

# DEVELOPING THE IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK: PROPOSALS FOR SITING PARTNERSHIPS

Briefing Paper B,  
January 07



## Introduction

The UK Government and devolved administrations have stated that “open and transparent partnerships with potential host communities “will be one of the “pillars” on which the approach to siting a geological repository will be based.”<sup>1</sup> They add that the details of exactly what partnerships might entail, and how they would operate in practice, need to be considered and developed in an implementation framework, which will be subject to consultation in the second half of 2007.

Government has also stated that it will: “... develop the proposed framework in discussion with local government associations and their relevant sub-groups, for example NuLeAF, and also any individual local authority, or group of local authorities, which believe they have an interest at this stage ...”<sup>2</sup>

NuLeAF welcomes the Government’s commitment to partnership working. It considers that the concept of partnership is important in two main ways. First, to express the spirit of the relationships that should be developed between national and local bodies within a siting process. Second, to inform the establishment of formal Siting Partnerships of local community interests in those areas where decisions have been taken to participate in the siting process.

This briefing paper has been prepared to inform discussion between Government and NuLeAF about partnership working, with particular emphasis on the nature, role and operation of formal Siting Partnerships. It sets out NuLeAF’s *current thinking*, based on international and UK experience<sup>3</sup>, discussion at a series of regional seminars<sup>4</sup> and feedback from member authorities.

Additional briefing papers are being prepared on:

- Initial Invitations and Local Decision-Making about Participation (Briefing Paper 4)
- Funding Participation and Enhancing Community Well-Being (Briefing Paper 5)
- Siting, Planning Requirements and Rights of Withdrawal (Briefing Paper 6)

---

<sup>1</sup> DEFRA, ‘Miliband announces radioactive waste disposal plan’, News Release, 25 October 2006.

<sup>2</sup> UK Government and Devolved Administrations, ‘Response to the Report and Recommendations from the Committee of Radioactive Waste Management’, DEFRA, 25 October 2006.

<sup>3</sup> NuLeAF Briefing Paper 2, ‘Proposals for Siting Partnerships’, October 06. This reviews a major European study of partnership working in siting radioactive waste management facilities (COWAM’s ‘Roadmap for Local Committee Construction’, draft, June 2006) and studies of UK experience of local strategic partnerships by the Comptroller and Auditor General, the ODPM, and I&DeA.

<sup>4</sup> NuLeAF, ‘Managing the Nuclear Legacy – Issues for Local Government’, Regional Seminars Report, December 06.

Each paper will be discussed with Government to inform preparation of the draft implementation framework.

## **The Scope of the Briefing Paper**

NuLeAF's initial view on the nature of Siting Partnerships was outlined in a policy statement in June 2006<sup>5</sup>. This stated that:

In order to ensure effective involvement of local communities, bodies and organisations, local authorities participating in a siting process should take steps to form appropriate local partnerships.

The role of a local partnership would be to engage fully in the siting process, undertaking the necessary scrutiny, research, consultation and negotiation on behalf of its members. In essence, local partnerships would advise and recommend, but the appropriate local authority/ies covering the area of interest would take major decisions, for example, exercising the right of withdrawal.

There needs to be flexibility in the geographic scope and membership of a local partnership to take account of local circumstances. The make up of partnerships should be a matter of local decision.

This briefing develops key aspects of this statement. In particular, it makes proposals about:

- the mission of a Siting Partnership
- guiding principles
- the role of a Siting Partnership
- decision-making responsibilities
- membership
- the role of national bodies
- establishing a Siting Partnership
- key steps and timescales
- organisation and ways of working
- engagement and consultation
- relationship to existing structures
- staffing
- costs and funding

## **The Mission of a Siting Partnership**

International experience shows that an approach based on the concept of partnership will enhance the prospects for building and maintaining confidence, respect and trust within a siting process. As CoRWM has highlighted<sup>6</sup>, it should also enable potential host communities to engage with implementing bodies without feeling victimised by a national process over which they ultimately have little control.

Against this background, NuLeAF proposes that the implementation framework should define the mission of a formal Siting Partnership as follows:

---

<sup>5</sup> NuLeAF, 'Implementing Policy on the Long Term Management of Radioactive Wastes', Policy Statement 1, June 06. This statement was informed by a study commissioned from Enviro, 'The Implementation of a National Radioactive Waste Management Programme in the UK: Implications for Local Communities and Local Authorities', June 06.

