

## After the backlash: what became the standard, and why

Fifteen cases, 1960s to 2025, one shape: an industry building as of right, a public backlash, a pause or refusal, then either a rule that let building resume or a ban that hardened. Page 1: what happened. Page 2: where each rule came from, who wrote it, and how the public accepted it. Every row is from the cited public record; nothing is estimated.

**Bottom line.** Wherever building resumed, the accepted rule was adopted by the authority that could say no: a government, a regulator, a council or a counterparty with a veto. No industry pledge or voluntary certification converted a backlash on its own; Ontario's own voluntary certification closed for lack of demand. Money worked only beside a consent step and a public formula, the rule had to resolve the physical constraint behind the fight, and it had to arrive within one to three years of the first refusal.

| Case                                                               | Business as usual, then backlash                                                                                                | What followed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Who held the pen                                             | Outcome                                                                         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Singapore data centres [1][2]</b>                               | Rapid growth; 7% of national electricity by 2020; implicit pause from 2019, confirmed end-2020                                  | Pause lifted Jan 2022. Pilot call: PUE 1.3 or better, innovation, strategic fit; 20+ proposals, 4 selected, about 80 MW (Jul 2023); Green Mark Platinum                                                                                                                                  | The state (EDB, IMDA)                                        | Building resumed, rationed by criteria                                          |
| <b>Amsterdam and Haarlemmermeer [3]</b>                            | Market growing 10–15% a year; immediate ban on new builds 12 Jul 2019 (land scarcity)                                           | Lifted 2020: designated zones, PUE 1.2 new / 1.3 existing, brokered by the Dutch Datacenter Association. Dec 2023: heat-reuse and water limits; national restriction on sites of 70 MW or 10 ha and up                                                                                   | Municipalities; industry association brokered                | Resumed under conditions; 62 MW added in 2023; wholesale demand moved elsewhere |
| <b>Dublin data centres [4]</b>                                     | Data centres above 10% of Ireland's electricity; grid constrained                                                               | Regulator (CRU) set connection criteria 23 Nov 2021, including power to require on-site dispatchable generation or storage. EirGrid Jan 2022: no new Dublin connections for the foreseeable future, possibly to 2028                                                                     | Regulator and grid operator                                  | Connections rationed by criteria; Dublin effectively closed                     |
| <b>Loudoun County, Virginia [5]</b>                                | World's largest market, by-right in its data-centre zones; complaints over noise, power lines, about 50 new substations         | 18 Mar 2025: by-right approval removed, legislative review for all; 500-ft residential buffer; phase 2 on noise, light, energy, design                                                                                                                                                   | The county                                                   | Discretionary review with performance standards                                 |
| <b>Quebec crypto-mining load [6]</b>                               | Requests for more than 18,000 MW in 2018                                                                                        | Hydro-Quebec applied to the Regie 14 Jun 2018; decision 29 Apr 2019: 300 MW block allocated by score (investment per MW 30%, jobs 30%, payroll 30%, heat recovery 10%)                                                                                                                   | Energy regulator                                             | Load admitted by criteria, not by queue                                         |
| <b>Ontario wind, 2009–2018 [7][8][9]</b>                           | Green Energy Act 2009 removed municipal planning authority; 155 municipalities declared themselves unwilling hosts              | Act repealed 2018, planning authority restored; about 750 contracts cancelled; cancellation cost reported at \$231M                                                                                                                                                                      | Province imposed, then province reversed                     | Industry ended in the province; money without consent failed                    |
| <b>Ontario aggregates: Melancthon and Cornerstone [10][11][12]</b> | 930-ha quarry; 40,000 at Soupstock; withdrawn 21 Nov 2012: "does not have sufficient support from the community and government" | Cornerstone Standards Council formed 2012 by industry, environmental groups and communities: voluntary third-party certification; three sites certified by 2017. Dec 2018: stopped certifying, "unable to create a strong enough value proposition for industry to pursue certification" | Voluntary coalition, no gate                                 | Certification died in six years                                                 |
| <b>Ontario intensive livestock [13][14]</b>                        | Post-Walkerton municipal by-laws and moratoria on large barns                                                                   | Nutrient Management Act 2002; Court of Appeal (Peacock v. Norfolk, 2006): s.61 renders conflicting municipal by-law provisions inoperative                                                                                                                                               | Province                                                     | Local moratoria ended by a provincial standard                                  |
| <b>Massachusetts casinos [15]</b>                                  | Siting fights                                                                                                                   | Expanded Gaming Act (M.G.L. c.23K): signed host community agreement with a community impact fee required before licensing; local referendum follows the agreement                                                                                                                        | Legislature                                                  | Sited with a host yes and a fee                                                 |
| <b>Voisey's Bay nickel [16]</b>                                    | 1990s: project could not proceed without agreements with the Innu Nation and the Labrador Inuit Association                     | Statement of principles 11 Jun 2002: Impacts and Benefits Agreements with Innu Nation and Labrador Inuit Association a condition precedent to proceeding                                                                                                                                 | Province and nations; contract                               | Built; IBAs became standard practice without a statute                          |
| <b>Nuclear waste: Canada vs US [17][18]</b>                        | US: Yucca Mountain designated over Nevada's objection (1987); DOE moved to withdraw the licence application 2010                | Canada: consent-based siting from 2010; 22 sites considered; Ignace poll 77.3% yes; Wabigoon Lake Ojibway Nation vote in support; site selected 28 Nov 2024                                                                                                                              | Host communities with a veto                                 | Imposition failed for decades; consent delivered a site                         |
| <b>Scotland vs England onshore wind [19][20]</b>                   | Same technology, same island                                                                                                    | Scotland, from 2014: voluntary Good Practice Principles promoting 5,000 pounds per MW per year, index-linked, on a public register; 214 projects, 15.7M pounds paid in 12 months (2019). England, 2015: planning tests; 97% fewer turbines permitted 2016–21 vs 2009–14; lifted Jul 2024 | Government-promoted norm (Scotland); planning rule (England) | Promoted formula kept Scotland building; England stopped for nine years         |
| <b>Denmark wind [21]</b>                                           | Local opposition                                                                                                                | Promotion of Renewable Energy Act, in force 1 Jan 2009: at least 20% of shares in new onshore turbines offered first to residents within 4.5 km                                                                                                                                          | Parliament                                                   | Ownership as the acceptance mechanism                                           |
| <b>Aircraft noise [22]</b>                                         | Jet aircraft from the early 1960s; London Noise Conference 1966                                                                 | ICAO Annex 16 noise certification standards adopted 2 Apr 1971, after the London Noise Conference (1966) and a 1969 special meeting                                                                                                                                                      | International regulator                                      | International certification standard, still in force                            |
| <b>New York fracking [23]</b>                                      | De facto moratorium from 2008; six years with no adopted state rule                                                             | Statewide ban announced 17 Dec 2014 on a health review: "The potential risks are too great"                                                                                                                                                                                              | The state                                                    | Six years without an adopted rule became a ban                                  |

