Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Our energy challenge: climate change and energy security

1. To what extent do you believe that tackling climate change and ensuring the security of energy supplies are critical challenges for the UK that require significant action in the near term and a sustained strategy between now and 2050?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 2395

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree - both are critical challenges	1222
Agree - security of energy supply is critical	232
Agree - security of supply is more critical	150
Agree - tackling climate change is critical	180
Agree - tackling climate change is more critical	61
Agree with qualification(s)	108
Agree with question but oppose nuclear power	219
Carbon capture - arguments against	7
Carbon capture - explore/improve utilisation	24
Climate change - international/strategic aspects	185
Climate change - needs global action	73
Climate change - prepare for/deal with impacts	43
Climate change - questioning assumptions re causes	139
Climate change - UK should take a lead	98
Comments on the consultation document/process	70
De-centralised energy - argument(s) in favour	94
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	362
Disagree - climate change not critical	41
Disagree - security of supply not critical	3
Economic growth challenge/lifestyle change	75
Energy supply - reduce reliance on other countries	227
Energy supply and use - strategic aspects	353
Fossil energy - argument(s) against	80
Fossil energy - explore/improve utilisation	52
Fusion power - arguments against	7
Fusion power - explore/improve utilisation	40
Government - credibility concerns	50
Hydrogen - arguments against	1
Hydrogen - arguments in favour	1
Hydrogen - explore/improve utilisation	6
Learning/reference to other countries	92
No comment/unable to comment	4
Non-nuclear options - general support	13
Nuclear - be open and transparent	6

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - carbon impact underestimated	35
Nuclear - cheap/affordable/cost effective	13
Nuclear - clean/low environmental impact	32
Nuclear - contributes to tackling climate change/emissions	207
Nuclear - cost aspects are overriding concern	63
Nuclear - cost aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	4
Nuclear - cost aspects need to be considered	22
Nuclear - cost prevents investment in other energy sources/efficiency	28
Nuclear - decommissioning aspects are overriding concern	10
Nuclear - decommissioning aspects can be managed; does not override benefits	1
Nuclear - decommissioning aspects need to be considered	11
Nuclear - design/building aspects	45
Nuclear - environmental aspects are overriding concern	15
Nuclear - environmental aspects need to be considered	9
Nuclear - explore/improve utilisation	17
Nuclear - general opposition	34
Nuclear - general support	65
Nuclear - government to be more proactive/supportive	67
Nuclear - health aspects are overriding concern	15
Nuclear - health aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	1
Nuclear - health aspects need to be considered	2
Nuclear - improve education/provision of information	18
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact needs to be considered	4
Nuclear - links to weapon production	27
Nuclear - long lead in time so must start now	49
Nuclear - media and lobbyist influence/interest	20
Nuclear - not the primary answer to climate change/emissions problem	32
Nuclear - ownership/funding aspects	27
Nuclear - private companies - profits over safety	10
Nuclear - public perception/risk	30
Nuclear - public sector ownership favoured	5
Nuclear - reduces reliance on imported fossil fuels	86
Nuclear - reliable/baseload capacity	88
Nuclear - reprocessing - in favour	5
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks can be managed; does not override benefits	8
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks is overriding concern	49
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks needs to be considered	24
Nuclear - safe/good safety record	40
Nuclear - safety aspects are overriding concern	56

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - safety aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	13
Nuclear - safety aspects need to be considered	9
Nuclear - security of supply will be improved	132
Nuclear - security of supply will remain a problem	41
Nuclear - skills aspects	24
Nuclear - spin off benefits	24
Nuclear - support as interim solution	27
Nuclear - support as only feasible option	168
Nuclear - support as option of last resort	2
Nuclear - support as part of the mix of energy technologies	170
Nuclear - timescale aspects need to be considered	10
Nuclear - uranium can be stockpiled	4
Nuclear - uranium comes from secure sources	18
Nuclear - uranium contributes to carbon impact	11
Nuclear - uranium mining and availability need to be considered	48
Nuclear - will take too long - need emissions reduction sooner	30
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	100
Reference to other question(s)	8
Renewables - argument(s) against	166
Renewables - support/explore/improve utilisation	391
Support new build at Wylfa	14
Waste - alternative ways of managing	4
Waste - problem can be managed; does not override benefits	49
Waste - problem is overriding concern	91
Waste - problem needs to be considered	45

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear power and carbon emissions

2. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's views on carbon emissions from new nuclear power stations? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations that you believe are missing? If so, what are they?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1684

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree	854
Agree with qualification(s)	135
Agree with question but oppose nuclear power	43
Carbon emissions not the priority/only issue/important issue	69
Carbon storage - arguments against	10
Carbon storage - explore/improve utilisation	17
Challenge figures presented by government	131
Climate change - international/strategic aspects	28
Climate change - questioning assumptions re causes	13
Comments on the consultation document/process	77
Comparing carbon emissions and other factors from different energy options	149
De-centralised energy - argument(s) against	2
De-centralised energy - argument(s) in favour	55
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	87
Disagree	235
Energy supply - fuel markets and pricing	3
Energy supply - reduce reliance on other countries	9
Energy supply - strategic aspects	28
Fossil energy - argument(s) against	52
Fossil energy - explore/improve utilisation	20
Fusion power - explore/improve utilisation	19
Government - credibility concerns	18
Government - should focus on transport policies	4
Hydrogen - arguments against	1
Hydrogen - explore/improve utilisation	12
Learning/reference to other countries	70
No comment/unable to comment	10
Non-nuclear options - explore/improve utilisation	7
Non-nuclear options - general support	10
Nuclear - be open and transparent	7
Nuclear - cheap/affordable	7
Nuclear - clean/low environmental impact	28
Nuclear - contributes to tackling climate change/emissions	91
Nuclear - cost aspects are overriding concern	27

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - cost aspects need to be considered	36
Nuclear - could prevent investment in other energy technologies	9
Nuclear - decommissioning aspects need to be considered	31
Nuclear - design/building aspects	53
Nuclear - environmental aspects are overriding concern	17
Nuclear - environmental aspects need to be considered	20
Nuclear - explore/improve utilisation	7
Nuclear - general opposition	27
Nuclear - general support	38
Nuclear - government to be more proactive/supportive	28
Nuclear - health aspects are overriding concern	13
Nuclear - health aspects need to be considered	10
Nuclear - historical aspects/learning	1
Nuclear - improve education/provision of information	17
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact can be managed; does not override benefits	20
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact is overriding concern	72
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact needs to be considered	203
Nuclear - link to weapons production	13
Nuclear - not the primary answer to climate change/emissions problem	36
Nuclear - ownership aspects	2
Nuclear - private companies - financial risks	1
Nuclear - private companies - operational risks	4
Nuclear - private companies - profit orientation	4
Nuclear - public perception/risk	23
Nuclear - public sector ownership favoured	6
Nuclear - reduces reliance on fossil fuels from unstable countries	4
Nuclear - regulation/planning aspects	3
Nuclear - reliable technology/no back up required	20
Nuclear - reprocessing - opposed	2
Nuclear - reprocessing - support	8
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks can be managed; does not override benefits	1
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks is overriding concern	22
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks needs to be considered	34
Nuclear - safe/good safety record	4
Nuclear - safety aspects are overriding concern	62
Nuclear - safety aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	7
Nuclear - safety aspects need to be considered	34
Nuclear - security of supply will be improved	38
Nuclear - security of supply will remain a problem	6

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - skills aspects	5
Nuclear - spin off benefits	6
Nuclear - support as interim solution	7
Nuclear - support as only feasible option	24
Nuclear - support as part of the mix of energy technologies	50
Nuclear - timescale aspects are overriding concern	10
Nuclear - timescale aspects need to be considered	31
Nuclear - uranium mining and availability need to be considered	89
Nuclear - uranium supply problems/transport	4
Nuclear - working conditions in uranium mining industry	3
Other calculations / figures	26
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	100
Reference to other question(s)	20
Renewables - argument(s) against	82
Renewables - explore/improve utilisation	160
Security of supply - is priority issue	4
Waste - problem can be managed; does not override benefits	22
Waste - problem is overriding concern	119
Waste - problem needs to be considered	77

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Security of supply benefits of nuclear power

3. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's views on the security of supply impact of new nuclear power stations? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations that you believe are missing? If so, what are they?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1579

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree	654
Agree with qualification(s)	101
Agree with question but oppose nuclear power	25
Climate change - is not the priority issue	2
Climate change - is priority issue	1
Comments on the consultation document/process	47
Concern - around sites and sea level rises	4
De-centralised energy - argument(s) in favour	111
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	116
Disagree	246
Economic growth model - opposition	3
Energy supply - diversification is necessary	186
Energy supply - electricity storage issues	6
Energy supply - fuel markets and pricing	51
Energy supply - nuclear not necessary to secure supply	47
Energy supply - reduce reliance on fossil fuels	52
Energy supply - reduce reliance on other countries	101
Energy supply - securing base load supply	60
Energy supply - self-sufficiency is necessary	44
Energy supply - strategic aspects	81
Fossil energy - explore/improve utilisation	38
Fusion power - explore/improve utilisation	17
Hydrogen - explore/improve utilisation	13
Learning/reference to other countries	67
Missing considerations	4
No comment/unable to comment	4
Nuclear - civil liberties implications	2
Nuclear - contributes to tackling climate change/emissions	11
Nuclear - cost aspects are overriding concern	10
Nuclear - cost aspects need to be considered	16
Nuclear - cost prevents investment in other energy technologies	38
Nuclear - design/building aspects	37
Nuclear - environmental aspects need to be considered	7
Nuclear - export potential	5

