



CONSULTATION ON WORKING WITH COMMUNITIES – IMPLEMENTING GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

1. Introduction

On 25th January 2018, the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) and the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (DAERA) jointly published a consultation entitled *Working with Communities – Implementing Geological Disposal*. The purpose of the consultation, which ended on 19th April 2018, was to seek views on how communities should be engaged and represented in a consent-based decision-making process for the siting of a potential geological disposal facility (GDF) for higher activity radioactive waste.

It was **not** a consultation on proposals to site a GDF in Northern Ireland but was aimed at ensuring that the citizens of Northern Ireland, as part of the UK, are included in the process and have their say on this issue, should there ever be a proposal to site a GDF here. The consultation document explains the engagement process being proposed by BEIS, which is intended to allow communities to consider hosting a GDF, without commitment.

As no higher activity radioactive waste exists in Northern Ireland, if a geological disposal facility were ever to be sited here, the waste would be from outside Northern Ireland and would require the appropriate hazardous waste authorisations as well as normal planning and environmental authorisations and compliance with various transportation requirements.

In addition, any future policy decision on whether there should be a GDF in Northern Ireland would be for the Northern Ireland Executive – it would not be a decision for a DAERA Minister alone.

This summary relates solely to the responses received in relation to Northern Ireland.

2. Background

The UK has accumulated radioactive waste from a range of activities including nuclear power generation, medicine, research and defence-related

programmes. Most of the waste can be disposed of safely in facilities on the surface, but a long-term solution is still needed for the most radioactive waste (higher activity waste), some of which will remain hazardous for hundreds of thousands of years¹.

In 2006, the independent Committee on Radioactive Waste Management² (CoRWM) recommended that geological disposal was the best available approach for the long-term management of the UK's legacy of higher activity radioactive waste. The UK Government accepted this recommendation.

Building on experiences from GDF site selection processes overseas and recommendations by CoRWM, a 2014 White Paper entitled *Implementing Geological Disposal*³ ("the 2014 White Paper") set out the framework for a consent-based approach to finding a community willing to host a geological disposal facility.

The 2014 White Paper set out a number of principles detailing how the delivery body, Radioactive Waste Management Limited (RWM)⁴, will work with communities in England and Northern Ireland that express an interest in participating in the GDF siting process. These principles relate to how communities could be represented; how investment could be provided to communities that participate in the siting process; how a right of withdrawal could operate throughout the siting process; and how a test of public support could be carried out.

The policy proposals in the consultation document were developed with input from the Community Representation Working Group⁵. This was supplemented with evidence gathered from other energy and major infrastructure projects, as well as lessons learned from previous GDF siting processes in the UK.

The main objective of the consultation was to establish a process of engagement and to set out specific proposals on how RWM could work in partnership with communities, including local authorities.

3. Responses and Confidentiality

In total, 35 consultation responses were received from Northern Ireland and two responses were received from Ireland.

¹ Higher activity waste comprises high level waste, intermediate level waste and a small amount of low level waste that is not suitable for disposal at the national low level waste repository (LLWR). In planning for geological disposal we also include nuclear materials (spent nuclear fuel, uranium and plutonium (this will be in a form suitable for long-term disposal and may be contained in spent nuclear fuel, immobilised, or a combination of both) that may be declared as waste in the future. The 'Radioactive Wastes in the UK: A Summary of the 2016 Inventory' can be found at:

<https://ukinventory.nda.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/18/2017/03/High-Level-Summary-UK-Radwaste-Inventory-2016.pdf>. See the Radioactive Waste Management Limited website for the most up to date information on the inventory for a GDF: <https://rwm.nda.gov.uk/publication/2013-derived-inventory/>

² Information on the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/committee-on-radioactive-waste-management>

³ The White Paper can be found at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/implementing-geological-disposal>

⁴ Information on RWM can be found at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/radioactive-waste-management-rwm-about-us>

⁵ Information on the Community Representation Working Group can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/groups/implementing-geological-disposal-community-representation-working-group>

Of the 35 Northern Ireland responses, 28 were from individuals (several as a result of a social media campaign) and 7 were from organisations.

This summary will include a list of names of organisations that responded but not the names, addresses or other contact details for individuals who responded. None of the responses summarised below are attributed to any individual or organisation.

