus and worksheets facts"
 "The statistics that were provided"
 "The quiz"
 "The quizzes"
 "Enjoyed it all!"
 "Generally good"
 "All aspects"
 "The group came together well. We found energy and passion to debate the topics"
 "But not like this. The friendly consensus that we built up at our table??"
 "Information is always better than silence"

Norwich:

"Several things were learnt that I was not aware of"
 "The fact that it has got people thinking about nuclear energy and therefore raised public awareness"
 "Learning more about it (nuclear energy) and contributing to it"
 "Finding out about electricity supply"
 "Finding out stuff I didn't know"
 "I became more knowledgeable on nuclear power and actual facts/figures/data were not provided to support statements put across"
 "Wide range of topics discussed"
 "Getting more understanding about our options as a nation"
 "Learned a lot"
 "Keeping people up to date with the facts"
 "To hear fully about the subject"
 "Opportunity to learn and examine nuclear power"
 "Coverage of the various opinions on the topic"
 "Professionally run"
 "Good lunch – well thought out structure"
 "Structure, in terms of many small discussions structured by question"
 "Very well organised"
 "Range of issues. The facilitator"
 "The informal and relaxed approach"
 "Our facilitator Andrew!"
 "How efficiently it was run"
 "Pleasantly organised and facilitated. Information provided"
 "The presentation was very good and thought provoking. Venue excellent"
 "Seeing the change in people's opinions for a greener, more renewable source that doesn't harm future generations"
 "Other people's views"
 "Opportunity to think the issues through with others who do not necessarily hold the same views/opinions etc as myself"
 "Hearing different sides to the argument"
 "Listening to other participants"
 "People's contribution"
 "Camaraderie"
 "Being able to discuss the issues"
 "Round table discussion"
 "Team discussions were very good"
 "The discussions"
 "The discussions"
 "Discussions"
 "Round table discussions of topics raised, helping greater understanding"
 "Team work and discussions. Keyboard polling system, comparing results, instant feedback very good"
 "Open discussion and fairness"
 "Meeting people who care about this vital issue"
 "Meeting new people I wouldn't otherwise have met and being able to discuss with like minded and not so like minded people all the issues that came up"

"Meeting [people?]"
 "Meeting new people and hearing different views"
 "Meeting new people"
 "The breadth of people involved"
 "Mix of people and different views"
 "Mix of people in discussions, enabled good discussion about the issues"
 "Secret voting"
 "Results of poll voting and resumes by group spokesmen at end of day"
 "Our voice being considered"
 "The repetition of questions, we covered old ground a lot"
 "If only we could trust government information"
 "It was all good"
 "As this will clearly affect all members of the public we should be consulted as it is then up to the individual if they act on the information received"
 "The venue! Also the opportunity to be involved"
 "Everyone had the chance to get their views across"
 "Just the event actually taking place has got to be the best aspect!"

10 What were the worst aspects of the event?

Comment analysis (680 comments)

- none / it was good (121)
- repetitive (104)
- wanted more information / facts and figures / alternatives / other options (97)
- venue / food / noisy (87)
- long day / event too long / too tiring (80)
- event / questions / information biased / leading (78)
- logistics / timing etc (45)
- too much information/handouts to take in / deal with in the time (23)
- wanted more from opposition groups (17)
- group discussions cut short / rushed (17)
- pub quiz took too much time (7)

All comments (except comments of "none" which are counted as above)

Belfast:

"Slightly long"
 "Bit long"
 "Too long and too biased"
 "Long at times"
 "Sitting too long"
 "Quite long"
 "Sitting"
 "A bit long and not enough information or facts on safety"
 "It was a very long day"
 "Late afternoon – woolly head!"
 "Tiredness at the end"
 "Length"
 "Sitting for too long! Quite repetitive"
 "Quite a long day. Several times I felt issues were being readdressed"
 "I found that some of the topics were quite repetitive"
 "Repetitiveness of questions"
 "Time – repetitive"
 "Had to think too much. Somewhat repetitive and leaning strongly to the government's view"
 "Repetition"
 "Somewhat biased information at times, lack of knowledge on topic"
 "Seemed biased, don't feel our opinions will be considered very much"
 "Facts presented biased. Questions loaded to produce the positive results the government want"
 "One sided opinion for new nuclear power"
 "Biased views, and too much sitting down"
 "The information given, needed other choices not just nuclear"
 "Not having ALL the facts, i.e. both sides of the argument"
 "Diversity of information from alternatives and opposers"
 "Not enough information on other suppliers"
 "A bit more direction from hotel and at venue would have been useful"

"Getting there"
"The preliminary call up – the map did not show the venue and there was no reference to car parking"
"Maybe the info on worksheets continuously being read out instead of us reading them"
"Lunch"
"Room was too hot"
"Poor lunch - bad coffee"
"Initially thinking questions were going to be on a one to one basis. Enjoyed group talks"
"Missing out on all the sporting events taking place on Sept 8th"
"Sun shone all day, while we were indoors"
"Some people talked too much and tried to hog the table"

Cardiff:

"The heat"
"Hot room"
"Room was hot and stuffy"
"The cramped and hot conditions of the room"
"The room was too hot"
"The venue was too hot"
"Heat in venue (very warm)"
"Stuffy room!"
"The heat"
"The heat in the voting areas"
"Very warm venue"
"Too hot"
"Lunch was very poor. The event venue was too hot, many complaints"
"The ambience – meaning the temperature in an overcrowded meeting"
"Too hot!"
"Lunch not very good"
"Some handouts and the heat"
"The heat. Lack of info"
"Too hot. Very laborious"
"No air con in room"
"Room uncomfortable"
"Heat of the room"
"Hard chairs"
"The room was hot and the food wasn't up to much"
"The heat"
"The heat"
"Questions where only positive answer could be given. Not enough food for all participating"
"Lack of detail from opposing arguments"
"Leading questions. Bias towards nuclear. No alternative options presented argument is weak and misleading. CO2 argument is weak and leading"
"Bias. A predetermined outcome. Omission of key arguments"
"Propaganda"
"All the questions were very leading and loaded if you were anti the wording of things made out as if you agreed"
"Biased leading questions"
"Too many questions expected positive feedback"
"Length and repetition"
"The acoustics, an airless room and the repetitive nature of much of the discussion which became tedious as the afternoon wore on"
"Length and repetition"
"Repetition"
"Going over the same topics"
"A bit too long"
"Length of time in one building"
"Sitting for so long"
"Long day"
"Length of time. After 3.30 I felt brain dead"
"Too much info to absorb"
"Too much information given in such a short time"
"Most of the questions were so complicated it was difficult to answer yes or no"
"Answering some of the questions in the discussions which were difficult to answer"
"Lack of info about costs of nuclear and alternative energy"
"Going on about CO2"
"Getting asked questions"
"Frustration on the debate limitations"
"Trying to contact the organisers prior to the event, only recorded telephone messages"
"The stretching!"
"Only limited to one group of people"

Edinburgh:

"Bit long, maybe space out over 1 day and a half"
"The length of time – questions were repeated / dragged out"
"The table discussions were too long"
"A long day"
"Length of time"
"Rather long"
"Very long day to take in the information"
"Exhaustion!"
"It was a long day with a lot to take in"
"Pretty heavy going"
"It was a long day with a lot of information to take in"
"Hard work, long day"
"The length and intensity"
"Too long and lots of the same info and many questions asked same but worded differently"
"Overall 20% shorter would have been ideal"
"A long day"
"Long day! Too much info with little time to discuss fully"
"Longevity"
"Long"
"The questions felt repetitive and almost as if asking the same thing but in a different way"
"Repetition of some of the questions"
"Very repetitive in areas"
"Repetitive questions – trying to influence the decision later in the day"
"Tedious, repetitive of questions, lack of information about alternatives to nuclear in helping come to a conclusion"
"Many points were repeated and there was not sufficient information on other energy sources"
"A bit over long and discussing [issues] over and again but wording different"
"A degree of repetitiveness in regard to exploration of major issues"
"The repetition of some questions"
"Information overload on handouts. Repetition of information. Too long"
"The last hour –too much information by then"
"A lot of information in a short period of time. Felt brain dead for the last hour. Some questions felt repetitive"
"Trying to digest all the information"
"Very intense in info given"
"Too much data in a short space of time"
"Handouts were too long and took too long to read"
"Amount of info given in time scale. The narrowness of the answers allowed"
"One sided nuclear energy"
"The blatant government propaganda!"
"The general feeling that we were being beaten into submission and the amount of bias"
"The contradicting statistics. The pub quiz and the carefully worded questions not allowing you to have your opinion"
"The information felt mostly biased"
"Nuclear power seems to be the only source they are considering"
"I feel the energy question was loaded in favour of opting for the nuclear option"
"Feeling questions were biased"
"Biased for nuclear"
"Late start – not enough technical information"
"Insufficient information"
"Lack of info about alternatives e.g. energy reduction/ the SD commission option"
"Not sufficient figures to back up facts"
"Some figures were not available which may have influenced things. Handouts should have been issued before event in order to leave more discussion time"
"I would have liked more facts and figures"
"Lack of information about alternative sources of energy and the views of bodies such as Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth"
"The exercise section – Random!"
"The fun interlude wasn't"
"Lots of paper but understood why we needed it to prompt discussions"
"Good"
"Good event, possibly needed longer breaks"
"Distinct impression of blandness – going thru the motions of consultation for a decision that has already been made"
"Not understanding a few of the questions, the way they were constructed"
"Badly written questions and propaganda films. We're as bad as the Nazis"
"Weak lunch, no cutlery! Cold"
"Too many people talking at once"
"[Sound levels??] from some tables where facilitator did not have control. Our facilitator, Harry, was excellent"
"Ignoring the Scottish parliament"
"It was rather rushed"
"Unsure of what worth it was as not sure if views will be listened to"
"Waste"

Exeter:

"A very long day, very mentally exhausted by the end"
"It was a long day"
"Too long a day"
"A very long day, not adequate breaks"
"Length of sitting"
"Sitting in same position all day"
"Went on a bit long"
"The distance travelled and also the event duration"
"Sitting for so long"
"Sore bottom"
"Too long"
"There was a little bit of repetition in some of the questions"
"Repetition"
"Heat and duplicating information and questions"
"The room was too hot. There was a fair degree of repetition"
"Questioning in discussion groups became a bit repetitive"
"Repetition"
"Repetitive nature of the whole programme. Could have done with more variety e.g. visiting speakers"
"Being asked the same questions over and over again"
"Repetitive information being discussed over and over in a biased manner"
"Too rushed. No experts to question. Far too repetitive"
"No air conditioning"
"Not much leg room, quite long and drawn out"
"Too hot!"
"It was a bit hot in the room"
"The heat in the room due to global warming!"
"Being in a windowless room on a sunny day"
"The map to the event was wrong"
"Badly organised, hotel booking was wrong. It was very hot"
"Never received my letter of confirmation. Very hard to get hold of anyone"
"No meal arrangement evening"
"Finding the venue (insufficient information)"
"Not enough information on the venue ie Park and Ride and direction information on location"
"Told 9am start but started at 9.45"
"Could have had a meet up on arrival with other guests organised"
"Not enough statistics given"
"Trying to answer some questions with not enough information"
"Limited info prior to the event"
"Not being able to fully discuss certain issues. Not having anybody with background information to answer the big issues"
"Lack of information on what the government's plans are for disposing of nuclear waste"
"Just not a lot of info"
"The absence of input from the environmental lobby"
"Not enough information from the alternative opinions in the handouts"
"Not enough time given to alternative energy"
"At times biased wording in paperwork making it unfair"
"Biased info"
"Being done on a Saturday, I don't get much time off"
"Sometimes people spoke too much"
"Bulk paper info – too much to take in at once when not a lot of knowledge in the first place"

Leicester:

"Not enough information on other alternatives"
"I would like to have heard more from the other parties involved"
"Difficult to hear facilitators and other group members. No information about issue before attending. No Greenpeace"
"A slight lack of information"
"Maybe all the information was not disclosed"
"Not finding out much about cost and waste"
"Lack of information in places"
"Lack of information about France's practices – which as Europe's major nuclear generator and our nearest neighbour would have been interesting"
"Not enough information and fact around alternative options"
"Not enough information given prior to the event and also other information on renewable energy sources to enable a valid argument such as findings from sustainable development commission"
"Too intensive – opportunity to study facts and figures in advance would have been very useful"
"No private sector information"
"Felt there were things we were not being told"
"Not enough info on other power sources"

"Not enough information on other sources"
 "Lack of information on other options"
 "More figures on cost"
 "Not enough info"
 "Not enough information was given"
 "Some questions asked repeatedly, hoping for right answer?"
 "A lot of things were repeated"
 "Repetition on certain points and questions"
 "Repeated questions"
 "Same questions"
 "Questions were repeated too many times, could be structured better"
 "Went over the same ground a few too many times"
 "The repetition of the questions"
 "Mainly repetition of same facts"
 "Lot of repetition"
 "Repetition, same issues over and over again"
 "Circular process of similar questions being asked over again"
 "Biased and incomplete statistics. Repetitive questioning – leading questions became frustrating"
 "Biased view"
 "I felt it biased towards nuclear fuel as a whole"
 "Biased information. Badly phrased questions in the polling"
 "I found the literature to be very biased and only gave the one view i.e. Government's"
 "Slightly biased information with little 100% TRUE facts"
 "Biased towards nuclear"
 "We were only given the positive views from the government"
 "The biased information provided"
 "Information very biased"
 "So very one sided in favour of nuclear energy"
 "All information seemed biased"
 "Room not big enough – tables too close together (one lady fell over). Food awful!"
 "Room temperature"
 "Lunch"
 "Uncomfortable chairs"
 "The lunch!"
 "Lunch menu not great"
 "The food"
 "The overcrowding in the room, very stuffy"
 "It got a little warm in the room in the afternoon"
 "Too long"
 "Quite tiring and sometimes repetitive"
 "Long day"
 "The length of time sat down"
 "It seemed very drawn out and overlong, dull"
 "Long day"
 "Time spell"
 "A lot of sitting"
 "Finding the venue!"
 "It started late. I arrived in good time and hung around for an hour"
 "Getting here"
 "Waiting to sign in"
 "Delay at registration"
 "Could have arranged a meet up for those staying overnight"
 "As mentioned before, no opposing organisation representation"
 "Not enough facts from the opposition"
 "I don't trust that this is not already a decision already made"
 "I felt that a decision on nuclear power had been made"
 "It was held on the same day as vital cricket, rugby and soccer matches"
 "Private sector participation"
 "Realising the extent of damage to our planet"
 "A lot of information over a short amount of time i.e. phase 2/3 several handouts one after the other"
 "Having to answer questions"
 "Clarification of what happens to nuclear waste"

Liverpool:

"Perhaps didn't give enough time to discuss potential alternative energy supplies"
 "Not a lot of actual figures and where did all sources come from?"
 "I had no information beforehand so it was [hard] to really get involved"
 "Lack of information before went"
 "None really. Only alternatives to nuclear power could have been discussed"

"The overall possibilities of electricity generation and its security was not really covered. Is the government looking into other generating methods?"

"Some members of group kept discussing subjects which were not relevant. A lot of info was not in depth enough"

"The lack of unbiased information"

"The content and the bias"

"One sided questions"

"Very strong bias displayed in videos and phrasing of questions"

"Lack of information on other energy sources. Generally feeling it is biased, lead to less productive discussions"

"Some info was biased towards nuclear e.g. wind farms taking up the countryside"

"No open questions, felt as if they were leading us a little"

"I felt it was a little biased and repetitive"

"The biased reporting"

"Covering the same ground over and over again"

"Repetition of questions"

"Over repetition of information"

"The teacups were too small"

"Venue could be a little bit bigger"

"No real representation by groups like Friends of the Earth/Greenpeace – no real contrary opinions"

"I would have liked Greenpeace to have been represented and the sustainable development commission"

"Encouraged to arrive promptly at 9am (I arrived 8.45) for a 9.30 start!"

"Having to get up so early to get here – 6am"

"Travel to and from"

"Too much paperwork and videos. Conversations stopped when in flow to move on to the next question when all valid arguments"

"Not having the time to read the information provided on the day"

"Not enough time for such an important issue. Needed more information on alternatives"

"Some discussions rushed"

"A lot of information to take in on the day"

"Variation in payments, not quantified correctly. Finding others, for no reason, are being paid more, spoilt the day"

"Finding the venue, paying varying amounts to people. Very UNFAIR. We all put the same amount of energy and time into the day"

"Having to read the handouts in the time frame, before discussion. Facilitator reading out word for word from the handouts, not taking the actual points of the group"

"Having the handouts read to us – find it irritating – we can all read!"

"The amount of electricity used by [electronic presentation hardware]"

"You could have saved a lot of money i.e. car sharing, 350 hotel allowance max"

"At times the event felt more like an information giving event rather than a consultation"

"More individual feedback opportunities should have been catered for – another section on this questionnaire would have sufficed"

"The possibility that our opinions will not be counted"

"Having to talk over people"

"It possibly went on a bit longer than it needed to"

"My person for taking down notes did not speak clear"

London:

"Repetitive questions, felt a bit too long, not enough info on renewable energy. More info needed at times"

"Round table discussions overlapped on various issues"

"The confusion around the safety issues of nuclear power and the repeat questions"

"Videos (the music especially). Very repetitive"

"Unequal pay. Repetitiveness"

"Sometimes the discussions went round and round, and waiting to start"

"Got a bit repetitive towards the end of the day"

"Repetitive"

"Being served many of the same facts, ideas, theories under different forms"

"A lot of repetition"

"Repetition"

"Going over the same issues"

"It was too repetitive, as we kept watching a video, having a discussion and doing a poll"

"Little overdrawn, seem to be some points repeated and discussed over! Handout 8 should be near the beginning"

"Rather circular questions – often repeated responses"

"Toward the end – tiredness – some questions seem repeated"

"Not enough information on the disadvantage and no accurate figures and facts"

"Lack of info"

"Not enough info provided"

"Frustrating lack of information on some aspects of the subject – not enough representation from different bodies to talk to us"

"I would of liked more info available"

"Not enough mention about renewable sources, and especially the negative effects on environments of some resources and on mining for uranium"

"Needed more info surrounding safety and security issues"

"Not being given any fact sheets / info prior to event"
 "Less information about nuclear waste management"
 "Lack of detailed data"
 "Lack of information and literature that contradicted the videos"
 "Certain lack of info and repetitive questioning"
 "Not enough info on some subjects"
 "The event did not really cover the variety of views – alternatives to nuclear power were consistently underplayed"
 "Lack of info on related issues"
 "Not having enough information about how much involvement the government will have if private companies run the plant. Who will pay? What locations? Terrorism? Security of supply?"
 "Need more information"
 "Non provision of materials or availability of experts in the energy sector"
 "Length of day, but I coped!"
 "Keeping my concentration for so long"
 "A very long day"
 "Time length"
 "Sitting too long"
 "The length"
 "It was tiring"
 "It was very long"
 "Sitting down for so long"
 "The event was far too intensive, too much covered though repetitive in the time allowed"
 "Travel to and from event"
 "Getting up at 6 am on a Saturday!"
 "Travelling here"
 "Too slow to start"
 "If everybody had turned up would have been too many people on table and screen position wasn't very good"
 "Last minute organisation problems during the week - no one got back to my calls for two days"
 "Early morning"
 "Arriving promptly and then waiting around for 20-25 minutes"
 "Location"
 "Travel. Good when you got there"
 "Waiting around, pub quiz was fun but waste of time"
 "The lunch was too long"
 "Not enough breaks"
 "Timing. Getting us here too early then not starting till 9.30"
 "Information seemed biased and leading"
 "Was slanted toward using nuclear energy and it seems a foregone conclusion that it will be used"
 "I felt the argument was slightly biased towards pro nuclear energy"
 "Some information I felt was biased towards nuclear energy and some figures not accurate and contradictory"
 "Biased info. Knowledge that consultation is a token gesture for PR purposes"
 "The inherent bias in the video presentation and the relentless re-questioning of issues already covered, so a clearer answer could be achieved"
 "Pub quiz, mainly excessive precision required for known trend. Question 2, official answer is ridiculous"
 "The pub quiz was too long and interrupted discussion, though it helped build a team spirit"
 "Difficult to hear some table participants"
 "Lack of lunch"
 "The tea!"
 "My hearing in spite of hearing aid"
 "Unavoidable noise"
 "Not having enough information from other groups like Greenpeace"
 "No representatives from other organisations to give an alternative view"
 "Just getting into a discussion and told to move on because of lack of time"
 "Rushed"
 "A bit rushed, especially rushing through the handouts"
 "Not enough time for some questions to be answered"
 "Not moving quick enough. Too many breaks"
 "Lack of expert opinion"
 "Wanted to be able to ask relevant questions"
 "The oral feedback from the tables did not remotely reflect the quality of discussion. Hotel dinner"
 "Nuclear waste discussion and carbon emissions"
 "Our facilitator having to read out all the notes to us"
 "Lack of variety of presentation"
 "The pretence of genuine consultation"
 "The hour long discussions"
 "Trying to concentrate on figures and statistics"
 "How scary nuclear energy is"
 "The nonsense"
 "Non participation by people at the table"
 "Telephone bureau"

Newcastle:

- "Crowded venue. It got cold too. Tedious reading aloud of the handouts"
- "It was SO, SO COLD! I can hardly write"
- "Sat too close together"
- "Lack of coordination groups. Catering. Noise control (almost impossible to hear dialogue around own table)"
- "Very cold"
- "The air conditioning temperature"
- "The awful muzak!"
- "Heating of the hall, or lack of!"
- "Canned music"
- "Freezing air conditioning. All fried food and sandwiches"
- "Overcrowding"
- "The hall was crowded"
- "Lack of facilities"
- "Room was too cold"
- "Noise in the room – difficulty hearing"
- "The videos were boring"
- "No meal in the hotel when I arrived late"
- "It was cold!"
- "I was freezing cold"
- "Too much background NOISE – made hearing difficult"
- "Seemed to repeat questions and issues too much"
- "Got a bit repetitive toward the end"
- "The repetition"
- "Repetition. Lack of unbiased information regarding viability of other energy suppliers, e.g. renewable"
- "I felt it was repetitive in parts, the same question seemed to be asked"
- "Too many repeats"
- "Information seemed to be repeated occasionally"
- "Repetition"
- "Some unnecessary repetition of discussion points"
- "There was perhaps too much repetition in the questions and the evidence presented was not a balanced view of all options"
- "Questions too similar"
- "Repeated questions"
- "Same questions throughout the day"
- "Constant repetition of the same question but in several different ways"
- "We seem to go over same questions!"
- "The long periods of repetition"
- "Repetitive information from the films"
- "The views/information given was clearly nuclear biased"
- "Too rushed and it was partisan. Not enough information on the side effects of nuclear waste, or why the opposition views are as they are. And our facilitator was charming but his reading skills were not good so really better to let people read by themselves"
- "One sidedness. Lack of info given beforehand"
- "Felt info was biased"
- "Biased information"
- "Bias"
- "Lack of unbiased information i.e. from both anti and pro nuclear authorities"
- "Unrelenting biased info"
- "Lead in a certain direction with questions"
- "Not a balanced view on energy and alternative sources"
- "I feel that it was being held to promote nuclear power energy, when it was generally agreed that there is a need for nuclear energy alongside developing renewable"
- "Biased arguments – lack of insight into alternatives. Not quantitative enough - need references for figures provided"
- "Bias"
- "Loaded information – one sided presentation – no information on valid alternatives considered"
- "Biased info"
- "Bias/ one sidedness of the information"
- "Lack of options on outcome. We really wanted the option for the government to run its stations. Better presentation of the data which allowed comparison"
- "Lack of information on broad range of options. Lack of time to digest information"
- "Not been given full figures and percentages of the effect of CO2 and the use of nuclear energy e.g. how many stations are we going to use?"
- "Lack of information on alternative energy options and views. Too many paper handouts – what a waste of paper and money!"
- "The lack of information about alternative energy sources"
- "Not enough information on time to give full views. More info needed earlier"
- "Not being told any risks"
- "Not enough focus on benefits/drawbacks on renewable energies and comparing costs"

"Not enough information on certain issues"
 "That we didn't hear from alternate options"
 "Not enough information"
 "No information provided in advance to read. No one to counter balance e.g. Greenpeace – very one sided"
 "Poor arguments put forward by government and lack of info. It was very cold!"
 "Lack of comparative information on renewables"
 "Not having info before the event to enable more understanding for discussions"
 "Day too LONG. Material needed before to digest – not enough info on alternatives, repetitive in places"
 "Long table discussions – too long"
 "Length of time"
 "Long day – handouts"
 "Long day"
 "Long day"
 "Being sat for long periods"
 "A bit long"
 "Long time sitting"
 "Was a little too long"
 "Could have a shorter lunch break and get home earlier"
 "The length"
 "The late start (waited 40mins in foyer)"
 "More time should have been allowed for the discussions"
 "Sometimes not enough time to digest all the info on handouts before discussing views"
 "Number of sub topics covered and time limitations involved"
 "Crammed discussion"
 "Some questions seemed rushed whereas we ended up covering the same issues many times in (more than?) others"
 "Being rushed on voting and debate"
 "I was disappointed that the association who oppose this plan pulled out of voicing their opinion to the public. Is public opinion important?"
 "Bland questions for discussion"
 "The sense that it was superfluous and would be unable to stop the government giving the go ahead for future nuclear stations"
 "Too short – A two day conference would have been better"
 "I agree with government views"
 "Health and safety"
 "Feedback"

Norwich:

"The standing and waiting for almost an hour at the beginning of the day"
 "The long wait before we began, asked to be at the venue at 9am started at 9.45am!"
 "Late starting"
 "The breaks"
 "Waiting for almost an hour before actual start"
 "Waiting at the start"
 "Getting up early"
 "Waiting for event to start, as asked to be on time, arrived 8.30"
 "Having to wait one hour for the event to start"
 "Heat and lighting"
 "Difficulty in hearing what was said because of the number of people in the room!"
 "Air con made me cold"
 "The dark, confined venue"
 "Stuffiness and poor lighting in room"
 "The layout for breaks"
 "Too much noise, not enough time"
 "Sitting down all day!"
 "A bit long. Pub quiz – time consuming"
 "Having to sit and concentrate for so long! And a day off!"
 "A bit too long"
 "My numb bum!"
 "A long day"
 "Long day"
 "Lack of information from other parties and lack of evidence backing up statements"
 "Still insufficient information"
 "Not enough water! Needed to provide a more balanced view from other agencies and stakeholders"
 "Not enough information"
 "Not as much info as would of liked on figures"
 "A lot to fit in, in the time available. More detailed and/or technical information was not available. Sound levels at discussion"
 "Some lack of financial information on the costs of nuclear power"
 "Videos rather over simplified"

"Energy wastage – food paper, gadgets. Biased opinion presented"
 "Not enough information. Questions geared towards agreeing with nuclear power. Not enough balance"
 "A feeling that information was biased"
 "Biased information"
 "The biased, unreferenced information sheets and videos, the repetitive nature of the questioning, the unreliable reproduction of our views"
 "Not a lot of breaks. Too one sided"
 "Bias"
 "Kept going over the same things without any more information"
 "Repetition"
 "Repetition of the information"
 "Standing up and giving feedback!"
 "Forcing public speaking"
 "Having to speak publicly"
 "Nominating, choosing a speaker within the table group"
 "Pub quiz"
 "Lack of discussion time – could have been longer"
 "Providing (?) the general feeling about the problems of climate change and of nuclear waste disposal"
 "The process, structure and wording of questions"
 "The music"

11 What was the most important benefit for you personally in taking part in this event (if any)?

Comment analysis (703 comments)

- learning / information / knowledge / awareness (317)
- talking to others / listening to others' views / meeting people (128)
- learning about nuclear power (90)
- taking part / contributing to something important / feeling valued (86)
- able to share my own views / have my say (78)
- incentives / rewards (e.g. money, hotel) (10)
- interesting / enjoyable day (9)
- the experience (6)

All comments

Belfast:

"Gaining knowledge"
 "Very informative"
 "Awareness of topic and issues"
 "My views on the use of nuclear power have shifted"
 "I found that I gained a lot of knowledge on energy sources and issues affecting our world"
 "Educated on energy sources and issues"
 "Information I learnt"
 "Assimilated more info on topic discussed"
 "New knowledge"
 "Knowledge"
 "Information I never knew"
 "Learning about climate control"
 "Confidence in meeting others"
 "Information gathered"
 "Learning about everything I didn't know before"
 "More knowledge"
 "A bit more information"
 "New knowledge"
 "Understanding of main issues"
 "I learned a lot and now I have made my mind up about nuclear energy"
 "A very interesting subject (I have BSc degree)"
 "Made me think more about issues"
 "The money and the awareness"
 "Learning exercises"
 "Learning"
 "Knowledge"
 "Receiving information on future resources"