<sup>6</sup> CoRWM, 'Recommendations to Government', CoRWM Document 700, July 2006, p136.

*The mission of a Siting Partnership is to ensure that:*

*all the questions and concerns of potential host communities within its area and other affected communities about repository siting, construction, operation, closure and post-closure are addressed and resolved as far as reasonably practicable; and*

*the well-being<sup>7</sup> of host communities is enhanced.*

It is anticipated that fulfilment of this mission would substantially enhance the prospects for a successful implementation programme.

## **Guiding Principles**

There is a case for proposing that the implementation framework should define a set of principles to guide the work of a Siting Partnership. In particular, early discussion amongst partners about how to apply these principles could contribute to the development of a shared vision about how to proceed.

The principles developed and used by CoRWM provide a model that could be adopted in the implementation framework<sup>8</sup>. CoRWM's principles are as follows:

- To be open and transparent
- To uphold the public interest by taking full account of public and stakeholder views in its decision making
- To achieve fairness with respect to procedures, communities and future generations
- To aim for a safe and sustainable environment both now and in the future
- To ensure an efficient, cost-effective and conclusive process.

## **The Role of a Siting Partnership**

It is proposed that the core elements of the role of a Siting Partnership should be defined in the implementation framework.

In order to fulfil a Partnership's mission, these core elements should include:

- Developing advice and recommendations for decision-making bodies
- Scrutiny of the work of the bodies involved in repository siting and development
- Obtaining specialist advice or commissioning research to inform its scrutiny role, address community concerns or identify ways of enhancing community well-being
- Provision of public information about the activities, views and recommendations of the Partnership
- Engagement or consultation with potential host communities, other affected communities and neighbouring local authorities
- Identifying and addressing divergent views within those communities

---

<sup>7</sup> CoRWM has defined 'well-being' as follows: "we mean those aspects of living that contribute to the community's identity, development and sense of positive self-image. Well-being is a broad concept and not narrowly defined in terms of financial incentives or community facilities. A community's well-being may be realised in a variety of ways through economic development, through greater control over its affairs and through an ability to define and realise its own vision for its future." [CoRWM Document 700, p134] This issue will be considered further in NuLeAF Briefing Paper 5.

<sup>8</sup> CoRWM, 'Recommendations to Government, Doc 700, p29

Liaison and discussion with local bodies with remits related to the mission of the Partnership (eg Local Strategic Partnerships or Site Stakeholder Groups)

Building the capacity of its membership to enable it to effectively carry out these roles.

The implementation framework should recognise that participants in a Siting Partnership may wish to adopt additional formulations of their role, as related to the mission of the Partnership<sup>9</sup>.

## **Decision-Making Responsibilities**

The implementation framework should set out the decision-making responsibilities of the bodies involved in repository siting and development, including Siting Partnerships and local authorities.

The framework should clarify that a Siting Partnership would be able to take decisions about how it undertakes all elements of its role. It should also confirm that a Partnership would not have powers to usurp the decision-making responsibilities of other bodies, including the NDA, the repository contractor, the regulators, and local government.

Nonetheless, the framework should highlight that a Siting Partnership is expected to develop a strong identity and role, so that it can play a critically important part in ensuring that the decisions of those bodies are well-informed and robust, particularly regarding community concerns.

On a local level, a Partnership would provide what COWAM describes as an "extra tool for local democracy"<sup>10</sup>.

The recent White Paper<sup>11</sup> highlights the importance of local government to local democracy:

Local government is a vital part of our democracy ... It provides leadership for local areas and communities; democratic accountability for a wide range of public services; and is key to effective partnership working at local level.

[The White Paper] ... proposes a new approach to local partnership to give local authorities more opportunity to lead their area, work with other services and better meet the public's needs. (p2)

The leadership role and democratic accountability of local government means that it should be responsible for major local decisions within the siting process. By 'major local decisions', we mean those relating to the following:

continued participation at key stages, or exercising a right of withdrawal<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Drawing on international experience, Nirex has pointed out that these might include: representing community diversity; defending community values and interests; providing an integrated vision of local issues; providing a democratic proposal for local development; and raising the local voice in national debate. Nirex, 'A Framework for UK Partnerships', Technical Note 515150, September 06, p12.

<sup>10</sup> The European Community Waste Management (COWAM) project has been addressing ways of involving local communities in decision-making and has produced a draft 'roadmap for local committee construction'. The roadmap is the product of collaboration between stakeholders from 8 European countries, including councillors, community representatives and researchers, and aims to "share our basic knowledge about committee building". See COWAM, 'Roadmap for Local Committee Construction', draft, June 2006, p27.