As stated in the consultation document, any information provided in response to the consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with access to information legislation (primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 1998 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).

However, since the consultation, on 25th May 2018, a new privacy law, the General Data Protection Regulation, came into force. For those responses that contained personal information, such as individuals' names, addresses and email addresses, DAERA and BEIS are duty bound to tell you that we will store your information securely and will only share your personal information where it is necessary for us to carry out our lawful business activities and only then with your approval to do so.

Responses from Ireland

The two responses from Ireland raised points such as:

- asking for responses only from the UK was contrary to the UK's obligations under the Aarhus Convention
- the limited scope of this consultation was inappropriate in the context of Brexit, the current political situation in Northern Ireland, the absence of an Executive, the joint responsibilities of the UK and Irish Government in that context and the Good Friday Agreement's commitments on environmental co-operation
- this consultation should be extended to the Irish public
- this consultation appeared to be related to the National Policy Statement consultation

They also echoed issues mentioned by Northern Ireland respondents, such as:

- transboundary impacts
- community representation
- information provided to communities
- financial incentives that may "exploit disadvantaged communities"
- the lack of awareness of the consultation in Northern Ireland
- safety risks of a GDF
- the viability of nuclear power

Departmental response

The Department reiterates that this consultation was **not** about hosting a GDF in Northern Ireland. Its objective was to ensure that, should there ever be any proposals to host one here, local communities – who would firstly have had to express an interest in hosting a GDF – would have the opportunity to have their say by way of an established engagement process. This proposed engagement process was the subject of the consultation.

The UK would not seek to site a GDF outside of its jurisdiction. Furthermore, the UK has no legal right to introduce proposals for an engagement process with communities that are outside of its jurisdiction, be that in Ireland or any other country. Accordingly, it would not have been appropriate for the consultation to have included Ireland.

However, should there ever be a proposal to host a GDF in Northern Ireland, that proposal would be the subject of separate consultation(s) and a range of ministerial, NI Executive, planning, environmental and safety considerations.

Brexit notwithstanding, the Good Friday Agreement is an international agreement between the British and Irish governments under which was established the British-Irish Council (BIC). The BIC may make agreements on common policies in specific work areas including the areas of ‘energy’ and ‘environment’. The Good Friday Agreement was enshrined in legislation (the Northern Ireland Act 1998), which includes provisions covering engagement within the BIC. Therefore, in addition to the various environmental and safety requirements, adequate, appropriate and lawful liaison with our near neighbours would be required in considering such a proposal.

Although the National Policy Statement (NPS) consulted upon by England included general references to Northern Ireland (particularly its geology), it also clarified that the NPS did not include plans in relation to Northern Ireland. In fact, it states:

“As the geological disposal facility is an infrastructure development on a major scale, and of national significance, all planning issues in Northern Ireland would be considered by the relevant department within the Northern Ireland Administration.”

At this point in time there are no plans to site a Geological Disposal Facility for radioactive waste in Northern Ireland.

4. Summary of Responses (Northern Ireland)

The summary below is divided into the following sections:

- Section 1 - Breakdown of responses to the questions
- Section 2 - Detail of responses and Departmental comments on points raised
- Section 3 - General comments received
- Section 4 - Next steps

Section 1 – Breakdown of responses

Table 1: Responses by group

Category	Number of Responses	% of Responses
Public Sector Organisation	1	2.7
Private Sector Organisation	0	0
Third Sector Organisation	5	13.6
Anonymous Organisation	0	0
Individuals	28	75.6
Political Party	1	2.7
Outside Northern Ireland	2	5.4
TOTAL	37	100%

The organisations that responded were as follows (in alphabetical order):

- Arts a wonder
- Friends of the Earth
- Greencastle Keep it Green
- Kilbroney Community Association
- Light 2000
- Newry, Mourne and Down District Council
- Sinn Fein

Table 2: Responses by question is attached as Annex A.

Section 2 - Detail of responses and Departmental comments on points raised

Whilst the responses raised some interesting and salient points, the majority of responses related to the issue of Northern Ireland hosting a GDF – not the proposals on engaging with communities, which was the sole focus of the consultation.

