

**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 by "going back to basics" you are addressing this in a transparent and correct manner. There is clearly a focus on demonstrating rock characteristics that would be positive to being able to develop a credible safety case for long term geological disposal. Going back to the transparency question though, do you think there is enough detail (and clear enough detail) about what would make a certain rock type unsuitable. Bearing in mind that we have had nearly 30 years of relatively slow progress on geological disposal it is important to demonstrate that the overall results are not perceived as being fixed if public confidence and support is going to be achieved.

**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.

You are demonstrating here that you are utilising a comprehensive data bank of available geological and hydrogeological data as well as factoring in the approach being taken by other countries in this field. For the stage you are at I think the data sources you cite should be sufficient for the next phase of the work.

**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 think the proposed outputs are logical. I do wonder however if groundwater (potable water) should also be classed as a resource and added to the list of potential resources in the table. Currently the table infers minerals etc. Stakeholders may ultimately have concerns about the potential of any released radionuclides to migrate upwards into a regional aquifer.

**Question 4:** Do you have any other views on the matters presented in the draft Guidance?

With any exercise that will ultimately lead to facilitated presentations and discussions with stakeholders it is imperative that the technical jargon and messages are appropriately simplified so that they can be clearly understood.

Name: **Peter Booth**

Email address: [REDACTED]

Telephone number: [REDACTED]

Organisation/affiliation: [REDACTED]

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