"Knowledge"
 "Learnt a lot and enjoyed the participation"
 "Again awareness"
 "I gained a lot of information and knowledge"
 "A greater understanding of nuclear power"
 "Learning about nuclear power, able to pass info onto family members"
 "Clarified nuclear power"
 "Understanding N.P."
 "Knowledge of nuclear energy"
 "Hearing others views, informing some more"
 "Education and a chance to talk to others and debate subject"
 "Meeting people"
 "Meeting other people"
 "Sharing views with others. Getting a glimpse of government's intentions"
 "Hearing other people's views"
 "£75! Being made to think coherently and present ideas to others. Listening to my table's views and those of the other tables"
 "To get opinion across. The money!"
 "Putting my views across"
 "Aired my views and concerns"
 "Voicing opinions"
 "Putting my point of view"
 "I had a say"
 "The experience"
 "The experience (first time)"
 "Pleasant experience, more enjoyable than anticipated"
 "Thinking of saving energy at home and on the road"
 "Using the keypad"
 "The openness of it"
 "Made me want to take part in more events"
 "Very friendly"

Cardiff:

"The experience and the information."
 "Learning about the issues involved and the opinions of others."
 "Educated me."
 "Experience and the opportunity to learn more."
 "My understanding of today's global warming situation."
 "Greater knowledge of the UK power/energy policies although felt info on climate change was very misleading."
 "Made me more aware."
 "Learn new things."
 "Understanding the importance of what needs to change."
 "To become more informed."
 "Learning the costs of wasting energy e.g. carbon dioxide emission and pollution"
 "Learn about the issue"
 "The awareness"
 "Eye opening"
 "Information and education"
 "Make me aware"
 "It will provide me with a lot to think about though I'm unsure I'm any closer to arriving at a conclusion"
 "To learn more about different types of energy"
 "Important knowledge of a subject I hadn't thought much about and the ability to make an informed decision"
 "I found out more facts"
 "More information and understanding"
 "More knowledge about important issues"
 "Revised profile of issues"
 "Becoming more aware of nuclear energy and the pros and cons."
 "Understand nuclear energy."
 "I learned some facts about nuclear energy I did not know before."
 "Raised my awareness surrounding nuclear energy."
 "Realising how soon a nuclear station were closing down"
 "To learn about nuclear power"
 "Being able to understand and marshal my own perspective on nuclear energy"
 "Nuclear power and waste"
 "To learn more about nuclear energy"
 "Listening to a broad spectrum of opinion."
 "I have come to understand other views than my own."
 "Involvement in debate with people of varying viewpoint."
 "Meeting other people with similar and dissimilar views to my own"
 "Awareness of other peoples views"

"Meeting people most with similar views and conscience."
 "Just being there and meeting new people."
 "I really enjoyed discussions with other participants"
 "Talking to people from all over"
 "Gave me the chance to put my view"
 "Being able to voice opinion"
 "My point of view"
 "Having my say"
 "Being invited to be part of the process."
 "Social involvement in important issues."
 "Feeling involved in a national debate."
 "Make me think more about the issue."
 "Time in which to focus on this one issue."
 "Considering more fully this issue and discussing same."
 "Confidence booster."
 "It has made me more adamant for NOT having nuclear power."
 "I thought I would learn more but I did not."
 "Nothing in particular"

Edinburgh:

"Enjoyed learning some of the facts although too much info was given"
 "Gaining information"
 "Info"
 "Understanding more about nuclear energy"
 "Learning more on the topic"
 "More knowledge = balanced views"
 "Knowing more on energy"
 "Information given out"
 "Learnt something"
 "Learning more"
 "More information"
 "Learning from the material and others in the group"
 "Information"
 "Gaining knowledge about energy"
 "To be more aware of the need of our own energy provision"
 "Presented a case that the government was making a plan for energy and shortage in the future and that they were concerned with climate change"
 "More aware and knowledgeable on energy supply"
 "Learning more, listening to the opinions of others"
 "I learnt something"
 "Learnt more on the topic"
 "I understand"
 "Awareness of issue"
 "I understand the issues more"
 "Gave me a chance to hear lots of different perspectives this in turn helped me to confirm my own views and beliefs"
 "Hearing the people's argument"
 "The intake of different points of view"
 "To hear so many different views and share views and understanding"
 "To hear so many opinions"
 "The interchange of views and opinions"
 "Meeting with others and hearing their views and comments"
 "Hearing the divergent points of view from a very mixed cross section of people from all over Scotland"
 "Hearing views of fellow participants"
 "Hearing others views"
 "To phase in discussion with others"
 "Meeting people with [vivid] views"
 "To hear others views and the videos were explicit"
 "Ability to put across views"
 "Hopefully having a say in energy production in the UK"
 "To publicly voice concerns"
 "I finally get to have my strong anti-nuclear opinions heard (I hope)"
 "Having a say in country wide policy regardless if it actually makes a change"
 "I have had a chance to have my opinions noted"
 "Fact I had my say"
 "Having my view shared"
 "Incentive and Input"
 "Having input and learning more about nuclear energy"
 "A better understanding of the benefits as opposed to the negatives of nuclear energy"

"Confirmation that the tough decision to go nuclear has been delayed too long, government painted itself into a corner"

"I now understand nuclear energy a lot more"

"Has given me a more insight to nuclear power"

"Learning more about nuclear energy"

"To understand about nuclear power and its effects"

"A clearer understanding of nuclear energy"

"More aware of nuclear energy"

"I now have an opinion on the whole situation"

"Made me think of issues"

"Sorting out my own views"

"Keen to be involved"

"Being asked opinions about important issues"

"None"

"It was an interesting day, I would like to do the same sort of thing again"

"Stimulating"

"Aerobics instructor"

"A day out"

"Got some exercise"

"How information received"

"Open discussion"

"Good to debate the bigger issues"

"Seeing how government can get views from individuals"

"Meeting other people and gaining an insight into how this process of decision"

Exeter:

"The information was excellent but I would have liked to know more about the alternatives"

"Clarified my thinking"

"A greater awareness of such an important subject – one that I hadn't really thought about I am ashamed to say!"

"Becoming informed"

"Now better informed"

"Clarifying my thinking"

"Greater awareness of energy mix"

"What I learnt"

"I became more informed, but wary of no information on research funding for natural sources and alternatives to waste storage"

"Gaining info about an important issue we wouldn't otherwise have got"

"Learning more on such important issues. Mixing with everyone"

"Better knowledge"

"Knowing a lot more"

"Finding out more info"

"For the info"

"I am now more informed on a subject I knew little about"

"Useful to hear about a usually unfamiliar topic"

"See how this is all done"

"Learning"

"Knowledge of what's going on in the future world of energy"

"To learn more about energy for the future"

"Made me understand more"

"I gained more knowledge than I held previously"

"Just able to understand a little more about change"

"Learnt more about the UK and its energy use"

"Learning the importance of this issue"

"Educational"

"Made me think"

"To air my views"

"I gained knowledge"

"Awareness"

"I learnt a lot"

"Education on this issue"

"I learnt a lot of information on the subject"

"Knowledge for future"

"To find the way others thought on the subject of power"

"Discussion sessions and hearing others opinions"

"Social and subject discourse"

"Meeting new people and talking about the issues"

"Learning about other people's views"

"Hearing views opposed to mine"

"Listening to other people's views"

"Interesting to hear other people's views, the fee for attending"

"Meeting people and open discussion"
 "Interaction and the views of others"
 "Being able to hear others' feelings on this subject"
 "Getting personal feelings about nuclear energy across and minuted "
 "Had a chance to air my views"
 "Giving my point of view"
 "To air my personal views and expand my knowledge of nuclear energy"
 "Getting my views across the others"
 "Having a say! (maybe)"
 "Putting my views forward and talking"
 "Having a say"
 "It was nice to have a say"
 "Being able to have a say"
 "I got to have my say, even though I do not agree with building new nuclear power stations"
 "Have a much clearer understanding of what nuclear power is"
 "Learning more about nuclear power"
 "Broader outlook on nuclear and renewable energy sources"
 "Reducing CO2 emissions. What impact nuclear power can have on reducing emissions"
 "Learning more about nuclear fuels, peace of mind on some topics"
 "Learning about nuclear power"
 "Ability to (hopefully) contribute to future occasions on energy"
 "Opportunity to influence government policy – maybe!"
 "To contribute on information hopefully for future generations"
 "Public service about an important issue"
 "Very interesting"
 "Getting something back from the government"

Leicester:

"Education, learning more about an important issue. Communication skills, meeting and debating with new and interesting people"
 "Learning and opportunity to find out more afterwards with own research"
 "Understanding a little bit more on this very important subject"
 "I feel a lot more informed on nuclear power"
 "Enlightenment"
 "Learning more about energy production and its future"
 "Learning about effect on climate change and possible options"
 "Learnt about some things I didn't know"
 "What I learnt"
 "Greater understanding of climate change and impact"
 "I learnt a lot"
 "Increased understanding"
 "Better understanding of energy requirements"
 "Given me a broad idea about energy"
 "More knowledge"
 "The information handouts"
 "To get more information from the government and the people round the table"
 "Learning new information"
 "Learning new stuff. Confidence has been boosted"
 "More information"
 "To know more about electricity and how we will get it"
 "Becoming more informed of aspects of the issue"
 "Learnt a great deal about the issue and other issues related to this topic"
 "Got wider information about the topic"
 "Acquiring new knowledge"
 "Awareness"
 "I learnt things that I didn't know about before and found different views interesting and helpful"
 "Learning"
 "Information"
 "Understanding more about where our energy comes from"
 "It has made me realise the importance of energy"
 "Gained more knowledge about the subject"
 "Knowledge"
 "It made me think"
 "I can talk now more freely about this matter"
 "Learnt something new"
 "Education on the said subject"
 "Getting information, listening to the views of others"
 "It increased my knowledge of subject"
 "Gave me more of an idea"
 "Knowledge of the subject"

"To find out more info"
 "Making me aware of the issues"
 "It was an eye opener!"
 "Learning more about it"
 "More awareness"
 "Making available pertinent facts"
 "Becoming more aware of the effects of nuclear energy"
 "To now understand the implications of nuclear energy"
 "Learning about nuclear energy and how it's needed"
 "Learning more about nuclear energy"
 "Learning more about nuclear energy"
 "Understanding nuclear power"
 "To fully understand the subject of nuclear"
 "Hearing some things about nuclear that I didn't know"
 "Getting to know more about nuclear power"
 "Learning new aspects of nuclear fuel"
 "The knowledge gained about nuclear energy"
 "More insight into nuclear subject"
 "I know more about nuclear power"
 "I am more aware of nuclear/energy issues in this country"
 "Increased my understanding for nuclear power"
 "Meeting people"
 "I have enjoyed the arguments and meeting new people"
 "Good listening to views of younger people"
 "Cross section on the table"
 "Hearing others views"
 "Meeting other people and hearing their views"
 "Communication with others"
 "Hearing different people's views"
 "Thought provocation and interaction with diverse members of the public"
 "I have enjoyed the discussion and meeting people"
 "Meeting other like minded people"
 "Have a wide spectrum of views and opinions"
 "Listening to what other people had to say"
 "Hearing others views and discussing with people outside my area"
 "Meeting other people and hearing their views"
 "Meeting other people, hearing different views"
 "Very interesting meeting different people"
 "Meeting so many nice people who came"
 "Group discussion"
 "Feeling important enough to be asked and listened to"
 "Being able to contribute my views and feeling that in some small way my views are benefiting society"
 "That some of my views may be taken on board and that government may take notice"
 "Getting views across"
 "I feel I have been given a chance to voice disquiet, although not sure if it will make any difference"
 "I have a strong opinion about nuclear power which I feel is important"
 "Feeling that I am important and my views count"
 "Having a say"
 "Having the chance to put my views"
 "To put forward my view"
 "Having a say in the future"
 "Just to have a say"
 "Being involved"
 "To give my opinion"
 "To be involved and to hopefully help make a difference"
 "Having a say in my grandchildren's future"
 "Had the right to give my opinion and have a better understanding of nuclear energy"
 "To have my say"
 "Public consultation"
 "Making my opinion count"
 "To have my opinion presented to government"
 "Being involved with public discussion"
 "Taking part"
 "Being involved"
 "To be involved and to hopefully help make a difference"
 "Having a say in my grandchildren's future"
 "None"
 "None"
 "I was. Don't know any thing about it"
 "An interesting day"

"I found it interesting and enjoyable"
"The hideous realisation that nuclear energy generation is to be left in the hands of the greedy capitalists!"

Liverpool:

"Expanding my knowledge"
"It has given me cause for thought"
"Enlightenment"
"Finding out new facts"
"Now knowing about the energies"
"It has swayed my original view"
"I was able to see the government's stance clearly and understand its reasoning"
"Made me think carefully about my personal responsibility regarding energy consumption"
"There seemed to be a consensus within the group that we all need to do more on an individual basis to lower our carbon footprints"
"I have learnt quite a lot about the current information regarding climate change and the estimated figures"
"Awareness of personal attitude to saving energy"
"Finding out about the obscene amount of carbon emissions created in this country"
"I learnt that power stations emit less carbon than I thought. I was pleased to be invited to have my say"
"Received more information"
"Enabling myself to learn more about the climate and issues with the role of energy"
"It made me think about the looming energy crisis"
"Added to the knowledge pot"
"More information than I had before"
"That I am now more informed of the facts than I was prior to the event"
"Information"
"Information"
"Understanding the effects of government energy"
"That maybe I will take the issues of climate change and its risk a lot more seriously than I did the day before. Its quite an eye opener"
"The well informed information put together in an easily digestible manner"
"To find out how this sort of consultation works was very interesting and the interaction with others was beneficial"
"Learning and contributing"
"It has made me think a lot more about energy and how it is made and used"
"More informed now"
"It opened my eyes up to the day to day issues we face"
"Learnt a lot about energy and how it is produced and what waste it makes. Increased knowledge"
"Greater insight"
"I learnt more about the subject although it didn't really change my mind"
"To be better informed about the issues"
"Very informative"
"Enabled me to understand nuclear energy and the pros and cons to nuclear energy. I was pleased to hear that the CO2 emissions were so low for nuclear energy"
"I learned a lot about nuclear energy, also other people's views about it"
"The most important benefit was that I am more aware of the advantages and disadvantages of nuclear energy"
"Finding out the government's plans for nuclear power"
"Learning so much about nuclear energy"
"Learning more about energy and nuclear power"
"Learning more about nuclear energy"
"To receive a greater understanding of nuclear energy"
"I have learnt a lot about nuclear energy"
"To know a bit more information about NE for the safe future for my children and theirs"
"A greater understanding of nuclear energy"
"Educating me on issues of nuclear energy"
"Learning about nuclear energy"
"Giving my views and learning about nuclear energy"
"Finding out more about nuclear power and about its waste etc"
"Ability to feel like I have some (small) contribution in such a major decision"
"Contribution to government thinking and potential impact to future decision making"
"Felt I was making a difference in this key issue. PLEASE NO nuclear power, it is a time bomb. Energy meters for all but use excellent PR to introduce it. I'll help you, I'm a PR expert!"
"That I along with other members of the public were able to take part"
"A chance to discuss a very important topic"
"Learning a bit more, feeling I've tried to make a difference to my country"
"Feeling that my views were important"
"Good to have a say on very important issue such as this"
"Being able to hear other opinions on nuclear energy and its future"
"I have learned a lot about the issues and different people's opinions"
"Hearing all the views"
"Hearing other points of view"

"Getting to know each other, real people's views on the matter, getting out of the house and discussing an important matter"
"I like to meet people. I like to share my views"
"To try to have my opinion heard, whether or not it is taken into account"
"Expressing my opinions and listening to other peoples' whilst getting a feel for the general public consensus on nuclear power"
"That my opinions were listened to"
"Getting across the importance of climate change effect on our children's / grandchildren's lives"
"To speak my mind"

London:

"I've become more conscious about the way I use energy"
"To look closely at a subject which I would normally pass over"
"New information regarding energy issues"
"Knowing what's going on"
"Learnt more than I knew before. Now feel more informed. Good to participate in the consultation"
"Educating myself on such an important subject"
"Learning the danger and drawbacks of the disadvantages for the future generation"
"Increase in knowledge"
"Being more informed"
"Knowledge"
"Making me more aware of the need to act now to secure energy for the future"
"Clarity"
"Enlightening the way questions can be manipulated towards a biased answer"
"To become more informed"
"An insight to views and future"
"To attain a knowledge of the subject"
"General, but important awareness"
"Better understanding of the issues"
"Having no previous knowledge of energy supply etc. I have learnt a lot on different ways of supply"
"Opened my mind"
"I want to raise my understanding and action on these issues"
"Gaining a little more understanding of the problems we are facing in the future"
"Widening my knowledge of the subject"
"More information"
"Learning more, understanding, enjoying hotel and meeting"
"Knowledge"
"Learning about the future and power"
"Understand more"
"Far more informed"
"It informed me more on the issue"
"I was able to get more information about energy supply in the UK"
"Learning and enjoying everyone"
"Getting a better understanding"
"Knowledge"
"Organised my thoughts"
"Increased awareness"
"The knowledge obtained"
"Assessing my CO2 emissions and how I can cut down my footprint. Understanding what the government plans are for the future. This brought to light serious implications"
"Helped my understanding of the subject"
"Learning more about the crossroads this country is at in terms of future energy security"
"Increasing my awareness of the issues"
"Broaden my knowledge. Probably a CPD"
"Awareness, knowledge"
"Discussing complex issue with different people"
"Sharing opinions"
"Hearing other views. I am presently studying part time and it was good to see a real consultation as thus far it was only something I had heard about in lectures"
"Listening to other people's views and opinions"
"Listening to other opinions"
"Meeting new people, listening to varied opinions"
"Getting to know different opinions on the nuclear debate"
"Hearing others opinions. Contributing, getting my views heard. Good hospitality"
"Listening to other's views"
"Interesting discussion on an important topic"
"Discussing my views and listening to those of others"
"Meeting other people and hearing their views"
"People's views and good decision making"
"I hear different views"

"Hearing other's views"

"Learning of the benefits of nuclear energy and that the government is looking ahead"

"Understanding nuclear power"

"A knowledge of nuclear power"

"To understand the implications of nuclear energy"

"Learnt a lot about dangers of nuclear energy and how we waste energy"

"Increased my knowledge about energy sources and about government views regarding building nuclear power stations"

"Have to think about nuclear power more! (should)"

"Increased knowledge in the nuclear industry"

"Finding out a lot more about nuclear energy"

"I have learnt a great deal about nuclear energy and will take this knowledge back to my primary school"

"Learning more about benefits/disadvantages of nuclear energy"

"Awareness that nuclear power stations have contributed already for half century"

"Awareness of nuclear power CO2 emissions, global warming"

"Learning about nuclear power"

"I have learnt so much more about nuclear power – great to also feel involved in any sort of decision making"

"Clarified my appreciation of nuclear energy"

"Made more aware of nuclear issue"

"Talking to others and being able to express my views"

"Chance to personally have our say"

"Having my say!"

"Putting across a younger point of view. Money"

"To be able to express my views"

"To express my views and discuss the future of nuclear energy"

"Great to learn more and have my say on such an important topic"

"Having a say on important decision"

"Allowing my views and ideas to be heard"

"Making sure my opinion was taken into consideration. Crystallising my views on the subject and hopefully overturning a needless, expensive and distracting nuclear build"

"Having my say"

"I have the opportunity to take part in this kind of event in my life"

"The taking part"

"I would like to think we can all make a difference"

"Hopefully participating in decision making"

"Realising I am able and have the knowledge to take part in interesting debate"

"It has helped to widen my knowledge and given me opportunity to air my views. Democracy still exists"

"Feeling that I am contributing to an important national issue"

"It was good to get involved"

"Taking part – despite not being sure if it will mean anything"

"A feeling of involvement in future issues that effect the country"

"Feeling involved"

"Involvement"

"Stimulation, sense of involvement"

"A day off, stimulating debate and the chance to influence the government"

"Stimulating conversation about a very important subject"

"Feeling involved even if I'm kidding myself"

"Having the opportunity to be involved, learning more about the issues and being invited to give my views"

"To feel part of decision making process"

"Hoping it will have an impact on the future"

"Opportunity to contribute"

"Being involved in the democratic process"

"Cash and doughnuts"

"The money"

"Financial"

"The money"

"The money"

"The meeting of the participants"

"Meeting others"

"Meeting other people from other ages and professions"

"None"

"Spreading the word about depleted uranium (DU) – a massive war crime!"

"Enjoyed the day"

"Enjoyable day out"

Newcastle:

"I feel very much more aware"

"Learning more about the issue"

"I learned a lot and will continue to consider these issues"

"Educating me on the seriousness of the energy crisis and global climate change"

"Feeling the issues were clearer in my mind"
 "It was a new experience which has created an interest in an important topic"
 "Sociable and informative"
 "Forced to consider this important area and investigate and question my initial opinions"
 "It gave me a lot more information on things I knew nothing about"
 "Better informed on certain aspects"
 "Understanding the energy crisis"
 "Insight"
 "I have I learned more about our future in terms of energy source and self sufficiency"
 "It has opened my eyes to global issues more"
 "Develop my understanding of the subject and gain a better understanding of public consultation process"
 "Thought more on subject"
 "Learning more about govs. consultation process"
 "Making me more aware of energy and power overall"
 "Getting information. Having opportunity to discuss it with people!"
 "Clarification of a subject about which I knew very little"
 "Think about things"
 "To learn more"
 "Learning about energy"
 "Gaining a deeper understanding of energy provision and how it is divided"
 "I learnt a lot"
 "Increased personal knowledge. Felt I had a say"
 "Feel I understand some of the issues more and could enter into future debates"
 "Knowledge about energy"
 "Finding more information into an important issue"
 "Broadened information and view"
 "To review the issues on this important policy decision"
 "Understanding more about energy, listening to others' views and feelings on nuclear power"
 "Increased knowledge in the area"
 "Educational"
 "The info"
 "Gaining information and giving point of view"
 "Very informative on most subjects"
 "Learning more"
 "More information 2nd generation nuclear power plant"
 "To understand a lot of points I did not know before"
 "New information"
 "A chance to voice various concerns I've had for some time, and hopefully have been listened to"
 "Felt like I was consulted. Clarified my thinking. Considered others' positions"
 "Never done anything like this before – privileged to be able to do something exciting and different"
 "I enjoyed taking part and feeling involved on such an important issue"
 "Feeling part of it"
 "Nice to have been asked"
 "Visiting Newcastle. Feeling involvement"
 "Overall public input"
 "Feeling that I was welcome to contribute in a national debate. It has proved an educational and enjoyable experience"
 "Future generations of my family"
 "The sense of being involved is always important in my country"
 "To feel part of what happens in the future, and that no one from any walk of life was exempt"
 "Seeing democracy in action"
 "Involvement"
 "Participating in the democratic process"
 "Chance to discuss an issue I probably would not have discussed in as much detail"
 "Feeling of respect"
 "Chance to participate"
 "My opinion was considered"
 "Realising that government takes notice of public views"
 "Hearing people's views"
 "Hearing the views of so many other people"
 "Listening to other people's views"
 "To listen to the tables' views and questions raised from the floor"
 "Listening to everyone's view"
 "Finding out what others think"
 "Hearing the views of other people"
 "To hear other people's views and share knowledge"
 "Learning other people's views and more information on nuclear power"
 "A good selection of viewpoints"
 "Listening to others' views and helping me to form my own"
 "Interesting views of different people"

"Knowledge of nuclear power and the way we use power"
 "Finding out more about our nuclear situation"
 "Gained knowledge about electricity/nuclear energy"
 "I now have a firmer view on nuclear power"
 "I have been given more insight to nuclear power than I had before coming to the event"
 "Learning about nuclear power"
 "Improved knowledge of nuclear power"
 "Finding out about nuclear energy"
 "I'd had no prior knowledge before on nuclear power"
 "To find out about the government's thoughts on NP"
 "Learning more about nuclear energy"
 "The chance to put my views forward in a palpable way"
 "Want the future people to know how I felt when they deal with our waste"
 "I had my input into an important topic"
 "Your opinion"
 "Having a say"
 "That the government may listen to my views"
 "Sharing my opinions"
 "Meeting other members of the group"
 "Very nice meeting new people and I feel a little more informed about nuclear power and now very much against"
 "Meeting like minded people"
 "None"
 "None"
 "All"
 "The experience"
 "Interesting experience"
 "My interest in our energy"
 "Further enhance my view that the government only has economic interest in mind and lacks transparency"

Norwich:

"To become more informed after the event"
 "Learn about energy"
 "Gained more information about issues involved"
 "More information"
 "It has forced me to think about nuclear energy and its risks to the public, and I am now aware that I need to ask my MP to vote against it"
 "Understanding consultation procedure"
 "Increased personal understanding of the issues and dilemmas facing the government"
 "Learning about something new and of serious importance"
 "Gather more information"
 "Having all the information all in front of me"
 "A better understanding"
 "I understand more"
 "A better understanding of what was said"
 "Gaining knowledge"
 "Gain a more balanced view, consideration of other issues"
 "To learn more about NP"
 "Learning about things I haven't even thought about"
 "I learnt about nuclear power. I also learnt that the government could do more to promote wind farms and solar"
 "Acquiring knowledge"
 "I learnt a lot"
 "New knowledge on these issues"
 "Understanding, discussing my views"
 "Finding out more about the topic and hope that the government use the info"
 "Information"
 "A learning curve. Also good to be in group discussion on the serious issues"
 "For me to gain more knowledge about nuclear power and listening to different views"
 "I learnt more about nuclear energy"
 "Raised arguments, feeling of involvement"
 "To be able to participate"
 "Discussion, participation"
 "Being involved"
 "To feel that I may have helped to make a slight difference"
 "Feel like I am contributing to national discussions and decisions. To consider in depth and more seriously the issues and nuclear crisis"
 "Feeling that I contributed"
 "To find out that I have an opinion that counts"
 "Helping to give a view"
 "I'm always interested in public affairs which will affect me and the future"
 "Political participation. Meeting an interesting, knowledgeable person"

"Gaining access to other people's views"
 "Talking to people about problems that I find of supreme importance"
 "Listening to other people"
 "Exchange of ideas"
 "Realising everyone had similar attitudes to the concerns over nuclear power/stations"
 "My views are aired"
 "A voice"
 "To get my views across"
 "It confirmed my original thoughts"
 "I enjoyed the day"
 "It reinforced the views that I already had"
 "First time I've ever taken part in such an event"
 "Try to save energy"

12 Is there anything else you would like to add?

Comment analysis (282 comments)

- no / nothing (93)
- thanks / enjoyable / informative / interesting (80)
- wanted more information on alternatives / renewables / other options (25)
- there should be more events like this / I'd like to do this again (16)
- depressed / worried / disappointed (5)
- too repetitive (5)

All comments (except comments of "none" and "N/A" which are counted as above)

Belfast:

"Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this enjoyable and educational day. I would like the opportunity to participate in this type of event again"
 "First class event, compliments to organisers"
 "An enjoyable day with an excellent facilitator"
 "Very enjoyable"
 "The facilitator was very pleasant and controlled the table well"
 "Very good day"
 "I enjoyed the event very much"
 "More information should have been given beforehand in order to make decisions"
 "Need to provide facts up front"
 "Nuclear power expert in attendance"
 "Day could be more condensed"
 "I hope all options of energy will be considered openly and honestly to benefit the next generation"
 "Would like to hear others' opinions and information"
 "My first time involved in discussions like this. I have gained confidence"
 "Would come again"

Cardiff:

"I enjoyed this event more than expected"
 "Many thanks for the invitation"
 "Thanks, good day"
 "Good day, informative, felt I have made a contribution and had my say"
 "Can I come again?"
 "I'd come again"
 "It appears the government decision has been made"
 "A question and answer from professionals"
 "I would like more info on other fields"
 "I don't like wind farms I think they are a waste of time and energy. They destroy our countryside with little benefit"
 "Consider solar panels and geothermal energy for domestic use please!"