In providing this analysis and synopsis of responses, DAERA has tried to accurately reflect responses and opinions relating to the proposed engagement process. Where the purpose of the consultation, or individual questions, has been misconstrued, the responses to the questions could skew the quantitative data. Therefore, where a response clearly relates to the siting of a GDF rather than the engagement process, DAERA cannot reflect that response in its quantitative findings. However, due to the level of concern expressed about the siting issue, a separate section (Section 3) has been added to address some of those wider issues.

**Question 1: Do you agree with this approach of identifying communities?
Do you have any other suggestions that we should consider?**

Responses

Many respondents believed that, because of the size of Northern Ireland and the potential harm a leak of radioactive material could cause, **community engagement should take in the entire region.**

Some respondents felt that **local authorities should not be included** as they do not represent communities and tend to give priority to vested interests, while the local community and the environment are regarded as collateral damage.

Some respondents expressed concern about the **potential for communities to be divided, bullied and intimidated** in the decision-making process, causing tension, unrest, stress and ill-health.

Some respondents felt that the process was **vulnerable to corruption.**

Some respondents highlighted the **land border between Northern Ireland and Ireland** and the potential impact on different government jurisdictions.

Some respondents stated that interested parties should include not only those who support a development in their locale, but also anyone interested in the plans.

One respondent stated that communities should include environmental and conservation specialists.

One respondent expressed a belief that this proposal is pre-emptive and distortive; that it is important to fully inform communities on proposals; and that the **references to 'host communities' implies that siting proposals are already in place.**

One respondent believed that the **proposal does not go far enough** and that there needs to be much more information in the public arena. Another suggested a mailshot to all households.

Departmental Response

The overall tenor of the responses indicates that the approach proposed is not acceptable in its current form. The Department notes the comments made and will reflect these to its Minister and the relevant Executive committees when such committees are re-established. However, as the Department currently has no ministerial direction and there is no Northern Ireland Assembly decision-making process in place, no decision on a way forward will be taken in the foreseeable future.

Question 2: Do you agree with the approach of formative engagement? Do you support the use of a formative engagement team to carry out information gathering activities? Are there any other approaches we should consider?

Responses

Some respondents stated that **local authorities were biased towards vested interests** to the detriment of local communities and should be excluded from the consultation.

Some respondents stated that too much emphasis was placed on the views of local authorities and that the engagement process should include trade unions, charities and environmental groups.

Some respondents felt that the process had many potential pitfalls – including a **lack of impartiality** in the relationship between departments and big businesses.

One respondent queried whether the process allowed for participation by people opposed to such a facility in Northern Ireland.

One respondent agreed with the approach of 'formative engagement' in principle, *"as long as this concept is not misused to secure a democratic mandate for an energy policy that has disastrous long-term consequences for our environment. Nuclear power is mis-sold as a 'green alternative' to fossil fuels."*

One respondent stated that successful engagement would depend on:

- membership of the team and their personal views on nuclear power;
- transparency; and
- independent oversight/regulation of the process.

One respondent stated that *"there should be neither mention of money nor any money given to any individuals who have an 'interest' in engaging in the consultation process. The proposal has sufficient interest without the need for any financial incentives. Including any financial gain at this or any stage may introduce bias into the process of engagement."*

Departmental Response

Again, the Department notes the concerns raised by respondents and these will be reflected in its correspondence with BEIS and in any advice provided to any future Minister.

Question 3: Do you agree with this approach to forming a Community Partnership? Are there other approaches we should consider?

Responses

There was a general **lack of trust in local authorities** in the decision-making process.

Some respondents felt that priority seemed to be given to local authorities.

Some respondents felt that **this approach was open to corruption** and that the members of such committees would be chosen to benefit the company rather than the community.

Some responses asked **how community partnerships would be identified** and what steps would be taken to ensure that such partnerships would be **representative of all the community affected**.

One respondent stated that the discussion in the document appeared only to be based on the idea of the siting process being successful rather than "*the legitimate and very understandable interest of a Community Partnership working to make sure that it is unsuccessful*". The same respondent asked how those opposed to the siting of a GDF may be involved in the discussion.

One respondent stated that the **proposed approach is too narrow**.

One respondent stated that the proposals should consider and involve the strong community infrastructure already present in local authority areas and that the local authority should have a defined role in the creation of the partnership.

One respondent stated that the chair must be totally non-partisan and that this is often difficult.

Departmental Response

The Department again notes the concerns and will reflect these accordingly in its advice to BEIS and any future Minister.