## Where the rules came from: precursor, author, acceptance

Three questions per case: what existed before the authority adopted the rule, who made that precursor and how, and by what step the public accepted the result. The three failures at the end had precursors too; what they lacked is in the last column.

| Case                                      | Precursor: what existed before adoption                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Who made it, and how                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | How the public accepted it (or did not)                                                                                                                     |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Singapore</b> [24][25][2]              | SS 564, Singapore Standard for Green Data Centres (2010), a certifiable energy and environmental management system; BCA-IDA Green Mark for Data Centres (10 Oct 2012), rating energy, water, construction and indoor environment                     | The IT Standards Committee with IDA and SPRING Singapore; Green Mark by BCA and IDA with NTU's energy institute and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; voluntary for a decade                                                                      | The state, not residents, was the party to satisfy: in 2023 the voluntary mark became the allocation criterion (Green Mark Platinum among the winning bids) |
| <b>Amsterdam</b> [26][27][3]              | PUE as the industry's efficiency metric; the EU Code of Conduct for Data Centre Energy Efficiency, voluntary since 2008; a regional data-centre strategy for the metropolitan area                                                                   | The municipality drafted the 2020 policy: four named districts, growth capped at 67 MVA a year to 2030, residual heat released free, sites over 80 MVA build their own grid station, renewable supply; industry association brokered                   | Public consultation to end of August 2020, then council approval. A twelve-year-old voluntary code became a condition of location                           |
| <b>Dublin</b> [4]                         | The regulator's own consultation paper CRU/21/060 proposing connection criteria                                                                                                                                                                      | Commission for Regulation of Utilities, public consultation, decision 23 Nov 2021; EirGrid applied it                                                                                                                                                  | Regulatory process; grid-driven, not resident-driven                                                                                                        |
| <b>Loudoun County</b> [29][5]             | The county's Data Center Standards and Locations project; existing Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance                                                                                                                                           | County staff and Board of Supervisors; phase 1 adopted 18 Mar 2025 making data centres a conditional use; phase 2 to write use-specific standards for land use, compatibility, aesthetics, infrastructure, resources                                   | Board vote after sustained resident pressure; the standards themselves are still being written                                                              |
| <b>Quebec load</b> [6]                    | Hydro-Quebec's own proposed selection process, filed 14 Jun 2018                                                                                                                                                                                     | The utility drafted it; the Regie de l'energie held hearings and modified it; decision 29 Apr 2019                                                                                                                                                     | Regulatory hearing with intervenors; public not the driver                                                                                                  |
| <b>Ontario livestock</b> [31][13][14]     | Municipal by-laws; the Walkerton Inquiry Part Two (23 May 2002): the Ministry of the Environment should regulate farm activities; large and high-risk farms should have binding water-protection plans developed with agricultural groups            | A judicial inquiry set the principle; the province wrote the Act (2002) and regulation (O. Reg. 267/03)                                                                                                                                                | The inquiry's standing carried it; the Court of Appeal settled the municipal challenge in 2006                                                              |
| <b>Massachusetts casinos</b> [32][15]     | The Hazardous Waste Facility Siting Act (M.G.L. c. 21D, 1980): local assessment committee (s.5), negotiated siting agreement (ss.12–13), compensation and arbitration (ss.14–15)                                                                     | The legislature; thirty-one years later the Expanded Gaming Act reused the form as the host community agreement with a community impact fee                                                                                                            | A local referendum after the agreement is signed                                                                                                            |
| <b>Voisey's Bay</b> [33][16][34]          | The Raglan Agreement (1995): one of the first impact and benefit agreements in Canada, signed by the mine with Makivik Corporation, Salluit and Kangisujuaq; training and hiring, preference for Inuit businesses, profit-sharing, a joint committee | Negotiated directly between a company and the affected communities; the province then made such agreements a condition precedent (11 Jun 2002)                                                                                                         | Ratification votes, June 2002: Labrador Inuit Association 82% yes (about 2,000 ballots); Innu Nation 68% yes (about 600 ballots)                            |
| <b>Nuclear waste, Canada</b> [35][36][17] | The Seaborn Panel (13 Mar 1998): the concept was "adequately shown to be safe from a technical perspective but not from a social perspective"; recommended a step-by-step approach and a dedicated agency                                            | Government chose Adaptive Phased Management in 2007; the NWMO designed the siting process in public dialogue 2008–2010 (May 2009 proposal revised on feedback; Elders, Municipal and Youth forums); launched May 2010 for "informed and willing hosts" | Community votes at each candidate site; Ignace 77.3% yes (2024)                                                                                             |
| <b>Scotland wind</b> [37][19]             | Highland Council policy (Dec 2011): not less than 5,000 pounds per installed MW annually, RPI-indexed, a developer concordat, allocation factors for distributing funds                                                                              | A council wrote it; the Scottish Government promoted the same rate nationally from 2014 and opened a public register                                                                                                                                   | Voluntary but registered and expected: 214 projects, 15.7M pounds paid in twelve months (2019)                                                              |
| <b>Denmark wind</b> [38][21]              | Cooperative ownership: about half of installed capacity cooperatively owned from the 1980s to the early 1990s; owners' association since 1978; Middelgrunden co-op formed 1997, 10 of 20 turbines, over 8,500 members                                | Grassroots cooperatives first; Parliament codified the norm in 2009 as a 20% offer to neighbours within 4.5 km                                                                                                                                         | Ownership: the neighbours are the shareholders                                                                                                              |
| <b>Aircraft noise</b> [39][22]            | US FAR Part 36 noise certification, applied to new large jets from 1 Dec 1969; ICAO Assembly resolution 1968; special meeting Dec 1969                                                                                                               | A national regulator first; ICAO Council adopted Annex 16 in April 1971, applicable January 1972                                                                                                                                                       | Through the certificate: quieter aircraft became the only aircraft that could be sold                                                                       |
| <b>FAILED: New York fracking</b> [40]     | A seven-year draft standard: Draft SGEIS Sept 2009 (13,000 comments), revised Sept 2011 (67,000 more; 180,000 on proposed regulations; 260,000 in all)                                                                                               | The state environmental agency; the regulations lapsed unadopted                                                                                                                                                                                       | Consultation without adoption; the health review (Dec 2014) ended it; formal prohibition 29 Jun 2015                                                        |
| <b>FAILED: Ontario wind</b> [41][7][8]    | A precise provincial standard: Renewable Energy Approval setback of 550 m from noise receptors, based on a 40 dBA night-time limit                                                                                                                   | The province, 2009, with municipal planning authority removed by the same Act                                                                                                                                                                          | No consent step at all: 155 municipalities declared themselves unwilling hosts; repealed 2018                                                               |
| <b>FAILED: Cornerstone</b> [11][12]       | The Responsible Aggregate Standard, with voluntary third-party audits                                                                                                                                                                                | A coalition of industry, environmental groups and communities, 2012                                                                                                                                                                                    | No adopter and no gate; certification ceased Dec 2018                                                                                                       |

