House of Commons

Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee

Draft National Policy statement for Geological Disposal Infrastructure

Twelfth Report of Session 2017–19

HC 1092

House of Commons

Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee

Draft National Policy statement for Geological Disposal Infrastructure

Twelfth Report of Session 2017–19

Report, together with formal minutes relating to the report

Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 23 July 2018

HC 1092
Published on 31 July 2018
by authority of the House of Commons

Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee

The Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.

Current membership

Rachel Reeves MP *(Labour, Leeds West)* (Chair)

Vernon Coaker MP (*Labour, Gedling*)

Drew Hendry MP *(Scottish National Party, Inverness, Nairn, Badenoch and Strathspey)*

Stephen Kerr MP *(Conservative, Stirling)*

Peter Kyle MP *(Labour, Hove)*

Mr Ian Liddell-Grainger MP *(Conservative, Bridgwater and West Somerset)*

Sir Patrick McLoughlin *(Conservative, Derbyshire Dales)*

Albert Owen MP *(Labour, Ynys Môn)*

Mark Pawsey MP *(Conservative, Rugby)*

Antoinette Sandbach MP *(Conservative, Eddisbury)*

Anna Turley MP *(Labour (Co-op), Redcar)*

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 152. These are available on the internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

Committee reports are published on the Committee's website at www.parliament.uk/beis and in print by Order of the House.

Evidence relating to this report is published on the inquiry publications page of the Committee's website.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Chris Shaw (Clerk), Ben Sneddon (Second Clerk), Jeanne Delebarre (Senior Clerk), Ian Cruse and Becky Mawhood (Committee Specialists), James McQuade (Senior Committee Assistant), and Gary Calder (Media Officer).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 5777; the Committee's email address is beiscom@parliament.uk

Contents

Summary

On 25 January 2018, the Government laid before Parliament the draft National Policy Statement ('NPS') for Geological Disposal Infrastructure ('GDI') which set out the Government's proposed framework for future development consent orders for a GDI in England. A GDI is a facility made of specially-engineered vaults and tunnels located deep underground that are designed to host the higher activity radioactive waste that cannot be stored at existing surface facilities on a permanent basis. Our Committee was designated to carry out parliamentary scrutiny of the draft NPS as required under the Planning Act 2008. The focus of our inquiry was on the content and scope of the NPS; it was not on the merits of geological disposal as a means of disposing of higher activity radioactive waste.

Overall, most of the evidence we received on the scope of the draft NPS was positive. We heard from several stakeholders that the draft NPS was on the whole fit for purpose and adequate, although the same evidence submissions also suggested improvements to the Assessment Principles and Impacts. In addition, we found that the draft NPS satisfactorily reflected lessons improvements from previous failed attempts to find a suitable location for geological disposal and we support the voluntary approach chosen for the siting process.

In this report, we identify and focus on the four issues which we found to be most decisive to building consensus for this process: National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty; using the GDI to dispose of waste from new nuclear build; the place of local community consent in the NPS; and how the NPS is linked with the Industrial Strategy to deliver socioeconomic benefits to host communities.

We decided against adding an exclusionary criterion for National Parks and AONBs as in our view it is right for safety matters to prevail over environmental concerns in this case. Although we agree that major developments should not be allowed in designated areas except under exceptional circumstances, we believe that existing planning legislation and the NPS contain sufficient safeguards against intrusive developments and environmental damage in National Parks and AONBs. Moreover, we support the Government's view that it is conceivable for a GDI to be designed in a way that would be acceptable to communities, preserve the socioeconomic benefits that National Parks and AONBs currently bring them and avoid any intrusive surface facility in conservation areas.

On the inclusion of waste from new nuclear build in the GDI, we conclude that regardless of whether the Government should have embarked upon a new nuclear build programme or not and regardless of whether geological disposal is the best approach to dispose of waste or not, any long-term waste management strategy should include waste from new nuclear as all waste generated from nuclear should be disposed of safely. Nevertheless, the Government must clarify in the NPS the level of uncertainty regarding the inventory of radioactive wastes and materials to be stored in the GDI, especially regarding levels of radioactivity of new nuclear waste.

We support the Government's decision to keep the community consent process separate from the NPS but we recommend that the Government should clarify the hierarchy between development consent orders and community consent in the NPS in a way that is accessible to a lay audience so as to promote engagement by prospective communities.

Finally, we find the link between the NPS and the Industrial Strategy to be spurious and the emphasis on socioeconomic benefits to the host community insufficient. In order to be consistent with the Industrial Strategy, the Government should ensure that the NPS places stronger requirements on the developer to establish robust local skills partnerships with the host community and to rely on local employment and sourcing opportunities. The Secretary of State should also favour developments that demonstrate they can deliver strong socioeconomic to host communities.

Overall, and with the caveats outlined above, we are satisfied that this NPS provides the right level of guidance to the decision-maker on the type of GDI that will be suitable for England's legacy and future higher activity radioactive waste. Provided that the Government takes into account our recommendations, we support the case for the final NPS to be brought forward and approved by Parliament.

1 Introduction

Geological disposal

1. On 25 January 2018, the Government laid before Parliament the draft National Policy Statement ('NPS') for Geological Disposal Infrastructure ('GDI')[1]which set out the Government's proposed framework for future development consent orders for a GDI in England. A GDI is a facility made of specially-engineered vaults and tunnels located deep underground (between 200 and 1,000 metres below the surface) that are designed to host permanently the higher activity radioactive waste that cannot be stored at existing surface facilities.[2] Radioactive waste is a devolved issue. As a result this NPS applies in England only, although the Appraisal of Sustainability and Habitats Regulations Assessment which informed this NPS considered the potential socio-economic and environmental impacts of nationally significant infrastructure related to geological disposal in Wales and Scotland, given their common borders with England.[3]

2. According to the latest Inventory for Geological Disposal (hereafter 'the Inventory', see Box 1 below), should it be granted development consent, this GDI would be used to store England's high level and intermediary waste, alongside small proportions of low level waste and other hazardous spent fuels and stocks.[4]

Box 1. The UK Derived Inventory

The UK Radioactive Waste & Materials Inventory (the Inventory) is the latest national record on radioactive wastes and materials in the UK and is usually compiled by the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority. The Inventory contains information about: radioactive wastes that exist now; radioactive wastes that will arise in future; and radioactive materials—which are radioactive items that are not classed as waste now but may be in future if no further use can be found for them. The Inventory is updated every three years. It is a snapshot of wastes and materials at a specific point in time, called the 'stock date'. For more information, see Nuclear Decommissioning Authority, UK Radioactive Waste Inventory, About the Inventory—What is the Inventory?, accessed 16 July 2018

For the GDI, the Inventory is undertaken by the developer RWM and called the 'UK Derived Inventory' or 'Inventory for Geological Disposal'. It is also updated every three years and is aimed specifically at identifying the wastes and materials that will need to be stored in the GDI. Information about the latest Inventory for Geological Disposal (dating from 2013) is in section 2.3 of the draft NPS.

