**ANNEX EXPLANATION & CONTENTS**

These annexes set out an initial ‘translation’ between the [Report of the Commission on the Future of Localism](http://locality.org.uk/our-work/policy/localism-commission/)[[1]](#footnote-1) and BEIS’ ‘[Working With Communities’ consultation document](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/working-with-communities-implementing-geological-disposal)[[2]](#footnote-2) (WWC). The ‘translation’ does not attempt to be a comprehensive analysis. It is merely designed to initiate and facilitate a dialogue.

To BEIS’ credit, considerable effort was made to engage widely and openly in developing the ‘Working With Communities’ proposals. However, a number of independent participants have noted that the Department for Communities & Local Government (CLG), while invited, was largely absent from discussions. This means that the WWC proposals do not well reflect the language, culture or activities of Localism. The annexes are therefore a starting point to harness the knowledge and skills of the localism sector in co-creating an informed way forward.

**Annex A** How the Localism Commission’s recommendations read across to WWC proposals p2

**Annex B** The Commission’s 6 key localism principles and the way they’re reflected in the WWC document p5

**Annex C** “Sources of Community Power”, and how these are articulated and supported by WWC proposals p10

**Annex D** Ways in which WWC proposals address “Blocks to Community Power” p14

***ANNEX A***

**LOCALISM COMMISSION’S RECOMMENDATIONS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Localism Report** | **Working With Communities consultation paper** |
| 1. **Institutions for localism:** healthy local governance structures integrated within wider governance | **Roles and responsibilities (p34)**  “Communities sit at the heart of this geological disposal facility siting process. For the process to be successful, the delivery body will need to engage with members of the community. The Community Partnership will decide when it has had sufficient information. It will decide when the Community will hold a test of public support. In addition, at any point in the siting process it can decide to withdraw. The process by which decisions will be made by the Community Partnership will be set out in a Community Agreement.”  **Community Partnership (paras 4.44-4.55 & Table 3 on p36)**  The Community Partnership will be the key governing body. Its powers, decision-making processes and responsibilities to be set out in a Community Agreement. Its membership to be drawn from eg parish councils, local business, residents, and community organisations.  **Community Agreement (paras 4.56-4.59)**  “A Community Agreement will define roles of its members and how the different parties on the Community Partnership will interact with each other in the siting process, including how disputes will be resolved. This will be central to ensuring transparency and community involvement in the siting process. The Agreement will enable community members to hold the delivery body to account.” |
| 1. **Powers and mechanisms for localism:** ensuring there are meaningful powers, levers and resources for communities to take action locally | **Community Agreement (paras 4.56-4.59)** [see above]  The Agreement, to be negotiated with the community, will define powers and other appropriate mechanisms.  **Engagement, Community Investment & Additional Funding (paras 4.37-4.41 & paras 4.60-4.73).** There are 4 separate resourcing strands:  Engagement funding is differentiated from community investment funding to make clear that the community will incur no costs from engaging in the process. For example, it will cover operational costs of the Community Partnership (including paying for a secretariat), costs of the community acquiring independent expert advice and/or support, and any costs of implementing the right of withdrawal.  Community Investment funding of £1m per year (rising to £2.5m per year) available to a community to fund well-being projects, local built or natural environment improvements, and economic development.  Additional, longer-term investment to help to maximise the significant economic benefits that are inherent in hosting the GDF. This additional investment will be significant (hundreds of millions of pounds) and capable of generating intergenerational socioeconomic and environmental benefits.  This is separate to any funding required to mitigate impacts during construction, or infrastructure investment directly required by the GDF. |
| 1. **Relational localism:** changing culture and behaviours requires embracing trust in devolution to communities, and disrupting hierarchies | **Community Partnership (paras 4.44-4.55 & Table 3 on p36)**  [see above]  **Community Agreement (paras 4.56-4.59)** [see above]  **Engagement, Community Investment & Additional Funding (paras 4.37-4.41 & paras 4.60-4.73)** [see above]  Changing culture and behaviours is a fundamental necessity of the ‘Working With Communities’ proposals. Securing community consent and managing a process spanning decades requires a new kind of partnership between the governed and those who currently govern. The Community Partnership (which requires community representation), the underpinning Agreement to be negotiated with the community, and the significant funds available can all be leveraged by a community to drive change in culture and behaviours, and the local decision-making hierarchy. |
| 1. **Capacity for localism:** supporting community organising, community development and sustainable spaces for participation | **Engagement, Community Investment & Additional Funding (paras 4.37-4.41 & paras 4.60-4.73)** [see above]  **Formative & Constructive Engagement (paras 4.22-4.36 & 4.42-4.43)**  The ‘Working With Communities’ document is explicit that building trust with a community will require the delivery body to work with a community to identify their needs, concerns and aspirations. Once these are agreed the delivery body is required to fund and support the community in addressing and realising those ambitions in terms of community organising, development and participation. |