Edinburgh:

"Enjoyable experience – but could have been done in several sessions"
 "Very interesting talks"
 "Thought very well run and presented, and excellent table facilitated. Think group should have been told why green groups did not wish to participate"
 "It was an informative day, fun and highly educational"
 "My thanks to all who worked to make the event run smoothly"

"The government should have provided info on renewables and consumer reduction"
"Not enough argument for renewables"
"Everything humanly possible should be done to keep the IMH and if something nuclear goes wrong – be open with the public"
"Concern about the way a lot of the questions were worded"
"A feeling of actually being involved"
"Some of us were concerned that the nuclear stations and subsequently waste are/will be in the hands of the private sector"
"Would like a demographic breakdown of the info, e.g. Scotland, Wales etc."
"The facts and statements were not verified"
"There definitely needs to be the same event about other energy sources"

Exeter:

"Thank you so much for enabling me to take part in this event, I have thoroughly enjoyed it."
"When can I attend another one?"
"Enjoyable"
"Greatly enjoyable and very informative"
"A well run event"
"The day was well organised and enjoyable"
"Enjoyed it very much"
"Excellent day, many thanks"
"Very informative"
"A good, but long day. Met some nice people! Actually had some laughs too!"
"Good company, nice day"
"Thoroughly enjoyable, a interesting way to spend a day!"
"Very organised event"
"The facilities are excellent, would have liked some help towards the petrol"
"Why were private transport costs not included - if I travelled by train I would be re-imbursed"
"Fee for attendance but this had to include travel expenses"
"The result of the last question we were asked was in favour of the government asking energy companies to invest in nuclear energy which I do not feel the feedback of groups reflected"
"Some of the questions on voting were a little loaded"
"I feel decisions have already been made"

Leicester:

"Thank you"
"Very good – enjoyed it a lot"
"Thanks"
"Thanks for invitation"
"It was fantastic"
"Good venue, well done!"
"Thanks, I had a nice day"
"No thanks"
"No thanks"
"Thank you"
"Staff at the hotel were extremely helpful"
"It's been a most interesting and rewarding day"
"Very enjoyable day, very interesting"
"Worthwhile"
"Great conducting, really well and would be happy to participate again"
"Well presented and educating"
"Information on alternative sources of power was not available"
"Would have liked to have heard more about Green lobby's alternatives"
"It was a pity that others not pro nuclear were not represented but you did your best to represent them in their absence"
"I feel there should have been more info on other energy sources"
"Please no private sector involvement. Forget profits. LIVES are at stake!"
"Why use private industry. The government should own the stations"
"Nuclear waste is a long term issue and should be given the respect it deserves. One mistake would be catastrophic and you are proposing to put commercial enterprise in charge of our long term safety – safety will diminish if there is pressure on profits"
"I think I feel I need more time to digest everything that I've learnt. I would like to make comments on the websites etc when I've had a chance to do this"
"It is reassuring that the government has taken the time to consult the people"
"Why doesn't the government build the nuclear power stations"
"Use renewables please"
"Don't go nuclear"
"It would be interesting to know how everyone was chosen for this event"
"I look forward to seeing the overall comments and conclusions drawn from around the country"

Liverpool:

"People involved in the consultation seemed unanimous that they want to see renewable energy as a way forward"
"Renewable energy e.g. solar, wind, wave, are the only renewable and therefore reliable energy sources."
"Poorly worded questions, very ambiguous"
"I'd like the government to look at all sources of energy before it commits itself to nuclear power, e.g. hydrogen, hydroelectric, wind, geothermal etc"
"I would like the government to invest more money on funding our other solutions of providing energy rather than going ahead with nuclear energy"
"I think a lot more research should be done into other possible methods of producing energy with low carbon emissions"
"Don't let the government forget the need for renewable energy"
"I feel that the government has already made its decision. Why no mention of geo thermal energy?"
"Both sides of the subject would have been more helpful"
"An extremely enjoyable, thought provoking day"
"Worthwhile day"
"I'd like to just thank everyone who made it possible for me to participate today. I've learned a lot and also enjoyed the experience"
"Thank you to all involved for a great day"
"Very good"
"Now they've done a mixed selection should do a younger group as the future generation are the younger generation – making it more appealing by doing brainstorms and creative activities than just table discussions, ie debates"
"More younger contributors"
"I enjoyed the session and would be more than happy to participate in a similar event in the future"
"Would be willing to take part in future events"
"More research needed"
"I think it is very important to involve the public"
"It needs to be more heavily advertised to the public"
"Nuclear power? No thanks!"
"Whilst I have signed a consent form for photography/filming I don't recall being told about this beforehand"
"Great facilitator"
"Scrap paper for notes would have been useful"
"Far too many handouts, could have been condensed a little, not time to read them"
"Educate the public. Please send feedback in the post"
"The lady taking down our views, I feel she didn't take down her notes properly. I also feel she is not well trained. Also she moves onto the next question/point before even consulting us on what exactly she has written. Furthermore I read what she wrote and failed to answer the question and didn't bother to take proper notes on what the people think. She doesn't talk clear enough and talks too low"

London:

"Good day, very informative"
"I really enjoyed the day! And am really surprised by that!"
"Thanks"
"Good idea. But how much did it cost?"
"Thank you very much for a nice day"
"Excellent idea, excellent event, needs fine tuning and to be more inclusive to be really worthwhile"
"Very enjoyable"
"A fantastic event and great opportunity to debate and discuss important events"
"I really enjoyed the meeting, thank you"
"Enjoyed participating"
"I will add that it's been a wonderful day"
"Uplifting way to run an event such as this"
"I was glad to be involved"
"I did not know at first why I was invited as I have no understanding of the subject – but I am glad I came to the conference"
"Government should do more of this type of seminar"
"I would like to have more chances like this"
"I'd like to do it again!"
"I would love to get involved in this kind of forum in the future. UK government has shown us that they value people's opinions"
"I would rather want to be a part of future consultation"
"I'd like to see more of these events. Well done!"
"I'd like to be asked again!"
"Need for more accent on development of alternative renewable energy"
"More research and finance in renewables – its there and free for life"
"I want a similar presentation on renewable energy"
"Invest now in renewables, make the companies invest, do a bond issue, anything. Do not waste an opportunity like this to maintain a wasteful status quo. Educate the public on all sides and follow their lead, not the stakeholder vested interests"
"Please look into new technology and new energy. Educate people"
"I disagree to go for developing nuclear energy"

"No nuclear power"
"More of this issue of public concern should be given to the public to debate upon"
"Pretty OK"
"I would like to be able to watch government answering some questions"
"International! Waste is an international global issue"
"Too tightly structured – open debate is more personal"
"The government needs to think very seriously about the destruction of rainforests, wildlife etc. if it should ever approve biofuels (esp. palm oil use)"
"I think the government have already decided and this was a bit of a waste of time"
"There could have been a mini amp so you could hear others"
"There should be a public referendum"

Newcastle:

"Thank you for giving me the opportunity to participate and for providing nice accommodation"
"Very informative"
"Thanks for the opportunity"
"Our facilitator (Alisa McNasnee) was very pleasant and helpful"
"Our table facilitator, Anne, was great and made some of the topics interesting and delivered the information well"
"The event was well organised"
"Good idea"
"Very good day. Thank you"
"Thank you"
"Thank you"
"Good day"
"A more balanced view would have credited a more balanced conclusion. By that I mean more information on other options"
"It would have been good to have a nuclear expert and an economist to quiz"
"Provide more balanced options"
"Alternatives were conspicuously omitted. All contributions should add to the whole"
"Felt government picked up on 2 biggest issues in press: Iraq and climate change. To gain public approval on nuclear took these two issues and did the appropriate SPIN, what about renewables?"
"Decision can only be made when considered in conjunction with what is realistic and possible with regard to reduction of energy consumption and ability of renewables to provide alternative source – I need this info"
"I would have liked some more information regarding other sources of supply e.g. wind farms etc"
"More information"
"Would like to be asked again"
"Another conference should be held on renewable energy sources"
"I would like to be updated on this event and its outcome, and if further consultation is necessary (and debate) the same people are invited back, as now we have more knowledge"
"I feel an opportunity for a FULL discussion about this has been missed – and feel anxious that it is too important to allow this to slip by"
"I go away depressed and disappointed"
"Quite concerned that we do not have a long term plan for storing waste currently"
"I look forward to living in my nuclear powered home and explaining the failures of my generation to solve climate change"
"Snap judgement required therefore unreliable results. Grave subject needs informed reflection"
"The event did seem directed to repeat questions until we would allow nuclear power stations"
"Repetitive towards end"
"The questions and discussions are repetitive and narrow in scope"
"USA needs to follow our lead in reducing CO2"
"Concerned about how info/stats from event could be used and distorted by gov."
"The staff and venue was lovely and it's unfortunate that the government has already decided"
"Venue: room not big enough, too noisy at times, couldn't hear. Arrive at 8.15 – no refreshments till 9?"
"If there was a debate"

Norwich:

"Thank you"
"Enjoyed the day – a lot better than I expected too"
"A well structured day. Great table facilitator. I hope these opportunities will shape more future policy and will be organised in more time in future to ensure government decisions have not already been made and the day results in mere lip service"
"Good event, enjoyed it"
"Consultation was about 45-60 minutes too long and there was a lot of repetition"
"Could have been done in a shorter time, I felt a lot of repetition"
"Pity the opposition groups did not attend to voice their opinion and the rationale behind them"
"I am very disappointed that Greenpeace et al chose not to come. It has made me less sympathetic to their views"
"They had more older than younger people which I found unfair"
"Will be interested in the findings of all groups in the UK"
"The design of the day was very badly done. The facilitator was very good"
"Should have had more about renewable alternatives!"

"Would be happy to take part in similar events"
 "Public consultation is a good idea – but need wider education and consultation"
 "I fear we have been wasting our time"

About the participants

13 Gender

	Male	Female
Belfast	31 (43%)	39 (54%)
Cardiff	43 (51%)	37 (44%)
Edinburgh	41 (45%)	46 (51%)
Exeter	40 (48%)	39 (47%)
Leicester	73 (52%)	66 (47%)
Liverpool	37 (49%)	38 (51%)
London	71 (48%)	74 (50%)
Newcastle	68 (49%)	68 (49%)
Norwich	31 (40%)	42 (54%)
Combined result	435 (48%)	449 (49%)

14 Age

	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-65	Over 65
Belfast	10 (14%)	9 (13%)	15 (21%)	15 (21%)	8 (11%)	13 (18%)
Cardiff	10 (12%)	11 (13%)	15 (18%)	12 (14%)	22 (26%)	10 (12%)
Edinburgh	10 (11%)	17 (19%)	13 (14%)	14 (15%)	18 (20%)	16 (18%)
Exeter	5 (6%)	8 (10%)	16 (19%)	15 (18%)	17 (20%)	18 (22%)
Leicester	19 (14%)	18 (13%)	25 (18%)	25 (18%)	26 (19%)	23 (16%)
Liverpool	12 (16%)	13 (17%)	14 (19%)	14 (19%)	10 (13%)	11 (15%)
London	17 (11%)	25 (17%)	32 (21%)	29 (19%)	19 (13%)	23 (15%)
Newcastle	15 (11%)	23 (17%)	30 (22%)	18 (13%)	26 (19%)	24 (17%)
Norwich	10 (13%)	15 (19%)	11 (14%)	15 (19%)	10 (13%)	12 (15%)
Combined result	108 (12%)	139 (15%)	171 (19%)	157 (17%)	156 (17%)	150 (16%)

15 Would you describe yourself as:

	White British	White other	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Other
Belfast	57 (79%)	11 (15%)	-	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Cardiff	73 (87%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	-	-
Edinburgh	81 (89%)	3 (3%)	1 (1%)	-	1 (1%)
Exeter	76 (92%)	2 (2%)	-	1 (1%)	-
Leicester	120 (86%)	4 (3%)	9 (6%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Liverpool	64 (85%)	2 (3%)	4 (5%)	4 (5%)	1 (1%)
London	105 (70%)	15 (10%)	10 (7%)	9 (6%)	4 (3%)
Newcastle	127 (92%)	4 (3%)	1 (1%)	-	2 (1%)
Norwich	67 (86%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	-	2 (3%)
Combined result	770 (85%)	45 (5%)	29 (3%)	16 (2%)	12 (1%)

Annex 9: Public events observers

Evaluation questionnaire analysis

Workshops attended (8 September 2007): Belfast (1 respondent), Cardiff (2), Edinburgh (4), Exeter (5), Leicester (5), Liverpool (1), London (6), Newcastle (0), Norwich (3)

Total 28 participants; total 27 completed questionnaires returned (96%)

NB All percentages are calculated against the total number of questionnaires returned, and are shown to the nearest whole number.

1 How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Please tick ONE box in each line	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
There was enough time overall to fully discuss the issues properly	5 (18%)	14 (52%)	2 (7%)	5 (18%)	1 (4%)
The amount of time spent on each topic was fair and balanced	5 (18%)	14 (52%)	5 (18%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)
The way the meeting was run was fair and unbiased	10 (37%)	9 (33%)	5 (18%)	3 (11%)	0 (0%)
All the main issues were covered	10 (37%)	8 (29%)	4 (15%)	4 (15%)	1 (4%)
There was a good enough mix of people to get a diverse range of views	15 (55%)	7 (26%)	4 (15%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
The facilitators encouraged everyone to participate fully	10 (37%)	12 (44%)	4 (15%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
All participants were treated equally and respectfully	14 (52%)	13 (48%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
No single view on the issues was allowed to dominate unfairly	9 (33%)	12 (44%)	3 (11%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)
The purpose of the event was made clear to participants	14 (52%)	10 (37%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)
The way the results of this event will be used was made clear	7 (26%)	11 (41%)	6 (22%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)
The level of influence this event will have on the Government's decision was made clear to participants	5 (18%)	8 (29%)	11 (41%)	3 (11%)	0 (0%)
The way this event fits into the wider public consultation on nuclear power was made clear to participants	7 (26%)	11 (41%)	5 (18%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)
I think the Government will listen to and consider the public's views	8 (30%)	7 (26%)	9 (33%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)

Comment analysis

- materials / presentations problematic / biased / Government view dominated (7)
- some facilitators could have done more to encourage participants (2)

All comments

"I am unsure that ethnic minorities were proportionately represented and would be interested in seeing this investigated statistically" (Leicester)

"Some facilitators were very good at bringing in passive participants but not all of them" (Leicester)

"I certainly felt that one particular side of the debate was championed and not all sides were really represented. This may not have been purposeful but I felt that participants picked up on this." (Leicester)

"Facilitators should not be taking notes as they could not concentrate on facilitation. Need separate note takers." (Edinburgh)

"Some facilitators could have done more to engage all participants" (Exeter)

"A missed opportunity to have a rounded debate. Videos were biased" (London)

"Participants were not shown or given sufficient information on alternatives to nuclear power" (Edinburgh)

"Although clearly an honest attempt @ deliberative democracy, seems to be flawed through problematic information presentation and too short time-frame" (London)

"Significant scepticism was expressed about data provided and Government perspective" (Edinburgh)

"Agenda too ambitious, attention and energy slowed towards last third. Government view dominated and farmed the whole event. Not sure why Government would take note since they seem so sure of their opinion" (Cardiff)

"The video [?] very supportive of a pro-nuclear position. Making clear that the Government 'already had a view' was very good" (London)

"Quite repetitive" (Exeter)

"The meeting was very effective in bringing together a large number of people and engaging them effectively in the questions. I thought the material was well presented and there was plenty of opportunity to discuss everything." (London)

"I have attended many Government consultation events. This event was by far the most balanced and thorough. It succeeded in getting a random set of the population to engage fully on all the issues regarding the future use of nuclear energy. There was plenty of time to discuss the major concerns of the participants" (Liverpool)

2 How important do you think it is for the Government to involve the public in discussing these sorts of issues?

Very important	Fairly important	Not very important	Not at all important
24 (89%)	3 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

3 What did you think of the information that was provided to the public for this event (information before the event, information sheets at the event, the video, answers to questions)?

Please tick ONE box in each line	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
The information provided covered the main different views on the issues	8 (30%)	10 (37%)	3 (11%)	3 (11%)	1 (4%)
The <u>way</u> the information was introduced to participants was fair and unbiased	10 (37%)	6 (22%)	3 (11%)	5 (18%)	2 (7%)
The information provided was fair and unbiased	8 (30%)	6 (22%)	6 (22%)	5 (18%)	1 (4%)
The information provided was accurate and reliable	8 (30%)	8 (30%)	6 (22%)	4 (15%)	0 (0%)
Participants seemed able to understand and use the information provided	5 (18%)	17 (63%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
There seemed to be enough information to enable participants to contribute fully	3 (11%)	12 (44%)	3 (11%)	4 (15%)	4 (15%)
Participants were given opportunities to ask questions to clarify anything they did not understand	5 (18%)	15 (56%)	4 (15%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)

Comment analysis

- not all facilitators could answer all questions from participants (3)
- shame Greenpeace / Friends of the Earth pulled out (2)
- honest attempt to present unbiased and balanced information (2)

- contested information was presented as fact (2)
- participants noticed / remarked on problems with the information (2)

All comments

"It is not universally true that all questions were answered. Probably facilitators could not answer every question" (Leicester)

"I believe some participants have unanswered questions and some have left the event with more questions than they arrived with. This should not be a surprise as having been given more information will prompt new questions" (Leicester)

"Still opinion being described as fact; sources unidentified" (London)

"Again - honest attempt, but clear problems with information and too little time to have any kind of discussion" (London)

"Did not see information presented to public" (Exeter)

"Facilitators didn't make enough use of 'experts' in the audience. Questions were left unanswered for some participants" (Edinburgh)

"Because I'm not an expert on the content it is difficult to judge the accuracy of the information. I think there was a genuine attempt to be unbiased and balanced" (Cardiff)

"Information that is contested e.g. energy demand, presented as inevitable" (London)

"Shame Greenpeace pulled out - although all views were covered, the lack of a Greenpeace video was remarked on" (Exeter)

"All the key facts were made available to the participants. Most participants seemed to feel very comfortable asking for any information they perceived to be missing. The views of Greenpeace and FoE seemed to be well represented in the material. Their untimely withdrawal from the process (the day before), seemed timed to undermine a very thoroughly researched event. It is disappointing that they withdrew from such a democratic process." (Liverpool)

"The handouts were poor. Too brief, simplistic and sketchy." (London)

4

What do you think about the influence that this event will have on Government? Please indicate below.

Please tick ONE box in each line	A great deal	Quite a lot	A bit	Not much	Not at all
To what extent do you think public views <u>should</u> influence Government's decision?	6 (22%)	17 (63%)	3 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
To what extent do you think public views <u>will</u> influence Government's decision?	1 (4%)	11 (41%)	9 (33%)	5 (18%)	0 (0%)

Comment analysis

- it is Government's job to lead (2)
- need balance between leadership by Government (with experts) and public input (2)

All comments

"There is clearly a balance between leadership by Government and popular acclaim. The public is the most reliable judge of 'moral' issues such as intergenerational risk" (Leicester)

"It is Government's job to lead, not blindly follow public opinion. Its important to carry the voters with policy" (Norwich)

"The public is key to success on CC [climate change]. The process should have been more straightforward wider" (London)

"Resolution to low-probability high-impact risks under conditions of scientific uncertainty is to weigh expert / everyday knowledge in order to gain a democratic means - the problem is what happens when real decisions are made before consultation process" (London)

"Government should be primarily influenced by 'informed' views across the spectrum. Public views are important but do not always have all the facts." (Cardiff)

"Future events must build capacity to go outside the 'room'" (London)

"The effects of climate change are not immediate and obvious in the day to day lives of individuals. It is therefore unlikely that the opinions from this event will fully reflect the challenge we face in mitigating climate change and this is an area in which the Government must show strong leadership." (Leicester)

"It is a shame that some organisations chose to withdraw from the process. To do so just the day before must have made it difficult to present their views accurately, but I think this was achieved very well by the organisers." (London)

"The national need for new electricity generating capacity and secure energy supplies in the future is a key issue. The need for such supplies from carbon free sources is crucial. The public views should not be outweighed by the extreme views of a very small number of outspoken protagonists." (Liverpool)

"As an observer I was there to watch the process. These questions are trying to elicit my personal view on how the Government might behave. I cannot express a view on that." (London)

5 How satisfied are you with the influence you feel this event will have on Government?

Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Not very satisfied	Not at all satisfied
8 (30%)	10 (37%)	8 (30%)	0 (0%)

Your views on the event

6 What are your views on the numbers of participants attending this event, and the mix of participants attending in terms of obtaining a diverse range of views?

Comments on the above

- good balance / OK / worked fine (20)
- black and minority ethnic groups missing (5)
- good number (5)

All comments

"The numbers [of participants] are impressive and sufficient. I heard a diverse range of views throughout the day" (Leicester)

"There was a good diverse range of views being expressed in the discussions" (Leicester)

"I think the number was good. I thought it strange that there were not that many from ethnic minority groups present, especially as the debate took place in Leicester. The mix of young and old was good. As was the mix of male and female." (Leicester)

"This aspect was fine. Few BME participants may well reflect 'rural' Wales but did not reflect Cardiff / Swansea" (Cardiff)

"Good mix of individuals. The numbers seem about right." (London)

"Good mix of age, gender, social class. Less sure on race, religion and sexuality - did not see any ethnic minority communities" (Edinburgh)

"Very balanced; a few self-appointed experts with strong, sometimes wildly incorrect views but they weren't able to sway the debate significantly." (Norwich)

"Well attended, good mix" (London)

"Without data - difficult to comment" (Edinburgh)

"Mix very good" (Edinburgh)

"OK" (London)

"Good cross-section" (Exeter)

"Very good - but lacked representation from ethnic minorities" (Edinburgh)

"Round table groups too large - poor audibility, not everyone able to contribute fully" (Cardiff)

"Very good. Although I think should have been demographic questions at the start" (London)

"Seemed fine" (Exeter)

"Very well attended and a good mix of people" (Exeter)

"Good number / mix" (Exeter)

"There seemed to be a wide range of participants" (Exeter)

"I felt the mix of participants could have been better. I felt there could have been more younger people" (Belfast)

"I believe there was a good mix of people from a range of backgrounds and diversity of views that enabled good discussion." (Leicester)

"The sampling was extremely well organised. It is important that a balanced view from this sample is heard. It is important to consult as widely as possible and to take a balanced view based on as wide a consensus as possible. It is important that the views of those who shout the loudest should not overrule others if they are not representative of the whole." (London)

"I have never attended an event where such careful attention has been paid to having a random and full mix of people from around the population. The widest spectrum of views was achieved." (Liverpool)

"The numbers and mix looked OK." (London)

7 What are your views on the timetable and process for the event, and the extent to which it was appropriate to the purpose of the event?

Comment analysis

- very competent / good structure / process (6)
- one day not enough for the issues / material covered (3)
- full day long enough / essential (3)
- it was a lot to fit in but that was done well (2)
- long day for some participants (2)
- good balance of time (2)

All comments

"The balance of information, discussion and feedback was well done. It was appropriate" (Leicester)
"I think a lot had to be fitted in and you did this well. If anything though, the day was very long and quite repetitive and the qualities of your later discussions may have suffered as a result" (Leicester)
"One day is a compressed time frame for a very complex issue. A 'reconvened' design where participants go away to reflect for a week before voting would be much better. Also the table facilitators struggled to present information, encourage deliberation and record views in one breath (task overload for many of them)." (Cardiff)
"Good process. Delegates enjoyed it. Those I questioned said they would take part in a similar process. They found it interesting and stimulating." (London)
"Good balance of time to all activities" (Edinburgh)
"Very competent process" (Norwich)
"Could have been done a lot better - more open whole system which participants noted ('where are the other options?')" (London)
"Event was extremely well executed" (Edinburgh)
"Perhaps too much material for one day" (Edinburgh)
"1 day is, quite simply, far far too short a time-frame" (London)
"Full day!" (Exeter)
"Excellent" (Edinburgh)
"Lack of scheduled comfort breaks meant the event suffered in the last third - people had lost concentration and were no longer fully involved or committed to the discussions. Room too crowded for comfort" (Cardiff)
"I don't know the Government objectives. It was good deliberative research" (London)
"Fit for purpose" (Exeter)
"All good" (Exeter)
"Good balance given difficult range of topics" (Exeter)
"Good" (Exeter)
"Timetable was OK, however it was a very long day for a number of participants" (Belfast)
"A full day event was sufficient to bring out the key issues." (Leicester)
"It was appropriate to use a whole day because the issues are so important." (London)
"The timetable was very good: devoting a full day to such an event at the weekend enabled a unique focus by participants on the issues" (Liverpool)
"The 'meat' was too thin. You should have supplied participants with better, more detailed information in advance and assumed they were at least familiar with it. You spent too much time leading up to the main business of the day. I think the 'pub quiz' was a mistake - it undermined the seriousness of the issues and patronised the participants." (London)

8 What did you think of the motivation, interest and commitment of the public participants?

Comment analysis

- very good / high level of interest and commitment (21)
- mixed / varied level (3)
- every effort made by facilitators to achieve this (3)

All comments

"The participants seemed engaged in the discussions and enthusiastic (Leicester)
"Most seemed genuine although there was some misinformation being used to guide discussions. Not sure if it was genuine or not" (Leicester)
"On the whole this as high. Later on though I think that people were getting tired. Perhaps 2 half day sessions may be worked better"(Leicester)
"V. good" (Cardiff)

"Good process. Delegates enjoyed it. Those I questioned said they would take part in a similar process. They found it interesting and stimulating." (London)

"Excellent! I have been extremely impressed by this throughout - put many 'paid' participants in other consultations to shame." (Edinburgh)

"They were clearly very interested and engaged" (Norwich)

"Good - all seemed to stay all day" (London)

"People were extremely well engaged" (Edinburgh)

"Very high involvement" (Edinburgh)

"Good" (London)

"Very good" (Exeter)

"Excellent" (Edinburgh)

"Very high level for the majority" (Cardiff)

"Excellent" (London)

"Participants were very interested and motivated including in the process" (Exeter)

"Very interested participants" (Exeter)

"Higher than I thought it would be" (Exeter)

"There seemed to be a high level of interest and tone was active discussion at the tables" (Exeter)

"Level of interest and commitment was high" (Belfast)

"I was very impressed with the knowledge motivation and interest of the participants and the facilitators did a good job in trying to engage all participants." (Leicester)

"There was a range of commitment, as should be expected from a random sample. However I thought the organisers did a good job in finding ways to present the information and promote dialogue." (London)

"The motivation, of course, varied depending of people's attitudes. However, every effort was made to fully engage the participants. Specific parts of the event eg the simulated pub quiz, raised great enthusiasm." (Liverpool)

"This was mixed. Some were very enthusiastic, some just there for the day out. So probably a reasonable cross section." (London)

9 What did you think of the quality of discussions among the public participants?

Comment analysis

- very good / high quality discussion (16)
- mixed / varied quality (5)
- hindered by lack of information (3)
- helped by facilitation (2)

All comments

"At times the participants struggled with lack of knowledge and information on specific issues, but this probably had little influence on discussion of the strategic issues" (Leicester)

"Varied considerably although most seemed reasonable" (Leicester)

"I got the feeling they were quite good. There was some transfer of misinformation within groups though. Also, some voices appeared to dominate at times which could have affected validity of conclusions" (Leicester)

"V. good" (Cardiff)

"Very good throughout." (Edinburgh)

"Mixed. Some tables were livelier than others but overall good quality discussions." (London)

"Generally good debate. Listening, learning, 'open-minded' debate for the most part" (Norwich)

"Good" (London)

"Due to the lack of full facts (only top level information was supplied) discussions could not be as fruitful as possible)" (Edinburgh)

"V. good" (Edinburgh)

"Good - but constrained by time and information provision and time to metabolise that information" (London)

"Generally good, surprisingly well informed on climate issues. Less so on energy" (Exeter)

"Excellent" (Edinburgh)

"Pretty good - people respected different opinions and asked questions when they needed more information to form a view" (Cardiff)

"Inhibited by a lack of information or time to read info in advance" (London)

"Very mixed"

"Good - although lots of myths (i.e. errors) were expressed with conviction by participants and taken as fact by their tables" (Exeter)

"High quality in main. Some confusion too" (Exeter)

"Lively, active and informed debate" (Exeter)

"I was very impressed with the knowledge motivation and interest of the participants and the facilitators did a good job in trying to engage all participants." (Leicester)

"While there was a range in the quality of contributions from the participants, the organisers made every effort to ensure everyone who attended had the opportunity to contribute effectively." (London)

"Again, there was a full range of qualities, depending on the knowledge and background of the participants."
(Liverpool)
"Very mixed" (London)

Costs and benefits of the event

10 What benefits (if any) did you gain personally or professionally from observing this event (If any)?

Comment analysis

- gained insight / heard public / grassroots views / public attitudes on the issues (11)
- learnt a lot about participatory processes (7)
- learnt generally (3)