**The three answers.** **Precursor:** in eleven of twelve successes the adopted rule already existed as a voluntary or lower-tier text: a voluntary national standard, a voluntary EU code, a utility's filing, a council policy, a company–community contract, a panel finding, a cooperative practice, another regulator's rule. The lag to adoption ran from one month (Walkerton report to Nutrient Management Act) to thirty-one years (Massachusetts); it was short only where a crisis or inquiry pulled the text into law. Ontario's data-centre trigger has fired, so the precursor has to exist now. **Author:** never the adopter alone; someone close to the physics or to the affected party, with legitimacy supplied afterwards by the adopter and the process. **Acceptance:** a step the public could take or watch: ratification votes (82%, 68%, 77.3%), a referendum after the agreement, a recorded consultation, an inquiry's finding, a public register, ownership. The two precise standards that failed, New York's and Ontario's, failed on that column: one consulted for seven years and never adopted; the other adopted without consulting at all.

## Seven patterns the record supports

**The rule that stuck was adopted by the party that could say no.** The state in Singapore, the municipalities in Amsterdam and Loudoun, the regulators in Quebec and Dublin, the province for livestock, ICAO for aircraft. In none of the fifteen cases did an industry pledge or voluntary certification convert a backlash by itself.

**A voluntary certification with no gate dies, in Ontario, with better founders than most.** Cornerstone had industry, environmental groups and communities at the table, a real standard and three certified quarries. It closed because no approval, contract or buyer required the certificate. The instruments that became universal without a statute had a gatekeeper: Impacts and Benefits Agreements were a condition precedent; Massachusetts wrote the host agreement into law; Scotland's rate is government-promoted and registered.

**Money works beside consent and a public formula, and fails without them.** Scotland's 5,000 pounds per MW, Massachusetts' community impact fee, Quebec's published scoring, Voisey's Bay's agreements: formulaic, public, to the host, next to a yes. Ontario's wind payments arrived after the province had removed the municipal yes, and 155 councils refused anyway.

**The rule must resolve the physical constraint that started the fight.** Amsterdam's efficiency rule held, but grid congestion did not go away, so restrictions tightened in 2023 and went national. Dublin's regulator reserved the power to demand on-site generation or storage. Loudoun's trigger was substations. For data centres the binding constraint is power and backup.

**The window is one to three years from the first refusal.** Singapore 2019 to 2022, Amsterdam 2019 to 2020, Quebec 2018 to 2019, livestock 2000 to 2002: rules adopted inside the window and building resumed. New York 2008 to 2014, England 2015 to 2024, Ontario wind 2009 to 2018: nothing adopted, and the backlash became a ban that took years to lift.

**The adopted rule was almost always a precursor that already existed.** Eleven of twelve successes adopted a text written earlier by someone else: a voluntary standard, a council policy, a contract, a panel finding, a regulator's rule elsewhere. The trigger pulled the precursor into law; where no precursor was ready, the trigger produced a pause and then a ban.

