

Question 1: To what extent do you think our proposed approach to providing national-scale existing information about geology relevant to long-term safety is appropriate? Please give your reasons.

I think the proposed approach to the national-scale screening process is entirely appropriate for assessing the existing information about geology relevant to the long-term safety of a waste disposal facility. I feel it will highlight gaps in geological data sets and where the data sets are sufficient to make an assessment regarding the appropriateness of the region for design options.

Question 2: To what extent do you think that the proposed national information sources are appropriate and sufficient for this exercise? Please give your reasons.

Ideally for this sort of exercise, it would be helpful if there was a network of equally spaced boreholes across the country from which to develop the screening assessment model. Clearly this type of data set is not available at this stage, given the sparse nature of the existing deep geologic data set. So the current data set, while in some areas may be suitable for completing the screening process; in other areas the information won't be adequate. In the sparse data areas, additional drilling will be required to provide sufficient information to complete the screening process. I also suspect that the 'gap' filling exercise and the subsequent reassessment of the geologic model may require more time that is currently anticipated as the new geologic information is fully assessed. It is inevitable that the new information will reveal unexpected surprises.

Question 3: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed form of the outputs from geological screening? What additional outputs would you find useful?

I agree with the proposed output forms: in alignment with the geologic maps. It would be nice to see how these maps join up at the margins - through the use of extra maps to show how the geology links across the borders to the neighbouring regions yet not at the national scale. This would be especially important if there are structures of interest near the boundaries of maps. I think provision should be made for a contingency where formations of interest are located at the edge of the map. Where this occurs, the presentation should be recentered on these features of interest and not split between multiple maps or presentations.

Question 4: Do you have any other views on the matters presented in the draft Guidance?
Respondent skipped this question

Name: **Susan Gann**

Email address: [REDACTED]

Telephone number: [REDACTED]

Organisation/affiliation **SERGann Consulting**

Do you agree to your responses to this consultation being published?

Yes