All comments

"It gave me a good idea of what can be achieved and the limitations of the process"
(Leicester)
"Good opportunity to hear people who are not directly involved in the industry" (Leicester)
"It was my first event so I learnt a lot. Thanks for letting me observe." (Leicester)
"Research material on (a) event process (b) public attitudes to energy." (Cardiff)
"Useful for planning future events. Interesting that there was a general consensus." (London)
"Real knowledge of the key issues and sense of public feeling on nuclear power." (Edinburgh)
"Quite a surprise at how much climate issues are embedded in the public mind" (Norwich)
"Awareness of how a literal approach to a task and brief can fall short" (London)
"It was interesting to note how UK Government is conducting reviews" (Edinburgh)
"Might run an event like this in the future" (Edinburgh)
"Insight into public opinion and knowledge" (Exeter)
"Always useful to observe how others facilitate. Easy then to think how one could do things differently (better?).
Main observation was that the lead facilitator should say less" (Cardiff)
"Understand the process" (London)
"It was an education" (Exeter)
"A very good insight into the views and level of understanding of a cross section of the public" (Exeter)
"Gaining grassroots views and understanding qualifications" (Exeter)
"Very useful insight" (Exeter)
"I learnt more about nuclear power and options for use" (Belfast)
"It was very useful to hear the views of the participants first hand and understand some of the fundamental drivers that affect their attitudes towards energy production and use." (Leicester)
"It gave me the opportunity to hear the range of views and to understand the issues on which people need reassurance." (London)
"It was an excellent opportunity to listen to new views and attitudes. Being part of the wider energy industry we get used to hearing the same points made repeatedly by groups with vested interest in specific technologies."
(Liverpool)

11 In what ways did attending this event affect your views of public engagement (if any)?

Comment analysis

- valuable approach / saw benefits of participation (6)
- felt more positive about public engagement (5)
- most people were able to discuss the issues well (2)
- people need the right / more information to have productive discussions (2)

All comments

"Public engagement is very useful in informing communication strategies, it is not a means of decision making"
(Leicester)
"Providing the right information is important, and should not be presented in ways that distract people's conversation from the key issues" (Leicester)
"It was interesting to see how it all worked." (Leicester)

"Reinforced my belief that details of the design / process are critical to success." (Cardiff)
 "Confirmed my views that most people are intelligent and able to discuss issues intelligently and considerately." (London)
 "Has shown me the benefits of genuine representative public participation." (Edinburgh)
 "Hugely reassuring. Difficult complex issues well managed. Impossible to stimulate this level of debate via the media" (Norwich)
 "Reinforced the view that given the info, time to talk and think, groups of people can [?] reach a robust conclusion" (London)
 "Helps my thinking on this issue" (London)
 "Need to provide more info to public" (Exeter)
 "Impressed by lack of 'conflict' and professional way participants handled themselves. I'm much more positive about this type of engagement now." (Edinburgh)
 "I was impressed by the genuine attempt to give citizens an opportunity to become informed and then debate issues. Better than I expected" (Cardiff)
 "Thought this approach was valuable and was appreciated by the participants" (Exeter)
 "Very impressed" (Exeter)
 "It reinforced my view of the need to consult the public. A number of questions and concerns were raised for which answers and solutions exist and the event highlighted the areas where further information was required. It is dangerous to assume what the general public knows or doesn't know. There is a definite need to make information available and allow people to make their minds up." (Leicester)
 "It underlined my belief that public involvement is vital and can be done very well." (London)
 "It underlined my belief in the need for full and transparent debate on difficult issues; it was the most effective event I've seen." (Liverpool)
 "Not very much. Except I would not talk down to the public on difficult issues." (London)

Lessons for the future

12 Overall, what do you think worked best in the event you observed. Do you remember anything specific that worked well?

Comment analysis

- pub quiz (11)
- polling (2)
- small group / table discussions (2)

All comments

"The pub quiz and its [?] nature created engagement and caused tables to bond" (Leicester)
 "The pub quiz got people involved." (Leicester)
 "Pub quiz was a good ice-breaker" (London)
 "Quiz was v. well received." (Edinburgh)
 "Good engagement with a cross-section of Welsh society (except [BME representation])" (Cardiff)
 "The 'pub quiz' produced very good group engagement and lowered 'tension' and apprehension" (Norwich)
 "Table discussion" (London)
 "General friendly approach" (London)
 "On line polling worked well" (Exeter)
 "Mix of presentation, video, discussion and fun" (Edinburgh)
 "Pub quiz was a good way to engage everyone. Individual key pads for polling" (Cardiff)
 "Pub quiz. Voting" (London)
 "High quality, well run event that was kept to time" (Exeter)
 "Pub quiz. Break out and feedback" (Exeter)
 "All parts" (Exeter)
 "Facilitators at table worked well. I think the event was run very well. The voting mechanism kept everyone interested" (Belfast)
 "The pub quiz was very good. Overall the structure of the event worked quite well." (Leicester)
 "The pub quiz was effective in engaging some participants who may have been more reticent if the organisers had not made so much effort to include a range of devices to encourage debate." (London)
 "The 'pub quiz' worked very well." (Liverpool)

13 What do you think worked least well?

Comment analysis

- poor / too little / biased information provision (especially videos) (9)
- day too long / participants tired by end of afternoon (4)
- too much information to take in in the time / rushed (3)
- repetitive (3)
- difficult for participants to discuss pre-conditions (2)
- venue problems e.g. too noise, too cramped (2)

All comments

"Energy levels dropped as the day wore on. Another quiz (or something else) to break the rhythm may have helped" (Leicester)

"The length of the day and slightly repetitive nature. Also mixing up tables half way through may have generated a broader range of responses." (Leicester)

"Security of uranium supplies - could have emphasised both physical security and economic security - physical security through storage and economic given the low proportion the price of uranium is in final electricity price" (Leicester)

"Too rushed and as participants themselves noted the questions were structured to elicit particular answers.

Videos were slick but probably antagonised a large part of the audience. The materials overall did not answer the very questions that participants wanted answered." (Cardiff)

"A lot of information to digest at the start of discussions. Groups felt they were not being given the wider picture." (London)

"The videos were sometime a little facile. Overall there's a sniff of bias in the presentations - as perceived by the participants" (Norwich)

"The video (unbalanced even allowing for absences)" (London)

"Information provision. 1 day much much too short" (London)

"Room was very noisy - difficult to hear at times" (Exeter)

"No windows / natural light in the room" (Edinburgh)

"Afternoon programme became repetitive and many participants became tired and less involved. Hence, last session almost worthless. Lead facilitators summaries very poor and unhelpful. Video - use of BCC authority figure Anna Ford gave Government view too much credence and weight. Over ambitious in terms of amount of information conveyed in one day" (Cardiff)

"No clear timetable. Lack of info. Biased nature of info" (London)

"The day was long and repetitive" (Exeter)

"Too repetitive" (Exeter)

"Areas where people were being asked for opinions that were generally outside their day to day comprehension or required specialist knowledge, such as their views on pre-conditions. This could have solicited a very wide range of answers and it is unclear how effective this question was." (Leicester)

"The section on 'preconditions' for new nuclear was very difficult for participants. I'm not convinced the public could think of any preconditions, it became a rather empty discussion." (Liverpool)

"I hated the 'pub quiz' which took too long and trivialised the point of the day. People had given up a day's time to 'do something useful'." (London)

14 Are there any specific lessons about public engagement that you would like Government to take from this event?

Comment analysis

- do more of these types of engagement events (3)
- do this early in the policy process (2)

All comments

"A worthwhile exercise which should be repeated selectively" (Leicester)

"Portray both sides to a better extent." (Leicester)

"Preframing of the issue means not all people were able to address wider issues they have liked to. In particular nuclear vs alternative energy options was not really up for grabs. Preframing as nuclear vs climate change and energy security precluded this." (Cardiff)

"Individuals had questions that facilitators could not answer. Perhaps there should be an expert panel for a Q & A session?" (London)

"Use the general public more! They have excellent ideas to contribute and a much better understanding than credited." (Edinburgh)

"More info on detail, less repetition" (Norwich)

"Use early in a policy process. Don't constrain officials" (London)
 "Deliberative democracy can work - ONLY if it is done well - it takes time, patience to engender trust. Its difficult, no-one really knows how to do it, but it really must be done in response to lack of engagement in representative democracy." (London)
 "Make expectations clearer at start over how info will be used" (Exeter)
 "Do more - public will trust you more" (Edinburgh)
 "Well worth doing BUT do it at an earlier stage in policy making so participants feel less cynicism about its contribution" (Cardiff)
 "Need to present these accurately - deliberative events of [?] people. Not 'mass' participation. Much more structured table discussion" (London)
 "Do it more!" (Exeter)
 "Trust public" (Exeter)
 "I'm sure this was a very expensive event. However, it was very worthwhile; and Government should consider similar events for other complex issues in future." (Liverpool)
 "Don't trivialise the issues. Don't talk down. Give people good quality information (in advance)." (London)

15 Is there anything else that you would like to add?

Comment analysis

- shame Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth pulled out, but their views were still put across (3)
- problems with information provided / leading / biased (3)

All comments

"Have you studied whether there is any effect of the sex of the facilitator on the result. The majority were female" (Leicester)
 "Arguments on reducing CO2 emissions should have been put across more clearly. 4% reduction doesn't sound like a big number but it is very significant (for example equivalent to half the cars on UK roads)" (Leicester)
 "On paper this appeared a successful logistical exercise. In reality its success will depend upon BERR properly documenting and responding to the nuances of public views presented. In particular the resistance of participants to the nuclear vs climate change framing. These nuances in the qualitative comments are probably more important than the overall (rather superficial) votes." (Cardiff)
 "Delegates did feel that they were being led in a special direction. The CO2 questions were described by one as 'motherhood and apple pie...' (London)
 "Would have been very useful if the experts in the room - e.g. E.A. safety - were able to fill in some of the blanks e.g. many participants think the private sector will be responsible for dealing with, not just paying for, the waste" (Norwich)
 "Over-simplification of complex realities combined with limited time-frames may result in a flawed process" (London)
 "By definition once people have participated they are by definition not representative" (London)
 "Very good event" (Belfast)
 "I believe the Greenpeace and FOE withdrawal was unhelpful but I do not believe this undermined the event. I felt the material used by the Government put across their concerns much more effectively than Greenpeace or FOE would have been able to do themselves." (Leicester)
 "It is such a shame that Greenpeace et al withdrew at the last moment - deliberately to try undermine the event. I don't think they achieved this and it was a very effective consultation exercise." (London)
 "I repeat my concern that the Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth withdrawal was timed to try to undermine the process, having previously participated in developing the material to be presented. I don't believe they managed to undermine it at all: it was a very open, transparent and thorough event." (Liverpool)
 "Always get someone who knows the facts to check any presentation / handout material. Some of the stuff used was very poor."

About you

16 What type of group or organisation are you from?

BERR (4), Other Govt Department (4), Government Agency (3), Environmental NGO (1), Other NGO (1), Business / industry (9), Academic / research (3), Other (1)

Annex 10: Public events facilitators Evaluation questionnaire analysis

8 September 2007: Total 122 facilitators; 95 questionnaires returned = return rate of 78%

1 Which consultation workshop did you attend?

Belfast (10), Cardiff (10), Edinburgh (7), Exeter (9), Leicester (14), Liverpool (7), London (16), Newcastle (12), Norwich (10)

2 As a facilitator, what do you feel about the overall timetable for the day, and the extent to which it enabled you to facilitate your group and contribute to the objectives of the event?

All comments

"The overall timetable for the day was too ambitious. The main problem, in my opinion, was that far too much (objectives and information) was crammed into one day. The fullness of the programme was such that it did not enable full discourse on my table (and others, I believe) of any of the detailed topics. My group became very disillusioned with the process, the information, the overall question – so much so that, at one point, I really thought that they were going to walk out! Professionally, I was pleased that I was able to keep them engaged ("if you choose not to participate, your views will not be heard"); personally, I would have walked out myself!"

"Timing was tight for some of the discussions- however overall was fine"

"I have quite a lot of experience of this kind of day. I felt that this one was well organised but there was pressure because of the quantity and complexity of the information which was to be passed to the respondents - having to read out all the required information took a lot of time and for my table was a bit onerous - they would have liked to have looked at some of the info under their own steam. The overall timetable enabled me to facilitate my group successfully and contribute well to the objectives of the day"

"I was worried about how much information we needed to get over. It was far too much. Rather than dialogue, it was a mission in understanding. There was so little time for thought and deliberation that people reacted rather than deliberated. My table felt forced into things and didn't trust that they were hearing both sides of the debate"

"The timetable was tight but it was still possible to be present for the group"

"Too rushed to allow effective facilitation of group discussion"

"The timetable endeavoured to give information in bite size chunks however there was a certain amount of repetition which led to the group feeling they had been asked to discuss the same points more than once thus making it harder to retain focus"

"Timetable was adequate given the unusual circumstance that every member of the public sitting at my table was overwhelmingly pro-nuclear from the onset"

"Under the circumstances I think it was manageable"

"Tight on time - most of the time it was just a matter of recording a response without exploring the statements both with the originator or their colleagues. This also meant that as a facilitator I needed to focus to a disproportionate amount on time. However, we were able to achieve the objectives but could have got 'richer' responses with more time - it is a question of the time/cost quality tensions"

"Seemed OK - if anything there was too much time in the afternoon to cover too little content"

"Input of information slightly too rushed - especially as it had to be read out, which eroded the time available to digest and consider"

"The timetable and structure were fine, it was the volume and nature of the information which impacted most on the day; there was so much material to be read out there was little time for proper discussion of the issues and thus I feel respondents were not as well informed to make the final decision about the topic as they should have been"

"There was too much reading out to be done compared to other similar events so this meant the timetable was extremely tight and made it extremely difficult to 'facilitate' the groups effectively. Also, there is little opportunity to 'facilitate' the group while simultaneously typing into the laptop"

"Too rushed - too much material in too short a time"

"The time is always tight at these events. But we got honest responses from the respondents"

"It worked ok but I did have to push on the discussions at some points. Making the day longer would result in participants suffering fatigue and thus losing interest"

"I felt the day was very informative and interesting and participants on my table certainly commented on how quickly the day had gone"

"Timetable was fine. Did enable facilitation if issues etc., but some of the questions that had to be answered were 'leading' and this led to mistrust amongst participants"

"It was a full, packed timetable. Table discussions were sometimes a little rushed owing to the need to keep to the tight schedule but objectives were still met"

"It was pacey, lots to get through, lots to read, but it kept it dynamic"

"There was a lot to pack in, but the lead facilitator did a good job at keeping spot on time and moving things along smartly - we covered a lot of ground during the day. However, it sometimes felt the discussion times were too short, especially as there was a lot of reading out to get through first"

"The timetable was fine and it was good that we finished earlier than we have in other events"

"It was a very full timetable, but then again it was a large and complex subject. However, it was very hurried, the timeslots would have been about right had we not been required to read out significant portions of the handouts. This left insufficient time for discussion leaving some participants feeling rushed"

"Very good. The drip feeding of information to the participants enabled them to understand a very difficult subject a lot easier"

"There was a lot to cover, especially in terms of reading out dense handouts which left little space for discussion and full deliberation"

"Timetable was fine - fairly structured and kept to time"

"The timetable and topics were very varied and built on each other. As a facilitator I felt the timetable was ok, but I felt that some of the participants were a bit overwhelmed by the amount of material and the length of the topic discussions. However my group were able to discuss the issues and I think we did meet the objectives"

"The timetable was quite pressured, but then there was a lot of information to get through. By the time we ended people had started saying the same things anyway"

"My personal view was that because the counter arguments put forward by the green lobby were taken out at the last minute, that by the end of the day, we were getting a bit repetitive. This did not stop strong views being expressed and recorded and because of the diverse group on my table, the very varied views were heard"

"My personal view was that because the counter arguments put forward by the green lobby were taken out at the last minute, that by the end of the day, we were getting a bit repetitive. This did not stop strong views being expressed and recorded and because of the diverse group on my table, the very varied views were heard"

"Because we had to read out so much of the handouts it was difficult spend as much time on the discussion as I would have liked"

"Well organised and planned but much too much to cover in a single day. This was doubtless down to what the client required and I thought that OLR made a professional job of trying to cover all the information. The requirement was not really for facilitation but more to read out information and type up responses. The volume of information read out prevented there being any real facilitated discussion"

"The timetable was OK - perhaps a little tight at times i.e. participants felt a little rushed. The main problem was the amount of information which participants needed to understand and digest throughout the day"

"I felt that there was too little time to give everyone the opportunity to discuss and exchange views with the time period allotted for each topic and insufficient time for me to record their views as fully and accurately as I would have liked"

"Overall timetable was very tight, especially the discussions in the afternoon, with huge amounts of info to get through"

"Timetable was tight but manageable. There were sufficient intervening platform periods for any catching up on inputting notes on the discussions"

"Timetable was tight but manageable"

"The timing of the day was fine with plenty of time for discussion as planned"

"I felt the timetable was sufficient to discuss perhaps an easier to understand topic but nuclear energy was quite difficult to grasp for some of my group who had no prior knowledge and I believe they would have benefited from a little longer"

"Initial thoughts: overload of information; very dense; a lot of paperwork to get through BUT the running order and overall timetable seemed well put together, considering the amount of paperwork to get through. It was evident from the run-through on the previous evening, there would be little opportunity to allow a debate to breathe. It all felt very superficial with little concept of who the target audience was"

"The timetable was ambitious but well organised so that the group were able to comment without feeling rushed"

"The timetable was fine but there was a lot of reading crammed into that period"

"I thought the timetabling was very well planned & structured"

"There was a lot to fit into one day but the group managed it adequately"

"Overall timetable was good providing opportunities to discuss issues concerned"

"I think it was fine. Maybe a little longer could have been spent on examining the real issues, but then the participants needed to be warmed up too and given info"

"What became apparent very quickly was that there was too little time to discuss in any detail the complex issues covered by the meeting. The information presented (in a variety of ways, quite accessible, apart from having to listen to me and colleagues read out large chunks of text) tended to punctuate as well as inform participants' discussions, and they grew frustrated by the tight timing"

"I think the timing was ok"

"Overall there was not really enough time to deal with discussion and the handouts"

"Overall having completed these types of events before I thought this event although giving a voice to people was on the whole too full a timetable particularly bearing in mind these was a lot of facts figures and public knowledge was low. Less questions or more layering would have been better"

"OK"

"I felt the days time table was too tight since participants felt rushed to move from one subject area to another also many of the questions were the same just expressed differently"

"The agenda and issues were complex in the extreme and the day itself was not long enough to consider the issues as thoroughly as everyone would have liked, However, none of the respondents would have stayed any longer and so the best use was, in fact, made of the time realistically available"

"The timetable worked well and participants increased their knowledge of the subject as the day progressed"

"Overall timetable for the day was ambitious but was do-able"

"For such a big issue, I thought the timetable was good but there were time pressures especially as so much information needed to be presented"

"The overall timetable was extremely tight and some of the questions very repetitive so I did not feel that I was able to facilitate the group in the sense of enabling them to discuss things together and perhaps expand their own views as a result of group discussion. My role was in effect a note taker with some basic group building - mainly keeping people to time and on the key point. the groups was required to answer the questions set not the explore the issues they wanted to - for example, with my group the issue was private companies controlling the future of nuclear power and time was not allowed for them to say what was on their mind so towards the end they began to 'send messages' within what they were being asked to discuss eg they went from being majority in favour of nuclear energy to a majority against"

"The overall timetable was excellent with its timings but rather crammed with more information and investigation than some respondents could digest and respond considerably. I found it very easy to coordinate with timings of the lead facilitator"

"I thought the timetable was OK and most topics were covered adequately"

"The timetable was good, but quite full in respects to content. This impacted on the contributions of the participants, in terms that they were a hard group to get responses from, and with a lot of effort they began to contribute, but we then had to move on to a new objective (in order to stick to the timetable)"

"Was a little rushed. Far too much information to get through, considering many respondents were not engaged with the issue. Respondents were skimming handouts by about lunchtime. I had to read everything out which just bored everyone"

"OK, some bits were a bit rushed, some may have had a little too much time"

"Too much detailed information to cover in the time available. Discussions had to be tightly controlled to enable us to cover the wide range of issues"

"The questions and topics for discussion became very repetitive as the day wore on. It was therefore hard to motivate participants as they had already answered questions earlier in the day"

"Did not like the idea of reading out lengthy handouts that were arguably not helpful to delegates - it took away time for the discussion at the table"

"The timetable as for all of these events was very tight. It felt like a lot of time was spent briefing participants on the subject rather than on the debate itself. This was necessary as most of my table were on a steep learning curve. Reading out the unusually lengthy but thorough information sheets took time and I know some participants looked bored listening to them. These duplicated some of the DVD info which. There was repetition of some info in the afternoon. Some of the material could have been reduced. It was the most challenging event like this I have facilitated because of the complexity of the subject also unlike other events eg health or children, not everyone had experience of this or a view on this"

"Overall it was a busy day - some sessions too rushed - in terms of gaining full feedback from all and time to digest the information given. For some sessions this was fine though (mainly earlier in the day questions"

"It was a HUGE amount of information to impart and for the participants to take on board, but generally timed ok"

"Timetable for the day was too full which meant that discussion was often limited in any one session to 1 or 2 minutes per person. I don't think this is sufficient time to voice one's own views, engage in some dialogue or learn from others around the table (and maybe amend one's views as a result). As a result, facilitation often felt very rushed and often only scratching the surface of peoples' agendas and views"

"I felt it worked well and that we were briefed clearly"

"Timetable fine"

"Our group was very efficient with time management and got through all the questions with little difficulty. My role and notes were focused on capturing the essence of what people said with quotes mingled throughout to give specific examples. The computer systems helps with that. They were agreeable and respectful of my need to keep the group on task even when there was more to say, but there were some questions that could have been explored for days and very little data. IF we had had internet access to Google specific questions we had that would have been helpful...OR an alternative source of information...which the participants were very upset about (to the extent that they would focus on it)"

"Timetable was fine, it needed very good management but I didn't feel particularly rushed"

"Lead Facilitator highly effective. This enabled table facilitators to work with group at the right points knowing that enough information was given both by Lead and myself. The overall timetable was reasonable which enabled me to facilitate the group effectively"

"I thought that the time given was o.k. and enabled me to produce a good response from my group"

"It was a very tight schedule, and we really didn't have time to dwell on stuff. On the whole I think it worked well though. It certainly couldn't have been a longer day"

"It was possible to complete the timetable and to facilitate the group but less easy to fulfil the objectives because of the imbalance in the information provided"

"Quite full but no too much. However the venue was very poor- far too small and noisy. Also far too much information to give to public and expect them to comprehend"

"I felt that on the whole the structure was good but that there was too many questions which were too similar to enable the quality of the debate in the morning to continue in the afternoon. Participants began to feel over questioned and their answers became repetitive"

"The timetable is always tight on these events, but the amount of material, rather than the timetable per se, and the nature in which I could use the material, made it more difficult than normal to facilitate"

"I think the timetable was very well organized however the reading of the questions and handouts was a bit too much for the participants to take in, in such a short time"

"I found it all a bit rushed. There was far too much reading out to be done which took up a lot of the discussion time"

"Very packed full of information, but a lot of repetition in the main structure, so little time to introduce supplementary materials such as reference docs"

"It was all slightly too rushed, making it hard to get any meaningful comments and feedback from the table.

Relaxing the schedule only slightly would have made it easier and more productive"

"The timetable was OK"

"The timetable was mainly ok - much better than I expected, however I think if there had been more disagreement on my table things would have been harder"

3 **As a facilitator, what do you feel about the overall structure and process design for the day, and the extent to which it enabled you to facilitate your group and contribute to the objectives of the event?**

Comment analysis (includes responses to Question 4)

- overall timetable and structure was OK / fine (75)
- the mix of approaches (quiz, polling, discussions, video) worked well (61)
- timetable too full / very tight / rushed (31)
- discussions too rushed (9)
- too many questions on each issue so rushed (4)
- morning OK; afternoon too much information / repetition / too little time (4)
- lead facilitators good at keeping time (3)
- pub quiz too long (3)

All comments

"I think the idea of information, probing, feedback, more information, more probing is good. However, the number of discussions sessions, the level of detail in the information and its sheer volume made it very difficult to keep meaningful discussions going throughout the day. The structure of each facilitated discussion was not good. With 10 people around a table, at least 20 minutes per question would be necessary to allow people to really engage. Although there were several 30 minute sessions (as I recall), those sessions covered 3+ specific questions. The reality of 10 minutes per question really meant that each person got to react to the subject matter and that the group had no time to discuss it/each others' views before it was time to move onto the next question. The rigidity of the programme – we were briefed to read all questions/prompts and that we absolutely had to complete all sections of the proforma – provided little flexibility when, on the odd occasion, the group was actually having a discussion! In my opinion, the group was not allowed to engage in real dialogue due to this fundamental structural error. The sessions should have had 1 subject/question with a series of optional prompts. The programme should have accommodated the possibilities of group focus on 1 or some (but not insist upon all) of the questions/subjects"

"Structure was good and comprehensive- this enabled me to support group adequately"

"The structure followed the tried and tested deliberative format and worked well as such. I was able to facilitate my group well and contribute to the objectives of the event"

"There was too much to do and read out. I think there were probably too many sessions. If there really needed to be that much information (and I am totally open to the fact that it was necessary) then the event should have been split up - but with the same participants. There are guidelines on how to do good deliberation which mention that scientists and specialists should be present to support the public in their deliberation so that they can check up on the science and behind some of the facts. This was definitely needed but we only had one (fantastic) scientist between 100 people. We also told not to bother him unless absolutely necessary"

"The structure and process was good given the constraints OL were under. But these constraints of complex wording and topic did mean that the findings from the group could not be described as emerging from a deliberative discussion. I think the topic needed a citizens jury type approach with the ability to cross examine and the provision of time to digest - instead we ran a form of focus group"

"Overall structure was OK"

"Reading out the highlighted text caused issues for my table as two people were hard of hearing and this was not factored into the process. In the end I had to abandon reading out all of the questions and allow people to read for themselves. Also the level of background noise in the room made it even harder for these people to try and hear what I was saying despite sitting them closer to me"

"Overall structure and process design seemed adequate although I suspect given the uniformity of opinion expressed at my table it would have been helpful to have more interaction with the rest of the room - that said, the lack of range in views was surprising and probably not foreseeable?"

"I think it was well structured and had enough breaks to allow effective contribution"

"Structure of the day - which I understand to mean the Agenda - the order in which we did things - worked well. It enabled me as a facilitator to keep the thread going from one section to the next and focus people on the stage we were at as it was clear we would be covering all aspects at some stage"

"I was lead facilitator, so didn't have as good a feel for how the tables progressed"

"On the whole, I felt the structure and process were acceptable, though some of the questions may have been slightly too 'closed' or limiting"

"The process design focussed too heavily on reading out information rather than discussing the issues so I felt the respondents didn't get as much of an opportunity to ask questions and for the discussions to develop"

"I am not sure the discussion was balanced. it struck me that BERR was asking the wrong question"

"A lot of material was shown and the visuals were often repetitive. the amount of material shown meant we could not get in depth and considered responses but we got spontaneous responses to our questions"

"Feeding the information in chunks to participants worked well and enabled them to take on board what was a complex subject area, so in this way it was good, although I query whether having such a structure tends to lead participants along a certain path in their thinking"

"The structure is good in terms of variety, but the discussions did feel somewhat 'rushed' at times"

"The day was well structured - the variety of tasks plus videos enriched the group's knowledge and interest in the subject. The build up of information throughout the day allowed the group to gain a more balanced view of the subject than they originally expressed during the table discussions"

"It kept participants interested, 'entertained' even, whichever way their views which made it easier to facilitate discussion"

"It was good that the day was broken up into relatively short sections with different types of activities - the variety helped to keep my table engaged during the day"

"The process was far too information heavy for participants and the questions too open ended. It was difficult for people to absorb so much information and give a considered view in such a short space of time"

"My Group were encouraged by how busy and professional it all seemed. The level of technology - IT, voting pads, instant analysis and manageable group sizes made them feel involved and consequently more willing to participate. The main downside for them however was that they felt that the final sessions became very repetitive with same questions + same answers = no discussion. Perhaps if these later sessions could have been consolidated, the earlier ones could have been lengthened to provide greater time for discussion"

"The structure enabled even those who came with preconceived ideas to reconsider the matter and I could see this often changed their initial views"

"Repetitive (probably inevitable). The overall structure was fine and the process worked well. My main criticism (and that of the respondents) was the biased nature of the information provided, with the result that the questions which were asked and the range of responses offered appeared contrived and intended to bring about a pre-agreed result. If the objectives of the event were to genuinely research attitudes to the issues involved and how these might change if people became more informed then these were probably not achieved because of the perception that the information provided and assumptions made were heavily biased"

"Overall the structure was varied, enabling: discussion, information from videos and handouts, and polling. The only negative I would say was the amount of information in each handout and the number of handouts, which detracted from the discussion time. However I appreciate that to discuss the issues, the participants did need to receive the information!"