1 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, National Policy Statement for geological disposal infrastructure - A framework document for planning decisions on nationally significant infrastructure, 25 January 2018

2 Radioactive Waste Management, Making sense of geological disposal, 10 February 2017, p 2

3 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, National Policy Statement for geological disposal infrastructure - A framework document for planning decisions on nationally significant infrastructure, 25 January 2018, section 1.3

4 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, National Policy Statement for geological disposal infrastructure: implementing geological disposal - a consultation, 25 January 2018, para 2.4.

3. The search for a safe solution to dispose of higher activity radioactive waste in the UK has a long and contentious history dating back to 1976.[5] Following several controversies and strong opposition from local communities to having a site imposed on them, in 2001 the then Government adopted a different approach and established the 'Managing Radioactive Waste Safely' programme.[6] In 2006, it led to the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management ('CoRWM')—an advisory non-departmental body which provides independent advice to UK governments on the long-term management of higher activity radioactive wastes—making a recommendation to the Government that geological disposal was the best available approach for the long-term management of higher activity radioactive waste.[7] Following this recommendation, it became the Government's policy to dispose of this waste.[8] Other countries like Canada, Finland, France, Sweden, Switzerland, Japan and the USA have also adopted this approach.

Our inquiry

4. Our Committee was designated to carry out parliamentary scrutiny of the draft NPS as required under the Planning Act 2008. The GDI, if it is ever granted development consent, will be in operation for up to 150 years, and the waste it contains will remain hazardous and therefore require safe storage for hundreds of thousands of years.[9] Given these timescales and the risks involved, it is crucial for this NPS to provide robust and rigorous guidance that can stand the test of time.

5. The focus of our inquiry was on the content and scope of the NPS; it was not on the merits of geological disposal as a means of disposing of higher activity radioactive waste. Following its initial recommendation, the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management ('CoRWM') reiterated its support for geological disposal in 2013 and the Government reasserted its view that a GDI was the "best available approach for the long-term management of England's legacy of higher activity radioactive waste" in a 2014 White Paper.[10] Our Committee accepts this policy and consequently, our inquiry focused solely on the NPS, how it fits within the Government's Industrial Strategy and whether it provides adequate guidance for future development consent orders. We were interested in examining both what is within the NPS and what is missing from it. In doing so, we took note of the consultation on the draft NPS[11] and the 'Working With Communities' consultation[12] but we did not examine them in detail, nor did we make recommendations as to their content. However, where we thought that some of the matters they cover should have been included in the draft NPS, we draw it to the Government's attention in our conclusions and recommendations.

5 Simmons, P and Bickerstaff, K (2006) 'The participatory turn in UK radioactive waste management policy.' In: Proceedings of VALDOR-2006. Congrex-Sweden AB, Stocklholm, pp. 529–536

6 Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, Consultation: Working With Communities - Implementing Geological Disposal, 25 January 2018, Table 1, p 18

7 Radioactive Waste Management, Making sense of geological disposal, 10 February 2017, p 4

8 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, National Policy Statement for geological disposal infrastructure - A framework document for planning decisions on nationally significant infrastructure, 25 January 2018, para 2.1.4.

9 Same as above, para. 1.5.2. & 2.2.2.

10 Same as above, para 2.1.9.

11 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, National Policy Statement for geological disposal infrastructure: implementing geological disposal - a consultation, 25 January 2018

12 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, Consultation: Working With Communities - Implementing Geological Disposal, 25 January 2018

6. In our terms of reference, we sought evidence from stakeholders and members of the public on the NPS's Assessment Principles, Impacts and supporting documents. We received 12 written evidence submissions from a range of stakeholders and a summary of the consultation responses from the Department.[13] We held an oral evidence session on 10 July 2018 during which we heard from the Planning Inspectorate, the Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum ('NuLeaf'), Campaign for National Parks, Radioactive Waste Management ('RWM'), the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management ('CoRWM'), the NGO Forum, and the Minister for Business and Industry. We are grateful for all the evidence and input we received during this inquiry from stakeholders and members of the public. This report concludes our inquiry and clears the way for the Government to bring forward a final NPS that reflects our recommendations.

Key issues

7. Overall, most of the evidence we received on the scope of the draft NPS was positive. We heard from several stakeholders that the draft NPS was on the whole fit for purpose and adequate, although the same evidence submissions invariably suggested improvements to the Assessment Principles and Impacts.[14] Two of the key players—the Planning Inspectorate, who will have to make a recommendation on development consent orders and RWM ,who will be putting forward any development consent order—were also broadly satisfied with the level of detail and guidance available to them in the draft NPS.[15]

8. This is not to say that the evidence we received was in full agreement with the NPS. Some stakeholders felt strongly about specific issues within the NPS, as outlined below. However, we agree with one of the witnesses[16] that overall the NPS satisfies the content requirements for similar national policy statements under planning legislation. In addition, when asked whether the draft NPS reflected lessons and improvements from previous failed attempts to find a suitable location for geological disposal, most witnesses agreed that it did. We welcome the fact that this draft NPS steers clear from the top-down approach through which previous governments had sought to impose a GDI on a community.[17] Another lesson from past unsuccessful attempts was to keep the process as flexible as possible in order to avoid asking communities to make a decision on geological disposal before they have all the information necessary. We will return to this point later in the report.[18]

9. This led us to focus our inquiry on the four key issues we had identified from the evidence as particularly acute:

i) National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty;

ii) using the GDI to dispose of waste from new nuclear build;

iii) the place of local community consent in the NPS; and

13 Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee, Draft National Policy Statement for Geological Disposal Infrastructure inquiry - publications

14 Q42 [Stephen Tromans QC]; Professor Neil Hyatt, GDI0013; Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group, GDI0009; Copeland Borough Council, GDI0008

15 Q2 [Dr Pauleen Lane] & Q41 [Bruce McKirdy]

16 Q2 [Dr Pauleen Lane]

17 Q17 [Philip Matthews]; Q40 [Bruce McKirdy & Stephen Tromans QC]; Q99 [Richard Harrington MP]

18 Q100 [Stephen Speed]

iv) how the NPS is linked with the Industrial Strategy and will deliver socioeconomic benefits to host communities.