*Please Note: Quoted text has been edited for succinctness.*

***ANNEX B***

**SIX KEY PRINCIPLES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Localism Report** | **Working With Communities consultation paper** |
| 1. **People are the end goal of localism:** interventions should be judged by the impact they have on people, rather than institutions alone | **Community Partnership (paras 4.44-4.55 & Table 3 on p36)**  [see above]  **Community Agreement (paras 4.56-4.59)** [see above]  **Right of Withdrawal (paras 4.74-4.82)**  **Test of Public Support (paras 4.83-4.91)**  The entire policy is based upon ‘community consent’. Communities have the right to withdraw at any time, retaining any benefits they’ve already received, and any costs associated with withdrawal being met by the delivery body. In addition, the process will be independently evaluated (para 4.33).  As part of the negotiations of the Community Agreement, and on an on-going basis, the community can help define the outcomes they are seeking, and how the impacts are to be assessed.  The creation of a new institution (the national repository or GDF) is therefore dependent on people in local communities being satisfied that they are benefitting overall. Thus, interventions can be judged by the impact they have on the people – if they’re not benefitting people, the community can terminate the arrangement, at no cost to themselves. |
| 1. **Equality in local participation:** not everybody wants to participate in the same way, but there needs to be equality of consideration and an equal opportunity to participate | **Community Partnership (paras 4.44-4.55 & Table 3 on p36)**  [see above]  The Community Partnership will have a funded support team to help build the skills, ability and confidence of the community to take part in the process (para 4.52). The Partnership could also support Stakeholder Forums and Working Groups to focus on specific issues (para 4.53). The professional skills of community residents could be deployed across a range of potential working groups, eg a local engineer monitoring and evaluating technical issues, or a local architect representing the community in the design of the surface facilities of the GDF.  **Community Agreement (paras 4.56-4.59)** [see above]  **Right of Withdrawal (paras 4.74-4.82)**  **Test of Public Support (paras 4.83-4.91)**  It will be for the Community Partnership, underpinned by the Community Agreement, to determine decision-making processes, and who to involve and how.  **Engagement, Community Investment & Additional Funding (paras 4.37-4.41 & paras 4.60-4.73)**  [see above]  Under both Engagement and Community Investment funding it would be entirely appropriate, for example, for communities to seek a ‘digital skills’ programme so nobody is excluded from doing their own online research, or participating in debates on any social media platforms set up to share information within the community. |
| 1. **Dynamic local accountability:** accountability must not be based on consultations and voting alone: it must value ongoing community participation, relationships and local action | **Community Partnership (paras 4.44-4.55 & Table 3 on p36)**  **Formative & Constructive Engagement (paras 4.22-4.36 & 4.42-4.43)**  **Engagement, Community Investment & Additional Funding (paras 4.37-4.41 & paras 4.60-4.73)**  The ‘Working With Communities’ paper repeatedly states in these sections, that the whole process must be built upon active community engagement and participation, with community representatives involved in designing and leading agreed processes.  **Test of Public Support (paras 4.83-4.91)**  “The test would only be taken after extensive community engagement and consultation. To ensure flexibility, to reflect the different needs of communities, and to allow for the possibility of new methods for securing community consent emerging, it will be for the Community Partnership to decide exactly when the test should take place and the most appropriate method.” |