"I felt that if they'd had a bit longer in the morning sessions to fully explore some of the issues that were coming up then they might have moved on from their key points. I think because it was so pressured they didn't really explore all their thoughts and so they just kept coming back to the same issue over again."

"The group clearly understood that the day was about the future of nuclear power, they were aware that it was specifically about whether non-governmental agencies could run nuclear power stations. They were able to express their views on this specific question and able to comment generally around the subject."

"The group clearly understood that the day was about the future of nuclear power, they were aware that it was specifically about whether non-governmental agencies could run nuclear power stations. They were able to express their views on this specific questions and able to comment generally around the subject"

"I thought the design of the day was good. It was a real shame that Greenpeace pulled out at the last minute as the participants in my group were keen to hear their views. It would have been nice to have been able to do some interactivity in the plenary e.g. be able to ask questions from the floor to experts"

"It's an interesting question what the objectives of the event were. If it was to answer the question about allowing private companies to allow development of nuclear power, the question was answered. It was not possible to facilitate the group in any real sense - that is, in the sense that is understood by International Association of Facilitator competencies. Instead this was an extended set of focus groups which took the temperature of a group of people in a room"

"The structure was good, in that it was quite varied, with handouts, video clips, voting using key pads etc."

"The process design is good, however, in my opinion - and in the opinion of the people on my table - the flow of information was not balanced (i.e. too much towards the participants, not enough from them)"

"Morning worked pretty well especially warm ups/introductory sessions (pub quiz etc), but afternoon was far too much information and repetition (via video/handouts) and too little time to go through it"

"Structure was OK, but became repetitive in the afternoon sessions. Some of the questions were too similar, and led to the same issues being discussed (despite our best efforts to tease out some slightly different angles!) Technically ok.... no difficulties from a facilitating point of view"

"The structure was satisfactory but I felt there was a fair bit of repetition of some of the issues resulting in some yawning (and boredom) of the respondents"

"The overall structure and process design was fine. I've facilitated for OLR on a number of occasions previously and they always get the structure right. I think the subject matter of nuclear energy was a little difficult for some of the group to understand"

"The overall structure was engaging and at times entertaining. The material was interesting and professionally put together. There was a good balance between live presentation from the podium/ video screenings/ interviews and discussion - at times it felt quite cutting edge and participants initially had the feeling they were part of an exciting and ground-breaking event. However, the material soon became repetitive and the outcomes of each discussion session became less well defined. I felt the material lost its focus. The discussion group began to feel they were repeating what had gone before"

"The structure - with filmed input, discussion, space for breaks and lunch and clear direction from the lead facilitator worked well from my perspective. The briefing on the previous evening was especially helpful in ensuring that we understood how the process would work"

"The overall structure and process was excellent it helped me as a facilitator"

"I thought the structure and process design was well thought out and I had enough time to facilitate my table"

"The major problem, and one which the group sensed but could not adequately address, was that the stated objective of wanting to assess citizens opinions on whether the government should proceed with its' stated preference for expanding nuclear energy, was explored without an honest and unbiased perspective of the options available and the true consequences and costs of expanding nuclear power. In this sense, a structure that could have been sound, let the process down"

"A number of questions were repeated and seemed to cover the same discussion grounds. Participants felt they had already answered some of the questions and could not understand why they were being asked again"

"I think the structure was fine"

"Largely because of the timing, I was basically acting as a note-taker, hander-out of info sheets and timekeeper, it was difficult to find time to really explore beyond each participants' initial (adversarial) position, why their opinions were what they were, what really concerned them, and under what circumstances (if any) they might find elements of the proposal more or less acceptable. The more vociferous / passionate participants tended to occupy most of the time available, because once they had made their points, there was little time left to encourage others to express themselves. This improved somewhat as the day wore on, and worsened again towards the close of the day, as time pressures were more keenly felt. There seemed to be a general shift in opinions during the course of the day, away from extreme positions ("strongly supporting" or "strongly against" to supporting and opposing) suggesting that people were influenced by the evidence and re-evaluated their positions to a certain degree but it was not easy, for each participant to understand and record what the significant influences were"

"I think the structure and process were good"

"There was a good feel to the day, people were engaged in the procedure throughout and a very dry subject was represented with varied activities to keep the attention of the delegates"

"Same comment as above although the mix of elements themselves was excellent the voting people liked the clips, mixed with discussion was very good . What was lacking was the personal representation from the 'other' views i.e. Greenpeace / Friends of the Earth"

"OK. The group were initially sceptical that as lay people they would be able to say anything. The process however did allow them to reflect on the issues and engage with them somewhat"

"I found difficulties summarising participant views and recording at the same time, the speed with which the participants responded to the questionnaires made meeting the objectives challenging"

"The structure and design of the day was actually, from the facilitators perspective, clearly carefully designed to impart as much complex material as possible in an easy to digest manner so as to allow the most considered comment as possible from the participants. And as such the design worked well. Research is not a precise science and there are many ways to design such projects. However, I feel that the process adopted was carefully constructed to make the best use of the available time having regard to the disparate participants and complexity of the topic"

"The overall structure and process design were very good, Opinion Leader is very efficient in both their organisational skills and their pre planning which all helped to make the task of facilitation much easier"

"My group felt that the outcome was already known, that this consultation came far too late. I also objected to reading material to my group. This is not good practice, although I understand there was a lot of material to get through. They enjoyed the quizzes, the videos and the fast pace of the day"

"I thought the process and structure were very good. I thought they enabled me to meet the objectives we had"

"I felt that the structure and the process design were based primarily on market research/polling principles in which the group is regarded as a statistically representative group of individuals. The Facilitator's job in that model is to record as accurately as possible people's expressed views and to probe reasons for holding that view. I think that the structure and process suited that model, however, with a controversial subject I am not sure that design best suited the objectives for the event"

"I found the overall structure and process design to be well conceived, logical and contingency planned"

"I think the process and design are generally OK as they are tried and tested - maybe facilitators could be brought in at draft stage to tweak at the margins"

"Well thought out, but very repetitive"

"As above, the structure was fine, it was just the materials were too meaty"

"The participants felt that the day was slanted to try and force their opinions into the way that the nuclear industry wanted. They regretted that only one side of the case was fully put and this made it harder to manage their comments"

"I was aware of many comments from participants who felt that the material was biased towards the nuclear option and not enough emphasis had been given to other options. Their views seemed to be that the answer had

already been decided and this was just a media exercise to placate the general public I felt the structure was about right, and enabled us to cover a difficult and emotive subject in sufficient detail to allow a healthy debate to take place

“The questions were very repetitive and it did appear at times as if the event was designed to convince participants of the merits of nuclear power rather than to solicit their views”

“Excellent apart from the handout issue above”

“The structure and process was clear to follow and we were well briefed I'm not sure how it could have been done differently unless by using a different methodology. My table was v diverse and there was some lively debate. By the afternoon they realised that some parts of the argument were missing i.e. Greenpeace. This made it more difficult to facilitate as we had a clear brief to say v little about the organisations that pulled out. The slightly obscure/cryptic context we were debating of 'giving energy companies choice to invest in nuclear energy was confusing and too difficult for many to grasp we needed a simpler question”

“There was perhaps a bit too much pub quiz time, this could have been better spent hearing from a wider range of speakers/input or on the questions; I think the may have worked better by asking less questions of the participants but giving more time for the deliberations. Facilitating was fine - though would have been very cramped had 2 people not turned up for my table. I would have appreciated some additional time with questions to really enable some of the quieter ones in the group the time to contribute. There was a process of course, but there could (with less questions) have been more opportunity to hear from wider perspectives which in turn I think would have given greater value to responses - it felt like particularly towards the end of the day some of the responses were being repeated (which in my view was symptomatic of participants not finding anything else to say as they could not absorb more information and turn it into further comment)”

“Again - HUGE information, but process ok. The issues that were difficult to address were already known as issues up-front (i.e. - 'we wanted to be consulted about using nuclear power at all - not what we need answers to') - this was a hard one to get around even though the process was clear at the start that that issue was NOT on the table”

“Again - HUGE information, but process ok. The issues that were difficult to address were already known as issues up-front (i.e. - 'we wanted to be consulted about using nuclear power at all - not what we need answers to') - this was a hard one to get around even though the process was clear at the start that that issue was NOT on the table”

“The day felt very top heavy in that there were many themes within the topic to address. While this was done in a more accessible way through videos, the combination of discussion, videos and text-based material meant that a lot of work was required to make sense of the different inputs. It also felt like there was a lot of repetition in the themes - my group kept saying 'we've already answered that' which meant that keeping the group motivated was hard work”

“It sometimes felt a bit rushed but overall was well structured”

“Generally fine, everyone appeared to feel that they had had their say / got their points across. As a facilitator the structure/content seemed somewhat repetitive”

“It worked well, as far as I can remember, but I would say that the lack of alternative points of view and sources of information made the debate a bit of a forgone conclusion...and as a facilitator my job to bring up and examine alternative points of view was cut off at the knees. I was VERY disturbed that the participants were told that it was "Greenpeace" who refused to participate when we were told it was 3 distinct groups. It would lead to the conclusion that Greenpeace was the only one disagreeing with the terms given to other bodies, when if the information we were given was correct, there were three separate groups that all disagreed and left the process”

“This was good, plenty of variation in activities to avoid boredom. Several of my group said they'd expected to get bored but hadn't”

“The structure of the day was designed to be workable and this was the case. The process was okay but became boring for group members”

“My feelings that the structure of the day was well organised and although the questions that sought active contribution by the group were repeated two of three times we managed to product a deeper response on each occasion”

“The structure of the day was fine, and it got the most it could out of the event”

“The structure and process were very well-organised producing an atmosphere conducive to good facilitating and to contributing to the objectives”

“Too much information and too many handouts to give”

“Similarly to other questions - some of the subtle nuances of the questions were not clear and led to a switching off as people appeared to be over asked some questions. The fact that the day was so full meant that as a facilitator there were some debates where there was no time to use your facilitation skills to take the discussion to a deeper level and in some cases to hear all views sufficiently. This was partly because of having to capture so much information so rapidly. The facilitators proforma could have been simplified”

“The structure was broadly similar to structures used on other occasions with OLR events, and as such was designed to keep a fairly fast pace. The focus, as ever, was on keeping the momentum going, which means that inevitably some issues are covered in more depth than others, and there is always more to say on each issue, but I felt that everyone got their chance to express their views, and that hopefully I captured them all, even if it meant they were not always in the correct 'box' on the pro forma!”

“The overall structure was well planned”

“I think in theory it was fine, but in practice there was just too much to cover in a single day and too much information for respondents to take in”

“Felt that the exercises were very time focused and the questions more closed than I'd normally expect so that it was difficult to allow the group to have any wider discussions on the issues or concerns raised. on several occasions I had to constantly remind them of the specific focus of the question which they felt was not asked in the right way as they were not able to give the answer and context that they wanted to, given the closed/directed nature of the question”

“There was a lot of information that had to be read out to respondents that meant that at times there was not a lot of time to discuss the points we were meant to discuss. Also it takes time to assimilate that much information so it was not like other events where people felt better informed - they were overwhelmed”

“Overall things were fine, the main complaint I have would be about the length of the handouts and how long these took to read but I guess this was unavoidable”

4

What did you think of the quantity of information provided, in terms of your task of facilitating a good discussion?

All comments

“The range of information formats was good and helped with accessibility and different learning styles. The quantity, however, was ridiculous and counter-productive. My group switched off completely at times and I made the following observations: • The discussion sessions' subjects/questions did not seem to be logically related to the preceding quiz/video/presentation. On several occasions, upon asking the opening question, my group was non-plused and I had to recap in some detail what they had just heard/seen/done. • The handouts were too numerous, too detailed and too boring! My verbatim delivery was tedious and time-consuming and limited the already short discussion time. My group was sceptical about the highlighted information that I had to read out – they thought that the selection of highlights (as compared to the reading of all parts of other handouts) was politically motivated. • The FAQs and the other thing were not used at all. Far too much information – for me to deal with and for the punters”

“Lots of information - and not so a lot of time to read it to group this was problematic as did not allow for full discussions before decisions were requested”

“As already mentioned there was really too much information however the reading out of great chunks of it was what slowed the whole thing down”

“There was too much information. There was not enough discussion of the other options - people mentioned being “funnelled” towards nuclear and away from wind, tidal etc.”

“The quantity of information was too much for me as facilitator to manage. I drew on some of it but was not sure that I did so effectively because of the volume. Similarly, I think that the group felt both overwhelmed by the information and lacking certain other information such as the strategy for energy reduction”

“Too much information to absorb in too short a time. A lot seemed to be repeated”

“Too much information to absorb in too short a time. A lot seemed to be repeated”

“The quantity of information was fine, it was the repetition that caused the issues”

“My table felt that there was too much repetition of the same information both in the video clips and then once or even twice more in the information facilitators were asked to read verbatim to them. I agree. They got frustrated/fed up and a little bored and I believe they began to feel patronised”

“Fantastic and perhaps too much”

“Very good - but again the time/cost/quality issue comes in. It is difficult for someone to read - or be read- a lengthy piece of info and then respond with deep understanding. If we have new information introduced to a group I always use the COC formula - first ask for questions of Clarification so we all have a similar understanding of the info - then ask for questions of Omission to ensure they info makes sense and there's nothing missing for them - then ask for questions of Challenge for the group to test their understanding. Once we have gone through this process the quality of responses is a lot better”

“Quantity – ok”

“Too much reading of complicated material to allow for proper discussions to take place”

“Too much detailed material”

“Too much information to be able to think things through”

“Good quality information, slickly presented. However, perhaps because of Greenpeace pulling out their information at the last minute, it felt a little unbalanced in terms of the arguments against”

“Too much information / detail. Participants barely had time to digest key facts (even if I read the required sections and summarised)”

“Overall, the information was good. I recognise there were problems with Greenpeace etc., but the videos looked very biased. For example, my participants commented that those 'for' nuclear were in suits and looked professional whereas those 'against' looked a bit like the 'loony left'. This added to mistrust that the event was a government organised thing that wanted a particular outcome. Also, the written information did feel a little biased in favour of 'pro' nuclear answer (such as only build nuclear on current sites). The 'pro' views seemed to get more information versus than the 'anti' views. Further, I was also interested in the sustainable development commission who viewed that nuclear energy did not pose a significant threat in terms of safety - BUT it also found that nuclear was not necessary to include in the mix. This was outlined in the written information but there was no explanation around it”

“An enormous amount of information was provided throughout the day. This was particularly beneficial for those in the group who felt a little intimidated by the subject as their knowledge prior to the day had been limited. The information gave them a more solid basis for discussion, and kept their interest in the subject”

“There was a lot to get through, a lot that needed to be read out, some which started to seem a bit repetitive, and participants at my table did start to pick up on / object to what seemed to be a slight bias of information in favour of nuclear energy and eg. A limited amount of information on renewables etc, but then Greenpeace pulled out etc making it difficult last-minute to keep it feeling more balanced”

“Far too much! A great deal to have to read out. My table was great and listened respectfully, but it was hard going to have to talk for so long, and to have to do it a dozen times. Felt it also really cut into the time for

discussion. Was also conscious of other table facilitators around me reading out as well, as we were in quite close proximity, which could have been off-putting for my participants”

“See above. This was particularly bad in the afternoon session where we had to read out a number of the information sheets. Some people even commented it felt like they were being brainwashed. Some of the information was also repetitive”

“Though the quality of the information was excellent, the quantity was overwhelming and too much to absorb and digest on the day. From what they understood, most believed it was well balanced but we come back to this issue of the time spent reading out the handouts. I understand why this needed to be done, but the Group did not. This then impacted upon the time left within the timetable for a meaningful discussion. Though we all tried our best within the time available, we also had to overcome some suspicion, particularly because of the last minute withdrawal of FOE and Greenpeace, that they were not being provided with all the information. It was interesting though that in my Group, despite the quantity of information and some suspicion, not one seemed to change their views over the course of the day and more discussion time may not have altered the outcome at all!”

“The quality of information was excellent”

“Too much”

“There could have been more material offered and, particularly, it needed to be more objective. Respondents rapidly became disillusioned about the integrity of the process because progressively, over the day, they became less confident in the nature and quality of the information they were being provided with and the decisions they were being asked to make - which they felt did not reflect their views and concerns”

“The quantity was very large and reduced the discussion time. I think it also made people quite tired, having so much information to hear/read and to then try to bring into the discussion. For me as a facilitator it also meant that I needed to be familiar with the information and try to bring it into the discussion so that the discussion covered as many points/areas as possible, rather than focusing on a narrow range. The positive was that the handouts were given out gradually, 1 or 2 at a time, and the amount of information over the course of the day was not distributed in one large set!”

“There was a whole lot of information and I think that was quite daunting for people. It felt like I had to talk quite a lot before they could get into the discussion. But they needed the information to have the discussion. I don't know how much they fully understood. They had lots of questions that they wanted answers to that I wasn't able to help with”

“There were possibly too many handouts - whilst information was needed, it was rather difficult to find time to encourage people to absorb all the information being given. Some commented on wishing to read about the counter arguments - which were referred to, but some wanted more”

“There were possibly too many handouts - whilst information was needed, it was rather difficult to find time to encourage people to absorb all the information being given. Some commenting on wishing to read about the counter arguments - which were referred to, but some wanted more”

“There was a lot of information - however it is a complex subject so I think it would have been difficult to do it with less. The main problem was having to read everything out which meant you couldn't as a facilitator focus on the bits your group needed to hear again”

“Much too much. It was not possible to have a good discussion. However it was not clear to me that 'a good discussion' was a desired objective of the day. I think that the objective was to get people's views on a number of questions, which is a different objective”

“There was far too much information. It was extremely difficult to keep peoples attention when I was reading out such large chunks of text from the handouts, especially when the tables were so close together. Participants wanted much more information but then found it difficult to understand and digest (when given additional information sheets) in time to have an informed debate”

“Too much information to both communicate (i.e. having to read out lengthy handouts), as well as assimilate”

“Far too much info overall, but also not enough on the 'anti'/green side of the arguments - this meant it was difficult to wade through all the information there was (especially the handouts), but also made it difficult to have a balanced debate as the participants flagged that they thought the information was weighted towards the 'pro' side“

“Information was comprehensive... perhaps too much for these to be fully digested by the participants. Less narrative, more bullet points on the key issues would have been helpful. PLUS the need to slavishly read out reams of information was far too time-consuming, and left too little time for subsequent discussion.... it also seemed to be a patronising and schoolish way to impart information, and could have been better done all together from the platform”

“The quality of the information seemed to be of a high standard with all literature explained in such a way as to facilitate understanding”

“The quantity of information was ok”

“Far too much information and repetitive. Somebody - outside of the research team - should had gone through the material and scored through the unnecessary and repetitive material. I think it would have felt tighter and slicker. As it was, participants lost their momentum and enthusiasm as they went through the same/ similar Q&As”

“I thought the information worked well - particularly the filmed elements. It highlighted key issues in a very complex and potentially emotional subject”

“Again this was excellent, I had everything I needed”

“I thought the quantity of information provided was well balanced and enabled me to facilitate my table with confidence”

“The quantity was manageable but not equally distributed between the pro nuclear stance and the anti nuclear stance- so much more was provided on the pro side. This most definitely affected the nature and quality of the table discussion as the participants had some specific questions about other non nuclear options for which there was no information or very inadequate information. Because they were not that well informed about the issue in

general I believe that if they had had more thorough information on both sides they would have reached different conclusions and made different recommendations“

“Participants were unhappy with the amount of written information which had to be read out to them”

“I think my table thought they were being ‘flannelled’ (their word) and started to resist the info that they felt was ‘leading’ them in a pro nuclear power direction (although they were pro nuclear power to start with, so it started a kind of reverse psychology thing). However, in terms of my task this made it somehow easier to facilitate a good discussion, but it sort of tended to go off topic and away from the objectives of the day”

“As a facilitator, I would re-iterate that participants felt that they didn’t have enough time to consider the information fully, consider whether the information was complete enough. The group always had more questions than could be answered by the information provided. Though there were experts on hand to aid the discussion, there was never time to call on this facility. Furthermore I would say that the group I worked with was a great mix of people; accordingly the knowledge which they brought to the discussion varied tremendously and in such cases discussions have to be managed more carefully. There were lots of concerns about the context of the information, and the dramatic (cynical?) Greenpeace last-minute pull-out certainly was a successful tactic if the objective was to make participants more sceptical about the process and its purpose”

“There was too much information and not enough at the same time. The sort of information the respondents wanted (i.e. the opposite side of the argument) was not always available and some of the information driving the governments view was somewhat repetitive”

“Some aspects were repetitive. No reference was made in detail in terms of Nuclear Power in other countries i.e. France. The actual discussion about the issue of companies being able to invest into nuclear power was confusing to an extent and discussions tended to drift into the issue of whether or not nuclear power was a good thing”

“Excellent by way too much and not enough time for people to digest or for us to quickly work through and relay information. The info was there but the space to access in and allow time for understanding could have been more”

“The biggest barrier to engagement was the lack of a voice from the anti-nuclear groups. This made the group feel that the event was biased. It lowered the levels of trust. They could not be sure that any information provided on the case against was complete”

“No the questions were repetitive and the information given to participants biased only one view was shared governments views(this was a criticism by my participant group)”

“I found it good - neither too much (though almost!) and not too little. Clearly a subject like this can always merit more and more information and achieving the right balance has to be almost impossible. I found that the quantity struck a good balance between giving the participants enough to prevent time being taken up by more and more questions - yet not so much that they switched off or became data-bound”

“The quality of the information was very good“

“I felt the material was satisfactory. Again, it should not have been read to them”

“There was a lot of information to provide and this was a complex issue to cover in one way. Perhaps some advanced reading may have been helpful for participants? But then again, there was more information provided than most people would normally get in terms of having to decide on their point of view on major issues”

“The quality of the information and the briefing provided to facilitators for the task required of them was excellent. As my answers above state, I do not think the process was the best way of facilitating a ‘good discussion’. The information provided on the content of the consultation, with obviously the issue about Greenpeace and others withdrawing, was high quality and designed to engage people of different ages, learning styles etc. However, it missed the point that participants might have issues about private sector control of the future of nuclear power and didn’t present any information on this. In addition, the phrasing of the questions provided to facilitators was very repetitive and there were too many to allow time for ‘a good discussion”

“The quantity of information was overloading for many respondents. While adequate explanation is required on many issues, I am certain that succinct editing would have achieved better understanding and maximum active listening on the part of respondents and, therefore, a more enriching discussion”

“The quantity of information was adequate for the role as a “non expert” though more emphasis could have been made to let the participants know that we were not experts”

“Very good, and extremely useful for me and the group”

“Way too much. The materials also came across as heavy on government perspective, light on alternative perspective such as the green agenda. Therefore respondents felt they didn’t have enough information to adequately debate the issue fairly”

“They wanted more information about the nuclear industry in other countries and what they did, in particular the French nuclear industry”

“Too much detail!”

“Too repetitive and fairly one sided, in favour of nuclear energy”

“Excellent”

“There was a huge amount of information to give to individuals - both the sheets we read and gave out and the reference sheets - I did not give out the reference sheets as there wasn’t enough time for people to read them and to stay focussed on discussion. At the end of the day I was asked a q about the cost of different fuels. It was too late to refer the reference sheets and go back to the debate”

“Of course this is difficult, nuclear issues are hardly brief - they are complex and simplifying will of course not do justice to issues. That said it had to be simplified, and the quantity of information was just too much, not helped by having to read selected text. But had we had less questions to address maybe the quantity of information could have been reduced...but also found other ways to convey the information - i.e. speakers/ more video. I was concerned that some critical points about the nuclear issue could be overlooked - e.g. whilst it was said in the info sheets & was read out (and subsequently re-clarified) about CoRWM’s work and its status, the group initially

assumed there was already an existing repository for the wastes, actually a key factor in their subsequent discussions”

“As noted - it was a huge amount to digest - and sometimes it was information restated with what participants felt was a 'slant”

“Videos (even edited at last minute) were good. Text based material was virtually impossible to handle in the facilitation process. Far too much text per page and too many pages trying to cover too many themes for the sake of 'completeness'. By the afternoon, participants were experiencing overload (some referred to this as 'overselling') of information and were complaining of confusion and difficulty in sense-making of the different claims. Pub quiz proved to be popular, but perhaps a little more 'zassy' to give a sense of event and competition?”

“The information was adequate and good for generating discussion”

“A lot of information much of which needed to be read out. However people on my table appeared to be able to take most of it on board although (3) above could be a little confusing”

“It was narrow and shamefully insufficient in terms of consistently asking questions in a leading manner. From my perspective doing events like this all over the globe I would say that this was an event whose information and questions were meant to lead the public to answers that the government wanted to hear so it could point to the results and say that the public supported them. I was not impressed at all”

“There were far too many handouts to be read out. It got very tedious, both for myself as a facilitator and the respondents. Several groups members said they felt there was a lot of repetition in the handout material”

“The quality of the information was okay but a little duplicated throughout the day. It enabled a good discussion to take place but as participants felt areas were duplicated they started to contribute less”

“The Quantity of not over the top as the discussions were productive and interesting and as the participants were a good mix, logically expressing their opinions I felt that the discussions progressed satisfactorily”

“I would say that the quantity of information was about right to understand the issues. It was the quality of the information. Obviously the Governments 'initial view' was articulated clearly, but people got very bored with hearing that view. The discussion deteriorated from a lively one to a frustrated and polarised one. People felt patronised, and I had to convince them that they weren't being preached to”

“There was rather too much information to be read out, and some of it was too repetitive and too imbalanced. This was remarked on by the participants who then found it hard to introduce new views into the discussion because as the day progressed they felt there was too much important missing information”

“Too much, also reading only parts of it gave impression it may be slanted”

“I felt that there was too much information provided and that there was too much repetition with what participants had seen in the videos. Participants were receptive to having some additional information but it seemed about one sheet of bulleted information would have been sufficient. The time spent reading the information often left little time for quality discussion”

“The sheer quantity of information, and, importantly, the fact we as facilitators were unable to paraphrase it, was quite a hindrance, and much more so than any other OLR event I have facilitated at. But as a qual researcher of some 18 years' experience, I feel that I nonetheless was able to encourage and facilitate participants to have a good discussion, and be able to express their differing views”

“I think the quantity was too much to take in, especially since we had to read long paragraphs”

“Too much information - some of it very repetitive - respondents had been given information on the videos and then I had to repeat the information they had already been given”

“I felt the back up information was good, but as pointed out earlier - the repetition in the proformas left little room to cover the back-up info”

“Fine, although having to read long tracts of text to the table seemed a bit pointless as most of it just repeated what was in the presentations and videos”

“Too much”

“Too much generally”

5 What did you think of the ways in which the information was provided to participants at the event (e.g. pub quiz, video, information sheets, information read out, answers to questions), in terms of your task of facilitating a good discussion?