10. We look at these issues in the next four chapters of the report.

2 National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty

A site-agnostic NPS

11. Unlike other NPSs,[19] but not all,[20] this draft NPS is not site-specific. This is because the Government's chosen approach for site identification is a voluntary one whereby through community engagement prospective host communities put themselves forward and give final consent to hosting the GDI, as outlined in the Government's 'Working With Communities' consultation[21] which is not part of this inquiry. The Government's preferred scenario is for the waste to be managed in one GDI only.[22] However, the fact that this draft NPS is site-agnostic implies that more than one GDI could be built and that it could be done anywhere in England—provided that the site put forward by a community met the NPS's Assessment Principles and Impacts.

12. As currently drafted, the NPS does not contain any exclusionary criteria.Some of the stakeholders we received evidence from—Campaign for National Parks,[23] Friends of the Lake District,[24] and the Lake District National Park Authority[25]—were concerned that this creates a risk that National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty ('AONBs') could end up hosting the GDI.

An exclusionary criterion

13. Campaign for National Parks contended that

> Geological disposal is completely incompatible with the statutory purposes of National Parks, particularly the conservation and enhancement of wildlife, cultural heritage and natural beauty[26]

The Lake District National Park Authority said they failed to see how a "development of this scale could be consistent with legislation and national policies protecting National Parks, AONBs or World Heritage Sites".[27]

14. Campaign for National Parks also said that National Parks "deliver key environmental resources and services" and "make a significant contribution to the economy through

19 See for instance most recently the Airports National Policy Statement: new runway capacity and infrastructure at airports in the South East of England, Department for Transport, 5 June 2018
20 Q4 [Dr Pauleen Lane]
21 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, Working with communities: implementing geological disposal, 25 January 2018
22 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, National Policy Statement for geological disposal infrastructure - A framework document for planning decisions on nationally significant infrastructure, 25 January 2018, para 2.2.6.
23 GDI0002
24 GDI0014
25 GDI0003
26 Campaign for National Parks, GDI0002, p 1
27 GDI0003, para ii

tourism, farming, and other related businesses" that must not be put at risk by major developments such as geological disposal."[28] Friends of the Lake District made a similar point in their evidence.[29]

15. Because of the environmental benefits they provide, conservation areas enjoy strong legal protection under the Environment Act 1995 which established a duty for all public bodies to:

> take account of the potential effect of their decisions and activities on National Park purposes, including activities undertaken outside National Park boundaries which may affect land within them.[30]

In addition, there is a presumption against major developments in National Parks within national planning policy.[31]

16. Campaign for National Parks also argued that because National Parks and AONBs are national designations, it would be impractical and unrealistic to get agreement from the entire national community on whether to put forward a site.[32] As a result, they asked for an exclusionary criterion to be added to the NPS so that all geological disposal developments be explicitly outlawed in protected areas such as National Parks and AONBs in the NPS.[33]

The Appraisal of Sustainability and the Government's view

17. Campaign for National Parks acknowledged that the draft NPS already contains requirements for the Secretary of State and the developer to take into account the impact of a GDI on National Parks and AONBs under existing planning guidance.[34] The draft NPS, for instance, prescribes that:

> If development is proposed in a nationally designated area, the Secretary of State should refuse development consent in these areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that it is in the public interest.[35]

18. The Appraisal of Sustainability supporting the draft NPS highlighted the 'significant positive effect' on biodiversity, air, noise, cultural heritage, and landscape and townscape that the addition of an exclusionary criterion on the grounds of landscape, cultural and natural heritage and nature conservation would bring.[36] However, the Appraisal also found that the draft NPS as currently drafted was nevertheless likely to have a 'positive effect' on the 13 Appraisal of Sustainability objectives including biodiversity, and landscape and townscape.[37]

---

28 GDI0002, para 2
29 GDI0014, para 17
30 GDI0002, para 6
31 Q21 [Ruth Bradshaw]
32 Q18 [Ruth Bradshaw]
33 GDI0002; GDI0003; GDI0014
34 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, National Policy Statement for geological disposal infrastructure - A framework document for planning decisions on nationally significant infrastructure, 25 January 2018, section 5.10
35 Same as above, para 5.10.9.
36 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, Appraisal of Sustainability of the National Policy Statement for geological disposal infrastructure: report, Table 2, xvii
37 Same as above.

19. Moreover, in the Appraisal of Sustainability report, the Government argued that:

> broad exclusionary criteria are not necessary to achieve the goal of ensuring that the environment is suitably protected, as site-specific examination may show it is possible to develop infrastructure in these areas without an unacceptable impact on people or the environment.[38]

20. As a result, despite the Appraisal of Sustainability report concluding that an exclusionary criterion would have the most positive effect, the Government decided against excluded National Parks and AONBs on the grands that it did not "wish to foreclose future possible locations that could be more advantageous in addressing safety over the lifetime of the facility."[39] The Government also claimed that "the adoption of exclusionary criteria may not necessarily exclude the possibility of adverse effects occurring" and that it:

> could result in unintended effects arising from increased development pressure on areas that, whilst not designated, may be sensitive to development (for example, areas at risk of flooding) or have value in terms of, for example, the economy or mineral resources.[40]

21. Richard Harrington MP, Minister for Business and Industry, also told us in evidence that the Government was not in favour of exclusionary criteria as they would preclude proposals from communities who may be interested in hosting a GDI that will have been designed to minimise the environmental impact:

> We have to look at all possible sites where communities want it. For example, the potash proposal near Whitby in North Yorkshire is in a national park, but the people who are proposing the site have shown a way of doing it where the actual buildings that are left will leave very little blot on the landscape of the national park. I am not saying we should have them on national parks, but it would be very wrong to exclude them at the moment in this big policy statement. […] I do not want to prejudge the situation. If it was huge, one-kilometre-wide industrial building in the middle of a national park, of course that would not be suitable.[41]