| 1. **Local leadership is built around place:** convening community partnership around shared local concerns | **Identifying Communities (paras 4.5-4.14)**  This is a key issue for the ‘Working With Communities’ policy and consultation. The document acknowledges the complexity of defining ‘a community’, and thus seeks to establish principles which retain flexibility to allow each Community Partnership to take the lead in defining ‘community’ in relevant local terms. |
| 1. **Localism requires meaningful powers and integrated structures:** local powers should not be easily dismissed by ‘higher’ tiers of governance, without clear reasons and means of redress | **The Role of County Councils, Unitary Authorities and District Councils (paras 5.1-5.12)**  This is by far the weakest part of the consultation document. It is potentially the most dangerous part, and requires serious push-back in any Consultation Response you may be considering. The document repeats frequently that “communities are at the heart of the policy”, and provides for a dispute resolution process to be part of the Community Agreement.  However, the document also seems to contradict itself by allowing for an effective local authority ‘veto’ a) at the start of the process over whether a community can even enter it, b) during the process over Community Partnership decisions, and c) even at the end by being able to stop a Test of Public Support. The document says:  “Local authorities may choose not to be involved in the formative [process]. They should be kept informed of the process and make clear they are content for the formative [process] to continue.” (p31)  “It the relevant principal local authority representatives no longer wish to support the process proceeding, then we recognise it is unlikely that the Community Partnership will be able [to proceed]” (p45)  This may be poor wording, as local authorities will clearly be important partners of the Community Partnership. However, it is an issue we urge you to seek clarification, and if necessary, correct. |
| 1. **Economic power must support community responsibility:** communities must have the means and resources to match powers and responsibilities, and to realise the potential of localism | **Engagement, Community Investment & Additional Funding (paras 4.37-4.41 & paras 4.60-4.73)**  Significant funding has been pledged to ensure the community has the means and resources required to realise the potential.  Engagement funding is differentiated from community investment funding to make clear that the community will incur no costs from engaging in the process. For example, it will cover operational costs of the Community Partnership (including paying for a secretariat), costs of the community acquiring independent expert advice and/or support, and any costs of implementing the right of withdrawal.  Community Investment funding of £1m per year (rising to £2.5m per year) available to a community to fund well-being projects, local built or natural environment improvements, and economic development.  Additional, longer-term investment to help to maximise the significant economic benefits that are inherent in hosting the GDF. This additional investment will be significant (hundreds of millions of pounds) and capable of generating intergenerational socioeconomic and environmental benefits.  This is separate to any funding required to mitigate impacts during construction, or infrastructure investment directly required by the GDF. |