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - general opposition	24
Nuclear - general support	55
Nuclear - government to be more proactive/supportive	47
Nuclear - historical aspects/learning	6
Nuclear - improve education/provision of information	3
Nuclear - increase utilisation/develop other nuclear technologies	19
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact needs to be considered	5
Nuclear - link to weapons production	12
Nuclear - market/incentives/subsidies/financing	59
Nuclear - ownership aspects	35
Nuclear - political/geopolitical aspects	41
Nuclear - private companies - financial risks	12
Nuclear - private companies - profit orientation	19
Nuclear - public sector ownership favoured	15
Nuclear - reduces reliance on fossil fuels from unstable countries	19
Nuclear - regulation/planning aspects	26
Nuclear - reliable technology/no back up required	26
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks can be managed; does not override benefits	6
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks is overriding concern	57
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks needs to be considered	39
Nuclear - safe/good safety record	2
Nuclear - safety aspects are overriding concern	27
Nuclear - safety aspects need to be considered	19
Nuclear - security aspects are overriding concern	6
Nuclear - security of supply will be improved	35
Nuclear - security of supply will remain a problem	27
Nuclear - skills aspects	14
Nuclear - support as interim solution	9
Nuclear - support as option of last resort	2
Nuclear - support as part of the mix of energy technologies	125
Nuclear - timescale aspects need to be considered	19
Nuclear - unreliability of nuclear power stations	24
Nuclear - uranium - finite resource	30
Nuclear - uranium - increased demand, decreased supply, and increased cost	49
Nuclear - uranium - need long term security of supply	22
Nuclear - uranium and conflict potential	5
Nuclear - uranium can be stockpiled	43
Nuclear - uranium comes from secure sources	73
Nuclear - uranium mining and availability need to be considered	56

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - uranium mining industry - working conditions	8
Nuclear - uranium supply problems	74
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	30
Reference to other question(s)	24
Renewables - argument(s) against	28
Renewables - explore/improve utilisation	201
Reprocessing - could help secure fuel supply/conserve resources	18
Security of supply - what constitutes security of supply	73
Transport of nuclear materials, risks associated with	36
Waste - problem needs to be considered	14
Waste and decommissioning - problem is overriding concern	19

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Economics of nuclear power

4. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's views on the economics of new nuclear power stations? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations that you believe are missing? If so, what are they?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1524

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree	405
Agree with qualification(s)	166
Agree with question but oppose nuclear power	1
Carbon storage - arguments against	1
Carbon storage - explore/improve utilisation	1
Climate change - international/strategic aspects	1
Climate change - is priority issue	14
Comments on the consultation document/process	15
Compare/consult on non-nuclear/renewable options too	43
De-centralised energy - argument(s) in favour	36
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	54
Disagree	244
Economic growth model - opposition	1
Economics - cost of dealing with waste is overriding concern	28
Economics - additional considerations/calculations/variables	33
Economics - carbon pricing/credits	109
Economics - challenge ability to predict future costs and markets	39
Economics - challenge figures presented by government	101
Economics - challenge the cost of dealing with accidents	21
Economics - cost aspects are overriding concern	17
Economics - cost aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	43
Economics - cost aspects need to be considered	24
Economics - cost of dealing with waste is overriding concern	7
Economics - cost of dealing with waste needs to be considered	139
Economics - cost prevents investment in other energy technologies	32
Economics - costs of decommissioning are overriding concern	26
Economics - costs of decommissioning need to be considered	142
Economics - costs of predicting impacts of climate change.	5
Economics - insurance risks	34
Economics - more clarification on government analysis needed	21
Economics - other economic benefits to nuclear	9
Economics - protecting against threat of terror attack	22
Economics - reprocessing	1
Economics - the economic case for nuclear is good / better than is suggested	27

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Economics - the industry has not been economically sustainable historically	39
Energy supply - reduce reliance on fossil fuels from other countries	7
Energy supply - strategic aspects	14
Fossil energy - argument(s) against	19
Fossil energy - explore/improve utilisation	4
Fossil energy - shortage of supply	16
Fusion power - explore/improve utilisation	1
Government - credibility concerns	27
Hydrogen - explore/improve utilisation	1
Learning/reference to other countries	60
Neither agree nor disagree/indifferent	10
No comment/unable to comment	58
Non-nuclear - full costs of carbon should be included	26
Non-nuclear options - explore/improve utilisation	17
Nuclear - be open and transparent	9
Nuclear - clean/low environmental impact	6
Nuclear - construction costs overrun/ underestimated	89
Nuclear - contributes to tackling climate change/emissions	45
Nuclear - decommissioning aspects need to be considered	12
Nuclear - design/building aspects	91
Nuclear - environmental aspects are overriding concern	12
Nuclear - environmental aspects need to be considered	21
Nuclear - general opposition	50
Nuclear - general support	33
Nuclear - government to be more proactive/supportive	94
Nuclear - health aspects are overriding concern	1
Nuclear - health aspects need to be considered	9
Nuclear - improve education/provision of information	1
Nuclear - inflexible	3
Nuclear - is affordable form of energy / compared to other forms	33
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact needs to be considered	4
Nuclear - market/incentives/subsidies	62
Nuclear - media and lobbyist influence/interest	1
Nuclear - ownership aspects	26
Nuclear - political/geopolitical aspects	16
Nuclear - private companies - financial risks	95
Nuclear - private companies - operational risks	15
Nuclear - private companies - profit orientation	54
Nuclear - public perception/risk	7

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - public sector ownership favoured	48
Nuclear - reduces reliance on imported fossil fuels	49
Nuclear - regulation/planning aspects	87
Nuclear - reliable technology/no back up required	11
Nuclear - reprocessing - in favour	2
Nuclear - risk - general concerns	10
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks is overriding concern	7
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks needs to be considered	20
Nuclear - safety aspects are overriding concern	34
Nuclear - safety aspects need to be considered	37
Nuclear - security of supply will be improved	91
Nuclear - security of supply will remain a problem	6
Nuclear - skills aspects	12
Nuclear - spin off benefits	21
Nuclear - subsidies will be required	144
Nuclear - support as interim solution	1
Nuclear - support as only immediate option	2
Nuclear - support as part of the mix of energy technologies	23
Nuclear - timescale aspects need to be considered	56
Nuclear - uranium comes from secure sources	12
Nuclear - uranium mining and availability need to be considered	45
Nuclear - uranium transport is a problem	1
Other aspects	11
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	36
Reference to other question(s)	34
Renewables - argument(s) against	18
Renewables - explore/improve utilisation	140
Security of supply - is priority issue	15
Waste - problem can be managed; does not override benefits	3
Waste - problem is overriding concern	27
Waste - problem needs to be considered	25

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

The value of the nuclear option in meeting our energy goals

5. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's views on the value of having nuclear power as an option? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations that you believe are missing? If so, what are they?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1481

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree	715
Agree with qualification(s)	159
Carbon storage - arguments against	54
Carbon storage - explore/improve utilisation	42
Climate change - international/strategic aspects	9
Climate change - is not the priority issue	2
Climate change - is priority issue	28
Climate change - questioning assumptions re causes	8
Comments on the consultation document/process	44
Compare/consult on non-nuclear/renewable options too	21
De-centralised energy - argument(s) against	3
De-centralised energy - argument(s) in favour	60
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	226
Disagree	352
Economic growth model - opposition	24
Energy supply - electricity storage issues	3
Energy supply - explore various options	12
Energy supply - strategic aspects	117
Fossil energy - argument(s) against	24
Fossil energy - explore/improve utilisation	15
Fossil energy - shortage of supply	22
Fusion power - explore/improve utilisation	21
Government - credibility concerns	30
Government - driven by economics	3
Government - should focus on transport policies	3
Hydrogen - explore/improve utilisation	6
Independent & strong regulatory body needed	2
Learning/reference to other countries	81
No comment/unable to comment	8
Non-nuclear options - explore/improve utilisation	48
Nuclear - base decision on technical/scientific evidence	1
Nuclear - be open and transparent	5
Nuclear - cheap/affordable	67
Nuclear - clean/low environmental impact	31

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - community aspects	5
Nuclear - construction costs overrun/ underestimated	2
Nuclear - contributes to tackling climate change/emissions	178
Nuclear - cost aspects are overriding concern	68
Nuclear - cost aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	4
Nuclear - cost aspects need to be considered	36
Nuclear - cost prevents investment in other energy technologies	36
Nuclear - decommissioning aspects are overriding concern	1
Nuclear - decommissioning aspects need to be considered	11
Nuclear - design/building aspects	34
Nuclear - environmental aspects are overriding concern	22
Nuclear - environmental aspects need to be considered	7
Nuclear - ethics	1
Nuclear - explore/improve utilisation	1
Nuclear - export potential	1
Nuclear - general opposition	59
Nuclear - general support	54
Nuclear - government to be more proactive/supportive	66
Nuclear - health aspects are overriding concern	11
Nuclear - health aspects need to be considered	2
Nuclear - historical aspects/learning	5
Nuclear - improve education/provision of information	8
Nuclear - inflexible	16
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact is overriding concern	3
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact needs to be considered	18
Nuclear - link to weapons production	10
Nuclear - low thermal efficiency	2
Nuclear - media and lobbyist influence/interest	2
Nuclear - not the primary answer to climate change/emissions problem	25
Nuclear - ownership aspects	12
Nuclear - political/geopolitical aspects	22
Nuclear - private companies - financial risks	5
Nuclear - private companies - profit orientation	8
Nuclear - public perception/risk	21
Nuclear - public sector ownership favoured	10
Nuclear - reduces reliance on imported fossil fuels	30
Nuclear - regulation/planning aspects	19
Nuclear - reliable technology/no back up required	114
Nuclear - risk - general concerns	24