Question 4: Do you agree with the approach to engaging people more widely in the community through a Community Stakeholder Forum? Are there other approaches we should consider?

Responses

Some respondents felt that the whole community should be involved, not just a chosen few who may have ulterior motives or prejudices.

One respondent agreed with the idea of engaging with people as widely as possible, including those opposed to the siting of a GDF in NI.

One respondent agreed in principle but advised that the "*resistance of most communities to being persuaded through democratic rhetoric and hoodwinking to poison their environments*" should not be underestimated.

Departmental Response

The intention behind the proposal was to ensure that communities, including those who may be opposed to the siting of a GDF in their area, would have a voice in the process, to ensure a fair and accurate level of agreement or otherwise in the engagement process. The right of withdrawal is intended to address that – see question 7.

However, as stated above, until the Department has a Minister in place, no decision will be taken as to whether or not Northern Ireland will continue to participate in this process.

Question 5: Do you agree with the proposal for a Community Agreement and what it could potentially include? Are there other approaches we should consider?

Responses

Many respondents pointed out that the document did not make it clear exactly what would constitute “a community”; therefore, respondents found it difficult to provide a definite answer.

Some respondents stated that every single person affected by the project should be involved and that the whole community should be in agreement.

Some respondents stated that the role of the local authorities was not clearly defined.

One respondent stated that a “community” must include environmental and conservation representatives as well as health and economic interests.

One respondent stated that the Community Agreement should be drafted by all members of the Community Partnership in the initial phase, and that the local authority alone should not have the final say on this without majority agreement within the community.

One respondent stated that a Community Agreement would be absolutely essential from a human rights perspective.

Departmental Response

See response to question 4.

Question 6: Do you agree with the proposed approach to the way community investment funding would be provided? Are there alternatives that we should consider?

Responses

Many respondents stated that:

- this represented a bribe;
- the amount of money involved implied that the proposed facility must be very dangerous to whatever community would be chosen;
- any consultation would be a token gesture; and
- local objections would be ignored in the engagement process.

Departmental Response

The Department again notes the comments made.

Question 7: Do you agree with the proposed process for the right of withdrawal? Do you have views on how else this could be decided? Are there alternatives that we should consider?

Responses

Some respondents stated that they would need more information about how the right of withdrawal would be implemented before they could provide an informed response.

Some respondents stated that communities should have the right to withdraw at all stages, that a simple method of withdrawal should be established and that this should be determined by the Community Partnership within its Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

One respondent stated that they did not believe that community rights would be honoured in this process.

In the case of a community withdrawing, one respondent questioned whether this would prevent the facility from being sited in that area or the community would simply be removed from the discussions without changing the final outcome.

Departmental Response

The Department again notes the comments made.

*For clarification, communities can enact their right of withdrawal at any time in the siting process **up until the test of public support**, which identifies whether there is community support to proceed. The delivery body can also withdraw at any time if it determines that the siting process is unlikely to be successful in a particular community, for example due to adverse geological survey results. The Community Partnership will be able to decide if they wish to use the right of withdrawal and will specify how it takes place. Without a positive test of public support, a final decision by the delivery body to proceed with the subsequent stages will not be possible.*

Question 8: Do you agree with the approach to the test of public support? Do you agree that the Community Partnership should decide how and when the test of public support should be carried out? Do you have views on how else this could be decided? Are there alternatives that we should consider?

Responses

Respondents stated that:

- they believed that the proposed test of public support would be a tick box exercise;
- no community would want such a site nearby and that communities along the Irish Sea were low priority;
- the whole community should be able to vote or have their say in order to ensure fairness and avoid corruption;
- a test of public support should be on a Northern Ireland-wide basis;
- any test of public support should be the first question to consider in this process;
- clear, unbiased and truthful information should be provided to communities;
- communities should have a period of at least a year to facilitate meaningful discussion, before any test of public support;
- community representatives should have the opportunity to visit sites like Chernobyl to gain insight, before any test of public support should take place;
- statistically representative polling is not an adequate test of public support;
- the Community Partnership is best placed to judge when the test should take place, and in the first instance the local authority should be in support;
- any test of public support should be carried out by the Community Partnership as an independent body and Chaired by an independent chair in the process;
- funding should not be mentioned until after the test of public support, in case people feel that support has been “bought”;
- the test of public support should take place at the very beginning of the process; and
- a dedicated website should be developed with information for all to access nationally and for local issues, and there should be an open interactive facility to ask questions and receive answers.