<sup>11</sup> DCLG, 'Strong and Prosperous Communities', Cm 6939-1, October 2006.

the local acceptability of proposals for funding participation and for community packages<sup>13</sup>

the local acceptability of the sites within an area that are proposed for field investigations

whether to accept an increased inventory of wastes in the repository should new nuclear power stations be built?<sup>14</sup>

In addition, the appropriate local authority/ies should be given opportunity to decide whether to support the recommendations of a Siting Partnership about whether (and if so for how long) the repository should be designed to allow an extended period of retrievability of wastes?<sup>15</sup>

In each case, the decision would be based on advice and recommendations from the Siting Partnership. Although it would be reasonable to expect that these recommendations would normally be ratified by the appropriate local authority/ies, these democratically accountable bodies must reserve the right to take a different view based on careful review of the evidence.

For areas that cross local authority boundaries or have two tier local government, NuLeAF recommends that the implementation framework set out the Government's expectation that local negotiations will take place so that agreement is reached about how local authorities will take decisions about Partnership recommendations as the siting process progresses.

CoRWM has noted that in some parts of the UK, the areas covered by local authorities are so large that it may prove difficult to resolve conflicts between potential host communities and the wider area. In such cases, CoRWM states, special arrangements for the ratification of partnership proposals may be necessary. NuLeAF does not agree with this view: it does not think that 'special arrangements' for devolved local decision-making are necessary or desirable in local government in England and Wales.

## **Membership**

The implementation framework should clarify that a Siting Partnership is primarily a partnership of local community interests, with members identified and recruited locally to enable the Partnership's mission to be fulfilled.

The framework should acknowledge that:

There needs to be flexibility in the geographic scope and membership of a local partnership to take account of local circumstances. The make up of partnerships should be a matter of local decision.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> This issue will be considered in detail in NuLeAF Briefing Paper 6.

<sup>13</sup> This issue will be considered in detail in NuLeAF Briefing Paper 5.

<sup>14</sup> NuLeAF supports CoRWM's view that the management of waste arising from a new build programme should be subject to a separate assessment process, and that there should be an additional step in the negotiation process with host communities to allow them to take a decision to accept or reject any additional waste.

<sup>15</sup> CoRWM members concluded that early backfilling and closure was preferable to an extended period of underground storage prior to closure. However this was not recommended to Government because some CoRWM members considered that the issue should be a matter for decision during the siting process, taking into account the views of potential host communities. In its response to CoRWM, Government states that it will consider what aspects of facility design could be determined by local communities when preparing the draft implementation framework.

<sup>16</sup> NuLeAF, 'Implementing Policy on the Long Term Management of Radioactive Wastes', Policy Statement 1, June 06.

The framework should, however, make clear that Government expects that the relevant local authority/ies will be effectively represented within the partnership so that its views can be expressed, local political realities are recognised and there are no surprises when proposals are presented for ratification. This position accords with the type of Local Partnerships developed in Belgium, where membership consisted of councillors, representatives of community groups and other interested parties<sup>17</sup>.

The implementation framework should set out Government's expectation that:

'Social mapping' of potential host communities will be carried out to help inform local decisions about representation in the Partnership<sup>18</sup>.

Transparent and consistent procedures will be used to recruit and appoint representatives to the Partnership.

These procedures will enable regular review and development of membership as appropriate to different stages within the siting process<sup>19</sup>.

Members of a Siting Partnership will provide feedback and seek the views of their organisation or group for input into Partnership discussions.

---

<sup>17</sup> Enviro, 'The Implementation of a National Radioactive Waste Management Programme in the UK: Implications for Local Communities and Local Authorities', Report for NuLeAF, June 2006 p9 and p26.

<sup>18</sup> In Belgium, social science researchers from the Universities of Antwerp and Liege interviewed local stakeholder groups to develop recommendations about who should participate in the Partnerships.

<sup>19</sup> For example, early membership of a Siting Partnership might reflect the broad area of potential suitability for repository development. Once potential sites within the area are identified, representatives from communities in the immediate vicinity of potential sites might be invited to join the Partnership.

## **The Role of National Bodies**

As highlighted in the introduction, the relationships between national and local bodies within a siting process should be based on a 'spirit of partnership'.

The implementation framework should make it clear that this is Government's expectation, and set out the implications for the role of national bodies in terms of input to and engagement with a Siting Partnership, including the NDA, the repository contractor and the regulators.