**A visible consent step converts; imposition does not.** Ignace voted 77.3% yes; Massachusetts requires a referendum after the agreement; Denmark offers neighbours 20% of the turbine; Melancthon was withdrawn for want of "community and government" support; Yucca Mountain, imposed in 1987, was still in litigation in 2010.

## What this means for a data-centre standard in Ontario

- A standard becomes the accepted one when an authority that can say no requires it: a council framework, a provincial guideline or connection criteria, or a financing condition. Nine Ontario jurisdictions are writing data-centre frameworks now; the province and the IESO decide connections. Selling certification before a gate exists repeats Cornerstone.
- The standard must carry the power terms: connection impact, substation siting and cost, backup without diesel, a capacity cap. Every data-centre precedent that held did so on power and efficiency criteria.
- The payment belongs beside the approval, not inside it, with a public formula and a host that has said yes: a host-community agreement on the Massachusetts and Voisey's Bay pattern, promoted by a ministry on the Scottish pattern. Payment without consent has already failed in this province.
- The window is open now and closes in 2027–2028. Hamilton's first refusal was June 2026; Oakville and Mississauga froze in August and September. What is adopted in the next eighteen months decides whether Ontario follows Singapore or New York.
- A pledge is not a guardrail. The cases that converted had a number, a public meter, a verifier the proponent did not pay, and a consequence for breach; the cases that failed had principles.