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks is overriding concern	36
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks needs to be considered	21
Nuclear - risks associated with human error	4
Nuclear - safe/good safety record	18
Nuclear - safety aspects are overriding concern	68
Nuclear - safety aspects need to be considered	19
Nuclear - security concern	5
Nuclear - security of supply will be improved	128
Nuclear - security of supply will remain a problem	5
Nuclear - skills aspects	14
Nuclear - spin off benefits	12
Nuclear - subsidies will be required	19
Nuclear - support as interim solution	24
Nuclear - support as only feasible option	39
Nuclear - support as option of last resort	4
Nuclear - support as part of the mix of energy technologies	136
Nuclear - timescale aspects need to be considered	54
Nuclear - UK vs foreign ownership	2
Nuclear - unreliability of nuclear power stations	4
Other aspects - population	1
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	64
Reference to other question(s)	82
Renewables - argument(s) against	101
Renewables - explore/improve utilisation	266
Reprocessing - should be an option	1
Research/calculation aspects	81
Security of supply - is priority issue	30
Skills - Job creation/ future industry	1
Skills - UK expertise retention, loss & continuity	3
Uranium - comes from secure sources	5
Uranium - contributes to carbon impact	6
Uranium - increased demand, decreased supply, and increased cost	6
Uranium - mining and availability need to be considered	9
Uranium - supply problems	21
Waste - problem can be managed; does not override benefits	5
Waste - problem is overriding concern	68
Waste - problem needs to be considered	27

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Safety and security of nuclear power

6. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's views on the safety, security, health and non-proliferation issues? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations that you believe are missing? If so, what are they?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1438

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree	657
Agree with qualifications	66
Agree with question but oppose nuclear power	1
Challenge credibility of nuclear industry	46
Climate change - is priority issue	14
Comments on the consultation document/process	32
Concern - around sites and sea level rises	17
Concerns around safety of non nuclear technologies	35
Concerns over insurance and public liability	16
De-centralised energy - argument(s) in favour	8
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	6
Disagree	373
Energy supply - reduce reliance on fossil fuels	3
Energy supply - strategic options	1
Fossil energy - argument(s) against	4
Fusion power - explore/improve utilisation	1
Government - credibility concerns	42
Independent & strong regulatory body needed	10
Ionising radiation - high risk	14
Ionising radiation - low/no risk	9
Learning/reference to other countries	21
Need for independent review and advice	4
Need for trained staff	16
Neither agree nor disagree/indifferent/not sure	2
No comment/unable to comment	10
Non-nuclear options - explore/improve utilisation	10
Nuclear - be open and transparent	6
Nuclear - concerns about a link to nuclear weapons	72
Nuclear - contributes to tackling climate change/emissions	8
Nuclear - cost aspects are overriding concern	5
Nuclear - cost aspects need to be considered	25
Nuclear - design/building aspects	34
Nuclear - develop other nuclear technologies	4
Nuclear - environmental aspects are overriding concern	5

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - environmental aspects need to be considered	9
Nuclear - future reactor designs are safer	89
Nuclear - future reactor designs untested technology	5
Nuclear - general opposition	11
Nuclear - general support	7
Nuclear - global instability is a concern	4
Nuclear - government to be more proactive/supportive	16
Nuclear - health aspects are overriding concern	44
Nuclear - health aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	18
Nuclear - health aspects need to be considered	70
Nuclear - If UK lead others could follow causing supply problem	1
Nuclear - improve education/provision of information	32
Nuclear - issues around leaks and accidents	127
Nuclear - link to weapons production	135
Nuclear - link to weapons production - negligible	1
Nuclear - media and lobbyist influence/interest	1
Nuclear - no concerns about a link to nuclear weapons	47
Nuclear - offsite releases	12
Nuclear - ownership aspects	8
Nuclear - political/geopolitical aspects	117
Nuclear - private companies - financial risks	6
Nuclear - private companies - operational risks	14
Nuclear - private companies - profit orientation	31
Nuclear - public perception/risk	37
Nuclear - public sector ownership	8
Nuclear - question validity/wording of offsite release assertion	9
Nuclear - regulation aspects	149
Nuclear - regulation effective	54
Nuclear - regulation ineffective	8
Nuclear - reprocessing - opposed	5
Nuclear - reprocessing aspects need to be considered	3
Nuclear - risk - general concerns	36
Nuclear - risk - unacceptable as high impact	94
Nuclear - risk - unnecessary as alternatives	34
Nuclear - risk acceptable	93
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks can be managed; does not override benefits	34
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks is overriding concern	82
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks needs to be considered	123
Nuclear - risks associated with human error	57

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - safe/good safety record	170
Nuclear - safety aspects are overriding concern	63
Nuclear - safety aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	73
Nuclear - safety aspects need to be considered	90
Nuclear - security is of general concern	18
Nuclear - security of supply will be improved	3
Nuclear - staffing - security concerns	16
Nuclear - support as interim solution	1
Nuclear – uranium – finite resource	3
Nuclear - uranium - human rights arising	2
Nuclear - uranium - net energy loss through lifecycle	2
Nuclear - uranium mining - health aspects	2
Nuclear - uranium supply problems	3
Questioning one in 2.4billion risk calculation	18
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	61
Reference to other question(s)	27
Regulatory system - ensure well resourced	3
Renewables - explore/improve utilisation	30
Renewables - general opposition	2
Research/calculation aspects	31
Security of supply - is priority issue	1
Socio-economic impact on local communities	2
Transport of nuclear material, risks associated with	13
Waste - future generations concerns/years involved	17
Waste - problem can be managed; does not override benefits	2
Waste - problem is overriding concern	67
Waste - problem needs to be considered	38

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Transport of nuclear materials

7. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's views on the transport of nuclear materials? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations that you believe are missing? If so, what are they?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1332

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree	702
Agree with qualification(s)	124
Agree with question but oppose nuclear power	1
Challenge credibility of nuclear industry	14
Climate change - is priority issue	1
Comments on the consultation document/process	26
Concern - around sites and sea level rises	2
De-centralised energy - argument(s) in favour	4
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	2
Disagree	269
Energy supply and use - strategic aspects	1
Government - credibility concerns	18
No comment/unable to comment	34
Nuclear - be open and transparent	1
Nuclear - cheap/affordable	1
Nuclear - clean/low environmental impact	3
Nuclear - contributes to tackling climate change	1
Nuclear - cost aspects are overriding concern	6
Nuclear - cost aspects need to be considered	20
Nuclear - design/building aspects	40
Nuclear - develop longer term alternative technology	3
Nuclear - explore/improve utilisation	7
Nuclear - general opposition	34
Nuclear - general support	12
Nuclear - government regulation/infrastructure	64
Nuclear - health aspects are overriding concern	11
Nuclear - health aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	7
Nuclear - health aspects need to be considered	8
Nuclear - improve education/provision of information	11
Nuclear - inadequate safety record during transportation	5
Nuclear - issues around leaks and accidents	9
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact needs to be considered	6
Nuclear - link to weapons production	3
Nuclear - ownership aspects	1

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - political/geopolitical aspects	7
Nuclear - private companies - financial risks	3
Nuclear - private companies - operational risks	7
Nuclear - private companies - profit orientation	3
Nuclear - public consultation, perception/risk	15
Nuclear - reprocessing - false assumption	19
Nuclear - reprocessing - in favour	61
Nuclear - reprocessing - keep the option open for the future	25
Nuclear - reprocessing - opposed	23
Nuclear - reprocessing should be commercial decision	1
Nuclear - risk - general concerns	39
Nuclear - risk - unacceptable as high impact	62
Nuclear - risk - unnecessary as alternatives	31
Nuclear - risk acceptable	80
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks can be managed; does not override benefits	5
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks is overriding concern	74
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks needs to be considered	88
Nuclear - risks associated with human error	14
Nuclear - safe/good safety record	211
Nuclear - safety aspects are overriding concern	57
Nuclear - safety aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	72
Nuclear - safety aspects need to be considered	60
Nuclear - security of supply will be improved	3
Nuclear - single site: reprocessing/power/storage	16
Nuclear - support as interim solution	2
Nuclear - transport mode/route - suggestions	40
Nuclear - uranium - increased demand, decreased supply,	4
Nuclear - uranium comes from secure sources	2
Nuclear - uranium supply problems	5
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	21
Reference to other question(s)	53
Renewables - explore/improve utilisation	14
Research/calculation aspects	13
Spent fuel - disposal needs to be considered	7
Spent fuel - safety aspects are overriding concern	5
Waste - cost aspects need to be considered	3
Waste - deal with legacy/no new build until	1
Waste - future generations concern/years involved	6
Waste - interim management issues	5

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Waste - need strategy, long term solution, proven	1
Waste - problem can be managed; does not override benefits	10
Waste - problem is overriding concern	29
Waste - problem needs to be considered	27
Waste - risk of terrorist attacks are a concern	8
Waste - send waste to Australia	1
Waste - siting/community aspects	1
Waste - storage on-site	4
Waste - transport/community aspects	6