Although these bodies would not participate in a Siting Partnership's formal decision-making, their role within a Partnership should include:

- The pro-active provision of timely information and advice to the Partnership, including the presentation of proposals, advice and research findings.

- Participation in Partnership discussions, working groups and studies.

- Responding to Partnership requests for further information and advice.

- Involvement in wider community engagement and consultation initiatives as organised by the Partnership.

- Assistance with building the capacity of Partnership members to fulfil its mission and undertake its role.

## **Establishing a Siting Partnership**

The implementation framework should specify that once a local decision to participate in the siting process has been accepted by Government, the local authority/ies concerned should take a lead role in setting up a Siting Partnership<sup>20</sup>.

As indicated above, in order to do this, the local authority/ies should:

- Undertake or commission 'social mapping' of local communities to help inform local decisions about representation in the Partnership.

- Develop transparent and consistent procedures to recruit and appoint representatives to the Partnership.

In addition, UK experience of Local Strategic Partnerships<sup>21</sup> highlights the importance of enabling prospective members of a Partnership to develop a shared vision about its mission, role, organisation and outputs. The implementation framework should set out Government's expectation that prior to signing of a formal Partnership agreement, there will be ample opportunity for local discussion and negotiation to assist with this process.

Local discussion prior to formally establishing a Siting Partnership could cover:

- Ways of fulfilling the mission of the Partnership, its guiding principles and role (see above).

- Organisation and procedures (to consider the role of a Chair and Executive Committee, the procedures for decision-making about Partnership recommendations,

---

<sup>20</sup> It is anticipated that there would already have been considerable discussion between potential members of a Partnership to inform decision-making about whether to participate in the siting process. This issue is explored further in forthcoming Briefing Paper 4.

<sup>21</sup> Reviews of recent UK experience are outlined in NuLeAF Briefing Paper 2, 'Proposals for Siting Partnerships', October 06.

the role of working groups, the link to decision-makers and the mechanisms for wider consultation and engagement).

Information, expertise and knowledge (to consider how to draw on different types of specialist and citizens' knowledge, and develop procedures to sort, evaluate, use and share information).

- Outputs (to identify desired outputs, what is appropriate and what is feasible).
- External communications (to inform local people about its role, work and conclusions and to get feedback on what communities think).

Training and skills (to invest in training and skills development to help members fulfil their roles eg leadership development, partnership-working skills, external communication and community engagement).

Funding and resources (to identify requirements for resourcing to develop competencies, ensure meaningful participation and engagement, and obtain, evaluate, use and share information).

- Evaluation (to learn from experience and identify ways of improving the work of the Partnership).

Discussions amongst prospective members of the Partnership should seek to develop recommendations in each of these areas. These recommendations could form the basis for the formal Partnership agreement<sup>22</sup>, and for adoption at the inaugural meeting of the Siting Partnership.

## **Key Steps and Timescales**

The implementation framework should acknowledge that a Siting Partnership must be able to develop, evolve and respond to change over a period of decades to enable it to undertake, or contribute to, key steps associated with the siting process.

Key steps include:

Development of shared vision about the mission, principles and role of the Siting Partnership (see above)

Development of working practices and capacity building (training and skills)

Development of proposals for Community Packages (see forthcoming Briefing Paper 5).

Development of the repository concept

Identification of potential sites within the area of the Partnership

Identification of a short-list of potential sites

Field investigations and assessment at short-listed sites

Identification of preferred site/s

Underground investigations

Construction of the repository

Emplacement of wastes in the repository

Closure of the repository

The implementation framework must contain a commitment on the part of Government that Siting Partnerships (and local/national decision-makers) will be allowed sufficient time at each step to undertake their roles. For Siting Partnerships, many steps will involve various combinations of scrutiny, research, public

---

<sup>22</sup> Forms of agreement will be discussed in forthcoming Briefing Paper 6. It is anticipated that Government will need to be party to Partnership agreements to ensure that aspects defined in the implementation framework are met.

information, community engagement and advisory roles. Some steps will involve consideration of whether to recommend continued participation in, or withdrawal from, the siting process (see forthcoming Briefing Paper 6).

## **Organisation and Ways of Working**

The implementation framework should not be prescriptive about the organisation and ways of working of a Siting Partnership. These should be developed locally as appropriate to local circumstances. The framework could, however, provide examples of organisational models for discussion by prospective Partnership members.