Comment analysis

- reading out information did not work well / was patronising / bored people (76)
- too much written information to get across in the time / too many handouts (68)
- information was too repetitive (43)
- pub quiz worked well (29)
- too much information for people to take in / too little time to take it in (26)
- video worked well (24)
- participants felt the information was biased in favour of nuclear / one-sided / not enough on alternatives / other opinions (18)
- it was good (17)
- about the right quantity (10)

- facilitators felt the information was biased in favour of nuclear / one-sided / not enough on alternatives / other opinions (10)
- video biased and long-winded (6)
- facilitators could not answer all questions / not enough others to answer questions (5)

All comments

“Good mix of materials and styles”

“As I have experience of this deliberative format I thought it all worked well - the discussion is not a focus group so there is no time and there is no brief to be looking for deep insights - it is about people responding to new information on a progression during the day - the discussion was good and my group had time and were able to reflect on the points and have a good discussion - exchanging views and influencing each others opinions”

“Pub quiz is always good - informative and team building on the tables. Video is an excellent medium, but there was a huge problem that the final version did not have the dark green opinions. Its so important to transparently have all views aired. If not there is a chink which people who wish to knock the dialogue can use to criticise it. Reading things from sheets is dull and seriously disturbs the flow of the table. Asking questions is fine and necessary, but reading out does need to be kept to a minimum. However, I also appreciate that some people do not read well, so a great way to make things easier is by using images - as OLR often do. I suspect the dialogue was arranged in too much of a rush to make all the necessary “

“It was great to mix it up. But I think that the information sheets and read out were very long and difficult to digest”

“Variety of formats and presentation methods was good but the same information seemed to come up again and again. Reading out large swathes of information was not effective”

“Variety of formats and presentation methods was good but the same information seemed to come up again and again. Reading out large swathes of information was not effective”

“Pub quiz and videos were useful, there was too much written information provided to candidates on the day itself and it could not all be fully absorbed and considered”

“The table liked the pub quiz and a good spirit of team and ice-breaking was the result. The video links were also good in that they helped break up the day and add pace and momentum to the proceedings. However, the table and I agree that there was too much repetition of the same information in the information sheets and the read-outs. Also the questions were very repetitive”

“It was very well presented although the order and content seemed to allude to a pre-conclusion. This led to some reservations that the whole process was a 'rubber stamping' exercise by government”

“The different forms made it easier - if we had stuck with one method it would have been very boring and difficult to keep the attention of the participants. The quiz added an element of team building - the videos appealed to visual thinkers - info sheets to verbal/linguistic people - info reads to Audio sensing/introvert people - Q&A to thinking/extrovert etc. So by using the different media we covered most of the learning styles and multiple Intelligences”

“Worked well, I think they enjoyed pub quiz element, and it did what it was meant to do (engage them, bond them, stimulate discussion etc)”

“Pub quiz & video ok; information sheets and information read out too rushed: would have been better if people could have considered material in advance”

“The variety of formats in which information is delivered is fine and helps to increase energy levels through out the day. It was just that this time the volume which had to be read out verbatim really drained energy from the groups and was extremely difficult for respondents to respond to”

“The variety in the way the information is provided is good and helps maintain interest but the majority was read out by the facilitators which meant respondents spent a lot more time listening than discussing”

“Variety of sources helped but they left participants "punch drunk””

“People enjoyed the pub quiz the videos were often showing repetitive visuals which made respondents lose concentration information sheets - too many read out - necessary but made us hoarse! answers to questions - spontaneous, no time for considered responses”

“The ways in which the information was provided were good. It enabled participants to access the information in a range of forms, reinforced the important issues and kept their interest”

“Good variety - made the discussion interesting. The handouts, however, were too detailed and I would also question why they weren't double sided?”

“This was good. The variety enabled the day to flow quickly. Although, as mentioned above, some of the multiple choice questions felt very misleading. For example, some of my table felt like the main question asked in the day was written in such as way so as to 'make' them seem pro nuclear when in fact they were either against it or unsure”

“The information sheets and the information read out was often too lengthy and detailed, and the language not particularly user friendly (it sounded a bit too technical). The reading out of the information sheets also reduced the time dedicated to the table discussion. Some of the information was repetitive. The information provided by the pub quizzes and videos was particularly effective”

“Video good although some comment that not enough for both sides of argument (see answer 4). pub quiz good idea, fun, but some comment that answers were leading i.e. not always a proper no/alternative, more a yes however small. info sheets/read out a bit too long-winded and even a bit repetitive which slowed down discussion initially but it would always pick up”

“Having the variety was good and helped to keep my table fully engaged. However, as mentioned above, the amount of information to read out was a struggle. (The pub quiz was a big hit, though.) Furthermore, some on my

table were cynical about what they perceived as a bias in favour of nuclear energy, i.e. the way the information had been presented would lead one no option but to vote in favour of it"

"The mix was good. Particularly the pub quiz engaged participants. The information sheets could have been more succinct and in bullet points - they were very text heavy. It was also hard for some people to hear given the background noise in the room and only reading out part of the text meant you had to explain where you were reading next which added to the time pressure"

"As a means of getting participants used to the voting pads, and establishing a base point of views the pub quiz was valuable. As were the videos which were very helpful, the right length, relevant to the topic under discussion and informative. The information sheets were excellent, comprehensive and in plain English. But there was a lot of information to digest on the day. Needing to read out significant portions of the information though was not helpful, some felt a little patronised by this approach, and questioned whether this was being done to guide them, influence them or merely to curtail discussion. Having experts on hand who answered questions immediately was also very reassuring for my Group. All these therefore made our task of facilitating much easier"

"I felt that all these means of conveying information to participants gave them a break from table discussions and again brought them back on track. The pub quizzes were a novel idea which went down very well and you could see the people relaxing and interacting with others more easily"

"Information read out and information sheets were too dense"

"The type of information and ways in which it was provided was fine; again, however, it was the information itself that appeared to lack integrity, not the process"

"It is important to provide information in a variety of ways to suit everyone's learning preferences, therefore there was visual and auditory information, and some active participation in the pub quiz and polling. This should have helped the participants digest more of the information and be able to discuss it than they would if it had been presented in a narrower range of methods. This helped my facilitation as I could bring participants back to where information had been presented and how, and their recall of it was facilitated"

"I thought the video worked well (would've been loads better if Greenpeace hadn't pulled out - people saw it as biased without their presence). The pub quiz really helped them to remember what they'd heard and lighten things up - they worked well. The information sheets were a bit full on and the additional information sheets were a bit pointless since we didn't have to use them. Having people on hand who could actually answer some of the questions people had (although understandably difficult to organise) would have meant people could progress their discussions much further since they seemed to get stopped"

"The general mix and style of delivery works well, breaks the discussion up and the quizzes provokes further discussion, which I think is good"

"The general mix and style of delivery works well, breaks the discussion up and the quizzes provokes further discussion, which I think is good"

"I think the variety worked but having to read out from the sheets often I felt I was reading out info they already knew which I think they found frustrating. I thought the videos and pub quiz worked well"

"Pub quiz worked well. Video worked well. Information read out was a ridiculous exercise (although I understood why it was done), although I felt that the information was well balanced and all the arguments were presented fairly. Again this is not how to facilitate 'a good discussion'. That requires time, and critically it needs to enable the group to come up with ideas, not just respond to questions"

"See 4 above. All good apart from the quantity of information required to be read out to participants (who were extremely tolerant, I have to say) and the information sheets which they didn't have time to read properly"

"The variety of media used to communicate was good. Pub quiz engaged the participants, videos were a bit too long-winded and biased, information read out took up too much time and was challenging to listen to (although they were very supportive of me as I went about this task). I simply did not have time to refer to the complex supplementary information I received the afternoon beforehand, that might have enabled me to answer some of the questions raised. All of these factors hindered my ability to facilitate as good a discussion as I would have been able to facilitate given more time before the event to study the materials, as well as during the event. On occasions, the time allowed to facilitate discussion of a topic only permitted about 1 minute per participant"

"Info sheets and read out were the most difficult parts - repetition particularly from the video. Pub quiz worked well"

"Same comments as 4... platform information was good, but again became repetitive. There was a view that the same outcomes could have been achieved in half the time, especially as the questions seemed to become progressively more "loaded"... gave rise to a view that "they've already decided what to do, they just want us to endorse it", rather than have any real input to the initial policy decisions"

"All good but some differences: 1. Thought the pub quiz was a good way to communicate information and to keep the respondents stimulated. 2. Although the read outs were of a good quality and explained all the information concisely there was a lot of it. I religiously read out every word as asked, but it took a long time leaving little time left to get down to the nitty gritty of the discussion. 3. After the first couple of video presentations there was a feeling that it was a bit 'over produced' as they followed a similar line which some felt to be a bit of 'party line' even if it wasn't"

"OLR always get the mix right and this event was no different. Having the pub quiz splits up the discussion and is a more relaxed way of obtaining people's views"

"Pub quiz was fun and brought the team together - also gave the less expressive, shy participants the feeling their voice was being heard and was valid. Perhaps again though ran a little too long. This was really just to get an initial impression and to establish a voting system. Video footage was professional, informative and initially paved the way for engaging discussions. Information sheets were not very useful and some of the information seemed bogged down in facts and figures, which were in some cases too technical for the event. Information read-outs should have been edited ("slash and burn" - BBC Radio 4 producer terminology) and a lot of the material wasn't written to be read out. The information was interesting, but the language felt quite clumsy sometimes. It just

needed an editor - possible with audio experience - to tighten it up. In the end discussions were going round in circles instead of moving forwards. The information was also biased in support of government policy, which most participants soon picked up on. Negativity set in towards latter half of afternoon. This was despite the group being told that Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth had been asked to take part in the event, but had declined. Ended up there was only a nod towards organisations concerned about nuclear expansion in UK, which had negative impact on further discussions"

"The quiz was thought provoking and helped the people on my table engage in the subject. As I mentioned above I thought the filmed elements were very useful in highlighting key issues. The information sheets were helpful for me in reinforcing areas of focus for each discussion"

"The combination of different types of information was good and it allowed the time to go quickly. As a facilitator having to read out so much information was onerous, it also made it feel less like a consultation and more of a publicity or propaganda exercise"

"I thought the range of formats used to provide information to participants was excellent - however i felt some of the handouts were too long (I'm not sure if the tech info could have been reduce any further and still be of use)"

"The variety was welcome. But as stated above, the information sheets were biased in favour of nuclear as were the info videos, which was frustrating for me as a facilitator since I knew the participants wanted more information, and were making important decisions with potentially wide ranging consequences for the future based on inadequate and distorted information"

"The quiz and videos prompted discussions of the issues raised. The amount of information to be read out cut down on the amount of discussion time available to participants"

"Excellent, enjoyable and illuminating"

"I thought this mixture was really good. The reading out bits were maybe not so accessible - I don't know?"

"Yes this was a good mix and kept them more interested than they would otherwise have been"

"Very good"

"Excellent – group commented that day went very quickly and I had a very mixed group in terms of knowledge"

"OK. There was far too much to read out and handout"

"I felt the diversity of information was good however the participants felt patronised by me reading out the handouts"

"There was a good balance achieved between the various methods in which information was imparted. The pub quiz fulfilled various functions - both in terms of imparting information, creating a group dynamic and energising the participants. The videos also worked well although the format can come across as somewhat one sided (my feeling is that this was a function of the medium rather than the content)"

"The mix was very good and helped to keep peoples' attention and it did help facilitate discussion"

"As mentioned above, this was helpful to sustain interest"

"I liked that there was a mix of ways information was presented. I think people process information in different ways"

"As said above, my group felt that there were issues about what information was provided that would be of interest to participants - key issues were missed. However, with the exception of one member of the group who thought the pub quiz style was patronising, they said and I would agree that there was a good and effective mix in the process of providing information. The one exception was having to read out large chunks of information from papers. This became a running joke. All table facilitators were reading the same information at slightly different speeds which was very distracting. Because the timetable was so tight, the inclination was to read as fast as possible. If anyone did have reading issues, I am not at all sure this would have overcome them and for other people it became risible. Either the volume should be cut significantly or one person should read from the front. However, in the latter case, I think you have to consider that people stop listening very quickly"

"Using a variety of ways helped to create dynamic atmosphere. It worked excellently in achieving my task of facilitation. In terms of the information sheets (Handouts), I would suggest that, along with excellent text editing, A5 rather than A4 paper size would work better for respondents handling as well as save on the environment"

"Whilst the read outs were informative, one could sense that most if not all of the participants felt patronised i.e. THEY CAB READ. Maybe the question could be asked prior to the event to all and if there is somebody on a table that needs help, only that table will read out"

"Very good, and extremely useful for me and the group. although the videos were some what biased (for example, playing upbeat music when showing nuclear stations etc)"

"All methods were fine, but the balance was wrong, too much written information, videos went down really well"

"OK, though there may have been too much information on some aspects and not enough on others (see above). Reading out much of the information - as requested - when it was already available in print, slowed down the process. All of the participants at my table had good reading skills"

"A good mix and it made the day both enjoyable and informative"

"Good combination of formats and different ways of providing information"

"Excellent"

"Pub quiz worked well as is the DVD for info giving. See above re info sheets too lengthy and reading verbatim not ideal - they could have been summarised"

"I think the pub quiz worked well to set the context, but could have been cut back a bit towards the end - there was a real novelty and engagement with it to start with but I think by the end of the day it was wearing a bit thin - perhaps because my table seemed to get most of the questions wrong! The video was a useful way to present views, however it was a shame that it was so one sided - even with Greenpeace's contribution in it would not have been equally weighted if I recall right. There could have been perhaps some interesting views from people living near sites, workers on sites etc to present the range. People on my table picked up what they felt was wrong about the video and the info sheets in particular - i.e. that the video was presented in favour of government views and likewise what was picked out to read in the info sheets was swayed that way too"

“Most were fine - it was the info readouts that were difficult - and sometimes the information had already been presented! So tons to read, but repetitive”

“Background information sheets: too dense, too much text; too many themes, too many sheets. Virtually impossible to use in the process as simply not enough time to access it. Information to be read out: felt like lecturing and clearly biased in some areas. Again, too much information per sheet. Videos - generally good, but more of the NGO voice would have been nice (I know they withdrew). Overall, too much information to handle in such a short space of time. Some participants wanted to know why they had not received information in advance”

“It was good to have a variety of different media”

“Good mix, rather repetitive but maybe this was different ways of getting various messages across”

“I liked the process and tools used. I admire the technology greatly and this is the majority of the reason that I like to work at these events”

“There was a bit too much repetition in general - the same facts being presented in many different ways. To the extent that people felt by the time it got to the last table discussion that they'd said it all before”

“Information was provided in a highly effect way. All areas of the information giving worked well. Videos, pub quizzes, information sheets etc. helped take the monotony out of the subject”

“The Pub quiz brought the team together well and the information sheets both given out and read aloud helped as they answered both the doubts and the cynical comments from hard headed Liverpoolians”

“All of these methods are good methods, it was the information itself that was the problem”

“That all worked very well apart from rather too much to be read out. One participant had taken it upon himself to read up on the subject beforehand in order to be able to contribute to the discussion more fully. With topics such as this where there is so much information to take in, it may be worth considering sending out some reading matter before the event”

“Good variety”

“The range of methods used was useful in stimulating the participants and providing some time for them to have a breather and receive information. As previously mentioned however too much duplication of information given in video and then on the information sheet and then read out by facilitator. I believe something more active at some stage of the day such as an open space session would generate a good level of participation and engagement”

“I think it is always a good idea to break up the ways in which information is shared, as it breaks up the potential monotony for participants of spending a whole day on one subject, as well as allowing for different views to come out by approaching the issues in a range of different ways. But, as mentioned above, there was simply too much material to get through it all, and most importantly, the way in which we could use a lot of the information was rather difficult. Not only could we only read out as it was written, which was time-consuming, but it also lent an air of formality and legality that was dissonant with the open and 'no wrong answers' way in which everyone shares their viewpoints at these events”

“The pub quiz, the video were brilliant ideas and I think were the most effective ways that provided the information needed. Passing round the 10 handouts, having to read large portions - meant that the participants concentration was sometimes lost”

“Information sheets far too long. The pub quiz worked well and was fun. The videos were too much like a 'government information video' - not really enough discussion on them. Anna Ford too severe”

“The variety of activities was good, and answers available when needed. the content on the reference sheets was not always enough for the participants who requested more on the pros and cons and case studies from other countries”

“All good apart from having to read out too much information, which few really concentrated on”

“These were good as they got the information over in a fun way - but there was a lot of information”

“The plenary info as much better than the handouts as the way it was presented was more interesting. People tended to switch off a bit as a read some of the longer handouts”

6 What did you think of the practical methods you used to keep a record of the views of participants during the discussions (on laptops), in terms of your task of facilitating the discussion?

Comment analysis

- recording method worked well / recorded points well (68)
- hard to do both good facilitation and recording (20)
- worked well if a touch typist (8)
- proformas worked well (8)

All comments

“Mostly I thought that this was good. But, I think the use of laptops and the live hook-up' was smoke and mirrors. It suggested urgency and rapid, live analysis and I do not think that this was the case. The programme was inflexible and unresponsive to punters' opinions. The only 'live' analysis that I could see was the quantitative, pub quiz results. My group expressed a thought that the only analysis would be of those. I wondered how the notes from 120 laptops would be used but did not access to this information”

"This can be difficult as one attempts to keep discussion flowing and on task and also to record what is being said. If the group has not formed as a unit, the reliance is then on the facilitator warming up and supporting the discussion"

"I am comfortable with this method - when you do it for the first time you worry that you might not be able to moderate as well as a normal focus groups but it is a really good way to get the information back quickly and interactively and I find that it does not interfere with the discussion especially as it encourages you to get the respondents to own the discussion which gives better results and makes them more engaged and interested"

"I don't have a problem with laptops because I type very fast without looking. However it does form a physical barrier between the facilitator and the participants which could be a bit of problem. Taken together however, I think the benefit of people being able to input their responses in freeform text, see it on a big screen and have others critique it outweighs the problems of the laptop barrier"

"That worked well"

"Worked well enough"

"The laptop was a useful tool and I think it was fine to use this method"

"I found using the laptop very easy and convenient"

"No problem may be more participatory methods could be introduced to put the control of the message more in the hands of the participants"

"Very easy to use and providing immediate feedback - support from IT team very good - although the participants couldn't see what I was recording I always summarised and feedback what I was submitting giving them a sense of ownership"

"Extremely difficult to facilitate discussion and make contemporaneous notes - becomes more of a chair than a facilitator"

"Simultaneously typing and facilitating is extremely difficult and presents a real challenge for the facilitators... it may mean that the information is immediately available to those doing analysis and producing reports but it does mean the facilitators are far more focussed on their laptops than the group's discussions"

"No problem - worked fine"

"Typing at the same time makes us lose contact with respondents. Can lose time if need to summarize what was said to take notes"

"It was easier than I expected to take notes on the laptop and facilitate to the extent that facilitation was required. It was not possible to probe as much as I would usually, but there was not time for this kind of depth anyway.

Taping the discussions would have been good to enable quality checking of a random sample of facilitators against their notes if there were any concerns about facilitator bias creeping in at any point"

"Worked well, although extremely glad I can touch type in light of how much content we needed to discuss"

"Fine"

"Facilitating and note taking on a laptop at the same time is quite a challenge, partly as this means looking at a laptop for much of the time rather than at the participants. The pro-forma on the laptop, and particularly the summary points, did help to focus the discussion on the key points, especially given the time restraints"

"Good, manageable"

"Quite a challenge to talk, listen, facilitate AND summarise on laptops, but I appreciate it's probably the best method for capturing the information - audio tapes would not be practical in those circumstances. The only other way would be to have both a facilitator and a laptop operator on each table, but I appreciate that would rather increase the costs!"

"Fine - much better than at previous events and the need not to include quotes meant you could get on with the task of facilitating rather than note taking"

"I have not used a laptop yet that has been able to recognise when I press a vowel key. As a recording tool it was invaluable. Everyone in the Group could witness what was being written. What is critical however, is the need to review with the Group, the information that was being recorded on their behalf, and to ensure that it was an accurate reflection of their discussion before it was sent"

"The laptop is a brilliant and quicker method than trying to write down everything (provided you can type quickly) It enables you to correct any spelling mistakes at the end and also go back and insert comments that were omitted when the question was first discussed"

"Fine"

"This was not a problem - in fact it was probably better than some other events as having note takers coming around reduced the problem of recording verbatims correctly"

"I find the laptop use much easier than writing. I am fortunate in that I am able to touch-type therefore I can maintain eye contact and the discussion whilst typing. I find it much more difficult if I have to write people's responses as I feel this detracts from being able to use sufficient and effective interpersonal skills which are vital to the facilitator role. Having proformas is effective as they help keep the discussion on track for each section"

"I think capturing the discussions on laptops worked well so long as the facilitator is able to touch type so could still engage with the participants without having to always keep an eye on the computer"

"I explain at the outset that I need record their view, so that they are heard and that the process is meaningful and that I may not always make eye contact I am listening. They readily accept this and soon get in the swing of it and often pause naturally so I can catch up if necessary. I like to record as we go along rather than précis, so I don't miss anecdotes etc. It works for me because I am a touch typist and can keep up with the flow of discussion"

"This worked fine. In an ideal world you'd have a note-taker but this seems a cost-effective compromise!"

"Reasonably easy to do, although I did tend to end up typing rather than facilitating. Technology worked well"

"This was fine and actually provided me with a good mechanism for summarising and checking back with the group that I had captured their views accurately"

"Although my ability to touch type at 80 wpm enabled me to record most comments verbatim, I did not have the time or opportunity to contextualise, paraphrase or summarise them as much as I would have wished to. This

meant that there was little opportunity to probe on any paraphrasing or reflecting of ideas. Typing while facilitating means that the quality of facilitating is reduced”

“Very happy with that - found the laptop easy to use and well laid out format”

“No problems...used to inputting comments to laptops while listening to discussion, and was enough platform time to catch up if necessary”

“Using laptops was fine as I've done it a fair bit before. Though getting the amount of detail down can be very challenging as one is tempted to type in the absolute basics as there is so much going on. It gets better with practice!”

“The use of laptops is the most efficient way to capture group views. It enables to facilitator to keep the group on track and stay 'connected' to the discussion”

“Use of laptops was very practical and efficient way to keep track of proceedings. Very well laid out and clear to follow”

“It's challenging to facilitate and type but I recognise the practical value of capturing information in that way”

“I touch type so I found it easy. The lay out of the information on screen was comprehensive and helped the capturing of the information”

“I thought the use of laptops to record participants views & opinions was fine - sorry about my poor spelling!”

“It was fine”

“Participants appreciate that comments are being captured as they discuss the issues. There is time between discussions to complete the input from notes taken and from memory”

“Excellent”

“I think if the timing is not too tight and the issues being discussed less emotive, this is a good method. Smaller groups (say of 6 people) would have been more manageable and constructive. Support facilitators might have helped (typing/recording)?”

“It is obviously harder to facilitate a discussion if you also have to put in info onto a laptop at the same time and as in other events that means whoever the facilitator is they will sometimes not be able to facilitate as well as if they did not have the laptop too. Having said this the main points can be recorded in this way”

“Fine I have used this method before – the key point is to ensure that you get eye contact with participants. An alternative would someone else manning the laptop and recording and this would allow you more time to draw out and watch the group and probe deeper time allowing”

“Fine”

“This I felt was excellent, however recording and summarising views was a challenge since I was not familiar with the subject matter”

“I found this an excellent means of recording data. Researchers typically have excellent laptop / computer skills and this is one of the most efficient and accurate data recording mechanisms I have used. It is quick, accurate (one simply does not have time to do anything other than synthesise and record) and easily comparable to other facilitators in that all the data recorded is chunked down into small 'byte sized' pieces”

“I have worked several times for Opinion Leader so I am used to using the laptop. We were given a paper version of the template to look over the night before. I am used to typing straight into a laptop whilst summarising at the same time - so that was no problem for me”

“Hard work to facilitate and do notes! However, I did it and felt that I did have a good rapport with the group and managed it all”

“Laptops were fine. You are a bit more of a recorder of information, but I am very experienced and felt everyone had a chance to have their say”

“Once I got the hang of the system it was relatively easy to use. However I can touch type and I am used to taking notes and listening. In terms of facilitating the discussion it was extremely difficult within the timeframes of each question to take notes and facilitate the discussion”

“Excellent, user-friendly, convenient and expedient. My only suggestion is the provision of adjustable chairs for facilitators which would allow better height, comfort and speed for typing”

“Laptops are fine as one has developed the prerequisite skills and experience over time”

“Laptops were the best method. Also gave 1 participant a chance to double check my typing and info”

“Adequate - though in terms of facilitating broader and deeper responses, managing the laptop can become a distraction”

“Fine, no problem”

“The methods were fine, however the amount of detail, coupled with a lack of time, meant that we were always struggling to reach satisfactory conclusions”

“Average - can be hard to track comments as well as facilitate as eye contact is very important”

“Excellent. I hadn't worked that way before and I found it much easier than I'd expected”

“Excellent”

“Record keeping with the proforma was clear and worked well. Having worked with OLR before and familiar with the methodology helped a lot. Timing was v tight and sometimes there was not enough time to get through all the questions especially when people needed help to understand the questions. It was more challenging than usual to facilitate and take notes and make sure everyone had the information but not an impossible task. Note takers helped to take pressure off a bit. There were enough breaks to tidy up text on the proforma”

“It was fine recording on laptops in terms of capturing what was coming from participants, and actually I felt I was able to capture most of what people said and in a majority of cases verbatim. As mentioned earlier this would not have been easy had the full number turned up to my table as with the papers there was little space! Where this method was more difficult was in letting people see how their views were being captured and recalling key points for them to put in summary - a more visual (for them) way may have been useful - ?? how about large screens to project what is being written for the tables? However when time was tight it was more about getting points down rather than facilitating discussion. Granted this was the brief, so there was less facilitation and more about just

capturing the information. The method probably meant that people in the group who were less vocal had less of a chance of being encouraged to contribute because it was quite rapid heads down typing”

“Laptops ok. Layout worked reasonably well, but some screens 'skipped' due to incorrect screen settings - which meant delays and errors. I inadvertently missed out 2 questions!”

“Fine - lots to capture but the pro forma was fine to do that”

“Worked very well”

“Fine, have done it before and feel that it works well. Voting / videos etc provide time to go back and correct / clarify notes written down”

“Great”

“Generally the laptops focus the facilitator and help the reporting of the discussion but there were times when the facilitator had to enter the data after the discussion as an enthusiastic group were saying many valid comments at the same time and therefore the worry was what the facilitator missed”

“I felt this was a good way of storing information given by the group. This method definitely helped in terms of structuring the answers in each area on the PC”

“That was fine”

“All the practical elements were as good as they could be”

“On the whole the system works well but there were too many separated boxes and too many questions which overcomplicated some of the debates and didn't allow as much for free range debates which would have got to quality with sufficient time allocated”

“Good”

“I've got used to it as the way it's always done at these events. It is obviously not how one would moderate a focus group, but then our job is facilitation rather than moderation, and in that sense it strikes me as the best way of getting down all the information in a timely and reasonably accurate manner (but then I have never seen what my forms look like at the end of the day!)”

“Great idea!”

“Worked fine, though quite hard work given the pressure of time/info”

“The major problem was that text that I had typed kept disappearing when I got to the end of a page - although it was retrievable it made it difficult to go back and edit it very easily”

“Good”

“That was fine”

“Fine”

7 Overall, what do you think worked best at the event in terms of facilitating a good deliberative discussion? Was there anything specific that you thought worked well?

Comment analysis

- pub quiz (32)
- video (13)
- good mix of activities during the day (13)
- people did listen, learn and re-evaluate their views (6)
- polling (5)
- time management, delivery etc on the day (5)
- good social mix on tables (5)
- people were engaged and discussed well (4)
- table / group discussions (4)
- people had a chance to come together for debate (3)
- organisation / structure (3)
- facilitators' skills to achieve good discussion (3)

All comments

“The venue and set-up were good. The sense of shared purpose with other tables in the room and other venues was good”

“The quizzes provided fun and made discussion easier, especially when group was forming”

“It was as good as others I have moderated for with the same elements - so nothing specific. However I have conducted research before on the emotive subject of nuclear and the environment and can say that the respondents here displayed the same sort of range of opinion that I have previously observed. My groups were well able to take on board the detail they were given at this event, those who were quicker explaining issues to those who were slower and the group went through several changes of opinion and concern through the day. If anything they were less likely to support a nuclear element than they had been at the beginning - they were better informed and therefore saw more caveats and more opportunities for inventive ways of dealing with energy and its emissions etc.”

“Pub quiz is always good and surprising for participants. Also just the fact that any kind of dialogue happened. Another important issue is that this part of the...”

“Engaged people coming together on an important topic is always good and this process gave an opportunity for this coming together. The location, refreshments and logistics were good and that gives a sense of occasion”

“Pub quiz”

“The pub quiz, the attempt to break things into bite size chunks although as stated before they were too similar”

“I do not feel that we had a good deliberative discussion on our table - despite my playing devil's advocate and asking members to reflect on the different opinions expressed in the video clips we were shown - there was too much conformity of opinion on the table from the outset - all members were pro-nuclear - was there not a way to ensure a better range of views when the tables were being set?”