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Waste and decommissioning

8. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's views on waste and decommissioning ? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations that you believe are missing? If so, what are they?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1396

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree	434
Agree with qualification(s)	88
Carbon storage - arguments against	1
Climate change - is priority issue	47
Comments on the consultation document/process	56
Concern about sites and sea level rises	4
Conditions - keep to existing sites if possible	6
Conditions - more streamlined planning process	2
Conditions - private company other requirements	4
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	7
Disagree	210
Energy supply and use - strategic aspects	4
Fossil energy - argument(s) against	1
Fusion power - explore/improve utilisation	2
Independent & strong regulatory body needed	2
No comment/unable to comment	20
Non-nuclear options - explore/improve utilisation	9
Nuclear - contributes to tackling climate change/emissions	20
Nuclear - design/building aspects	23
Nuclear - general opposition	14
Nuclear - general support	3
Nuclear - health aspects need to be considered	1
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact needs to be considered	1
Nuclear - link to weapons production	8
Nuclear - not the primary answer to climate change/emissions problem	14
Nuclear - political/geopolitical aspects	4
Nuclear - regulation/planning aspects	3
Nuclear - risk - unnecessary as alternatives	35
Nuclear - skills aspects	4
Nuclear - spin off benefits	1
Nuclear - support as part of the mix of energy technologies	1
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	24
Reference to other question(s)	47
Renewables - explore/improve utilisation	18

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Reprocessing - general opposition	6
Reprocessing - general support / keep options open	44
Security of supply - is priority issue	12
Transport of nuclear material, risks associated with	12
Uranium - finite resource	2
Uranium mining and availability need to be considered	1
Waste - be open and transparent	10
Waste - categories	2
Waste - comments around CoRWM and NDA	66
Waste - cost aspects are an overriding concern	46
Waste - cost aspects can be managed	11
Waste - cost aspects need to be considered	84
Waste - deal with legacy and new separately	14
Waste - deal with legacy and new together	56
Waste - deal with legacy/no new build until	141
Waste - do not preclude new build	36
Waste - environmental aspects are a concern	24
Waste - environmental aspects can be managed	3
Waste - future generations concern/years involved	142
Waste - future generations, not concerned	8
Waste - geological repository opposition	63
Waste - geological repository progress immediately	49
Waste - geological repository support	141
Waste - geological repository with recovery/ reprocessing	27
Waste - government credibility concerns	39
Waste - government to be more proactive	107
Waste - handling of existing facilities	4
Waste - health aspects are a concern	8
Waste - interim management issues	65
Waste - international aspects	16
Waste - lack of knowledge, perceptions, education	34
Waste - leaks, earthquakes, geological changes are a concern	74
Waste - lessons/historical issues	51
Waste - lessons/other countries dealt with the waste	64
Waste - LLW other options	2
Waste - monitoring and controls	14
Waste - MRWS comments	8
Waste - need better information/research	31
Waste - need strategy, long term solution, proven	200

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Waste - new build/benefits	11
Waste - new build/expands physical requirement	6
Waste - new build/implications for repository	7
Waste - new build/legacy problem anyway	6
Waste - new build/manage own waste plus	2
Waste - new build/problem gets bigger	11
Waste - new build/timescales	4
Waste - new technologies, engineering developments	39
Waste - private company - concerns	49
Waste - problem can be managed, does not override benefits	49
Waste - problem is overriding concern	73
Waste - problem needs to be considered	26
Waste - problem of other wastes	2
Waste - recovery and re-use	10
Waste - responsibility for managing	36
Waste - risk of terrorist attacks are a concern	29
Waste - safety aspects are a concern	54
Waste - safety aspects can be managed	24
Waste - safety aspects need considering	4
Waste - Sellafield concerns	4
Waste - siting/community aspects	81
Waste - siting/other (locations, geology)	71
Waste - storage on-site	18
Waste - technology available	32
Waste - use above ground storage	12
Waste - use of term ethics concerns	13
Waste - views on disposal in space	6
Waste - volumes are manageable	29
Waste - volumes less from new build	65
Waste - volumes needs to be considered	12

9. What are the implications for the management of existing nuclear waste of taking a decision to allow energy companies to build new nuclear power stations?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1119

	Number of responses per group heading
Climate change - is priority issue	4
Comments on the consultation document/process	19
Conditions - keep to existing sites if possible	16
Conditions - only allow British or European companies to invest, construct	1
Conditions - private company requirements	2

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Conditions - waste management plan	4
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	2
Energy supply - strategic aspects	2
No comment/unable to comment	64
Non-nuclear options - explore/improve utilisation	1
Nuclear - contributes to tackling climate change/emissions	6
Nuclear - cost aspects need to be considered	3
Nuclear - design/building aspects	22
Nuclear - general opposition	11
Nuclear - general support	2
Nuclear - historical aspects/learning	2
Nuclear - link to weapons production	10
Nuclear - regulation/planning aspects	2
Nuclear - risk - unnecessary as alternatives	8
Nuclear - skills aspects	20
Nuclear - support as part of the mix of energy technologies	2
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	8
Reference to other question(s)	56
Renewables - explore/improve utilisation	4
Reprocessing - design into new build/reactors	1
Reprocessing - general support	6
Reprocessing - keep the option open for the future	1
Security of supply - is priority issue	8
Transport of nuclear material, risks associated with	8
Waste - be open and transparent	8
Waste - comments around CoRWM and NDA	15
Waste - cost aspects are an overriding concern	33
Waste - cost aspects can be managed	9
Waste - cost aspects need to be considered	99
Waste - deal with legacy and new separately	20
Waste - deal with legacy and new together	95
Waste - deal with legacy/no new build until	129
Waste - do not preclude new build	36
Waste - environmental aspects are a concern	5
Waste - future generations concern/years involved	22
Waste - geological repository opposition	5
Waste - geological repository progress immediately	21
Waste - geological repository support	35
Waste - geological repository with recovery/ other recovery	3

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Waste - government credibility concerns	16
Waste - government to be more proactive	41
Waste - handling of existing facilities	2
Waste - health aspects are a concern	2
Waste - interim management issues	32
Waste - international aspects	8
Waste - lack of knowledge, perceptions, education	8
Waste - leaks, earthquakes, geological changes are a concern	10
Waste - lessons/historical issues	15
Waste - lessons/other countries have dealt with the waste	18
Waste - monitoring and controls	26
Waste - need better information/research	12
Waste - need strategy, long term solution, proven	98
Waste - new build/benefits	85
Waste - new build/expands requirements	64
Waste - new build/implications for repository	39
Waste - new build/implications too great	18
Waste - new build/legacy problem anyway	18
Waste - new build/manage own waste plus	11
Waste - new build/no other implications or limited	132
Waste - new build/other implications	12
Waste - new build/problem gets bigger	75
Waste - new build/timescales	16
Waste - new technologies, engineering developments	19
Waste - private company - concerns	84
Waste - problem can be managed; does not override benefits	6
Waste - problem is overriding concern	19
Waste - problem needs to be considered	8
Waste - recovery and re-use	9
Waste - responsibility for managing	97
Waste - risk of terrorist attacks are a concern	16
Waste - safety aspects are a concern	18
Waste - safety aspects can be managed	14
Waste - safety aspects need considering	14
Waste - Sellafield concerns	2
Waste - siting/community aspects	28
Waste - siting/other (locations, geology)	32
Waste - storage on-site	3
Waste - technology available	5

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Waste - use above ground storage	2
Waste - views on disposal in space	2
Waste - volume needs to be considered	1
Waste - volumes are manageable	10
Waste - volumes less from new build	95

10. What do you think are the ethical considerations related to a decision to allow new nuclear power stations to be built? And how should these be balanced against the need to address climate change?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1201

	Number of responses per group heading
Carbon storage - arguments against	5
Carbon storage - arguments in favour	1
Carbon storage - explore/improve utilisation	2
Climate change - international/strategic aspects	44
Climate change - is not the priority issue	25
Climate change - is priority issue	197
Climate change - questioning assumptions re causes	17
Comments on the consultation document/process	61
De-centralised energy - argument(s) against	1
De-centralised energy - arguments in favour / improve utilisation	32
Demand side management/efficiency - argument(s) against	4
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	113
Economic growth model - opposition	9
Energy supply - reduce reliance on other countries	10
Energy supply - strategic aspects	32
Ethical challenges/deliberations	132
Ethical considerations - none/not the priority issue	123
Ethical considerations - of other energy sources/materials	73
Ethics - definition	5
Fossil energy - argument(s) against	24
Fossil energy - argument(s) in favour	10
Fossil energy - general opposition	4
Fossil energy - improve education/provision of information	2
Fossil energy - shortage of supply	7
Further consultation needed	3
Fusion power - explore/improve utilisation	10
Global population/demographics/economics	8
Government - accountability (to the nation/environment)	8
Government - credibility concerns	29
Government - should focus on transport policies	8