One model would be to have:

- A Steering Group

- A Main Group

- Working Groups for each of the main issues of community concern (eg community packages, siting and design of the repository, safety, environmental impacts, and community engagement/information).

In this model, the Main Group would bring together all members of the Partnership, and decide the main aspects of a Partnership's strategy and work programme. It would also agree the recommendations to make to decision-making bodies. The Main Group would also appoint the Steering Group and Chair. The Steering Group would have responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the Partnership's strategy and work programme. The Working Groups would consist of members of the Partnership, plus representatives from national bodies, citizen groups or specialists as appropriate. The Chair of each Working Group would be a member of the Steering Group to ensure adequate liaison and coordination.

The Working Group structure should be flexible, reflecting local priorities and changing requirements over time in the siting process.

Given Government emphasis on the leadership role of local government (see above), the implementation framework should point out the advantages of appointing a senior local authority member as Chair of the Siting Partnership.

## **Engagement and Consultation**

The implementation framework should highlight Government's expectation that a Siting Partnership will engage or consult with local communities and other stakeholders at key points within the siting process.

Although the membership of a Siting Partnership should reflect a wide range of community interests, it will be necessary for the Partnership to actively engage or consult with a wider public. This will help ensure that public views and concerns are understood, or enable the level of support for a proposed way forward to be assessed.

It is also likely to be necessary for a Partnership to liaise and consult with other bodies, such as local authorities neighbouring the area of the Partnership, or regional bodies with an interest in aspects of the Partnership's work. This liaison and consultation should seek to ensure that the concerns of "other affected communities" are identified and addressed (see the 'mission' proposed above).

It is anticipated that the nature and findings of a Partnership's wider engagement or consultation will be an important factor that the relevant local authority/ies will take into account when deciding whether to ratify a Partnership's recommendations at key steps within the siting process.

The framework should indicate that a Partnership should seek to utilise a range of engagement techniques, as appropriate to the step in the siting process and its associated objectives.

## **Relationship to Existing Structures**

The implementation framework should make clear that a Siting Partnership is expected to establish a formal link or effective liaison arrangements with Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs).

Although there are important differences in the missions and roles of LSPs and proposed Siting Partnerships, there are also likely to be some significant similarities and overlaps. In particular:

- overlap in membership;
- shared interest in the socio-economic well-being of the area and initiatives to enhance well-being; and
- shared concern to engage widely with community representatives, voluntary groups and neighbourhood residents.

The framework should also outline Government's expectations that any Siting Partnership in an area containing existing nuclear site/s should establish effective liaison arrangements with local Site Stakeholder Groups or Liaison Committees.

## Staffing

The recent review by the Improvement and Development Agency<sup>23</sup> concludes that partnership working should be seen as highly specialised and resource intensive. It is therefore important that a Siting Partnership is able to appoint full time staff that can provide the appropriate project management and organisational support.

As an example, MONA – a Low Level Waste Siting Partnership in Belgium – employed two full-time Project Coordinators. Note, however, that the UK siting process is for a geological repository with a more complex waste and materials inventory, providing a more challenging task over a longer period of time.

Given the important relationship between a Siting Partnership and the relevant local authority/ies, there may be advantage in having the latter as the employing organisation. Partnership staff would then be able to operate within a well-developed infrastructure.

## Costs and Funding

To achieve its mission and fulfil its roles effectively, a Siting Partnership will need adequate funding. This funding should be seen as part of the Involvement Package proposed by CoRWM (see forthcoming Briefing Paper 5).

The implementation framework should outline national arrangements for the funding of Siting Partnerships. These arrangements should provide confidence that adequate funding will be sustained over the lifetime of a Siting Partnership. The framework should also make it clear that it will be for a Partnership to decide exactly how – in seeking to fulfil its mission - it spends its funding<sup>24</sup>. Independence of decision-making in a Partnership about the use of resources will be important if the Partnership is to secure and maintain the confidence and trust of local communities.

There are a number of possible methods of funding. In Sweden funding is made available through a National Waste Fund. In Belgium the waste management agency granted each partnership an annual budget that it could use autonomously. Nirex have suggested that in the UK it would be beneficial to set up a fund for the Siting Partnerships that is managed by a body independent of the implementing organisation<sup>25</sup>. This suggestion would have the advantage of contributing to the development of confidence and trust in the Partnership on the part of local communities.

