# Response Form

Please use this form to respond to this Call for Evidence on Working with Communities.

The closing date for the submission of responses is **4 September 2015.**

Responses can be returned by email (preferable) or post.

Email address: OND@decc.gsi.gov.uk

Or by post to:

Office for Nuclear Development

Geological Disposal Team

Department of Energy and Climate Change

55 Whitehall

London

SW1A 2EY

|  |
| --- |
| **Call for Evidence Question: Your details** |
| **Name** |       |
| **Organisation / Company** |       |
| **Organisation Size (no. of employees)** |       |
| **Organisation Type**  |       |
| **Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of your organisation?** |       |
| **Job Title** |       |
| **Department** |       |
| **Address** |       |
| **Email** |       |
| **Telephone** |       |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Would you like your response to be kept confidential? If yes please give a reason** | Yes/No |

# Call for Evidence Questions

|  |
| --- |
| **Call for Evidence Question 1: How to define a community** |
| 1.1 Siting a GDF will involve a process of working with willing communities – but what constitutes a ‘community’ in this context has not yet been defined. Do you have evidence, examples, experience about how ‘the community’ should best be defined, in the context of a community considering whether or not it wishes to host a geological disposal facility?  Evidence could be drawn from the UK or from abroad, and from other examples of nationally significant infrastructure, however respondents should bear in mind that the eventual definition will need to be flexible enough to be applicable to different areas across the country that may wish to join the siting process.  |
|       |
| 1.2 Please provide examples of where this approach has been used and how it contributed to effective community representation during the delivery of a major infrastructure project. Please also identify any barriers and challenges that should be taken into account.[NB: While the precise layout and design of a GDF will depend on where it is sited, it would have both surface facilities (around 1 square kilometre) and underground facilities, linked by shafts and / or access tunnels. The underground facilities do not need to be located directly below the surface facilities, they could be separated by a distance of several kilometres.]  |
|       |
| 1.3 Is this approach written up and available? This could be in the form of formal reports, research papers, and articles in periodicals or the press.Title:Author:Publication:Date:If not, could you provide a brief summary? |
|       |
| **Call for Evidence Question 2:** **How to provide effective representation, governance and decision making** |
| 2.1 Do you have evidence, examples or experience of effective ways for the views of a local ‘community’ to be represented in formal discussions in the delivery of large infrastructure projects? Respondents should bear in mind that the siting process for a GDF could take many decades, and representing a community will involve representing a diverse range of local views and opinions over a time period extending over many local and national electoral cycles. Please identify any innovative or best practice examples, as well as any barriers and challenges.  |
|       |
| 2.2 Do you have evidence, examples or experience of community representation bodies or structures that have worked well in the siting of large projects? What roles and responsibilities were necessary for the body/bodies to properly represent the community? Please identify any innovative or best practice examples, as well as any barriers or challenges. |
|       |
| 2.3 A community representation body (or bodies) will need to ensure that the developer is held to account in providing information to the community engaging in formal discussions. It will also hold the responsibility for deciding if and when to withdraw from these discussions. Do you have evidence, examples or experience of governance and decision making approaches in relation to community involvement in large scale infrastructure projects that would be applicable to a community representation body for the siting of a GDF?  |
|       |
| 2.4 Could you provide examples of where the approach set out above has been used and how it contributed to the successful delivery of a project? Please identify any innovative or best practice examples, as well as any barriers or challenges. |
|       |
| 2.5 Is this approach written up and available? This could be in the form of formal reports, research papers, and articles in periodicals or the press.Title:Author:Publication:Date:If not, could you provide a brief summary? |
|       |
| **Call for Evidence Question 3: How to manage and disburse Community Investment** |
| 3.1 Substantial investment will be made available to communities engaging in the siting process for a GDF (up to £1m per community initially, rising to £2.5m later in the process). Do you have evidence, examples or experience of methods for disbursing community investment of this scale – including the body that manages the funding, how capacity can be built to disburse investment in the most productive way, and the ability of communities to influence investment within their geographic areas? |
|       |
| 3.2 Please provide examples of where this approach has been used and how it contributed to the successful delivery community investment projects. Please identify any innovative or best practice examples, as well as any barriers or challenges. |
|       |
| 3.3 Is this approach written up and available? This could be in the form of formal reports, research papers, and articles in periodicals or the pressTitle:Author:Publication:Date:If not, could you provide a brief summary? |
|       |
| **Call for Evidence Question 4: How to deliver a test of public support** |
| 4.1 The policy set out in the 2014 White Paper is that a GDF will not be constructed unless there has been a positive test of local support for hosting a GDF at the site in question. This test of public support will be a direct community based decision, taken by the people in the local community.Do you have evidence, examples or experience of how the views and opinions of a community can be most effectively sought? Responses could include the method by which a final public test of support should be taken, and methods to identify whose views should be sought in such a test (e.g. territorial, interest or population extent). |
|       |
| 4.2 Could you provide examples of where this approach has been used? Please identify any innovative or best practice examples, as well as any barriers or challenges. |
|       |
| 4.3 Is this approach written up and available? This could be in the form of formal reports, research papers, and articles in periodicals or the press.Title:Author:Publication:Date:If not, could you provide a brief summary? |
|       |
| **Call for Evidence Question 5: Is there any other information or background research that you think would be useful to the CRWG?** |
|       |
| **Call for Evidence Question 6: Further Information** |
| For some respondents we would like to follow up with additional questions. Are you happy to be contacted for further information if required? |
|       |

When the Call for Evidence ends, we may publish or make public the evidence submitted. Also, members of the public may ask for a copy of responses under freedom of information legislation.

If you do not want your response - including your name, contact details and any other personal information – to be publicly available, please say so clearly in writing when you send your response to the Call for Evidence. Please note, if your computer automatically includes a confidentiality disclaimer that will not count as a confidentiality request.

Please explain why you need to keep details confidential. We will take your reasons into account if someone asks for this information under information legislation. However, we must comply with relevant legislation and cannot promise that we will always be able to keep those details confidential.