The Minister concluded that it wanted:

> to ensure that the separate siting process has sufficient flexibility to identify the safest location for a GDF over the lifetime of the facility.[42]

22. In their evidence, Campaign for National Parks had expressed concerns about safety and security factors being given greater weight than environmental concerns due to the nature of the material being stored.[43] We note those concerns but **we believe that given the nature of the material to be stored in a GDI, safety matters should be paramount and be given a greater weight than any other criterion.**

38 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, Appraisal of Sustainability of the National Policy Statement for geological disposal infrastructure: report, xix

39 Same as above, xix

40 Same as above.

41 Q127&130 [Richard Harrington MP]

42 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, Appraisal of Sustainability of the National Policy Statement for geological disposal infrastructure: report, xix

43 Same as above, xix

23. **We also note the conclusions from the Appraisal of Sustainability that the overall impact of the GDI on the Appraisal criteria is "positive", although we recognise that it is necessarily less "positive" than if National Parks and AONBs were excluded from developments. In our view existing planning legislation and the NPS contain sufficient safeguards against intrusive developments and environmental damage in National Parks and AONBs, particularly because any development requires community consent. We agree with the Government that a site could conceivably be designed in a way that would be acceptable to communities, preserve the benefits of National Parks and AONBs and avoid any surface facility in conservation areas.**

3 New nuclear build

The Government's policy on managing waste from new nuclear

24. In 2008, the then government published a White Paper on nuclear energy in which it established that it was "technically possible" and "the right approach" to dispose of waste from new nuclear build using geological disposal.[44]This policy was then adopted by the following government in 2011 in the National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6).[45] As a result, this NPS applies to a GDI which, if built, would store both legacy waste and waste from new nuclear.[46]

25. The focus of this inquiry is not on the Government's new nuclear policy. In this report we will not be taking a view on whether there should be a new build programme or not. Given the award of a development consent for Hinkley Point C[47] and talks between the Government and Hitachi regarding a proposed plant at Wylfa Newydd,[48] we looked at the draft NPS assuming that the GDI, if built, would indeed eventually host high activity waste from 16 to 18 gigawatt electrical of new nuclear power, in addition to the 764,000 cubic metres of legacy waste.[49] The Government currently estimates that wastes and materials from new nuclear will constitute roughly 10% of the total volume of waste stored in the GDI although this is subject to change in the future.[50]

The view from NGOs

26. We received evidence from the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group which strongly argued against including waste from new nuclear build into any potential GDI.[51] Their position is that:

> [… I]t would be perverse to compound the problem of finding and developing a site for a GDF by a new build programme that will result in vastly increased radioactivity and an unknowable volume of spent fuel and other highly radioactive wastes which will have to be stored indefinitely at vulnerable sites scattered around our coasts. A new-build programme would create an unmanageable and intolerable burden on communities into the far future.[52]

This point was also made by the Chair of Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group, Professor Andrew Blowers, when he gave evidence to our committee on 10 July 2018.[53]

44 Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, Nuclear White Paper 2008: 'Meeting the Energy Challenge', Cm 7296 , 2008, p.99
45 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, National Policy Statement for geological disposal infrastructure - A framework document for planning decisions on nationally significant infrastructure, 25 January 2018, para 2.1.9.
46 Same as above, para 2.1.9. & 2.1.10.
47 Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, News story: Hinkley Point C contract signed, 29 September 2016
48 HC Deb, 4 June 2018, col 76 [Commons ministerial statement]
49 Letter from Richard Harrington MP to the Chair, regarding geological disposal infrastructure, dated 13 July 2018
50 Same as above
51 GDI0009
52 GDI0009, pp 1–2
53 Q78 [Prof Andrew Blowers]

27. Professor Blowers also told us that he and other NGOs participating in the NGO Forum[54] felt that the Government had cherry-picked CoRWM's recommendations regarding geological disposal in order to justify its new nuclear build programme.[55] In the view of the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group, a new nuclear build programme is unnecessary and an alternative policy to deal with intergenerational waste from existing and future nuclear would be surface storage.[56]

28. The draft NPS is focused on geological disposal and does not include alternatives as that is the Government's chosen approach to manage higher activity radioactive waste. CoRWM maintains that "There are no obvious alternative solutions coming down the road that we are aware of."[57] We note the view from the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group that "the main priority must be safe management of the existing legacy with the search for a suitable site for a GDF a less pressing concern".[58] However, in our view, the two should not be mutually exclusive. A long-term solution to high activity waste has been delayed for long enough by successive governments and is separate from the issue of responsible management of existing waste. The latter is not within the scope of this inquiry and is regularly assessed by the National Audit Office[59] and the Public Accounts Committee.[60]

29. **Successive governments have for too long left it for future generations to find a solution to dispose safely of higher activity radioactive waste. It is time for a decision. Regardless of whether the Government should have embarked upon a new nuclear build programme and regardless of whether geological disposal is the best approach to dispose of waste, any long-term waste management strategy should include waste from new nuclear.**

30. Both the developer and CoRWM told us that the NPS could be strengthened if a stronger case was made for geological disposal as the best available approach against alternatives.[61] NuLeaf, despite being in favour of geological disposal, also questioned why alternatives had not been appraised in the NPS.[62] **We understand that the Government thought it would be enough to rely on references to CoRWM's recommendations in the NPS. However, we think that advice from both RWM and CoRWM that further justification for geological disposal is needed in the NPS should be taken seriously. *We therefore recommend that the Government work with CoRWM and RWM to strengthen the justification for geological disposal in the NPS.***

54 A panel of NGOs which meets regularly with relevant regulators and officials to discuss their views on geological disposal.
55 Q78 [Prof Andrew Blowers]
56 Q80 [Pro Andrew Blowers]
57 Q51 [Stephen Tromans QC]
58 GDI0009, p 1
59 See for instance the latest National Audit Office report The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority: progress with reducing risk at Sellafield, 20 June 2018
60 See for instance the latest Public Accounts Committee inquiry on the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
61 Q41 [Bruce McKirdy] & Q42 [Stephen Tromans QC]
62 Qq1, 3 [Philip Matthews]