*Please Note: Quoted text has been edited for succinctness.*

***ANNEX C***

**SOURCES OF COMMUNITY POWER**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Localism Report** | **Working With Communities consultation paper** |
| **Spaces for being together, for participation and deliberation:** Communities need the spaces and forums to come together, socialise and organise. Democracy thrives on spaces for conversation, connection, shared purpose, debate and resolving differences. Disagreement, conflicting priorities and concerns arise in all communities: powerful communities have the means and routes for addressing these through collective problem-solving. | As should be clear by now, the consultation document is very explicit about the need for open, participative community dialogue and engagement. The engagement processes will be funded, independently facilitated, and designed to encourage all voices in the community to be heard. The community will have a leading role in negotiating and agreeing the discussion and engagement processes that meet the needs of their community.  In addition to the funding for engagement activities, it is also open to communities to supplement such activities through community investment funding. For example, there may be a perceived need to provide digital skills classes and/or community access to computers for less-advantaged community members so that nobody needs be excluded from information and discussion.  Providing an appropriate ‘democracy infrastructure’ is critical and central to this process, which is acknowledged and funded in these policy proposals (paras 4.37-41 & 4.22-4.36). |
| **Connectedness and belonging:**  While place is only one aspect of identity, and different people experience belonging in different ways, involvement in local social action can strengthen feelings of community cohesion and generate a greater sense of civic pride and purpose.  Connectedness and belonging within a community is often associated with ‘social capital,’ broadly defined by levels of social trust, participation and association, cohesion and collective efficacy. | Evaluating the risks and benefits of hosting a GDF will take several decades before a community has the necessary information before a decision is even required. The issues are inter-generational, built around active consideration of what kind of community and environment does this generation want to create for successive generations. This unique empowerment, to determine the community’s destiny, would be a cohesive force.  The consultation document proposes an infrastructure for sustained and structured community discussion, representation and decision-making. This is allied to new funding, designed to support a process of building trust between the community and delivery body, and of helping the community determine and service its own needs (paras 4.37-41 & 4.22-4.36). If at any time the community feels ‘unempowered’ or that the process is failing to deliver social and other benefits, they can withdraw with no obligations and no cost. |
| **People’s ideas, creativity, skills and local knowledge:**Community is actively created through social relationships between people. Their ideas, creativity, skills and ways of supporting each other can be powerful. Powerful communities recognise these unique assets, and governance structures are able to harness these for the benefit of people and place. | The emphasis within the consultation document on the Community Partnership engaging all parts of the community supports the idea of harnessing the talents and skills of residents. For example, the document mentions working groups (para 4.53) to focus on specific issues, which would allow interested/skilled community members to be more influential within the process. |
| **Equality in participation and voice:** Whilst not everyone within a community will want to get involved in community decision-making structures, powerful communities have equality of opportunity to participate, addressing barriers of resources and economic circumstances, time, and perceived qualifications. Forums for participation, including local governance models, need to be non-hierarchical and enable broad-based participation | The Formative engagement phase (paras 4.22-4.36) requires an independently facilitated discussion between the delivery body and the community, in which issues of participation and voice are critical.  The process cannot move forward until the community and delivery body have agreed how community engagement, participation, decision-making and dispute resolution will be conducted. The community therefore has a key role in determining participation and voice, which would then be enshrined in the Community Agreement (paras 4.56-4.59)  Funding for the ‘democratic infrastructure’ would then be met fully by the delivery body (paras 4.37-4.41) |
| **Community governance has meaningful influence:**Powerful communities have effective community governance which has formal and meaningful integration with other tiers of governance. | The whole purpose of the consultation is to create a new set of relationships between the governed and those who currently govern. Current UK local governance arrangements, and the electoral cycle, hinder the decades-long process of gathering information before a decision is required on whether it is even possible to build a GDF at a particular site.  The new relationships, governance roles and responsibilities would be enshrined in the Community Agreement (paras 4.56-4.59) |
| **Economic power:**  Having control over economic resources at a local level, including through community ownership of assets and devolved budgets, and having the means to address local priorities and find community-led solutions is critical to community power. | Significant funding has been pledged to ensure the community has the means and resources required to realise the potential. This is set out in the Engagement, Community Investment & Additional Funding sections (paras 4.37-4.41 & paras 4.60-4.73)  Community Investment funding would be managed and awarded by an independent, community-led Panel (paras 4.70-4.71)  The community will also work in partnership with the delivery body and others to build on any existing local ‘vision’ -- eg a Neighbourhood Plan -- to identify longer-term socioeconomic and environmental opportunities of interest to the community (paras 4.67-4.69). This ‘visioning’ work would be funded within engagement costs (paras 4.37-4.41), and underpin significant additional long-term investment in the community, local environment and economy (para 4.62)  How a community chooses which assets to invest in or control will be for the community to discuss and decide. |
| **Health and wellbeing:**  Healthy and happy citizens with access to good quality services are often better placed for participation. Crucially, meaningful participation and local engagement should fulfil its capacity to lead to greater health and happiness within communities. | Access to public services is not directly addressed in the ‘Working With Communities’ consultation document. Although “wellbeing” is one of the key criteria for Community Investment funding (para 4.66)  However, it is a statement of fact that long-term planning for the provision of every public service would be impacted. The GDF would create up to 1000 jobs sustainable for almost 200 years. With family members of those workers, that’s a sustainable community of almost 5000 people. For rural or isolated communities this could have a profound impact on the current levels of local access to quality services.  Environmental protection and enhancement is expected to be a key area of discussion and investment within the Community Partnership. |