## Sources (all retrieved October 27, 2026; numbers not listed reuse an earlier source)

- [1] DCD, Singapore after the moratorium — [datacenterdynamics.com/en/analysis/after-the-moratorium-how-singapore-plans-to-stay-in-data-center-race](https://datacenterdynamics.com/en/analysis/after-the-moratorium-how-singapore-plans-to-stay-in-data-center-race)
- [2] Singapore EDB, pilot DC-CFA results, 14 Jul 2023 — [edb.gov.sg/en/about-edb/media-releases-publications/four-data-centre-proposals-selected-as-part-of-pilot-data-centre-call-for-application.htm](https://edb.gov.sg/en/about-edb/media-releases-publications/four-data-centre-proposals-selected-as-part-of-pilot-data-centre-call-for-application.htm)
- [3] DCD, impact of Amsterdam's moratorium — [datacenterdynamics.com/en/analysis/the-ongoing-impact-of-amsterdams-data-centre-moratorium](https://datacenterdynamics.com/en/analysis/the-ongoing-impact-of-amsterdams-data-centre-moratorium)
- [4] DCD, EirGrid and Dublin, 11 Jan 2022 (CRU/21/060, 23 Nov 2021) — [datacenterdynamics.com/en/news/eirgrid-says-no-new-applications-for-data-centers-in-dublin-till-2028](https://datacenterdynamics.com/en/news/eirgrid-says-no-new-applications-for-data-centers-in-dublin-till-2028)
- [5] Patch Ashburn, Loudoun by-right removed, 20 Mar 2025 — [patch.com/virginia/ashburn/data-center-right-approval-process-removed-loudoun-county](https://patch.com/virginia/ashburn/data-center-right-approval-process-removed-loudoun-county); [loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/222461](https://loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/222461)
- [6] McCarthy Tetrault, Hydro-Quebec framework for digital currency miners (Regie, 29 Apr 2019) — [mccarthy.ca/en/insights/blogs/canadian-energy-perspectives/hydro-quebec-s-new-framework-for-digital-currency-miners](https://mccarthy.ca/en/insights/blogs/canadian-energy-perspectives/hydro-quebec-s-new-framework-for-digital-currency-miners)
- [7] ReNew Canada, Green Energy Act repeal, 2018 — [renewcanada.net/ontario-repeals-the-green-energy-act/](https://renewcanada.net/ontario-repeals-the-green-energy-act/)
- [8] CTV London, 155 unwilling hosts, 10 May 2024 — [ctvnews.ca/london/article/155-ontario-municipalities-unwilling-hosts-for-future-wind-projects/](https://ctvnews.ca/london/article/155-ontario-municipalities-unwilling-hosts-for-future-wind-projects/)
- [9] CTV London, cancellation cost \$231M — [ctvnews.ca/london/article/doug-fords-cancellation-of-green-energy-deals-costs-ontario-taxpayers-231m](https://ctvnews.ca/london/article/doug-fords-cancellation-of-green-energy-deals-costs-ontario-taxpayers-231m)
- [10] Global News, mega quarry withdrawn, 21 Nov 2012 — [globalnews.ca/news/310987/](https://globalnews.ca/news/310987/)
- [11] Rock to Road, CSC audits, Sept 2017 — [rocktoroad.com/audits-for-aggregates-5551](https://rocktoroad.com/audits-for-aggregates-5551)
- [12] Rock to Road, CSC stops certifying, 18 Dec 2018 — [rocktoroad.com/aggregates/profiles/csc-releases-revised-standard-industry-best-practice-document-shifts-role-6201](https://rocktoroad.com/aggregates/profiles/csc-releases-revised-standard-industry-best-practice-document-shifts-role-6201)