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Hydrogen - explore/improve utilisation	3
Learning/reference to other countries	41
Livestock/farming - tackle methane production	3
No balance/separate issues/cannot compare	24
No comment/unable to comment	20
Non-nuclear options - explore/improve utilisation	37
Non-nuclear options - general support	17
Nuclear - base decision on technical/scientific evidence	9
Nuclear - be open and transparent	12
Nuclear - cheap/affordable	13
Nuclear - civil liberties implications	2
Nuclear - clean/low environmental impact	20
Nuclear - community aspects	19
Nuclear - contributes to tackling climate change/emissions	173
Nuclear - cost aspects are overriding concern	36
Nuclear - cost aspects need to be considered	26
Nuclear - cost prevents investment in other energy technologies	16
Nuclear - decommissioning aspects are overriding concern	3
Nuclear - decommissioning aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	1
Nuclear - decommissioning aspects need to be considered	9
Nuclear - design/building aspects	36
Nuclear - environmental aspects are overriding concern	19
Nuclear - environmental aspects need to be considered	31
Nuclear - explore/improve utilisation	3
Nuclear - fuel - use of different types	1
Nuclear - general opposition	32
Nuclear - general support	47
Nuclear - global instability is a concern	10
Nuclear - government to be more proactive/supportive	11
Nuclear - health aspects are overriding concern	29
Nuclear - health aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	3
Nuclear - health aspects need to be considered	21
Nuclear - historical aspects/learning	15
Nuclear - improve education/provision of information	26
Nuclear - is ethical choice/not to consider it would be unethical	85
Nuclear - is unethical choice/no ethical justification at present	102
Nuclear - keep to existing sites if possible	1
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact can be managed; does not override benefits	1
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact is overriding concern	4

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact needs to be considered	5
Nuclear - link to weapons production	42
Nuclear - market/incentives/subsidies	1
Nuclear - not the primary answer to climate change/emissions problem	151
Nuclear - other ethical considerations	2
Nuclear - ownership aspects	2
Nuclear - political/geopolitical aspects	49
Nuclear - private companies - financial risks	1
Nuclear - private companies - operational risks	4
Nuclear - private companies - profit orientation	8
Nuclear - public perception/risk	58
Nuclear - public sector ownership favoured	5
Nuclear - reduces reliance on imported fossil fuels	7
Nuclear - regulation/planning aspects	8
Nuclear - reliable technology/no back up required	7
Nuclear - reprocessing - in favour	6
Nuclear - reprocessing - opposed	1
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks can be managed; does not override benefits	3
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks is overriding concern	17
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks needs to be considered	20
Nuclear - safe/good safety record	13
Nuclear - safety aspects are overriding concern	50
Nuclear - safety aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	21
Nuclear - safety aspects need to be considered	54
Nuclear - security aspects are overriding concern	2
Nuclear - security aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	6
Nuclear - security aspects need to be considered	1
Nuclear - security of supply will be improved	89
Nuclear - security of supply will remain a problem	7
Nuclear - skills aspects	6
Nuclear - spin off benefits	19
Nuclear - support as interim solution	6
Nuclear - support as only feasible option	22
Nuclear - support as part of the mix of energy technologies	17
Nuclear - timescale aspects are overriding concern	2
Nuclear - timescale aspects need to be considered	9
Nuclear - uranium mining and availability need to be considered	13
Nuclear - uranium supply is not a problem	1
Nuclear - working conditions in uranium mining industry	7

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	29
Reference to other question(s)	82
Renewables - argument(s) against	23
Renewables - explore/improve utilisation	105
Research/calculation aspects	12
Security of supply - is priority issue	89
Spent fuel - treatment/storage	2
Waste - concern about environment	10
Waste - concern about leaks, earthquakes, geological changes etc	7
Waste - CoRWM and NDA comments	11
Waste - cost aspects are an overriding concern	1
Waste - cost aspects need to be considered	9
Waste - future generations concern, years involved	209
Waste - future generations, not concerned	13
Waste - geological repository support	29
Waste - historical issues/lessons	1
Waste - interim management issues	4
Waste - international aspects	8
Waste - need strategy, long term solution, proven	32
Waste - problem can be managed; does not override benefits	99
Waste - problem is overriding concern	34
Waste - problem needs to be considered	83
Waste - responsibility for managing	10
Waste - risk of terrorist attacks are a concern	1
Waste - security is a concern	1
Waste - siting/community aspects	8
Waste - siting/other (locations, geology)	9
Waste - volumes are manageable	16

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Environmental impacts of nuclear power

11. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's views on environmental issues? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations that you believe are missing? If so, what are they?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1245

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree	487
Agree with qualification(s)	62
Agree with question but oppose nuclear power	3
Comments on the consultation document/process	27
De-centralised energy - argument(s) in favour	41
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	32
Disagree	196
Energy supply and use - strategic aspects	2
Environment - build on existing sites	109
Environment - invalid comparison of land-take impact	74
Environment - low volume plant, fuel and waste	46
Environment - need for full environmental assessment/costing	100
Environment - nuclear accident	67
Environment - radioactive leakage	73
Environment - sea-level rise	41
Environment - visual impact a problem	22
Environment - visual impact better/acceptable	33
Environment - water impacts: supply and cooling	18
Fossil energy - argument(s) against	51
Fusion power - explore/improve utilisation	2
Government - credibility concerns	30
Government - should focus on transport policies	5
Learning/reference to other countries	23
No comment/unable to comment	10
Non-nuclear options - general support	4
Nuclear - be open and transparent	6
Nuclear - clean/low environmental impact	158
Nuclear - community aspects	34
Nuclear - contributes to tackling climate change/emissions	34
Nuclear - cost aspects need to be considered	6
Nuclear - cost prevents investment in other energy technologies	1
Nuclear - decommissioning aspects need to be considered	30
Nuclear - design/building aspects	40
Nuclear - environmental aspects are overriding concern	20

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - environmental aspects need to be considered	30
Nuclear - explore/improve utilisation	5
Nuclear - general opposition	24
Nuclear - general support	23
Nuclear - government to be more proactive/supportive	32
Nuclear - health aspects need to be considered	32
Nuclear - improve education/provision of information	6
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact needs to be considered	13
Nuclear - link to weapons production	9
Nuclear - market/incentives/subsidies	5
Nuclear - media and lobbyist influence/interest	4
Nuclear - not the primary answer to climate change/emissions problem	5
Nuclear - ownership aspects	6
Nuclear - political/geopolitical aspects	4
Nuclear - private companies - financial risks	3
Nuclear - private companies - operational risks	7
Nuclear - private companies - profit orientation	11
Nuclear - public perception/risk	11
Nuclear - public sector ownership favoured	4
Nuclear - regulation/planning aspects	165
Nuclear - reliable technology/no back up required	8
Nuclear - risk - unacceptable as high impact	16
Nuclear - risk acceptable	6
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks needs to be considered	18
Nuclear - safe/good safety record	9
Nuclear - safety aspects are overriding concern	12
Nuclear - safety aspects need to be considered	24
Nuclear - security aspects need to be considered	9
Nuclear - spin off benefits	6
Nuclear - support as part of the mix of energy technologies	10
Nuclear - timescale aspects are overriding concern	5
Nuclear - timescale aspects need to be considered	31
Nuclear - uranium contributes to carbon impact	4
Nuclear - uranium mining and availability need to be considered	39
Nuclear - working conditions in uranium mining industry	10
Other issues	5
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	8
Reference to other question(s)	56
Renewables - argument(s) against	74

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Renewables - support/explore/improve utilisation	88
Transport of nuclear material, risks associated with	5
Waste - problem can be managed; does not override benefits	5
Waste - problem is overriding concern	16
Waste - problem needs to be considered	90

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

The supply of nuclear fuel

12. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's views on the supply of nuclear fuel? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations that you believe are missing? If so, what are they?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1231

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree	521
Agree with qualification(s)	128
Agree with question but oppose nuclear power	4
Challenge credibility of nuclear industry	1
Comments on the consultation document/process	27
De-centralised energy - argument(s) in favour	4
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	14
Disagree	255
Energy supply and use - strategic aspects	1
Fusion power - explore/improve utilisation	23
Government - credibility concerns	8
Hydrogen - explore/improve utilisation	7
Increased carbon dioxide due to low grade ore extraction	19
Increased carbon dioxide due to transporting uranium from overseas	8
Increased carbon dioxide due to uranium mining	3
Increased carbon dioxide due to waste management	2
No comment/unable to comment	46
Nuclear - contributes to tackling climate change/emissions	1
Nuclear - cost aspects are overriding concern	9
Nuclear - cost aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	10
Nuclear - cost aspects need to be considered	43
Nuclear - develop longer term alternative technology	6
Nuclear - develop other nuclear technologies	54
Nuclear - environmental aspects are overriding concern	7
Nuclear - environmental aspects need to be considered	25
Nuclear - explore/improve utilisation	9
Nuclear - general opposition	18
Nuclear - general support	3
Nuclear - government to be more proactive/supportive	7
Nuclear - health aspects are overriding concern	4
Nuclear - If UK lead others could follow causing supply problem	20
Nuclear - improve education/provision of information	2
Nuclear - in favour of (fast) breeder technology	36
Nuclear - in favour of extracting uranium from sea water	9