Based on the roles and tasks outlined above, the funding should be sufficient to cover:

- salaries and associated costs of staff
- running the Steering Group, Main Group and Working Groups
- commissioning specialist advice and research
- capacity building of members
- public information

---

<sup>23</sup> I&DeA, 'Making it real: a report of the pilot partnership improvement programme with voluntary and community organisations and local authorities', June 2006.

<sup>24</sup> An independent audit process should be established to ensure that Partnership expenditure is related to fulfilment of its mission.

<sup>25</sup> Nirex, 'A Framework for UK Partnerships', Technical Note 515150, September 06, p15.

liaison, consultation and engagement  
evaluation

In addition, NuLeAF supports the recommendation of participants in the COWAM project that members of a Partnership should receive reimbursement for travel, subsistence, childcare and lost wages<sup>26</sup>.

It is reported that annual funding of 'siting partnerships' in Sweden and Belgium is of the order to £150,000 - £300,000<sup>27</sup>. However, it should not be assumed that the annual costs of running a Siting Partnership in the UK will fall within this range. UK costs will depend on the structure and organisation of a Siting Partnership, staffing requirements, and the level of activity required by the different steps in the siting process. Once a clearer picture emerges of the proposed implementation framework and outline repository development plan, cost estimates could be generated.

## Summary and Overview

The concept of partnership is important in two main ways. First, to express the spirit of the relationships that should be developed between national and local bodies within a siting process. Second, to inform the establishment of formal Siting Partnerships of local community interests in those areas where decisions have been taken to participate in the siting process.

This paper is intended to inform discussion between Government and NuLeAF about partnership working, with particular emphasis on the nature, role and operation of formal Siting Partnerships.

It has proposed that the implementation framework should define the following:

- the mission of a Siting Partnership (p3)
- a set of principles to guide the work of a Siting Partnership (p3)
- the core elements of the role of a Siting Partnership (p3-4)
- the decision-making responsibilities of a Siting Partnership (p4/5)
- national arrangements for the funding of Siting Partnerships (p11/12)

The paper has also proposed that the implementation framework should set out Government expectations that:

- a Siting Partnership will play a critically important role in ensuring that the decisions of bodies involved in the siting process are well-informed and robust (p4)
- in areas that cross local authority boundaries or have two tier local government, local negotiations will take place so that agreement is reached about how local authorities will take decisions about Partnership recommendations as the siting process progresses (p5)
- the relevant local authorities will take a lead role in establishing a Siting Partnership (p7) and be effectively represented within the Partnership (p6)
- transparent and consistent procedures will be used to recruit and appoint representatives to a Partnership (p6)

---

<sup>26</sup> Reported in Nirex, 'A Framework for UK Partnerships', Technical Note 515150, September 06, p15.

<sup>27</sup> Reported in Nirex, 'A Framework for UK Partnerships', Technical Note 515150, September 06, p16.

the relevant national bodies will provide an input to and engage with a Siting Partnership and work with those bodies in a spirit of partnership (p7)

prior to signing of a formal Partnership agreement, there will be ample opportunity for local discussion and negotiation to enable a shared vision to be developed about the mission, role, organisation and outputs of a Partnership (p7)

a Siting Partnership will engage or consult with local communities, neighbouring authorities, regional bodies and other affected communities, using a range of appropriate methods (p10)

a Siting Partnership will establish a formal link or effective liaison arrangements with Local Strategic Partnerships and, in areas with nuclear sites, Site Stakeholder Groups or Local Liaison Committees (p10)

a Siting Partnership will appoint full time staff to provide appropriate project management and organisational support (p11)

Finally, the paper has proposed that the implementation framework should acknowledge that:

a Partnership may wish to adopt additional formulations of its role, as related to the nationally defined mission (p4)

there needs to be flexibility in the geographic scope and membership of a Siting Partnership to take account of local circumstances (p6)

a Siting Partnership must be able to develop, evolve and respond to change over a period of decades (p8)

a Siting Partnership will be allowed sufficient time at each step of the siting process to undertake its role (p9)

a Siting Partnership will be able to develop its own organisational structure, as appropriate to local circumstances and changing requirements over time (p9)

the level of national funding of a Siting Partnership must be sufficient to enable it to effectively fulfil its mission and roles (p12)

it will be for a Siting Partnership to decide exactly how to spend its funding in fulfilling its mission (p11)

Overall, the implementation framework must be sufficiently flexible to enable local circumstances to be taken fully into account in shaping the Partnerships that are created. This is particularly important when it comes to the definition of what is meant by local, for decisions about local representation and for taking into account local relationships between stakeholders.