The Inventory

31. One of the key issues around the inclusion of waste from new nuclear in the GDI is the uncertainty regarding the total volume of waste new nuclear may generate and the difficulties of asking a community to consent to an uncertain volume of waste. Stephen Tromans, Member of CoRWM, told us about some of CoRWM's concerns on this matter:

> That was certainly CoRWM's view, that if new nuclear was going to come forward there needed to be a fully and proper ethical debate as to what was going to happen to the waste from the new build. Unfortunately, that debate has not happened perhaps as CoRWM would like. What has happened is essentially a decision in favour of new build, taking on trust the fact that there will be a solution. The critical thing, as far as Working With Communities is concerned, is complete transparency and understanding on the part of the community as to what is going to go into the GDF they will be hosting. Their views may be very different as to dealing with and accepting legacy waste than new-build waste.[63]

He then added: "The inventory that the communities are being asked to take as part of the Working With Communities process has to be absolutely crystal clear in that regard."[64]

32. The uncertainty of the inventory and the difficulties this creates when it comes to asking a community to volunteer to host a facility whose size and content may vary were raised in several submissions. Professor Andrew Blowers said there was uncertainty regarding the possible inclusion of plutonium and spent fuel in the final Inventory.[65] Copeland Borough Council and NuLeaf both told us that the likely impact of uncertainty regarding the final Inventory should be made clearer to potential host communities.[66] The Lake District National Park Authority stressed that the infrastructure requirements for geological disposal would remain uncertain until there is a final inventory.[67]

33. We note that the draft NPS addresses some of this uncertainty in section 2.3 'Waste to be managed'.[68] It provides a list, compiled by RWM and updated every three years, of the waste that the Government and the developer expect to be stored in the GDI, should it be built. We understand that the nature of an inventory means that it will continue to evolve in the run-up to identifying a site for the GDI as more power stations come online and decommissioning work progresses. Following our visit to Sellafield Ltd, we also understand the complex challenges faced by the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority in trying to deal with decades of poor management of higher activity radioactive nuclear waste, some of which still needs to be identified and quantified. The developer and the Government have provided us with an estimate of the additional volume of waste and costs that the new nuclear build programme as currently planned would add to the inventory, and we expect this would also have an impact on site capacity.[69] RWM acknowledged

63 Q55 [Stephen Tromans QC]
64 Same as above.
65 GDI0009, p4
66 GDI0008, para 3.23 and GDI0005, para 32
67 GDI0003, para 3.4
68 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, National Policy Statement for geological disposal infrastructure - A framework document for planning decisions on nationally significant infrastructure, 25 January 2018, section 2.3
69 Q60 [Bruce McKirdy]; Letter from Richard Harrington MP to the Chair, regarding geological disposal infrastructure, dated 13 July 2018

that if the new nuclear build programme grew beyond the 16 to 18 gigawatt electrical currently planned, "you would probably have to find another site", but reiterated that the Government's preference would be for a single site to cover both legacy and future waste.[70]

34. **Given the changing nature of inventories and the timescales at stake, we reject the idea that the total the UK Derived Inventory should be finalised before proceeding with the final NPS. However, we agree with the evidence that before communities are asked to volunteer to host the GDI, it should be made absolutely clear to them that the inventory is uncertain and likely to change. As currently drafted, the NPS does not make that point clearly enough, especially to lay readers. Although the NPS is primarily aimed at the Planning Inspectorate and the developer, it should also be helpful to communities that are thinking of volunteering to host the GDI.** ***We recommend that the Government clarifies in the NPS the level of uncertainty regarding the inventory and explains to prospective host communities how this will affect their right to reject the GDI at any point during the siting process.***

35. We acknowledge Professor Blowers's view that volume of waste and level of radioactivity are two different things. He told us that "for Hinkley Point C alone, […] by the year 2200 the amount of waste, in terms of radioactivity, would be 80% of the existing legacy waste."[71] Evidence we received from Professor Neil Hyatt, Chair in Radioactive Waste Management at the University of Sheffield, likewise stressed that "the underground footprint" of the waste to store in the GDI is determined by "the volume of heat generating spent nuclear fuel and high level waste", and is a "key driver of the environmental impacts identified in the Appraisal of Sustainability Report".[72] He argued that "the impact of the radioactive waste inventory on the infrastructure requirements and impact assessment of the geological disposal facility are not well considered in the Draft NPS". He suggested that

> the draft NPS […] should consider the extent to which bounding scenario assumptions on the waste inventory, particularly concerning spent MOX fuel and spent fuel from new build, affect the infrastructure requirement and impact assessment.[73]

36. Moreover, we were told by witnesses that one of the key reasons for the failure to find a site for geological in the past was that the decision-making process was too "rigid" and "required local authorities to make decisions before sufficient information had been provided on which to base those decisions."[74] We are keen to ensure that the same mistakes are not repeated. Asking communities to give their consent before they have enough information about the Inventory could be one of those pitfalls.

37. **Volume of waste and underground footprint are two separate but crucial issues which will affect the type of facility required. It is essential that communities understand what responsibility—both in terms of volume of waste and level of radioactivity—they would be signing up for by hosting the GDI.** ***For transparency purposes, the Government should clarify in the NPS the level of radioactivity that, to its knowledge, waste from the 16 to 18 gigawatt electrical new nuclear build programme***

70 Q60 [Bruce McKirdy]
71 Q92 [Prof Andrew Blowers]
72 GDI0013, para 3
73 Same as above.
74 Q40 [Bruce McKirdy] but also Q17 [Philip Matthews] and Q100 [Stephen Speed]

would add to the total volume of radioactivity in the GDI and how that will impact the infrastructure requirements of the facility. The Government should also provide details in the NPS on the level of radioactivity from new nuclear build waste as a proportion of the total level of radioactivity in the GDI.

4 Local community consent

Community consent in the NPS

38. As indicated earlier, our inquiry does not focus on the 'Working With Communities' policy, on which the Government consulted separately.[75] Nevertheless, given how contentious previous attempts to find a site for a GDI have proved to be, our work would have been incomplete if we had failed to examine whether the Government was right to keep community consent separate from the NPS. Unlike other NPSs[76] (but by all means not every NPS), this NPS does not list community consent or community engagement amongst its Assessment Principles.