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - in favour of MOX fuel	36
Nuclear - in favour of thorium	40
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact is overriding concern	11
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact needs to be considered	12
Nuclear - link to weapons production	12
Nuclear - ownership aspects	4
Nuclear - political/geopolitical aspects	47
Nuclear - public sector ownership favoured	2
Nuclear - reduces reliance on fossil fuels from unstable countries	12
Nuclear - regulation aspects	1
Nuclear - risk - unacceptable as high impact	1
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks is overriding concern	4
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks needs to be considered	8
Nuclear - safety aspects are overriding concern	4
Nuclear - safety aspects need to be considered	15
Nuclear - security of supply will be improved	16
Nuclear - security of supply will remain a problem	86
Nuclear - support as interim solution	19
Nuclear - support as only immediate option	2
Nuclear - support as part of the mix of energy technologies	3
Nuclear - UK should be self-sufficient in fuel supply and energy production	15
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	35
Reference to other question(s)	26
Renewables - general support	76
Reprocessing - economic benefit	2
Reprocessing - in favour	70
Reprocessing - keep the option open for the future	50
Reprocessing - opposed	4
Reprocessing - safety aspects are overriding concern	4
Reprocessing - security aspects are overriding concern	3
Reprocessing - waste just as difficult/harder to manage	2
Research/calculation aspects	37
Skills - Job creation/ future industry	7
Spent fuel - store in a retrievable manner	1
Uranium - supply is not a problem	129
Uranium - transport is a problem	21
Uranium - challenging 85 year assertion	47
Uranium - comes from secure sources	90
Uranium - contributes to carbon impact	23

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Uranium - finite resource	63
Uranium - human rights arising	21
Uranium - increase in demand, increase in price, increase in exploration/supply	30
Uranium - increased demand, decreased supply, and increased cost	111
Uranium - increased worldwide demand	17
Uranium - long term contract needed	3
Uranium - need long term security of supply	22
Uranium - net energy loss through lifecycle	11
Uranium - price change won't effect generating costs	9
Uranium - price increases are of concern	21
Uranium - stockpiling issues	55
Uranium - supply problems	115
Uranium mining - health aspects	7
Uranium mining and availability need to be considered	25
Waste - problem is overriding concern	7
Waste - problem needs to be considered	8

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Supply chain and skills capacity

13. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's views on the supply chain and skills capacity? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations that you believe are missing? If so, what are they?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1176

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree	378
Agree with qualification(s)	122
Comments on the consultation document/process	17
De-centralised energy - argument(s) in favour	2
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	11
Disagree	112
Energy supply - strategic aspects	3
Government - credibility concerns	2
Invest in renewables/energy efficiency skills not nuclear	91
Learning/reference to other countries	10
Missing considerations	9
No comment/unable to comment	62
Nuclear - challenge credibility of nuclear industry and government	8
Nuclear - consequences of new build	2
Nuclear - cost aspects are overriding concern	4
Nuclear - cost aspects need to be considered	16
Nuclear - design/build issues	1
Nuclear - effect of new build on development of renewables	19
Nuclear - general opposition	24
Nuclear - general support	5
Nuclear - government to be more proactive/supportive	26
Nuclear - human error	1
Nuclear - improve education/provision of information	31
Nuclear - loss of skills when companies sold	13
Nuclear - market/incentives/subsidies	12
Nuclear - need for early decision	44
Nuclear - private companies - financial risks	3
Nuclear - public perception/risk	9
Nuclear - public sector ownership favoured	5
Nuclear - regulation/planning aspects	6
Nuclear - safety aspects need to be considered	4
Nuclear - security of supply will remain a problem	1
Nuclear ownership aspects	4
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	6

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Reference to other question(s)	26
References to skills training institutes and programmes	30
Security issues arising from foreign involvemernt in nuclear power	19
Skills - alternative uses	7
Skills - decommissioning and waste management	21
Skills - effects of timing/uncertainty	95
Skills - government intervention/policy	40
Skills - investment required in nuclear education, training & skills	233
Skills - job creation/future industry	83
Skills - lack of interest in nuclear careers	7
Skills - lack of skills capacity is risk factor	26
Skills - market forces will resolve shortages	22
Skills - need to attract young people to science/engineering	57
Skills - need to create UK skills base	41
Skills - no problems/not enough to block new build	32
Skills - oppose public subsidy of nuclear skills	3
Skills - skills shortage blocks new nuclear build	18
Skills - specific skill shortages/training required	25
Skills - timing	12
Skills - UK expertise retention, loss and continuity	181
Skills - will need/attract skills from outside UK	167
Skills- reprocessing	3
Supply chain - design of reactors/technology/sourcing	75
Supply chain - market forces will resolve	11
Supply chain - no problems/not enough to block new build	23
Supply chain - possible problems and constraints	22
Supply chain - role/response of international suppliers	34
Supply chain - timing	10

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Reprocessing of spent fuel

14. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's views on reprocessing? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations that you believe are missing? If so, what are they?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1174

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree	376
Agree with qualification(s)	115
Agree with question but oppose nuclear power	5
Comments on the consultation document/process	35
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	3
Disagree	216
Energy supply and use - strategic aspects	2
Further information is required	3
Government - credibility concerns	15
Learning/reference to other countries	56
Neither agree nor disagree/indifferent	17
No comment/unable to comment	76
Non-nuclear options - general support	2
Nuclear - construction costs overrun/ underestimated	1
Nuclear - design/building aspects	11
Nuclear - fuel - use of different types	4
Nuclear - general opposition	58
Nuclear - general support	2
Nuclear - government to be more proactive/supportive	9
Nuclear - improve education/provision of information	5
Nuclear - link to weapons production	33
Nuclear - ownership aspects	6
Nuclear - political/geopolitical aspects	1
Nuclear - private companies - profit orientation	13
Nuclear - public perception/risk	3
Nuclear - public sector ownership favoured	6
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks needs to be considered	2
Nuclear - safe/good safety record	2
Nuclear - safety aspects are overriding concern	4
Nuclear - timescale aspects need to be considered	7
Nuclear - uranium supply is not a problem	1
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	18
Reference to other question(s)	29
References to discharges to the Irish Sea	47

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

References to MOX fuel	45
References to THORP and Sellafield	57
Renewables - general support	6
Reprocessing - challenge figures presented	1
Reprocessing - cost aspects are overriding concern	27
Reprocessing - cost aspects need to be considered	27
Reprocessing - could help secure fuel supply/conserve resources	170
Reprocessing - design into new build/reactors	12
Reprocessing - economic benefit	29
Reprocessing - environmental aspects are overriding concern	14
Reprocessing - environmental aspects can be managed; does not override benefits	6
Reprocessing - environmental aspects need to be considered	3
Reprocessing - environmentally preferable	19
Reprocessing - explore/improve alternatives	6
Reprocessing - explore/improve utilisation	44
Reprocessing - facilities/tech/skills are available	40
Reprocessing - fuel available from reprocessed should be used	7
Reprocessing - general opposition	23
Reprocessing - general support	30
Reprocessing - historical aspects/learning	42
Reprocessing - is not the primary/only issue	16
Reprocessing - keep fuel pending fusion	2
Reprocessing - keep the option open for the future	166
Reprocessing - leave it to the experts	1
Reprocessing - market drivers/financial aspects	30
Reprocessing - other argument(s) against	11
Reprocessing - other argument(s) in favour	27
Reprocessing - ownership aspects	30
Reprocessing - political/policy aspects	31
Reprocessing - questions arising	34
Reprocessing - reduces risk of diversion	4
Reprocessing - reference to fast breeder reactors	41
Reprocessing - research to continue	17
Reprocessing - safety aspects are overriding concern	14
Reprocessing - security aspects are overriding concern	13
Reprocessing - should be commercial decision	6
Reprocessing - should be Government decision	3
Reprocessing - UK as world leader	10
Reprocessing - waste decreased/easier to manage	48

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Reprocessing - waste just as difficult/harder to manage	18
Reprocessing - waste to sea - specific concerns	31
Spent fuel - treatment/storage	51
Waste - need for a secure repository	18
Waste - problem is overriding concern	58
Waste - problem needs to be considered	29
Waste - transport issues	11

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Other considerations

15. Are there any other issues or information that you believe need to be considered before taking a decision on giving energy companies the option of investing in nuclear power stations? And why?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1101

	Number of responses per group heading
Act now on nuclear new build	37
Carbon storage - arguments against	2
Carbon storage - explore/improve utilisation	6
Climate change - international/strategic aspects	12
Climate change - is priority issue	21
Climate change - questioning assumptions re causes	2
Comments on the consultation document/process	64
De-centralised energy - argument(s) in favour	24
De-centralised energy - explore/improve utilisation	26
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	99
Economic growth model - opposition	6
Energy supply - fuel markets, costs and pricing	30
Energy supply - reduce reliance on other countries	5
Energy supply - strategic aspects	50
Ethical challenges/deliberations	2
Fossil energy - argument(s) against	7
Fossil energy - explore/improve utilisation	6
Fossil energy - general opposition	3
Fossil energy - shortage of supply	6
Further consultation/referendum needed	22
Fusion power - aspects to be considered	2
Fusion power - explore/improve utilisation	10
Global population/demographics/economics	9
Government - accountability (to the nation/environment)	11
Government - credibility concerns	23
Government - driven by economics	5
Government - should focus on transport policies	12
Hydrogen - explore/improve utilisation	13
Learning/reference to other countries	59
Missing information/considerations	12
Need for full objective comparison of costs, benefits and impacts of all energy sources	36
No comment/unable to comment	19
No/none to add	206
Non-nuclear options - explore/improve utilisation	18

