

Community Representation Working Group (CRWG)

Wednesday 20th April 2016 – 11:00-15:30

Attendees:

Tom Wintle, Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) Chair
DECC officials
Welsh Government

Natalyn Ala – RWM
Steve Barlow – RWM
Holmfridur Bjarnadottir
Prof Andrew Blowers
Prof Patrick Devine-Wright
Lisa Levy
Annabelle Lillycrop - RWM
Phil Matthews
Prof Nick Pidgeon
Phil Richardson
David Toman – RWM

Apologies:

Kirsty Gogan
Phil Stride
Julian Wain
Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)
HM Treasury

Observers:

Brian Clark - Committee on Radioactive Waste Management
John Rennilson - Committee on Radioactive Waste Management

Item 1: Introductions and house-keeping

The Chair welcomed members to the final CRWG meeting, and passed on apologies from those unable to attend. The Chair summarised the purpose of the meeting – to discuss the draft consolidated discussion paper for the three strands of work - Community Representation, Community Investment and Test of Public Support. These proposals reflect discussion with CRWG members, and the evidence base, including a literature review, case studies and public dialogue workshops.

Item 2: Discussion on approaches to identifying communities

The purpose of identifying a community or communities in relation to the Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) siting process is to enable a transparent and fair approach to community representation for engagement with the developer, distribution of community investment, the Test of Public Support and right of withdrawal. This is particularly challenging due to the long-term nature of the siting process – this means the way the ‘community’ is identified will develop over time.

Key issues that were raised in discussion:

- The importance of the developer’s decision making criteria being clear at the beginning of the siting process.
- The use of appropriate language and terminology in describing the process is essential ahead of formative engagement.
- The importance of appropriate oversight of the process.
- The technical nature of the GDF siting process and required safety cases needs to be made clear to the community i.e. an interested community may not have suitable geology for a GDF.
- The right of withdrawal of the developer needs to be made clear.
- The use of impact assessments.
- The use of ‘impact boundaries’ and existing Local Authority boundaries.
- The definition of community including both social and physical attributes.
- The recognition that the use of boundaries can cause negative reactions.
- The use of international GDF siting case studies is helpful.

Item 3: High level process and principles for working with communities

The following topics were discussed; Initial Contact, Formative Engagement, Constructive Engagement, the Community Representation Partnership (CRP), Community Investment, the Test of Public Support and Right of Withdrawal.

Key issues that were raised in discussion:

- The use of a ‘start team’ in community discussions.
- The membership of the Community Representation Partnership – the size of the core group needs to be manageable.
- The possibility of using a professional Chair at the beginning of the process.
- The provision of secretariat support to the CRP.
- The use of an ‘organogram’ to ensure clarity of roles and responsibilities.
- The roles of the developer and the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) in the process.

- The use of ‘weighting for proximity’ in applications for community investment funding.
- The potential use of an independent mediator in the formative stages of the process.

Item 4: Updates on progress with the Initial Actions

National Geological Screening – the revised Guidance, the detailed technical instructions and the RWM ‘response to consultation’ report were published on 21st April and can be found [here](#). The British Geological Survey will work with RWM to implement the Guidance and produce the screening outputs.

National Land-use Planning – the final amendments are being made to the draft National Policy Statement (NPS), to incorporate comments from stakeholders. Preparation is underway for the NPS consultation.

Item 5: Actions and next steps

Member’s comments will be incorporated into a revised consolidated paper. Policy proposals will be developed for submission to Ministers in light of the advice received. Relevant details captured during CRWG discussions will be provided to RWM to develop into guidance on the siting process as appropriate.

Item 6: AOB

The Chair thanked members again for all of their advice and input into this process.