Respondents also questioned whether a test of public support would have any bearing on the final decision.

Departmental Response

The test of public support is designed to elicit a final response from people in the community on whether they are content for the delivery body to proceed to apply for development consent for a geological disposal facility in their area, and for other permissions to be sought from the environmental and nuclear safety regulators. The test could be carried out using a range of methods, including a local referendum, a formal consultation or statistically representative polling. The timing, method and breadth of the test will be decided by the Community Partnership. That is why it is important to provide for such a partnership that will represent all of the diverse views of its community in this process.

As stated above, without a positive test of public support, the delivery body will not continue with the siting process. In addition, it should be noted that formal requests for authorisations would only be submitted after the test of public support had been successfully completed. It cannot be assumed that a facility will be automatically located at such a site because that proposal has been successful in the test of public support. Further considerations and authorisations, which would also be the subject of consultation, would be required.

Question 9: Do you feel this process provides suitably defined roles for local authorities in the siting process? Are there alternatives that we should consider?

Responses

Some respondents stated that local authorities should not have any role in the process.

One respondent suggested that the only fair means of testing public support would be a referendum separate from councillors.

One respondent stated that much of the language in this process is vague and that much more detail is required in defining the roles of all involved.

Departmental Response

The Department again notes the comments made.

Question 10: Do you have any other views on the matters presented in this consultation?

Responses

Some respondents stated that this consultation was a token/tick box exercise, and that decisions had already been made.

Some respondents stated that the questions in the consultation were above their heads and, in many ways, designed to disengage people from becoming involved.

Some respondents stated that the proposed process left communities vulnerable to the interests of big companies.

Some respondents expressed the need for officials in relevant organisations to be trained and able to make informed decisions – not staff who know nothing about radioactivity.

Some respondents stated that the consultation document lacked clarity and had very little regard for the opinions of those who would be opposed to the disposal of higher activity radioactive waste.

Some respondents stated that people should be fully informed about the severity of the risks attached to this proposal.

One respondent stated that plans for a community engagement process should be widely advertised before any test of public support.

One respondent stated that there should be an extension and revision of the consultation document in light of the fact that it had not been advertised in Northern Ireland, and that much of the text had been tailored to an English audience.

One respondent expressed concern that the funding mechanisms supporting the proposals appear to have been decided already.

Departmental Response

The Department again notes the comments made.

However, at this point in time, in the absence of a Minister and the Northern Ireland Assembly, no decision will be taken as to whether or not Northern Ireland engages further in this process.

Section 3 – General Comments Received

As stated at the start of Section 2 above, a large number of responses related to the perceived siting of a GDF in Northern Ireland, rather than on the proposed engagement process that was the consultation's sole purpose. However, due to the number of such responses, the Department decided to reflect them in this summary of responses.

The general sense of the responses is that there is strong opposition to the disposal of higher activity radioactive waste in Northern Ireland in any circumstances. Concerns expressed included perceived risks to health, damage to the environment – not just now but in the future – and damage to Northern Ireland's clean and green reputation. The safety of the disposal method (GDF) as well as the requirement for long distance transportation of such materials was also challenged. Some questioned whether the risks

involved in the management of nuclear waste outweighed the benefits of nuclear power in the first place.

Because quite a few respondents based their replies on the assumption that the consultation was about siting a GDF in Northern Ireland, they stated that the community would have to be involved, which was, of course, the purpose of the consultation. However, other responses were around communities' ability to give meaningful consent. Concerns were raised about the time lag of many years before adverse health impacts may become apparent and that communities cannot reasonably be said to have given informed consent over such a long timeframe.

Transboundary issues – particularly with Ireland – also featured and some people were worried about the peace process as well as the risk of fissile materials falling into the hands of paramilitary organisations.

Departmental response

The Department is taking this opportunity to assure all respondents that this was not a consultation on whether or not to host a GDF in Northern Ireland. As stated a number of times, the consultation was aimed at ensuring that the people of Northern Ireland had the right to engage in this community engagement process, should they wish to do so.