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Non-nuclear options - general support	2
Nuclear - base decision on technical/scientific evidence	9
Nuclear - be open and transparent	14
Nuclear - civil liberties implications	4
Nuclear - clean/low environmental impact	5
Nuclear - community/local economic aspects	31
Nuclear - contributes to tackling climate change/emissions	13
Nuclear - cost aspects are overriding concern	20
Nuclear - cost aspects need to be considered	14
Nuclear - cost/focus prevents investment in other energy technologies	26
Nuclear - decommissioning aspects need to be considered	6
Nuclear - design/building aspects	55
Nuclear - environmental aspects are overriding concern	4
Nuclear - environmental aspects need to be considered	8
Nuclear - ethical issues	6
Nuclear - explore/improve utilisation	10
Nuclear - export potential	7
Nuclear - fuel - use of different types	5
Nuclear - future reactor designs untested technology	1
Nuclear - general opposition	34
Nuclear - general support	21
Nuclear - global instability is a concern	7
Nuclear - government to be more proactive/supportive	74
Nuclear - health aspects are overriding concern	5
Nuclear - health aspects can be managed; do not override benefits	2
Nuclear - health aspects need to be considered	7
Nuclear - historical aspects/learning	25
Nuclear - improve education/provision of information	44
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact is overriding concern	2
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact needs to be considered	1
Nuclear - link to weapons production	10
Nuclear - market/incentives/subsidies	96
Nuclear - media and lobbyist influence/interest	20
Nuclear - not the primary answer to climate change/emissions problem	17
Nuclear - ownership aspects	45
Nuclear - political/geopolitical aspects	35
Nuclear - private companies - financial risks	11
Nuclear - private companies - operational risks	16
Nuclear - private companies - profit orientation	26

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Nuclear - public perception/risk	26
Nuclear - public sector ownership favoured	25
Nuclear - reduces reliance on imported fossil fuels	4
Nuclear - regulation/planning aspects	76
Nuclear - reliable technology/no back up required	5
Nuclear - reprocessing aspects need to be considered	5
Nuclear - risk of protest	3
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks is overriding concern	7
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks needs to be considered	6
Nuclear - safe/good safety record	8
Nuclear - safety aspects are overriding concern	28
Nuclear - safety aspects need to be considered	20
Nuclear - security aspects are overriding concern	5
Nuclear - security aspects need to be considered	14
Nuclear - security of supply will be improved	13
Nuclear - security of supply will remain a problem	5
Nuclear - skills aspects	29
Nuclear - spin off benefits	8
Nuclear - support as interim solution	4
Nuclear - support as only feasible option	10
Nuclear - support as part of the mix of energy technologies	17
Nuclear - timescale aspects need to be considered	19
Nuclear - UK vs foreign ownership	25
Nuclear - uranium mining and availability need to be considered	12
Nuclear - uranium transport is a problem	3
Nuclear - weighting of the various aspects/information	4
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	43
Reference to other question(s)	48
Renewables - argument(s) against	16
Renewables - explore/improve utilisation	117
Research and development required	9
Security of supply - is priority issue	18
Spent fuel - store in a retrievable manner	3
Tackle other sources of emissions	6
Waste - problem can be managed; does not override benefits	2
Waste - problem is overriding concern	25
Waste - problem needs to be considered/solved	28

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Our proposals on nuclear power

16. In the context of tackling climate change and ensuring energy security, do you agree or disagree that it would be in the public interest to give energy companies the option of investing in new nuclear power stations?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1338

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree	734
Agree - in context of climate change	4
Agree - in context of security of supply	15
Agree with qualification(s)	74
Carbon storage - explore/improve utilisation	3
Clarity around market incentives	3
Climate change - questioning assumptions re causes	9
Comments on the consultation document/process	12
Concern - about non-British ownership	11
Concern - about private sector liabilities	8
Concern - around ability to obtain insurance	1
Concern - around private company motives	27
Concern - around sites and sea level rises	13
Concern - economics too high risk/displaces investment in alternatives	22
Concern - government credibility and history of the industry	11
Concern - lack of skills	2
Concern - nuclear power is not carbon neutral / cost effective	8
Concern - regarding excessive liability regarding waste	6
Concern - the tax payer will pick up the bill	17
Concern - there are not enough incentives for companies to invest	22
Conditions - support cap on capacity	1
Consider extending the life of existing plant	5
De-centralised energy - argument(s) in favour	13
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	53
Disagree	424
Energy - international and strategic issues	8
Invest in alternative technologies	16
Lack of willingness of private sector to invest	11
Learning/reference to other countries	6
More consideration/information required	14
Must be subject to full planning/public enquiry	3
Must streamline planning to expedite new build rapidly	12
Need for common design	7
Need for new style nuclear power stations	4

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

No comment/unable to comment	11
No other restrictions/level playing field	5
No public money should be used	18
Not publicly acceptable	14
Nuclear - design/building aspects	13
Nuclear - environmental risks too high	7
Nuclear - ethical concerns	13
Nuclear - government to be more proactive/supportive	96
Nuclear - improve education/provision of information	5
Nuclear - not a long term solution	4
Nuclear - public sector ownership favoured	45
Nuclear - risk - unacceptable as high impact	36
Nuclear - safety risks must be managed	2
Nuclear - security risks must be managed	4
Nuclear - too little too late to help climate change	11
Nuclear - uranium - finite resource	8
Nuclear - will provide economically efficient solution	6
Provide fiscal incentives for carbon friendly technologies	8
Public money should be invested in safety	1
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	10
Reference to other question(s)	46
Renewables - explore/improve utilisation	78
Renewables - general opposition	4
Requires government regulation and control	22
Support carbon reduction targets	2
Support investment in nuclear and other technologies	7
Timescales - new build will take too long	6
Waste - problem is overriding concern	29
Waste - resources required to ensure it is undertaken effectively	18
Waste - solutions are sufficiently developed to proceed	3

17. Are there other conditions that you believe should be put in place before giving energy companies the option of investing in new nuclear power stations? (for example, restricting build to the vicinity of existing sites, or restricting build to approximately replacing the existing capacity)

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1119	Number of responses per group heading
Clarify role of government	3
Climate change - is priority issue	2
Comments on the consultation document/process	23
Concern about sites and sea level rises	29

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Conditions - address existing waste management issues first	25
Conditions - away from populated areas	13
Conditions - consider and explore non-nuclear options first	17
Conditions - divest nuclear weapons	3
Conditions - do not be constrained by existing sites	121
Conditions - energy companies should also invest in efficiency and renewables	10
Conditions - energy efficiency improvements	12
Conditions - energy market considerations	7
Conditions - ensure accident and waste management costs can be paid for	32
Conditions - ensure no public funding	19
Conditions - government should decide	16
Conditions - improve skills/training	3
Conditions - independent regulations	5
Conditions - invest in nuclear research	4
Conditions - keep to existing sites if possible	271
Conditions - local community compensation	10
Conditions - local community should have a say	34
Conditions - local community used to stations	18
Conditions - local council studies	1
Conditions - mix of energies	17
Conditions - more streamlined planning process	35
Conditions - national referendum or measure public acceptability	10
Conditions - only allow British or European companies to invest, construct	16
Conditions - oppose cap on capacity	113
Conditions - private company concerns	18
Conditions - private company other requirements	39
Conditions - private company/market support	16
Conditions - provide at least the same support to renewables	9
Conditions - restrict to brownfield sites	5
Conditions - restrict to site for weapons production	3
Conditions - safety	14
Conditions - same conditions as other industries	6
Conditions - SEA / EIA	10
Conditions - security aspects	12
Conditions - should be dictated by energy demand	12
Conditions - should be proposal specific	12
Conditions - site close to urban centres, political centres	17
Conditions - siting other considerations	51
Conditions - socio-economic	12

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Conditions - standardised design of plant should be required	14
Conditions - support cap on capacity	32
Conditions - technical requirements (cooling water etc)	16
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	7
Energy supply and use - strategic aspects	4
Further information required	2
Government - credibility concerns	5
Government - should focus on transport policies	2
Independent & strong regulatory body needed	2
Learning/reference to other countries	6
No comment/unable to comment	25
No conditions/no other conditions	249
Non-nuclear options - explore/improve utilisation	9
Nuclear - contributes to tackling climate change/emissions	3
Nuclear - cost aspects need to be considered	15
Nuclear - design issues for new power stations	26
Nuclear - design/building aspects	4
Nuclear - develop other nuclear technologies	1
Nuclear - environmental aspects are overriding concern	2
Nuclear - general opposition	9
Nuclear - global instability is a concern	1
Nuclear - government to be more proactive/supportive	17
Nuclear - historical aspects/learning	5
Nuclear - improve education/provision of information	6
Nuclear - lifecycle carbon impact needs to be considered	1
Nuclear - media and lobbyist influence/interest	1
Nuclear - only a short term solution	1
Nuclear - opposition to new build	114
Nuclear - political/geopolitical aspects	3
Nuclear - preference for a number of smaller facilities	2
Nuclear - private companies - profit orientation	3
Nuclear - public perception/risk	5
Nuclear - public sector ownership favoured	10
Nuclear - regulation/planning aspects	36
Nuclear - reprocessing - opposed	1
Nuclear - risk of terrorist attacks needs to be considered	4
Nuclear - skills aspects	7
Nuclear - timescale aspects need to be considered	3
Nuclear - UK should be self-sufficient in fuel supply and energy production	1

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Planning and regulatory requirements should not be weakened	3
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	7
Reference to other question(s)	33
Renewables - support/explore/improve utilisation	23
Reprocessing - general support	2
Security of supply - is priority issue	5
Transport of nuclear material, risks associated with	3
Waste - cost aspects need to be considered	4
Waste - future generations concern/years involved	3
Waste - international aspects	1
Waste - need better information/research	2
Waste - need strategy, long term solution, proven	8
Waste - problem is overriding concern	5