39. When we asked whether this should be rectified, the majority of the evidence we received agreed. Some like the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group[77] and Copeland Borough Council,[78] while broadly supportive of the process outlined in 'Working With Communities', argued it was "essential"[79] and "axiomatic"[80] that community consent be added to the list of Assessment Principles and Impacts in the NPS. Pupils 2 Parliament,[81] NuLeaf,[82] the Lake District National Park Authority,[83] Campaign for National Parks,[84] and Prospect[85] shared the same view.

40. Cumbria County Council differed and claimed that:

> It is not clear what value adding Local Community Consent to the list would bring to the decision making process given that without passing the Test of Public Support a development consent application for a GDF could not be submitted and it is at the point of assessing an application for a GDF that the policies in the NPS become pertinent.[86]

Interaction between development consent and community consent

41. Copeland Borough Council was amongst the stakeholders who more generally noted that "the link between the NPS and the local siting process, likely to involve several 'volunteer' communities, is [not] adequately reflected in the draft"[87] - a view echoed by NuLeaf:

75 Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, Working with communities: implementing geological disposal, 25 January 2018
76 See for instance most recently the Airports National Policy Statement: new runway capacity and infrastructure at airports in the South East of England, Department for Transport, 5 June 2018
77 GDI0009, p5
78 GDI0008, para 1.9
79 GDI0008, para 1.9
80 GDI0009, p5
81 GDI0006, para 24
82 GDI0005, para 14
83 GDI0003, para 3.1
84 GDI0002, para 20
85 GDI0010
86 GDI0011, para 2.15
87 GDI0008, para 3.10

> Our sense is just, going back to some of the earlier discussion here, that there is not necessarily the clarity at the present time about exactly how that community consent process, voluntarist process, ability to veto the process from the local community, will interact with the NPS properly.[88]

Evidence from Mr Alun Ellis made a similar point,[89] and Stephen Tromans QC said it was also CoRWM's view that "it should be made clear that an application for a development consent order should not come forward until the test of community consent has been passed."[90]

42. We were reassured by RWM's explanation of the process:

> It is not in the NPS, but the point is that the Working With Communities policy requires us to get a consenting community before we can put in a DCO application. We cannot put in a DCO application for boreholes until we are engaged with the community and we have a community partnership. We cannot put in a DCO for a GDF until we have had a final test of community support and confirmed with that community. You will never have a position where we are applying for a DCO without a consenting community, because sequentially it goes the other way round.[91]

43. Dr Pauleen Lane told us that "This is the first time that there has been a separate process identified as an issue of community consent that is separate to but parallel to an NPS."[92] We note her concern that "importing the question as to the test of the validity of community consent into a national policy statement takes it to a place that they were never meant to be."[93] We also acknowledge that planning legislation requires the Planning Inspectorate and Secretary of State to judge the extent to which the developer has engaged with affected communities.[94]

44. **We conclude that what may be a clear framework to the developer and Planning Inspectorate may not be as easily accessible to a lay audience. It is of paramount importance that prospective host communities understand how their 'right of withdrawal' interacts with the development consent orders for boreholes and geological disposal. We do not suggest that community consent should become an Assessment Principle as we think the 'Working With Communities' policy already guarantees to communities that no GDI could be granted development consent without their express approval. However, the NPS as currently drafted does not explain clearly how these two frameworks interact. *The Government should clarify the degree of priority afforded to community consent in the NPS in a way that is accessible to a lay audience so as to give prospective communities all the tools they need to engage with the siting process.***

88 Q12, 31 [Philip Matthews]
89 GDI0001
90 Q42 [Stephen Tromans QC]
91 Q48 [Bruce McKirdy]
92 Q15 [Dr Pauleen Lane]
93 Q35 [Dr Pauleen Lane]
94 Q8 [Dr Pauleen Lane]

5 Industrial Strategy

Benefits to the hosting community

45. The need for the GDI to provide clear and substantial benefits to the host community and for the Government to work with the host community to ensure that an integrated approach to investment and employment is taken was mentioned many times in the evidence we received.[95] This is because "the overall balance of effects must be significantly positive"[96] for any future host community. Pupils 2 Parliament recommended "going beyond identifying likely impacts on local communities and population" and that "increasing local employment be a principle in its own right" that would guide the developer's application and the Secretary of State's decision.[97]

Link with the Industrial Strategy

46. The link between the Industrial Strategy and the NPS is not currently clearly established in the draft NPS. The Industrial Strategy is only mentioned once in the consultation on the draft NPS and is nowhere to be found in the NPS itself. For instance, the NPS does not require Local Industrial Strategies to be drawn once a site for geological disposal has been identified or for the Secretary of State to expressly favour developments that deliver clear socioeconomic benefits to the host community.

47. Nevertheless, the ministerial foreword states that a GDI:

> is a responsible public service to our future society and will contribute to the Government's Industrial Strategy, which identified the key role the nuclear sector has in increasing productivity and driving clean growth.[98]

When pressed for further details during our oral evidence session, the Minister told us that the Industrial Strategy was "an important part of" the NPS and that "the two are linked together."[99] The Minister argued that the recently-agreed Nuclear Sector Deal,[100] was "relevant to geological disposal" in terms of "reduction in cost, skills, women, et cetera.".[101] The Minister claimed that the GDI would fit within the Industrial Strategy's Places policy but did not explain how.[102] When we tried to establish whether the Government would tie in the NPS with Local Industrial Strategies and local skills plans, the Minister's response was non-committal.[103]

95 Copeland Borough Council, GDI0008, para 3.18; Folkestone & Hythe District Council, GDI0007, para 6; GDI0005, para 24
96 Folkestone & Hythe District Council, GDI0007, para 6
97 GDI0006, para 32
98 Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, National Policy Statement for geological disposal infrastructure: implementing geological disposal - a consultation, 25 January 2018, p 2
99 Q135 [Richard Harrington MP]
100 Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, Policy paper - Nuclear Sector Deal, A Sector Deal between government and the nuclear industry, 27 June 2018
101 Q135 [Richard Harrington MP]
102 Q138 [Richard Harrington MP]
103 Q139–140 [Richard Harrington MP]

48. Given the timelines at stake, it is likely that by the time the siting process is completed (15 to 20 years from now according to the Government's estimate),[104] the Industrial Strategy may no longer be a Government policy and the Government itself will have changed. **For this reason, it is acceptable for the NPS not to contain any specific mention of the Industrial Strategy. However, *the Government should refrain from drawing connections between the Industrial Strategy and geological disposal in order to justify its policy choices. If it wants to maintain the link between the two policies, the Government should justify in detail how geological disposal will be integrated within the Industrial Strategy framework.***