*Please Note: Quoted text has been edited for succinctness.*

***ANNEX D***

**WHAT BLOCKS COMMUNITY POWER**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Localism Report** | **Working With Communities consultation paper** |
| **Top-down decision-making:**  When things are ‘done to’ communities this reinforces a paternalistic relationship between citizens and the state. When collective endeavours are scuppered because ‘real power’ resides elsewhere at another level of governance or within the private sector, this frustrates community energy and contributes to a sense of powerlessness. | The whole consultation is about building a framework that supports full community participation in decision-making, to build trust and confidence within the community, for a decision ultimately to be decided by the whole community in a Test of Public Support (paras 4.83-4.91)  The ‘consent-based’ policy set out in the consultation document requires “bottom-up decision-making”. |
| **Lack of trust and risk aversion:**  A lack trust and risk aversion on behalf of public authorities and political leaders can dampen community action. | The consultation is about changing the decision-making model for any community involved in the siting process. Establishment of a Community Partnership (paras 4.44-4.55 & Table 3 on p36), underpinned by a Community Agreement (paras 4.56-4.59) are designed to refashion existing local decision-making arrangements.  And while the consultation paper would not say this, communities which implement the proposed process would likely be ‘trail-blazers’, showcasing how communities can be entrusted with important decisions. This policy is not just about finding a site for a GDF, but lessons learned could act as a model and be applied to dealing with issues in other areas of social, economic and environmental policy. |
| **Narrow participation:**  When community participation is narrow, this can lead to a dominance of those with the loudest voices and those that have the confidence, skills, wealth and time to participate. Even where community governance is led by a small group of passionate and involved members of the community, this still needs to be based on broad-based participation, community engagement and active relationships. | The ‘Working With Communities’ consultation proposals are very explicit in completely supporting broader-based participation, and active community engagement and communications.  The Engagement Funding proposals (paras 4.37-4.41) also commit to funding of costs associated with community engagement and participation. Any engagement plan or programme would be co-authored by the community.  A key driver of the development of the proposals within the ‘Working With Communities’ document has been the need to broaden discussion. Previous attempts to find a site for a GDF have failed largely because discussion and decision-making was limited to influential minorities. It takes decades before a decision can be taken, and the policy is designed to allow all members of the community to freely explore the pros and cons of hosting a facility, so that no one group can prematurely shut down discussion until the wider community is ready to make an informed decision (para 1.17) |
| **Accountability deficit:**  This can occur in any layer of local governance, where accountability is reduced to basic methods of voting and consultations. A lack of a dynamic approach to accountability, which prioritises participation, ongoing relationships and co-creation, can reinforce the status-quo, block new ideas, and lead to a feeling of powerlessness. | Everything within the ‘Working With Communities’ consultation paper espouses and supports a more dynamic approach to accountability (through the Community Partnership), which prioritises participation, ongoing relationships and co-creation. |
| **Lack of access to data and information:**  When communities cannot take action or effect the change they want to, because they lack access to local data and information, or lack the capacity to gain ownership and understanding of it. When people feel they cannot contribute to local decision-makingbecause they do not have access to information or the perceived knowledge requirements, this limits power. | Again, the consultation paper actively addresses this issue. There will be a huge amount of technical, socioeconomic and environmental data to be collected and discussed. The paper clearly states it is imperative that that data is shared and discussed with the community. Without such transparency it will be impossible for the delivery body to build trust with the community – and the community can walk away at any time if they are not satisfied they have full access to the information they deem is necessary. It is only armed with such information can a community make an informed decision at the necessary time. |
| **Lack of control of funding and resources:**  The ability to get things done, achieve local priorities and re-design local services is often constrained by lack of control over resources. In areas of multiple deprivation particularly impacted by cuts to public spending, this is a significant and compounding barrier to the opportunities of localism. | Significant funding has been pledged to ensure the community has the means and resources required to realise the potential. This is set out in the Engagement, Community Investment & Additional Funding sections (paras 4.37-4.41 & paras 4.60-4.73)  Community Investment funding would be managed and awarded by an independent, community-led Panel (paras 4.70-4.71)  The community will also work in partnership with the delivery body and others to build on any existing local ‘vision’ -- eg a Neighbourhood Plan -- to identify longer-term socioeconomic and environmental opportunities of interest to the community (paras 4.67-4.69). This ‘visioning’ work would be funded within engagement costs (paras 4.37-4.41), and underpin significant additional long-term investment in the community, local environment and economy (para 4.62)  How a community chooses which assets to invest in or control will be for the community to discuss and decide.  All the funding proposed above is additional to existing public funding currently available to the community. |

*Please Note: Quoted text has been edited for succinctness.*
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