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

Our proposals for facilitative action

18. Do you think these are the right facilitative actions to reduce the regulatory and planning risks associated with such investments? Are there any other measures that you think the Government should consider?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 1101

	Number of responses per group heading
Actions should be limited to nuclear construction	3
Actions should be the same for all developments	21
Additional measures - allow reprocessing	5
Additional measures - create a standing commission	3
Additional measures - energy prices/markets/incentives/subsidies	48
Additional measures - grid connection	4
Additional measures - have all consents in place early	2
Additional measures - local people should be compensated/involved	28
Additonal measures - ensure accident, waste & decommissioning costs can be met	36
Agree	440
Agree with qualifications	76
Carbon storage - explore/improve utilisation	4
Comments on the consultation document/process	25
Consideration should be on a site by site basis	9
De-centralised energy - explore/improve utilisation	11
Decision should be made by central government	20
Decommissioning fund - challenge if this can be guaranteed	16
Demand-side management/efficiency - explore/improve	21
Disagree	133
Energy supply and use - strategic aspects	1
Finding the balance between speeding the process up and credibility	5
Fossil energy - explore/improve utilisation	1
Further public consultation nationally and locally	13
Fusion power - explore/improve utilisation	3
Generic design and licence of the plant	61
Get on with it - speed is of the essence	99
Government - credibility concerns	1
Government to show leadership	82
Issues around the devolved governments	44
Keep to existing sites if possible	13
Learn from and work with other countries	28
Learn from other sectors/bodies	2
Limit excessive consultation	28
Need more clarity/certainty on what is planned	8

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Main Consultation

No comment/unable to comment	67
Non-nuclear options - explore/improve utilisation	20
Nuclear - cost aspects need to be considered	46
Nuclear - environmental concerns	1
Nuclear - general opposition	47
Nuclear - health aspects need to be considered	1
Nuclear - historical aspects/learning	4
Nuclear - public perception/risk	3
Nuclear - safety and security aspects need to be considered	28
Nuclear - support as part of the mix of energy technologies	3
Planning and regulatory requirements should not be weakened	88
Planning and regulatory requirements will be too much	5
Planning process needs to be strengthened	27
Public education required	28
Public ownership preferred	12
Refer to other response	24
Reference to other document(s)/source(s)	9
Regulators resources - concerns	23
Renewables - argument(s) against	2
Renewables - explore/improve utilisation	40
Skills - education, training & skills investment	7
Stronger measures to expedite new build is required	39
Suggested changes are undemocratic	53
Waste - problem is overriding concern	3
Waste - problem needs to be considered	4
Waste - sort this out in order to build public credibility	4

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Technical Consultations

Section 3 - Process for Making and Considering Applications

1a. Are Government plans to structure the proposed Justification process by making a time-limited "call for applications" helpful?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 122

	Number of responses per group heading
Alternatives to a time-limited call for applications	6
Comments on the consultation document/process	2
Concern - for democratic process	2
Concern about lack of volunteers being forthcoming	1
Design and construction issues	8
Do not restrict other applications	3
Ensure full consultation and engagement	9
Further information research required	6
Get on with it - time is of the essence	7
More clarification on these proposals is required	4
No - do not support proposed Justification process	8
No comment / unable to comment	1
Nuclear - opposition	4
Nuclear - support	3
Refer to other documents	1
Renewables - explore/improve utilisation	2
Rule out unsuitable areas to avoid public concern	1
Yes - but review the timeline	11
Yes - support proposed justification process	74
Yes - with qualifications	14

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Technical Consultations

How will Government Consider Applications?

1b. Is the proposed application, assessment and decision-making process clear, appropriate and proportionate? If not, how can it be improved?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 94

	Number of responses per group heading
Clarity around public engagement processes	11
Comments on the consultation document/process	5
Concern that requirements go beyond those of other countries	3
Ensure openness and transparency	5
Introduce a review process	3
Learn from other countries	4
License the design separately from the site	3
More clarity is required regarding the proposals	15
More leadership and commitment	1
No - do not support the process	2
No comment	2
Oppose nuclear new build	2
Question need for drawn-out process	9
Renewables - explore / improve utilisation	1
Role and involvement of the insurance industry	1
Suggested additions - to table 1	1
Suggested additions - additional consultees	1
Suggested additions - design specifications	4
Suggested additions - processes for surrounding infrastructure	1
suggested additions - provide site options prior to calls for proposals	1
Suggested additions - research into waste management	1
Suggested additions - technical advice should be independent	2
Timescale issues	23
Waste is an overriding concern	3
Yes - appropriate and proportionate	30

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Technical Consultations

What Information Should an Applicant Provide?

1c. Is the indicative list of information, described in Appendix A, appropriate for applicants to be able to make applications?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 79

	Number of responses per group heading
Additional suggestion - clarification of proposed technology section	4
Additional suggestion - design issues	3
Additional suggestion - carbon lifecycle information	1
Additional suggestion - cost benefit	2
Additional suggestion - draw on other existing data	1
Additional suggestion - emphasis on proliferation	2
Additional suggestion - existing infrastructure	1
Additional suggestion - resource levels	1
Additional suggestion - restrict electricity to UK consumption	1
Additional suggestion - revise health detriments section	3
Additional suggestion - safety and security plan	4
Additional suggestion - scheduling down time	1
Additional suggestion - should include fuel sourcing	2
Additional suggestion - technical supplement	1
Additional suggestion - toughen wording	2
Additional suggestion - visual appearance	1
Additional suggestion - waste disposal routes	5
Agree	44
Allow flexibility	1
Comment on the consultation document/process	2
Consult with regulatory agencies	2
Further clarity required	6
Learn from other countries	1
No comment	3
Nuclear - general opposition	2
Nuclear - support new build	1
Potential duplication of effort	2
Renewables - explore/improve utilisation	2
Some issues are outside the applicant's control	1
Timescale issues	7

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Technical Consultations

How Will Government Consider Multiple Applications?

1d. The Government is planning, where possible, to consider concurrent applications for Justification (relating to new nuclear power station technologies) through a single Justification assessment process. Is the Government's proposal appropriate?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 69

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree	42
Clarification of how a single application is defined	4
Comments on the consultation document/process	1
Design issues	2
Disagree	4
Ensure flexibility	4
Ensure full supporting documents provided	1
Justification process should stand alone	2
Needs independent/non-biased assessment	3
No comments	1
Nuclear - general opposition	2
Process should not hold up decisions	7
Renewables - explore/improve utilisation	1
Systems needed to manage this approach	6
Timescale issues	3

1e. Are there any other ways in which the draft Justification process can be improved? If so, we welcome your suggestions.

Number of participants who responded to this question: 59

	Number of responses per group heading
Beware of excessive consultation	3
Comments on the consultation document/process	1
Consider alternatives to nuclear power	5
Enable flexibility	3
Ensure waste is managed safely	4
Further and effective consultation engagement	9
Generic design issues	4
Good and balanced communication	1
Include fuel sourcing as part of Justification	1
Introduce a review process	1
Learn from other countries	2
No further suggestions	19
Nuclear - oppose new build	2
Nuclear power - general support	1
Produce educational and information materials	1

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Technical Consultations

Renewables - explore / improve utilisation	1
Timescale issues	10

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Technical Consultations

Section 3 - The Proposed Process to be followed for the Strategic Siting Assessment

2a. Is the proposed approach to the Strategic Siting Assessment a logical approach to identifying suitable sites? If not, how could it be improved?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 82

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree	39
Assessment should be on site-by-site basis	4
Build on existing sites	5
Clarity of criteria for site identification required	5
Comments on the consultation document/process	1
Concern over sea level rises	2
Concerns about site identification process	3
Consider alternative assessment systems	1
Consider multiple sites at the same time	1
Devolved administration issues	4
Ensure full public and stakeholder consultation	12
Ensure sites can accommodate CHP	1
Further clarity and information needed	3
Keep to existing sites to reduce time and requirements	6
Learn from other countries	1
Need clarity on cap on capacity	1
No comment	1
Nuclear - oppose new build	2
Question need for drawn-out process	3
Refer to other question	1
Renewables - explore / improve utilisation	1
Siting close to urban centres	1
Speed up/change stages	8
Suggested additions - add detail to Appendix B	2
Suggested additions - consider existing infrastructure	1
Suggested additions - consider flood risk	2
Suggested additions - create SEA/SSA steering group	1
Suggested additions - review and monitor processes	1
Suggested additions - toughen the language	1
Support the idea of local acceptance	3
Timescale issues	8

Appendix A. Collation statistics

Technical Consultations

2b. Does the proposed incorporation of Strategic Environmental Assessment into the Strategic Siting Assessment represent a reasonable and robust approach to assessing environmental issues that would be raised by the construction and operation of new nuclear power stations? If not, how could such issues be taken into account?

Number of participants who responded to this question: 79

	Number of responses per group heading
Agree	51
Also include socio-economic impacts	4
Comments on the consultation document/process	2
Concern around extending timescale	3
Concern around rising sea levels	3
Design issues	5
Detailed comments on the text	2
Disagree	2
Ensure full consultation	6
Get a move on - time is of the essence	4
Include waste management and decomissioning proposals	4
Keep to existing sites to reduce time and requirements	8
Learn from other countries	1
Needs to be site specific	2
Nuclear - general opposition	2
Refer to other question	1
Renewables - explore / improve utilisation	1
Set up a steering committee	1
Suggested additions	5
The process could be confusing	2