Benefits currently outlined in the NPS

49. The conclusion we draw about the link between the Industrial Strategy and geological disposal does not negate the need for the NPS to establish strong benefits to the potential host communities. Although we acknowledge that RWM estimate that the GDI could bring "up to 1,000 [highly skilled] jobs for about 100 years"[105] to the host community, some submissions argued that the NPS's Impacts lacked details on:

> the transport infrastructure requirements; skills and training requirements to ensure the local workforce can access new jobs and also to address labour migration from existing services/industries; management of waste generated by the development.[106]

50. We were told by RWM that the Government was planning on making payments of £1million a year to communities that enter the siting process; giving £2.5 million a year for communities that go as far as having boreholes drilled; and that the one community that ends up hosting a GDF would get a "significant additional investment".[107] We strongly support these plans but we regret that the NPS does not provide the same level of guarantee that host communities will receive tangible skills and employment opportunities from geological disposal. In this respect, the NPS does say that the developer "should look" to maximise employment opportunities and sourcing of materials locally but no firm obligation is placed on the developer to deliver these provisions to be granted development consent.[108]

51. NuLeaf suggested ways to make the link between the NPS and the Industrial Strategy more compelling so as to deliver more benefits to prospective host communities:

> The GDF has the potential to bring a significant number of direct operational jobs (around 550 on average) to an area. More importantly, there is scope for the GDF to support local skills development and supply chains and, through the significant investment promised to the community that hosts a GDF, to develop local infrastructure to wider benefit. The Industrial Strategy does recognise that, through Science and Innovation Audits and the Knowledge Exchange Framework, collaboration on research occurs across the UK and internationally. The GDF could therefore support and

104 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, Consultation: Working With Communities - Implementing Geological Disposal, 25 January 2018, para 3.28
105 Q57 [Bruce McKirdy]
106 Cumbria County Council, GDI0011; NuLeaf and Copeland Borough Council made similar arguments.
107 Q73 [Bruce McKirdy]
108 NPS, para 5.7.2

enhance local and regional economic growth if such opportunities are part of the project. To improve the social and economic benefits, the developer should be encouraged to work with local authorities and the Local Enterprise Partnership to establish the right strategy for the area if a GDF were consented.

52. **Beyond making payments to prospective communities and incentivising the developer to rely on local skills, it is hard to see how the NPS would expressly guarantee a development consent order that has robust socioeconomic benefits for the host community. It is also disappointing that the Government plans do not make local growth and skills a priority for the GDI if it is not one of the decisive factors of the development consent order.**

53. ***The Government must clarify in the NPS how the Secretary of State will have regard to local skills and employment opportunities when considering development consent orders for geological disposal. The Government should also place stronger requirements on the developer in the Impacts section of the NPS to establish robust local skills partnerships with the host community and to rely on local employment and sourcing opportunities.***

6 Conclusion

54. Overall, the draft NPS is fit for purpose and contains adequate level of guidance and details needed for the developer, the Planning Inspectorate and the Secretary of State to put forward and make recommendations on development consent orders. We welcome the fact that the NPS and the separate but relevant 'Working With Communities' policy incorporate some of the key lessons from previous unsuccessful attempts to find a suitable location for a GDI. Provided that the Government takes into account our recommendations aimed at improving the engagement of and benefits to prospective host communities, we support the case for the final NPS to be brought before Parliament for approval.

55. With these recommendations in mind, we are satisfied that this NPS provides the right level of guidance to the decision-maker on the type of GDI that will be suitable for England's legacy and future higher activity radioactive waste.

Conclusions and recommendations

National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty

1. We believe that given the nature of the material to be stored in a GDI, safety matters should be paramount and be given a greater weight than any other criterion. (Paragraph 22)

2. We also note the conclusions from the Appraisal of Sustainability that the overall impact of the GDI on the Appraisal criteria is "positive", although we recognise that it is necessarily less "positive" than if National Parks and AONBs were excluded from developments. In our view existing planning legislation and the NPS contain sufficient safeguards against intrusive developments and environmental damage in National Parks and AONBs, particularly because any development requires community consent. We agree with the Government that a site could conceivably be designed in a way that would be acceptable to communities, preserve the benefits of National Parks and AONBs and avoid any surface facility in conservation areas. (Paragraph 23)

New nuclear build

3. Successive governments have for too long left it for future generations to find a solution to dispose safely of higher activity radioactive waste. It is time for a decision. Regardless of whether the Government should have embarked upon a new nuclear build programme and regardless of whether geological disposal is the best approach to dispose of waste, any long-term waste management strategy should include waste from new nuclear. (Paragraph 29)

4. We understand that the Government thought it would be enough to rely on references to CoRWM's recommendations in the NPS. However, we think that advice from both RWM and CoRWM that further justification for geological disposal is needed in the NPS should be taken seriously. *We therefore recommend that the Government work with CoRWM and RWM to strengthen the justification for geological disposal in the NPS.* (Paragraph 30)

5. Given the changing nature of inventories and the timescales at stake, we reject the idea that the total the UK Derived Inventory should be finalised before proceeding with the final NPS. However, we agree with the evidence that before communities are asked to volunteer to host the GDI, it should be made absolutely clear to them that the inventory is uncertain and likely to change. As currently drafted, the NPS does not make that point clearly enough, especially to lay readers. Although the NPS is primarily aimed at the Planning Inspectorate and the developer, it should also be helpful to communities that are thinking of volunteering to host the GDI. *We recommend that the Government clarifies in the NPS the level of uncertainty regarding the inventory and explains to prospective host communities how this will affect their right to reject the GDI at any point during the siting process.* (Paragraph 34)

6. Volume of waste and underground footprint are two separate but crucial issues which will affect the type of facility required. It is essential that communities

understand what responsibility—both in terms of volume of waste and level of radioactivity—they would be signing up for by hosting the GDI. *For transparency purposes, the Government should clarify in the NPS the level of radioactivity that, to its knowledge, waste from the 16 to 18 gigawatt electrical new nuclear build programme would add to the total volume of radioactivity in the GDI and how that will impact the infrastructure requirements of the facility. The Government should also provide details in the NPS on the level of radioactivity from new nuclear build waste as a proportion of the total level of radioactivity in the GDI.* (Paragraph 37)