Whilst participation in this consultation was under the previous DAERA Minister's direction, a decision on whether or not Northern Ireland will continue to be associated with the proposed engagement process cannot be taken in the absence of a DAERA Minister or the Northern Ireland Executive. In addition, as a large infrastructure project, such a proposal would also be subject to discussion by both the North/South Ministerial Committee and the BIC as established by way of the Good Friday Agreement.

Hopefully, the responses above will allay fears that, even if a community expresses an interest in hosting a GDF, no such facility would be built unless it had successfully negotiated the whole engagement process; obtained all of the necessary environmental, safety and planning authorisations; and received the ultimate approval of the Northern Ireland Executive.

Section 4 – Next steps

In the absence of a Minister, a decision cannot be made on further DAERA involvement in the geological disposal programme. Accordingly, there are no proposals to take this further at this stage.

Annex A

Table 2: ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONS

	Y= Yes		N=No			D/K=Don't Know		N/A=Not Relevant to the issue				U=Unclear							
RESPONDEE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Q1. Do you agree with this approach of identifying communities?	N	-	N	N	N	N/A	-	N/A	N	U	N	U	N/A	-	N	N	N/A	-	-
Q2. Do you agree with the approach of formative engagement?	N	-	N	N	N	-	-	U	N/A	U	N	U	N/A	-	N	N	N/A	-	Y
Q3. Do you agree with this approach to forming a Community Partnership?	N	-	N	N	N	-	-	U	-	N	N	U	N/A	U	N	Y	N/A	-	Y
Q4. Do you agree with the approach to engaging people more widely in the community through a Community Stakeholder Forum?	N	-	Y	N	N	-	-	Y	Y	U	N	U	N/A	U	N	Y	N/A	-	Y
Q5. Do you agree with the proposal for a Community Agreement and what it could potentially include?	N	-	Y	U	N	-	-	Y	-	-	N	N	N/A	U	N	N	N/A	-	Y
Q6. Do you agree with the proposed approach to the way community investment funding would be provided?	N	D/K	N	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N/A	-	Y
Q7. Do you agree with the proposed process for the right of withdrawal?	-	-	Y	Y	U	Y	-	N/A	-	N	N	U	N/A	Y	Y	U	N/A	D/K	Y
Q8. Do you agree with the approach to the test of public support? Do you agree that the Community Partnership should decide how and when the test of public support should be carried out?	-	N	U	Y	N	-	-	U	Y	-	N	N	N/A	N	U	N	N/A	N	Y
Q9. Do you feel this process provides suitably defined roles for local authorities in the siting process?	-	-	N	U	N	N	-	N	N	-	N	-	N/A	N	U	N	N/A	-	Y

	Y= Yes		N=No			D/K=Don't Know		N/A=Not Relevant to the issue				U=Unclear						
RESPONDEE	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37
Q1. Do you agree with this approach of identifying communities?	N	U	N	U	N	N	U	-	-	N	N	N	N	N		-	-	
Q2. Do you agree with the approach of formative engagement?	N	U	N	U	N	Y	U	-	-	U	U	N	N	N		-	-	
Q3. Do you agree with this approach to forming a Community Partnership?	Y	U	Y	U	Y	N	U	-	-	U	Y	Y	N	Y		-	-	
Q4. Do you agree with the approach to engaging people more widely in the community through a Community Stakeholder Forum?	Y	U	Y	U	Y	N	U	-	-	U	Y	Y	Y	Y		-	-	
Q5. Do you agree with the proposal for a Community Agreement and what it could	N	U	N	U	N	N	U	-	-	N/A	Y	N	U	N		-	-	

potentially include?																		
Q6. Do you agree with the proposed approach to the way community investment funding would be provided?	N	U	N	U	N	N	U	-	-	N/A	N	N	N	N		-	-	
Q7. Do you agree with the proposed process for the right of withdrawal?	Y	U	U	U	U	U	U	-	-	N	Y	U	N	Y		-	-	
Q8. Do you agree with the approach to the test of public support? Do you agree that the Community Partnership should decide how and when the test of public support should be carried out?	N	U	N	U	N	N	U	-	-	U	N	N	Y	Y		-	-	
Q9. Do you feel this process provides suitably defined roles for local authorities in the siting process?	N	U	N	U	N	N	U	-	-	N/A	Y	N	N	Y		-	-	

■ Indicates a response received from Ireland