“Keeping to time was admirable especially as it was a huge event which usually is very challenging”

“Straightforward facilitated dialogue - issue identification & definition + alternative generation + evaluation + decision making. This worked very well and better when there was more time”

“Pacing was reasonable - people didn't get tired”

“Videos are interesting; they are a great way to get information across to people and something they really seem to respond to. They listen, write things down and seem to respond well to this medium. The quizzes are also a bit of fun and do get the groups (briefly) discussing issues and reaching some agreement”

“People engaged and were prepared to discuss”

“Pub Quiz - got people working together and become competitive. Also made them pay attention and was informative I think the verbatim note takers are good for OLR for analysis”

“Having mixed opinions around the table worked well because it challenged the whole group to justify their own opinion”

“Good variety with discussions, quizzes, videos etc. and chaired well”

“The way in which participants had the opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of the subject through the variety of tasks and different ways of delivering information. Participants were able to express their views in a more informed and confident way. The videos, key pad exercises and pub quizzes worked particularly well: they brought the subject to life, they helped create a team spirit among the group and kept the discussion lively and dynamic”

“The drip-feed approach to giving information and the pace of the day which kept it all dynamic”

“I don't know if I was just lucky, or whether the guidelines I suggested they all agreed to right at the beginning helped, but my table were very good at respecting other people's points of view (even when they didn't agree with them!)”

“Pub quiz, short sessions”

“That the facilitators and organisation was regarded as being totally independent of Government. The consequences were that none felt inclined to shoot the messenger (i.e. me), the tendency to adopt a position or view based on party politics was avoided, and that their views would be accurately represented”

“It all worked reasonably well but I would say (1) videos (2) handouts (3) pub quizzes. This is because only the brightest and more interested people tend to take part in this area”

“Pub quiz, group discussions of summary points”

“As above, having note-takers around was a help”

“I think what works best at any event worked well on this one - the organisation, structure, the feeling of participants being involved, clear aims and objectives which the participants are aware of and know what they are discussing, the facilitator keeping the participants to the specific topic area of each discussion section and prompting them with questions and reminders about the wider areas they need to discuss. Facilitating a good deliberative discussion also requires involving everyone, maintaining a balanced discussion, probing responses for more detail, and ensuring participants feel able to give their opinion. The tables contained a good number of people - mostly 9 or 10; any larger and it is difficult for people to hear and see each other during discussions and this can have an adverse effect. The tables were also well balanced in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, geographical area etc”

“I think having the tables individually facilitated and enabling people to vote so they could really see what they think worked well. The pub quiz really lightened the atmosphere and added an element of fun”

“Certainly the variety in pace and delivery, mixing up the quizzes etc helps discussion”

“As I understand it, a deliberative discussion is one in which people deliberate on a range of options or propositions and then take a view on them. In this context, probably the video worked best (or least badly) because it encapsulated the main points. The problem is that the deliberative bit and the discussion bit were out of kilter, because some of the channels the group might have wanted to pursue - e.g. my group were in favour of nuclear power, but against delivery through the private sector, so wanted some public ownership - were not on the agenda, and there was no means of generating new ideas”

“People were interested in the topic and although they had big knowledge gaps, 9 out of 10 people on my table started the day with an open mind and a willingness to debate the issues”

“It is difficult to give feedback about this because the event was so long ago. From memory, the earlier, more straightforward questions were easier to facilitate”

“Pub quiz and voting worked well”

“Good information from the platform, and good prompts on screen to drive discussion along.... table discussions went well”

“The gathering of so many people in one space and generating an open atmosphere was the main ingredient for a good deliberative discussion. I was lucky with my table as they bonded as a team quickly and worked well together but then there all of a similar opinion re nuclear energy. If there had been strong opposing views that would have changed the dynamics and there may not have been time to explore the different avenues. Certainly the quizzes added to the event a lot in my case”

“The mix of discussion and pub quiz worked well. Also the use of experts on the day - a resource I used myself when the group were struggling to move on with the discussion”

“The video footage was very informative and engaged the participants”

“Neutral, direct presentation of the issues which really helped bring out a range of views Clear areas for discussion during the course of the day I benefitted from a really diverse mix of people on my table too which made for a rich discussion”

“The Pub quiz”

“I loved the way participants were taken care of - I felt it followed Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and this went a long way to ensuring participants felt safe enough to participate in what felt like "out of my depth”

“As stated above the process as a whole would be sound if the information was more representative of the broader range of opinions, interests, and options available”

“Participants enjoy the quiz and respond to answers, generating discussions. Videos also work well generating discussion of the topics raised”

“I think it worked best when the participants felt they would indeed be 'heard' that their contributions would mean something in the larger picture. When there is a national link up and somebody's actual words are used and picked up on then this is really great. In terms of that day I think they loved the pub quizzes best”

“I thought the breadth and range of representation was pretty good, in terms of demographic mix of civic society/stakeholders. It wasn't apparent though how many came from areas (in Wales) adjacent to existing nuclear power stations, how many from N Wales (none on my table), i.e. the geographic and cultural mix (no discussion groups required Welsh-language facilitation)??”

“The mix of different techniques (quiz's etc) to keep them interested and the mix of ages and interests at the table”

“The mix of elements the positiveness and humanness of the facilitators inform (but needs to be in a more timely and accessible way)”

“Pub quizzes did work for getting them to engage with the data. And the videos were informative and provided a break”

“I felt the quiz and visual presentations excellent”

“The variety of different methods and the energy that this generated worked very well”

“I think people liked the quiz section because it gave them an opportunity to examine their perceptions against facts. i.e. how many tons of fuel does it take to ...”

“Basically, it is the facilitator's skills that matter most. There will always be group members who need to be reminded about letting others have the chance to speak”

“The process was good I thought, I felt that information was presented in a non judgemental fashion, people had the space to change their mind (which they did throughout the course of the day). I thought it was well organised and I felt well briefed”

“I think that the mix of the way the information was presented, with the exception of the facilitator reading out pages of badly highlighted information, worked well. However, the latter really interfered with the time available for a good deliberative discussion”

“The regular and periodical shift from facilitation table to the lead facilitator's podium kept respondents attention spans resuscitated as well as the reminders of time remaining”

“The voting and quizzes are very popular”

“Nothing that stands out”

“The variety of info sources was useful”

“Video generated a lot of debate, especially the Greenpeace one”

“Pub quizzes, films explaining how things worked rather than lengthy documents for people to read”

“The pub quiz seemed to work particularly well, but apart from that nothing stood out”

“Pub quiz”

“The pub quiz element added a lot of fun, but serious information as well, people really thought they'd learned new information”

“The 'pub quiz' is always the one section in these events that gets people really engaged”

“Good briefing and preparation info the step by step process worked well I can't remember the details We had clarity of questions and information Catering was good with a proper time to leave the room helped”

“It was a really tough brief for OLR and it is of course easy to pick out what could be improved. I think overall people went away far more enlightened than they came in - the pub quiz worked well to give people the context of the issues (though note earlier comments about perhaps over-use). I think people felt they had had their chance to have a say and actually appreciated that opportunity - though of course there was some cynicism about really how far that would be used”

“Giving people the space to discuss the topic in their own words and experience the difficulties of making difficult decisions (i.e. how to weigh up conflicting views and evidence)”

“Hard to find a specific - but generally when questions were more open and seemed to request a real point of view...”

“The variety of media in which information was presented”

“Mix of different ways of communicating information. People seemed able to assimilate a good deal of information”

“The diversity of the group selected. The venue was nice. The technology and ability to rapidly transmit information and data, compare it and display it was great! The round tables were significant, as were the keypads for voting. Hearing from other tables was brilliant and helped the participants get a sense of how their peers were processing the same information”

“The event's information on the statistics of Nuclear power verses renewables prompted many comments that they thought at the beginning that the government had already made up their mind however the video presentations made the group stop and revise some of their feelings which moved the discussions from a negative to a more positive stand for nuclear power provided the same efforts were made for renewables”

"I felt the variety of processes during the day was the best thing. I think the briefing session was immensely helpful. Having individuals around you prompting you (e.g. if you did not press save enough) and the red card worked well"

"The variety of methods worked well, keeping up a momentum throughout the day"

"The pub quiz worked well"

"The morning sessions worked better - partly because people are fresher - this could be taken account of more in the afternoon. People do generate a sense of team through having events like the pub quiz and through having a facilitator - people are usually very supportive of this role as a group, this generates buy in to the process despite varied opinions"

"Nothing out with normal facilitation skills"

"I think the process of having to come to an agreement on the three key points raised in some of the discussions worked particularly well. Not only was it a good way of summarising the debate as a way of coming to conclusions, but it also allowed those with differing views to air them again, and feel listened to, as we would capture three points that were sometimes contradictory"

"The Pub Quiz, video, and the mini competition worked very well and made it light hearted - Everything was done within the time frame"

"The participants had varying views and worked well as a team despite this"

"The quizzes"

"Good prompts, good mix of people at the table, good videos"

"The videos were excellent quality and the pub quizzes were good at getting people to think about the information they had received"

"The pub quiz was good, as was the quality of lead facilitation"

8 What do you think worked least well?

Comment analysis

- reading out information handouts (30)
- too many handouts / too much written information (26)
- information / questions leading / biased (18)
- repetition led to cynicism (14)
- too much emphasis on information giving at expense of discussion time (9)
- venue too cramped / noisy (6)
- timetable too rigid (3)
- nothing wrong (3)

All comments

"High number of handouts to be read out- but little time"

"The reading out was the least successful aspect - there was such a great deal of it -it could have been cut back. I know it was a requirement from the lawyers to reduce criticism that respondents would not have all the facts actually spelt out"

"The large amount of information and the perceived bias of the info. Also some of the questions were phrased terribly and people felt they were leading. I also feel that OLR were held back by legal issues and there were too many cooks - it was not clear who was in charge and I don't think anybody was able to work to their best. I suspect COI are not the right organisation to be managing dialogue until there is more practical experience and learning. Deliberative work is certainly not all about one way communication"

"I think that we needed something more deliberative than the process we were able to use. We ran a form of focus group. This means that the group's response was not top of the head, but it wasn't informed and considered either"

"Reading out material"

"Reading out the text, the volume of written information provided"

"Two things: 1. Despite all being "pro-nuclear" from the outset, my table began to feel less convinced as the day went on and even they began to question why "the Government" (their words, not mine) were feeding them the same information over and over and over again. They began to feel cynical and suspicious that they were being "tricked" into supporting a policy which they believed had already been set. i.e. by the end of the day they were not convinced that this had been a true consultative process and felt slightly more cynical about the Government and nuclear than it had before. 2. Lack of diversity - in all aspects but for age - on the table. i.e. everyone was white, lower middle or working class, they all hailed from very nearly the same geographic area (which was important in that it meant that every single person on my table, for instance, had a family member whose employment had been adversely affected by the downscaling of coal mining), and they were all pro-nuclear from the outset... under such circumstances having a day-long explorative discussion is too challenging"

"The role of the rapporteurs as some of them just captured what was typed by the facilitator as instead of capturing the discussions and highlights"

“Reading out a page of info. - difficult to understand yourself never mind the listeners. Not sure of the value of reading out (unless we knew some people may suffer difficulties - did we?) In a normal group facilitation I would check if everyone was ok and get people to read it themselves - go through a COC process to deepen understanding and exploration of the content then record responses - difficult in the time span though”

“Stretching content too much over the afternoon - lost people a little”

“Feeling of repetitiveness of the questions - making it obvious that they were expected to change their answer after each new piece of information”

“Respondents can lose interest if they spend too long having to listen to facilitators reading things out to them..... is seems to be a less efficient way to deliver the information and then expect people to respond, especially bearing in mind the complex nature of the material for this topic”

“Too much material had to be read out leaving too little time for discussion”

“Amount of material also a couple of respondents commented that the information seemed a bit skewed”

“Not having any time flexibility because of the tight timetable”

“Volume and depth of material”

“There was a lot to read out - this became slightly repetitive and there was no way my table were taking it all in. It also cut into a lot of the time we had to do the discussion and also, most of the information had already been explained during the talks. I felt that some of this was unnecessary”

“The information sheets for reasons stated previously”

“The amount of information on some of the handouts which we had to read out”

“Proximity of the tables, the heat of the room, the need for noisy fans, the amount of information to read out and for participants to take in, all made it difficult for people to concentrate. That said, I think they all did well to keep engaged throughout”

“As per previous responses - too much information. The videos also replicated the information we had to read out”

“The sheer volume of information presented to participants on the day did impact upon the time available for discussion within the timetable. As the information was already within the public domain, perhaps on this occasion the information should have been provided to participants prior to the event. I know it was an incredibly sensitive subject, the information could have been misrepresented and publicised prior to the event and thus may have influenced the outcome. I also suspect that after a period of reflection a good number of participants would have thought of new and interesting things to say”

“Long queues at registration making participants late in arriving at the table, thereby causing problems in going through certain procedures”

“Reading out dense information verbatim”

“There was a lot of reading out loud to be done. This worked better than anticipated but the way in which it was written was dry and boring and was probably not easy to listen to. Perhaps wording it more around the way news items on the radio or TV are worded might be better?”

“The amount of information for participants to read/hear and digest in order for it to inform their discussion. I'm not sure this had the effect (informed discussions) that was hoped. I think participants left the event feeling quite tired and overwhelmed. However, again, I do appreciate the reasons why so much information was important, and other ways of getting that information across also have their disadvantages”

“The video without Greenpeace. My table thought it was really biased and hadn't even heard Greenpeace's opinion being spoken by the narrator until I pointed it out. I realise this was out of the control of the organisers though. But, perhaps more could've been done to emphasise that they had to listen hard for the green opinions in the video since interviews had been removed”

“Having a limited agenda. People can cope with more than one question”

“The overall question itself! Several people in my group felt strongly that the way it was worded e.g. 'Given that x x and x do you think y' meant they were being led in one way”

“Reading out the material”

“At this particular event, people felt they had been pressurised into one way of thinking (a pro nuclear stance) by the way the information was presented. They thought it was biased and would have benefited from information from other perspectives”

“Time allowed for discussion, trying to facilitate and type at the same time, lengthy handouts and being required to read them out”

“Trying to get through too much complex information in too little time”

“Having to read out too many, too-long, too-detailed pieces prior to discussion, which was curtailed as a consequence”

“Not having enough time at the beginning to discuss all the issues then in the afternoon having too much time as there was a fair bit of repetition. Plus reading through the sheets made the discussion rather 'flat' sometimes which made it more difficult to keep up the buzzy atmosphere”

“Least well was probably expecting some of the group to understand the subject matter”

“Information sheets to read out - only because densely written and repetitive. Otherwise read-out sheets would have been good as contextualises video/ pub quiz info”

“It was a long demanding day but I recognise that we needed that time for a genuinely consultative session on a vital topic”

“Reading lots of hand outs”

“I felt the sense of being "coerced" worked least well. Participants wanted to discuss wider issues but felt restrained & commented that "it seems like the Gov. has already made their decision and just want us to rubber stamp it”

“Information sheets worked least well. Too much information to be discussed in too little time”

“I think the 'agenda' that was no explicit worked badly. I think it would have been better to have presented more info from opposing groups e.g. Greenpeace. I think it is always good to trust the British public to arrive at the

'right' decision and to debate all points fairly. My table wanted nuclear energy to go ahead, but didn't like that decision not to have been examined in the light of all that Greenpeace etc. might have had to say about it"

"Complex issues crammed into short time frame. Some of the facilitators weren't really experienced facilitators"

"The repetitive and generally perceived one sided nature of the information provided - i.e. the government's view)"

"Too much info – overload framing of nuclear – my group would have benefited from a much stronger assurance up front that the government had specific commitment on other energy sources (they kept coming back here like they were not convinced and it was hard to keep them on to the yes no of nuclear). The debate was a difficult one as the participants really wanted a different debate that was not covered i.e. public or private connection to other regional events helps and makes people feel that they have a say – this time we did not use this – shame as it works well and keeps people interested and empowered last minute pull out of Greenpeace etc. Facilitators could have done with a fuller briefing the morning of the event"

"Reading out far too much"

"I felt the participants should have been given the information hand outs before hand to give them time to think about the issues more time could have been allocated for open questions and the participants would have benefitted from a longer plenary"

"The amount of information was, somewhat overwhelming at times and could in fact put the respondents 'off'. At my table, the majority of respondents were favourably (and thoughtfully) disposed toward nuclear energy generation as an option. None had taken their viewpoint lightly and all seemed to be remarkably well considered. However, there was a point when the sheer volume of data (both for and against the proposition) seemed to force them into a more negative stance than at the beginning of the discussion. My feeling, as a facilitator, was that the information they were being presented with was erring so far on the side of being 'scrupulously unbiased and fair to both sides' that it became rather apologist and raised the anxiety of several of the participants"

"Sometimes it seemed that the same question was being asked again - but with a slight 'twist'. Sometimes there was nothing more to say"

"Reading a lot of material aloud!"

"Time pressure to give people so much information. It is such a huge issue really with so many complex variables involved that the findings from this day need to be seen within a broader context"

"There were too many, too similar questions and no time for participants to bring into the discussion their own issues. I am not certain that the processes provided any benefit from getting people physically together - it was more like doing an extended one to one survey only in a group setting"

"The inevitable and inescapable hubbub from other surrounding tables"

"Reading back the data sheets"

"Timescales for discussions, and repetiveness of questions"

"The tight timetable was not productive; the day was over-managed; the information provided was sometimes perceived to be partial"

"The written hand outs"

"As above, the amount of paperwork, the fact that participants felt they were being manipulated by the way the information was presented"

"The amount of time spent reading out the discussion topics severely curtailed the time available for debate. The amount of time spent by the lead facilitator and others in 'setting the scene' and interrupting the flow of the event during the day"

"Overall number of discussions - too many and too repetitive"

"Handouts - turgid language and just too much to read out"

"Reading out lengthy handouts"

"The room was cramped - tabled too close together people, me included, had to shout to be heard Too many info sheets with not enough time for people to assimilate the info We needed and afternoon wakeup/exercise session which I know was planned but didn't happen or else some mid afternoon lively activity to re-energise us all The lack of input from the green parties which made making an informed choice difficult"

"I can see how these deliberative events work really well for subjects where there is some experience of what is being discussed, I wonder if nuclear is that subject - many on my table had extremely little information about nuclear - e.g. not knowing we currently have nuclear power stations. Nuclear is complex and I felt that people needed longer to really deliberate and understand the information. So I think we could have had a more successful event tackling less of the issues"

"Background sheets and 'read out' sheets and the scope of the agenda to cover. Far too much information to convey in such a short space of time. I am aware that this was 'required' by the legal team, but legal teams generally do not, good facilitators or process designers make! Some interpretation of the requirements for the day was needed"

"Repetitive information that seemed to slant the participants towards answers - they want to say what they WANT not what the government will LET them want within boundaries.... the PROCESS here was not so much at fault as perhaps the decisions ALREADY reached, which narrowed the impact the participants felt they could have..."

"Some of the questions were repetitive which irritated respondents"

"Reading long pieces of information. Repetitive"

"The information provided was shamefully biased. And to be honest I agreed with the idea of using nuclear...but it was hardly a multiple perspective. And there were sections of the text that labeled alternative perspectives in dismissive and judgmental ways...which the participants picked up on immediately and were upset by. They did not go away feeling that they had a full sense of the debate and the options...and therefore did not feel that they could any better judge the future of nuclear energy"

"There was nothing that stands out as not working"

"The room used. The lighting was poor and the tables being so close together made you have to shout all the time to be heard. The group did not like the seating arrangements"

"The imbalance of material was an issue. It had the effect of stymieing the discussion as the day wore on because people felt that they were being fed more and more information on one side of the discussion and far too little on the other side. They therefore began to feel that they were unable to contribute further to any useful debate. It appeared as if people felt somewhat affronted to be provided with what they perceived to be a poor spread of information. The ultimate feeling amongst the group was that the day had turned out to be a government brain-washing exercise"

"Re-packaging the same information in the last few handouts made discussions really difficult"

"The amount of handouts and reading out of the handouts - this distracted from the wisdom of the group, i.e. being allowed to debate fully"

"At the risk of sounding repetitive, the long screeds of detail that had to be read out word for word, for the reasons listed above - too time consuming, and lending a sense of intransigence to what after all can only be just one perspective on what is a complicated issue(even if it is the government's)"

"The passing of 10 handouts within such a short time frame and having to read lengthy questions"

"The feeling of bias from the materials - participants felt very 'herded' and directed as to what options were allowed as answers"

"The amount of information. I also facilitated at the Healthcare event and it worked much better - more fun for respondents, far more time for discussion The venue - no natural light - it made it really tiring for everyone"

"The room was much too hot and stuffy, with no air allowed in the whole day. Everyone on my table complained about this (there is nowhere else on this q're to put this important point so I put it here)"

"The fat that there was so much information - it was too much and it all seemed to support the case for nuclear, there was some non supportive information but not very much of it"

"The bias of the information provided - both the content and tone was one sided in favour of nuclear energy"

9 Are there any specific lessons about public engagement that you would like Government to take from this event?

Comment analysis

- ensure information and event is impartial (17)
- no point if decision is made (8)
- don't overload people with detailed information (6)
- fewer, more focused questions (5)
- give participants time to think / discuss (5)
- have more open questions / discussions (5)
- do not underestimate participants / do not patronise them (4)
- give participants some information in advance (4)
- demonstrate how results make a difference (4)
- run a second day, to follow issues from the first (3)
- dialogue is different from market research (3)
- need a diverse group of participants (particularly BME groups) (3)
- do it earlier in policy process (3)
- don't be afraid of including opposing views (3)
- do it more (3)

All comments

"I think the concept is good but the implementation was limiting and I am sure that (at least on my table) real participative dialogue was not achieved. I think this process actually stifled dialogue for all the reasons I've mentioned. But, I'd like to be positive and suggest some learning for government AND Opinion Leader: • Less is more. The number of questions/subjects needs to be limited to the top 3 (or 4). If there are more, then the others should be probed in other ways, perhaps as a 2nd day using the same punters. Fewer, specific questions and related information would allow more comprehensive dialogue and, therefore, more meaningful results. A 2nd day could then probe further using the results of the 1st. That would be real, responsive engagement and dialogue. • Feedback is crucial 1. The questions on the feedback forms were quite limited. My group was very disgruntled and felt that they had no opportunity to express that. They wondered if there was a way for them to do so at points throughout the day. I understand that that would be difficult but it might help to avoid feelings of being used. • Feedback is crucial 2. I asked three OLR people for information on how table facilitators would feedback. Three times I was given a 'dunno'. Given that OLR/BERR had paid for 120 facilitators to interface with the public, it seems inefficient/costly to not gather or learn from their feedback at the time. But, it is good that this feedback exercise is happening now. • Dialogue/participation is different to market research. It seemed that the consultation event was really about numbers rather than participative debate. I think I have Gordon Brown saying that 1,200 people were engaged in debate. Well I suppose on the face of it they were but really they did a pub quiz and reacted to some issues. My table did not really debate – they were not given the opportunity to! • Learning is better than repetition. After the nuclear event, I worked at the NHS event later in the month. I have the same observations and concerns. I broadly support the activity and believe that real public dialogue should be used to inform developments that affect people and the environment. It is my hope, in completing this evaluation in some

detail, the OLR and commissioners have the willingness and ability to learn and adapt. I'd be saddened if this process is rejected as I think it has some real potential to actively engage. I hope that this is the beginning of a dialogue to work out the best way to do so"

"Ensuring that hear from a variety of people but that emotional vulnerability needs supporting. I feel one of the members of my group did not cope well with the intensity of the group contact"

"Having the Prime Minister make an appearance certainly has impact - it adds credibility but does that the results will be listened to though it does not remove the skepticism about the value of government consultation - these days are often media events as well as research events so anything that makes everything more transparent and reduces spin is an advantage"

"Do it sooner and spend the right amount of time running the process. This was a 50 year old issue with entrenched positions which deserved much longer in deliberation. Public engagement was the right thing to do, but needed more attention and time and more scientific expertise present in the room. A dialogue about energy would be fantastic, and could be run in a fair and expert way and give huge insights to ministers about what the public would support and change their behavior for. Multiple types of process are a good idea - there always need to be more than one strand, so excellent that people had chance to feed in to the Dialogue by Design online part too. More connection with the stakeholder section could have been secured and the stakeholders could have been happier given more time and more real link in with the public dialogue process. It was essential to work with stakeholders first and agree materials, but there has to be transparency and a feedback process for them too"

"Match the purpose with the right engagement method"

"Yes, there was a feeling information presented was not impartial and I have to agree in some instances it appeared that way. Not to overload people with written information and to consider the needs of those with sensory disabilities when requiring information to be 'read out'"

"Such processes need to be much more transparent and, to a degree relaxed, than this process was. The jargon used in the information was off putting; the tone was at times patronising and repetitive and I'm afraid to say that I do not feel that they gave any great sense of confidence in the procedure or BERR's motives to the members at my table"

"The need for more balance and open discussions. More use of Participatory community consultation activities and collaborative problem solving techniques which result in richer and feedback and content that provides alternative solutions and even redefinitions of the perceived problem"

"The one big lesson is that people will genuinely try their best to provide information about their views - they really work hard with groups of people they have never met before so it isn't easy but they all give it their best shot. What the Government must do is reward this effort and update the contributors of what's happening to their contributions - people don't object to change - they object to being changed 0- the government should be applauded for trying to engage and allow the public to contribute"

"I would argue the basic that it's not worth doing discussion if the decision has already been taken, which it had"

"I think the events look very slick, and the quantitative information is valuable; I think far more could be extracted from the qualitative phase by using proper participatory techniques, e.g. those championed by the institute for cultural affairs www.ica-uk.org.uk - technology of participation. I feel that real consultation and listening is being sacrificed to glitzy events which yield soundbites"

"The public see things far more simply than Government and I hope these consultation exercises are showing Government this... it is Government's responsibility to ensure they can present their policies and ideas in a simple way so the public can fully understand the issues. This event was less successful at doing this than other similar events I have been involved in"

"Possibly this was too ambitious and insufficiently thought through. I recall there were too many changes to our instructions in the closing sessions as Government advisors sought to address emerging issues. I also thought the question on private sector involvement was too complicated for most people to appreciate"

"Ensure all points of view are represented in the material shown be honest about information provided give respondents time to think"

"Make sure all sides are fully on board and signed up to the process so that balanced information can be agreed and presented. Without this balance, there is always a danger that the results will be biased"

"Be a bit more neutral in your presentation. It seemed to me, pretty clear what you were wanting to achieve and this only adds to mistrust and the view that you have already decided the course of action you want to take versus really listening to your public"

"Participants enjoyed the consultation and felt it was very useful. They enjoyed expressing their views and being involved in a decision making process. It is important for the participants to get a balanced view of a complex subject such as nuclear energy in a public consultation of this kind"

"Where appropriate, be sure to provide sufficient information for each side of the argument to assuage any possible cynicism by participants that they are being led by Government to give the answers they want"

"Be very careful how you present the information to be as neutral, impartial and as balanced as possible. The danger of people feeling "led" is one to watch for"

"Whilst the event had to stand up to public scrutiny it does not seem as if it gave a fair representation of views and nor was it the best way to communicate the required information. More attention should be paid to designing the process rather than bombarding people with information"

"The clear message from participants was that they believed this event was valuable both personally in enabling them to be better informed, and nationally as a means of reflecting the views of the country. If the process of public engagement is to have credibility, it is critical that the outcome is seen to influence policy. So that participation is not to be viewed as a chore eg jury service, but as a valuable contribution to improving the well-being of society. Importantly, it must not be seen as politicians abdicating their responsibility for decision making. particularly for difficult and potentially unpopular decisions With this particular event, none of my Group felt that the outcome would influence whether or not the Government decided to progress the nuclear option. In

fact the majority took the view that this decision was for the politicians alone - that is what they are elected to do. It was in the detail, such as transport, storage and security etc where they believed they had the greatest opportunity to influence. So the lesson for the Government? You make the big decisions and tell the public what you are going to do, and the public would like the opportunity to tell you how they would like you to achieve it"

"Room was too small and it was very noisy. It was difficult to hear your own table over the adjoining tables and particularly participants with a poor command of English. This point also holds up the discussion when you are trying to extract views and they tend not to join in if they can get away with it"

"The public are sceptical and distrusting of government. Even when a policy position - like the government's position of the future of nuclear power - is made clear as it was from the start of this event, there is a fine balance in establishing the credibility of such an event in presenting all sides of the debate. Even though the government's position was made clear as the starting point of the days' discussions - in many ways this in itself served to undermine the public's perception of why they were there and they had made up their minds within the first few minutes that it was a 'fix'. The government should only consult using public engagement methods on things that are yet to be decided"

"Do not underestimate the knowledge of participants. Avoid being patronising and make sure that information provided reflects a range of opinions (and I don't just mean Greenpeace) and experts. More opportunity for open ended questions might also be useful (though admittedly difficult to manage)"

"To ensure that participants feel listened to and that they are actually having a say. It appears that consultation events are increasing, which is good and should be a continuing trend. and it is vital that the points raised in consultations are listened to, utilised, and that the public are made aware of how their discussions have influenced policies to demonstrate that consultation does have an impact. It is important that people at the event feel that their time and input is valued and will count. I think at the event on 8 Sept, most people felt that they were having a say and that it would be listened to, yet there were others who were sceptical on this and felt it was a publicity exercise. The participants on my table were a very balanced group and nobody had extreme views either for or against nuclear energy, and the discussion was a pleasant one and the day went very well. However I am aware from other facilitators that other tables did have some more extreme views and some participants who felt that the information was biased. However, I think it was made clear about the government agenda - in many consultations I have done the government is looking to the public for not only views but also ideas. In this one, the government's view about nuclear was made clear and it was for the public to comment on this. In this way, many participants knew why they were there, but others felt that decisions had already been made. I think this is why consultation needs to increase - with more awareness of the use of consultation and the results from it and its impact on policies, then participants may see the benefits and understand the importance of their discussions"

"Time and time again the issue of trust came up!"