Local community consent

7. We conclude that what may be a clear framework to the developer and Planning Inspectorate may not be as easily accessible to a lay audience. It is of paramount importance that prospective host communities understand how their 'right of withdrawal' interacts with the development consent orders for boreholes and geological disposal. We do not suggest that community consent should become an Assessment Principle as we think the 'Working With Communities' policy already guarantees to communities that no GDI could be granted development consent without their express approval. However, the NPS as currently drafted does not explain clearly how these two frameworks interact. *The Government should clarify the degree of priority afforded to community consent in the NPS in a way that is accessible to a lay audience so as to give prospective communities all the tools they need to engage with the siting process.* (Paragraph 44)

Industrial Strategy

8. For this reason, it is acceptable for the NPS not to contain any specific mention of the Industrial Strategy. However, *the Government should refrain from drawing connections between the Industrial Strategy and geological disposal in order to justify its policy choices. If it wants to maintain the link between the two policies, the Government should justify in detail how geological disposal will be integrated within the Industrial Strategy framework.* (Paragraph 48)

9. Beyond making payments to prospective communities and incentivising the developer to rely on local skills, it is hard to see how the NPS would expressly guarantee a development consent order that has robust socioeconomic benefits for the host community. It is also disappointing that the Government plans do not make local growth and skills a priority for the GDI if it is not one of the decisive factors of the development consent order. (Paragraph 52)

10. *The Government must clarify in the NPS how the Secretary of State will have regard to local skills and employment opportunities when considering development consent orders for geological disposal. The Government should also place stronger requirements on the developer in the Impacts section of the NPS to establish robust local skills partnerships with the host community and to rely on local employment and sourcing opportunities.* (Paragraph 53)

Formal minutes

Monday 23 July 2018

Members present:

Rachel Reeves, in the Chair

Vernon Coaker	Albert Owen
Peter Kyle	Mark Pawsey
Sir Patrick McLoughlin	Anna Turley

Draft Report (*Draft National Policy Statement for Geological Disposal Infrastructure*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 55 read and agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Thirteenth Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 134.

[Adjourned till Wednesday 12 September at 9.45 am

Witnesses

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the inquiry publications page of the Committee's website.

Tuesday 10 July 2018	*Question number*
Philip Matthews, Executive Director, Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum; **Ruth Bradshaw**, Policy and Research Manager, Campaign for National Parks; **Dr Pauleen Lane**, Group Manager National Infrastructure, Planning Inspectorate	Q1–39
Bruce McKirdy, Managing Director, Radioactive Waste Management; **Stephen Tromans QC**, Member, Committee on Radioactive Waste Management; **Professor Andrew Blowers**, Co-Chair, NGO Forum and Chair, Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group	Q40–98
Richard Harrington MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Minister for Business and Industry, Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy; **Stephen Speed**, Director, Nuclear, Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy; **Umran Nazir**, Deputy Director, Decommissioning, Radioactive Materials and Geological Disposal Programme, Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy	Q99–146

Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the inquiry publications page of the Committee's website.

GDI numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

1 BANNG (GDI0009)

2 Campaign for National Parks (GDI0002)

3 Copeland Borough Council (GDI0008)

4 Cumbria County Council (GDI0011)

5 Folkestone & Hythe District Council (GDI0007)

6 Friends of the Lake District (GDI0014)

7 Lake District National Park Authority (GDI0003)

8 Mr Alun Ellis (GDI0001)

9 Neil Hyatt (GDI0013)

10 NuLeAF (NUclear Legacy Advisory Forum) (GDI0005)

11 Prospect (GDI0010)

12 Pupils 2 Parliament (GDI0006)

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the publications page of the Committee's website. The reference number of the Government's response to each Report is printed in brackets after the HC printing number.

Session 2017–19

First Report	A framework for modern employment	HC 352 (HC 966)
Second Report	Leaving the EU: implications for the civil nuclear sector	HC 378 (HC 881)
Third Report	The safety of Electrical Goods in the UK	HC 503 (HC 920)
Fourth Report	Pre-legislative scrutiny of the draft Domestic Gas and Electricity (Tariff Cap) Bill	HC 517 (HC 865)
Fifth Report	The impact of Brexit on the automotive sector	HC 379 (HC 1018)
Sixth Report	The impact of Brexit on the aerospace sector	HC 380 (HC 1049)
Seventh Report	The impact of Brexit on the processed food and drink sector	HC 381
Eighth Report	Pre-appointment hearing with the Government's preferred candidate for Chair of the Competition and Markets Authority	HC 985
Ninth Report	The impact of Brexit on the pharmaceutical sector	HC 382
Tenth Report	Carillion	HC 769
Eleventh Report	Pre-appointment hearing with the Government's preferred candidate for Chair of Ofgem	HC 1353
First Special Report	Industrial Strategy: First Review: Government Response to the Committee's Second Report of Session 2016–17	HC 337
Second Special Report	Corporate governance: Government Response to the Committee's Third Report of Session 2016–17	HC 338
Third Special Report	Apprenticeships: Government Response to the Second Joint Report of Session 2016–17	HC 450
Fourth Special Report	Leaving the EU: negotiation priorities for energy and climate change policy: Government Response to the Committee's Fourth Report of Session 2016–17	HC 550

Fifth Special Report	Pre-legislative scrutiny of the draft Domestic Gas and Electricity (Tariff Cap) Bill: Government Response to the Committee's Fourth Report	HC 865
Sixth Special Report	Leaving the EU: implications for the civil nuclear sector: Government response to the Committee's Second Report	HC 881
Seventh Special Report	The safety of Electrical Goods in the UK Government Response to the Committee's Third Report	HC 920
Eighth Special Report	A framework for modern employment: Government response to the Second Report of the Work and Pensions Committee and First Report of the Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee of Session 2017–19	HC 966
Ninth Special Report	The impact of Brexit on the automotive sector: Government Response to the Committee's Fifth Report	HC 1018
Tenth Special Report	The impact of Brexit on the aerospace sector: Government Response to the Committee's Sixth Report	HC 1049
Eleventh Special Report	The impact of Brexit on the pharmaceutical sector: Government Response to the Committee's Ninth Report	HC 1426