"Be clear about when you are genuinely consulting and when you are ratifying something. The fact that Gordon Brown had already made a pronouncement on the issue meant this was more the latter than the former. This isn't necessarily a bad thing but I think it's important to be clear upfront"

"This was not an exercise in public engagement. It was a variant on a social research exercise, carried out in a competent way by an organisation that is good at it. Essentially it was a giant piece of polling contributing to a public consultation. Public engagement is something quite different. It involves much more generative processes, putting members of the public in the driving seat to set the agenda as much as follow it. One thing is not better than the other thing, but they are not the same"

"This kind of deliberative event works well, especially with "lay" representatives but works less well when there are professionals and lay people mixed"

"People lose interest and become sceptical and disheartened when they feel that their opinions don't really count - i.e. if they feel that their opinions are being sought after the Government has made up its mind about a particular issue, or if they sense that their feedback has the potential to be used in a way that could be construed to support a particular argument when they have not had the opportunity to discuss other aspects of that argument because those aspects were not on the discussion agenda"

"In my view it would have worked better with less technical information and more general info on the principles of nuclear energy (which was how the participants perceived it anyway), which would have given time for more open debate. Also, not to be scared of introducing opposing views - the participants on my table were very rational in their deliberations, but what annoyed them was their perception that information was being withheld from them"

"Frame questions in a true open "give us your opinion" way...not "if we did this, would you agree", which led to a strong feeling amongst delegates that the process was superficial and cosmetic, and policies had already been decided"

"That the public were fairly consulted and allowed to express their own opinion. However, one has to be aware that people's opinions may well have been tapped after being given a certain amount of information from a variety of media which may have led them to come to a set of conclusions that on reflection, they may think differently. A sort of 'audience effect'"

"I'd like to suggest the use of an informative DVD for participants, particularly when the subject matter is a difficult one as the one for future nuclear energy. Participants should be permitted to share the DVD with friends and family. This would enable them to attend the consultation event better informed, to feel more confident, and to bring views of family and friends"

"Never underestimate the public - I felt all of my participants had arrived with an open mind and were willing to let themselves believe nuclear was the way forward - if part of a fair, balanced and impartial debate. By the end of day many left feeling hoodwinked by government spin. Reverted back to "exhaust and exploit fully renewables debate" before considering nuclear. Felt in some cases we had taken a step back rather than moved forward. Think was also evident from concluding vote"

"The presence of a minister who not only spoke formally but talked with people during the course of the day made a positive difference"

"I received many comments from facilitators at other events that they way it was framed was unbalanced in favour of Nuclear development and as such it contributed to the event having the feel of being a propaganda exercise rather than a consultation"

"Allow a slot for 'other' issues so that people don't feel so hemmed in"

"I think it's positive that government is requesting feedback from the public. But for it to be genuine they need to be sure that the information on controversial topics be full and thorough- otherwise it is manipulative and also feeds the general public cynicism that is so prevalent today, and which is expressed by significant number of participants at these events"

"It is always difficult to engage with the public and to obtain responses. This is an effective way of engaging with the public but participants need to feel that their views will be taken into consideration and that the outcome is not already decided"

"Perhaps to present a level playing field and as much info as possible of all kinds as well as the dilemma and trust the process. But on the whole I think it was a brilliant debate and made all the more interesting because of the swings of opinion and the lively debating going on. The gov should do more of these kinds of events and listen and learn and then do more again, so that the public feel truly on board, even with hard decision making"

"Participants are SMART. Don't underestimate them. You can't direct them into overlooking problems, not asking more questions than you have answers for - they will protest and to some degree, override your agenda. I think the "main question" or "purpose" at this event was overly complicated; simpler, more straightforward language and more open questioning might have been more successful. It's not good to rush people"

"Present all sides of the argument even if the other side will not take part as otherwise the event can end up being perceived as purely a PR exercise as opposed to a real deliberative event where what is considered and fed back is really listened to"

"Yes – when there is a lot of info don't overload have a scribe for the facilitator both these will allow the facilitator to work deeper with people – to get more at the root of people concerns"

"Provide participants with a map of the structure of the event - this issues being covered -otherwise it felt repetitive. This form should have been received closer to the event when the experience was fresher"

"I hope that they take the public views into account and that this was not just an tick box exercise"

"I do feel that with some of the more complex and contentious issues, which this certainly was, that more time could usefully be spent preparing the respondents obviously a preliminary, working evening whereby basic information could be laid out, would be ideal. The costs would be considerably more but I feel that the pre-discussion preparation would have justified the additional expenditure. Nuclear Power is a contentious subject and the majority of participants came to the discussion with strong views and a pronounced mental set. If the 'truest' reading of how the public will react 'longer term' then preparatory work really should be done to try and work through some of these issues prior to the 'recorded discussion'. A far more complex task admittedly. I have taken part in a less contentious study where the day was certainly adequate"

"Participants were happy to give their views on nuclear energy issues but said that they would like their answers to be set in the context of the total energy needs of the country and not just whether or not more nuclear was a good idea"

"Public consultation must take place early enough to listen to the people consulted. The group members felt it was just a rubber stamping exercise"

"I think when given the chance (such as this event), people are pretty forthcoming in giving their honest views about things and are able to make up their own minds about issues effecting them. I think it does come down to the quality and experience of facilitators used as well to ensure that everyone has a chance to have their say. Try not to cover too much at once, as there was a lot to get through for this event"

"There are different models of how to engage people depending on the purpose. This process was heavily driven by market research and polling models. It had more in common with market testing than, for example, large scale, facilitated approaches to stakeholder engagement and dialogue. I do not, for example, think I was required to use facilitation skills which can help with the process being seen as independent of the client/government and which encourage people to listen to each other as well as the presented information before coming to their own views. I would want the government to understand that there are a number of quite different approaches to public engagement each of which have their strengths and weaknesses and they should be chosen based on the purpose of the engagement. The danger with only using a market research/testing model is that the participants get very sceptical - the government only wants our views so they can sell things to us. You also need some ways of engaging that are more participatory and at an earlier stage of decision-making. Having said all that, I welcome the new developments in public engagement as another step in an on-going developmental process and I think my group would have gone home having enjoyed it and would do a bit of viral marketing on the issue"

"That changing public perception and preconceptions require sustained engagement with the public"

"Ensure that the participants are as representative of the general population as possible - start the recruitment process early"

"No - format of the day worked well"

"Try to provide more time opportunity for thoughtful response, with a less managed timetable and overall more space to allow facilitator to work more with their own group"

"Spend more time demonstrating to respondents that the information that they receive has been carefully balanced and represents all views, not just the government agenda"

"Whilst appreciating that the environmental lobby had declined to take part in these events, it would have been useful if more of the opposing argument had been given as the participants at my table were worrying about what information they hadn't been given and doubting some of the information that they were given"

"Issues such as this must be presented in a balanced way, and whilst I understand the last minute difficulties relating to Greenpeace, not enough was done to cover the alternative options. With this and all other events of this nature, please allow more time for the real purpose, i.e. debate and discussion and reduce to a minimum the

time allocated to the various facilitators, ministers and everyone else who feels the need to take the stage and 'contextualise' anything that moves"

"This type of event is suitable when you want to genuinely elicit peoples views. This event felt very much like a "public education " exercise to convince people that nuclear energy is great. I didn't feel that it was a balanced event"

"Keep messages short and sharp and don't overload people with information"

"The concept is excellent - I have worked as a facilitator now for probably 30 events for OLR and they are an excellent organisation. Much thought is put into the events beforehand and briefings for facilitators are superb, I have nothing but praise for OLR. In my opinion the models OLR has developed are an example of excellent public involvement"

"Perhaps involve less people but have a more in depth debate Don't be afraid to tackle difficult issues like this in this way - I think it was worth it and appreciated Less is more - may be tackle this in smaller bite sized chunks"

"I hope that they continue to explore and experiment with ways to engage the public. This is another huge learning opportunity, both good and bad I expect. From the participants there was a sense of cynicism because the government had to state its view - this sat uneasily with many participants - i.e. it made the process less credible as people think government will do what it wants to anyway"

"Keep it simpler! From information sheets to the range of themes to be addressed during the day. Don't overload either participants or the process. How about expanding the space at the beginning of the day (or the whole morning?) to be an open ended discussion about 'nuclear power' during which the group could articulate their views of the topic and come up with, say, 2 themes they want to explore in more detail during the rest of the day. This works with their enthusiasms. The ensuing discussion could then use prepared materials looking at these themes (eg generation; waste disposal) along with videos (run a video on the table laptop?). The discussion could still have some introduced structure when looking at their chosen themes to cover the main points within their themes and new ones introduced by the group. A variation on this would be for the whole event to have up to 5 key themes from which each table chooses 2 and then goes through prepared material (again with table based videos). Apart from information overload and extraction, I think there is a danger in trying to develop a wholly front-led generic process which blankets over participants' enthusiasms or areas of interests on each table. Designing in some flexibility and room for participants' to develop their own agenda and views *at the table* would, I think, give a richer and ultimately more informed discussion. Otherwise there is a risk, given the limited time for discussion, that it is simply an individual questionnaire survey disguised with videos and voting machines. Also - what opportunities for sending people background material beforehand?"

"ALWAYS bring people in at the beginning of a process - with decisions already made on controversial topics, people feel cheated of REAL participation. It may well be that these things have already happened, but then the results and the details of that need to be available for people. You can't feel that you have a valid opinion when it seems that much information is not available (and possibly not consulted on!)"

"Maybe longer discussions "

"Next time...don't fail to offer clearly opposed view points. If you feel that your position is secure and thoroughly thought through don't be afraid to let the opposition speak. It only strengthens the trust the people have in you for being considerate and honest with them. My participants went away trusting the gov't less"

"That it is possible with the right approach and information to well chosen people to achieve a sensible debate on a subject where the normal discussions, probably in the pub, would be more driven by emotion"

"Yes. At the event I could only see 2 people who were evidently from BME groups. This is not to say that individuals from places like Eastern Europe did not attend. However, for the demographics of the area I felt there could have been more people from other ethnic groups. I think that perhaps the sampling techniques utilised should be reassessed"

"Respect those from whom you wish to encourage serious debate by providing them with clear and unbiased information as part of the exercise"

"I think they need to think more about what it is they hope to achieve. The day felt like the government really just wanted to know if people liked their view, it did not feel like they wanted to know what other peoples views about the entirety of the subject were. Also, and this was a big problem, is that the final 'key' question was about private investment in Nuclear Power, which was hardly touched upon in the main body. everybody felt that had been slipped in to confuse, and felt very patronized"

"Clarity of questions, questions are often phrased in a cumbersome way and too similar to each other. Being careful of the amount of information given and careful that views which are different to the governments are not glossed over. Participants are able to deal head on with difficult debates which are complex. This was apparent despite some room for improvement in the overall process"

"Get correct venue and not too much information"

"I was really impressed by my participants, in the way that they conducted the debate. It is an immensely emotional issue, with strong feelings on all sides, and one in which there is quite clearly no simple answer. I was very proud of the way that my participants debated with each other, always very respectful of other people's points of views, but without being defensive, patronising, or aggressive in terms of ensuring they put their own view across. No one was dogmatic, everyone listened. When you compare it to discussions on Newsnight or R4's Today programme, I would say that the British public should not be judged by the behavior of both the media and some politicians and pundits, looking to get their soundbite across. They should be given much more credit for their ability to deal with complicated issues, and their willingness to consider different points of view. I think it is unfortunate that neither Greenpeace, who as my participants said, were much missed by virtue of their abstention from the debate, nor the Government, with their legally appropriate descriptions of issues, were able to 'muck in' and take the risk of just running ideas by people and allowing them to make up their own minds"

"The Government should do this on a more regular bases as a means to engage with the public and educate the public"

“To consult with the public/stakeholders first and then go about having an opinion based on these results. Also to be more brave about allowing blue sky thinking. it would be great if this event had been preceded by information sent to the participants on the details and facts surrounding the discussions - in this way the depth and quality of insights would be worth more. In addition, having discussion groups where members of the public can pose their ideas and get insights from experts on the subject would also work well to bring more out of the process. as it was it seemed quite superficial, touching the surface of an issue people (by the end of the day) felt was very important”

“Try to present the information in a more interesting way. Try to make it feel less biased - I felt at times that we were trying to persuade respondents to adopt opinions and some of my respondents felt that they were being rail-roaded into saying things that they didn't want to say”

“If you want real feedback (I have no idea if you do and most people at my table assumed you don't), allow time for proper discussion - not just a token 3 minutes covering each massive issue”

“It seemed that if they had allowed more time for the information to be taken on board - maybe a 2 day consultation with half the people so they had time to take in the information”

Annex 11: Interview questions

Interview questions for participants at stakeholder events

Interview questions for participants at stakeholder events

Range of people / process

- 1 Did you feel that the relevant stakeholder interests were represented at the meeting you attended? If not, who else should have been there? Please say why.
- 2 Did you feel the structure and delivery of the event enabled you to have your say on the issues? If not, how should the structure and delivery have been changed to make it better?
- 3 Do you feel that everyone there had an equal chance to have their say and that no single view was allowed to dominate the discussion?
- 4 Were you able to make the points you wanted to on nuclear power? Please say why.
- 5 Was there enough time to cover all the main issues?
- 6 Did you feel that the comments and views from stakeholders were recorded appropriately by the people running the meeting? Please say why.
- 7 Did you take part in any other elements of the consultation (e.g. responding online to the consultation document)? Please say what you did, and why, and whether you have any comments on that.

Information and understanding

- 8 Was there enough information provided to enable you to take part fully in the discussions?
- 9 Was the information at the meeting clear and reliable? Please explain.
- 10 Were you clear about the Government's initial view on the future of nuclear power? Please explain.
- 11 Did you feel able to ask questions? Were you happy with the answers you were given? Please say why.
- 12 Did you feel that the important issues around nuclear power were covered? Please explain.
- 13 Had you seen much media coverage of the issues in the consultation before you attended the event? Did that media coverage affect your views on the consultation? Did it affect your views on nuclear power?

Transparency

- 14 Were you clear about why and how the Government was consulting stakeholders on the future of nuclear power? Please explain.
- 15 Were you clear about how this consultation fits within the wider context of UK energy policy generally, and the challenges of climate change and energy security? Please explain.
- 16 Were you clear about the purpose of the event you attended? Please explain.
- 17 Were you clear what the stakeholder involvement was expected to achieve, and what difference it would make? Do you think that was the case? Please say why.
- 18 Are you clear about how the information collected at the event you went to was used? If not, what else do you want to know?
- 19 Are you clear about how the event you took part in fitted in to the overall Government consultation on nuclear power? Is there anything you still need to know before you are clear?
- 20 What do you know about the results of this consultation? Are you satisfied with what you have been told about that? Please say why.
- 21 What do you know about the Government's decision on the future of nuclear power? Have you read *Meeting the Energy Challenge. A White Paper on Nuclear Power*? Are you satisfied with what you have been told about the decision? Please say why.
- 22 Do you think the Government (who commissioned this consultation) listened to and considered what stakeholders had said when they decided their policy on nuclear power? Please say why.
- 23 Are you clear about the overall impact of stakeholder views on the Government's decisions on nuclear power? Please explain more.

Benefits (and costs) of the consultation

- 24 Did you learn anything new by taking part in this consultation that informed your understanding of nuclear power? If so, what and why?
- 25 Did being involved in the consultation make any difference to what you think about nuclear power? Please say how and why.
- 26 Did being involved make any difference to what you think about Government consulting stakeholders on these sorts of issues? Please say why.
- 27 Overall, what were the main things that you got out of being involved in this consultation?
- 28 Are you satisfied with your involvement in this consultation? Did you have any disappointments with what happened? Please say why.

- 29 Stakeholder consultation obviously has financial costs. Do you think it is money well spent, or not? What do you think would make these sorts of consultations really good value for money? Please say why.
- 30 As a result of your involvement, are you more likely to want to get involved in this type of consultation in future, or not?

Lessons for the future

- 31 Overall, what do you think worked best at the event you went to? Do you remember anything specific that worked well? Please say what and why.
- 32 What do you think worked least well, and should be changed in future to make stakeholder involvement easier and better? Please say what and why.
- 33 Are there any specific lessons about involving stakeholders that you would like the Government to take from this consultation? Please say what and why.
- 34 Is there anything else you would like to say about being involved in this consultation that we have not covered?

Interview questions for participants at public events

Range of people / process

- 1 Was there a good mix of public participants at the event you attended? Please say why. Were there any types of people that you feel should have been there but weren't?
- 2 Do you feel that everyone there had an equal chance to have their say and that no single view was allowed to dominate the discussion? Please say why.
- 3 Were you able to say what you wanted to say? Please say why.
- 4 Was there enough time at the event to cover all the main issues? Please say why.
- 5 Did you feel that the comments and views from the public were recorded fully and in the best way by the people running the meeting? Please say why.
- 6 Did you take part in any other elements of the consultation (e.g. responding online to the consultation document)? Please say what you did, and why, and whether you have any comments on that.

Information and understanding

- 7 Were you clear about the Government's initial view on the future of nuclear power? Please explain.
- 8 Was there enough information provided to enable you to take part fully in the discussions?
- 9 Could you understand and use the information provided on the day (by the facilitators, in handouts, on the video, in answers to the pub quiz)? Please say why.
- 10 Was the information on the day clear and informative? Please explain.
- 11 Was the video useful in helping you understand the different views on the issues? Did you feel that was an appropriate range of views for you to consider? Please say why.
- 12 Was there enough time at the event for you to absorb the information and use it to develop your own views and discuss those with the other participants? Please say why.
- 13 Did you feel able to ask questions? Were you happy with the answers you were given? Please say why.
- 14 Did you feel that the important issues around nuclear power were covered? Please explain.
- 15 Had you seen much media coverage of the issues in the consultation before you attended the event? Did that media coverage affect your views on the consultation? Did it affect your views on nuclear power?
- 16 Did you personally find out any extra information on nuclear power before or after the event? Please say what and why.

Transparency

- 17 Were you clear about why and how the Government was consulting the public on the future of nuclear power? Please explain.
- 18 Were you clear about how this consultation fits within the wider context of UK energy policy generally, and the challenges of climate change and energy security? Please explain.
- 19 Are you clear about how the event you took part in fitted in to the overall Government consultation on nuclear power? Is there anything you still need to know before you are clear?
- 20 Were you clear about the purpose of the actual event you attended? Please explain.
- 21 Were you clear what the public involvement was expected to achieve, and what difference it would make? Do you think that was the case? Please say why.
- 22 Are you clear about how the information collected at the event you went to was used? If not, what else do you want to know?
- 23 What do you know about the results of the public consultation? Are you satisfied with what you have been told about that? Please say why.
- 24 What do you know about the Government's decision on the future of nuclear power? Are you satisfied with what you have been told about that? Please say why.

- 25 Do you think the Government (who commissioned this consultation) listened to and considered what the public had said when they decided their policy on nuclear power? Please say why.
- 26 Are you clear about the overall impact of public views on the Government's decisions on nuclear power? Please explain more.

Benefits (and costs) of the consultation

- 27 Did you learn anything new about nuclear power as a result of taking part in this consultation? If so, what sorts of things?
- 28 Did being involved in the consultation make any difference to what you think about nuclear power? Please say how and why.
- 29 Did being involved make any difference to what you think about Government consulting the public on these sorts of issues? Please say why.
- 30 Overall, what were the main things that you got out of being involved in this consultation?
- 31 Are you satisfied with your involvement in this consultation? Did you have any disappointments with what happened? Please say why.
- 32 Public consultation obviously has financial costs. Do you think it is money well spent, or not? What do you think would make these sorts of consultations really good value for money? Please say why.
- 33 As a result of your involvement, are you more likely to want to get involved in public consultations in future, or not?

Lessons for the future

- 34 Overall, what do you think worked best at the event you went to? Do you remember anything specific that worked well? Please say what and why.
- 35 What do you think worked least well, and should be changed in future to make it easier for the public to contribute, or to help the public make a better contribution? Please say what and why.
- 36 Are there any specific lessons about involving the public that you would like the Government to take from this consultation? Please say what and why.
- 37 Is there anything else you would like to say about being involved in this consultation that we have not covered?

Interview questions for observers at public events

Your activities and role in the process

- 1 Have you been involved in this sort of consultation process before? If so, in what ways? How was this process different from your previous experience?
- 2 Which events did you attend and why?
- 3 Was there anything that you think worked particularly well, and that you would recommend could be used in future consultations of this sort? Please say why.
- 4 Was there anything that did not work well, and should not be done again? Please say why.
- 5 What did you think of the interest and enthusiasm of the participants at the events you attended? Please say why.
- 6 What did you think of the quality of discussions among the participants at the events you attended? Please say why.
- 7 What did you think of the way information was introduced and used on the day? Please say why.
- 8 What did you think of the quality of the information used on the day? Was it clear and reliable? Please say why.
- 9 Was the video useful in helping the public understand a range of views on the issues? Did you feel this was an appropriate range of views for the public to consider? Please say why.

Transparency

- 10 Were you clear about why and how the Government was consulting the public and stakeholders on the future of nuclear power? Please explain.
- 11 Were you clear about how this consultation fits within the wider context of UK energy policy generally, and the challenges of climate change and energy security? Please explain.
- 12 Were you clear about the Government's initial view on the future of nuclear power? Please explain.
- 13 Were you clear what the public and stakeholder involvement was expected to achieve, and what difference it would make? Do you think that was the case? Please say why.
- 14 What do you know about the results of this consultation? Are you satisfied with what you have been told about that? Please say why.
- 15 What do you know about the Government's decision on the future of nuclear power? Have you read *Meeting the Energy Challenge. A White Paper on Nuclear Power*? Are you satisfied with what you have been told about the decision? Please say why.

- 16 Do you think the Government (who commissioned this consultation) listened to and considered what stakeholders and the public had said when they decided their policy on nuclear power? Please say why.
- 17 Did you feel that the important issues around nuclear power were covered? Please explain.

Benefits (and costs) of the consultation

- 18 Did your involvement in this consultation process make any difference to what you think about Government consulting stakeholders and the public on these sorts of issues? Please say why.
- 19 Overall, what were the main things that you got out of being involved in this consultation? Please say why.
- 20 Are you satisfied with your involvement in this consultation? Did you have any disappointments with what happened? Please say why.
- 21 Public and stakeholder consultation obviously has financial costs. Do you think it is money well spent, or not? What do you think would make these sorts of consultations really good value for money? Please say why.
- 22 As a result of your experience of this consultation, are you more likely to want to see Government run these sorts of consultation in future, or not? Please say why.

Lessons for the future

- 23 Overall, what do you think worked best in this consultation from your experience? Do you remember anything specific that worked well? Please say why.
- 24 What do you think worked least well, and should be changed in future to make public and stakeholder involvement easier and better? Please say why.
- 25 Are there any specific lessons about involving the public and stakeholders that you would like the Government to take from this consultation? Please say what and why.
- 26 Is there anything else you would like to say about being involved in this consultation that we have not covered?

Interview questions for BERR policy people

The design and delivery of the consultation

- 1 Did you attend any of the public or stakeholder consultation events? Please say which ones and why.
- 2 Do you feel that the overall design of the events for the public and stakeholders worked well to get the sort of information that BERR needed to develop its policy on nuclear power? Please say why.
- 3 Do you think the delivery of the events worked well or not (e.g. management of the event, facilitation, presentations)? Please say why.
- 4 Did you think there were enough people, and a good enough mix of people, at the events to make the consultation effective and valuable? Please say why.
- 5 How well do you feel the discussions among participants in small groups worked? Please say why, and what could improve that.
- 6 Did you feel that the introduction of different perspectives in the video for the public events worked well? Did you feel there was an appropriate range of views for the public to consider? Please say why, and what could improve that.
- 7 Did you feel that the written consultation document and online consultation elements worked well or not? Please say how and why.
- 8 Was there anything that you think worked particularly well, and that you would recommend to future consultations of this sort?
- 9 Was there anything that did not work well, and should not be done again?
- 10 What did you think of the interest and enthusiasm of the participants at the events?
- 11 What did you think of the quality of discussions among the participants at the events?

Using the outputs from the public and stakeholder consultation

- 12 How important do you feel it is to legitimacy of the results of the public consultation that a representative cross-section of UK citizens took part in the events? Please say why.
- 13 Were the results of the consultation given to you in a form that was easy for you to use? What would have made that information easier for you to use?
- 14 What were the most useful outputs that came from the public and stakeholder consultations for your work? For example:
 - you listening directly to the views of the public and stakeholder at events
 - direct feedback from the people delivering the process (OLR, BERR, COI etc)
 - the public responses to the written consultation / online responses
 - the written findings from the various parts of the consultation
 - any others?
- 15 Was the quality of the outputs from the process what you needed for the policy development process?
- 16 How did you analyse and use the findings from the public and stakeholder consultations? Please say why.

- 17 How was this different from the way you / the department usually comes to conclusions on this sort of issue? Please say why.
- 18 How did you assess and integrate the findings from the consultation with evidence from other sources (e.g. conventional research, internal policy development) to inform your decision-making processes? Please say why.
- 19 Did you give different weights to the data from different sources? How was that weighting done and why?
- 20 Did that integration process work well, or not? Please say why.
- 21 What challenges did you encounter in analysing and integrating the data from the consultation, and how did you overcome these? What would have help address these challenges?
- 22 Can you suggest ways of integrating findings from different sources that would have worked better? Please say why.

Impacts / influence of the public engagement

- 23 What was the main value of the public and stakeholder consultations to the department's policy development and decision-making? Please say why.
- 24 What would have increased the value of this consultation to your work - anything that could have been changed or added to make it more valuable? Please say why.
- 25 How was the decision on the future of nuclear power affected by the results of the consultation? Please say how and why.
- 26 Can you give examples of changes that have or will result from the consultation? For example:
 - any ideas / issues increased in importance for future government policy
 - any ideas / issues added
 - any ideas / issues downgraded in importance
 - any ideas / issues removed.
- 27 Did the department feel the Government's preliminary view on nuclear power was supported by the results of the consultation? Please say how and why.
- 28 Did the department feel the Government's preliminary view on nuclear power was challenged by the results of the consultation? Please say how and why.
- 29 What is likely to change in future Government policy development on nuclear power as a result of the findings from the consultation? Please say how and why.
- 30 What is likely to change in future Government policy development on energy generally, and on climate change and energy security, as a result of the findings from the consultation? Please say how and why.
- 31 Did any new or unexpected ideas emerge from the consultation to your knowledge? Please give examples.
- 32 Do you feel that the consultation process has improved the accountability and legitimacy of the Government's policy development and decision-making on this issue? Please say how and why.
- 33 Have you changed your views on public and stakeholder consultation as a result of being involved in this process? If so, in what ways and why?
- 34 Are you more likely to want to engage the public and stakeholders in this way in future, as a result of your experience here? Please say why.
- 35 Were you surprised at anything you heard or experienced during the consultation, for good or bad? Please say what and why.

Finally ...

- 36 Overall, do you think that this consultation has been successful? *Yes, very / yes, fairly / Not sure / No, not really / No, not at all.* Please say why.
- 37 Public and stakeholder consultation obviously has financial costs. What factors affect your view on whether this is money well spent, or not?
- 38 Can you suggest any specific lessons from this consultation that could make future consultations work better?
- 39 Is there anything else you would like to say about this consultation on the future of nuclear power that we have not covered?

Many thanks for your help.