- [13] Nutrient Management Act, 2002, S.O. 2002, c. 4 — [ontario.ca/laws/statute/02n04](https://ontario.ca/laws/statute/02n04)
- [14] Peacock v. Norfolk (County), ONCA, 28 Jun 2006 — [ca.vlex.com/vid/peacock-v-norfolk-680678997](https://ca.vlex.com/vid/peacock-v-norfolk-680678997)
- [15] Massachusetts Gaming Commission, host community agreements (M.G.L. c. 23K) — [massgaming.com/about/host-sounding-communities/host-community-agreements/](https://massgaming.com/about/host-sounding-communities/host-community-agreements/)
- [16] Newfoundland and Labrador, Voisey's Bay statement of principles, 11 Jun 2002 — [releases.gov.nl.ca/releases/2002/exec/0611n03.htm](https://releases.gov.nl.ca/releases/2002/exec/0611n03.htm)
- [17] BLG, repository site selected, Jan 2025 — [blg.com/en/insights/2025/01/canadas-first-deep-geological-repository-site-is-selected](https://blg.com/en/insights/2025/01/canadas-first-deep-geological-repository-site-is-selected)
- [18] CRS, Closing Yucca Mountain: Litigation, R41675 (2011) — [e-verycrsreport.com/files/20110705\\_R41675\\_826f81eca87043473f25c1274285c3d9ede1e848.html](https://e-verycrsreport.com/files/20110705_R41675_826f81eca87043473f25c1274285c3d9ede1e848.html)
- [19] Scottish Government, Good Practice Principles, rev. 8 May 2019 — [gov.scot/publications/scottish-government-good-practice-principles-community-benefits-onshore-renewable-energy-developments/pages/2](https://gov.scot/publications/scottish-government-good-practice-principles-community-benefits-onshore-renewable-energy-developments/pages/2)
- [20] Brodies LLP, onshore wind ban in England lifted, Aug 2024 — [brodies.com/insights/renewable-energy/de-facto-to-defunct-labour-removes-onshore-wind-farm-ban-in-england/](https://brodies.com/insights/renewable-energy/de-facto-to-defunct-labour-removes-onshore-wind-farm-ban-in-england/)
- [21] IEA Policies, Denmark Promotion of Renewable Energy Act (2009) — [iea.org/policies/4887-promotion-of-renewable-energy-act](https://iea.org/policies/4887-promotion-of-renewable-energy-act)
- [22] ICAO, Annex 16 postal history — [icao.int/sites/default/files/po-stalhistory/annex\\_16\\_environmental\\_protection.htm](https://icao.int/sites/default/files/po-stalhistory/annex_16_environmental_protection.htm)
- [23] CleanTechnica, New York fracking ban, 18 Dec 2014 — [cleantechnica.com/2014/12/18/governor-cuomo-announces-statewide-new-york-fracking-ban/](https://cleantechnica.com/2014/12/18/governor-cuomo-announces-statewide-new-york-fracking-ban/)
- [24] IDA Singapore, SS 564 press release, 31 Mar 2011 — [mda.gov.sg/archived-ida-press-releases-2011](https://mda.gov.sg/archived-ida-press-releases-2011)
- [25] NCCS / BCA-IDA, Green Mark for Data Centres, 10 Oct 2012 — [nccs.gov.sg/media/bca-and-ida-launch-new-green-mark-for-data-centres/](https://nccs.gov.sg/media/bca-and-ida-launch-new-green-mark-for-data-centres/)
- [26] European Commission JRC, EU Code of Conduct for Data Centres (voluntary, since 2008) — [joint-research-centre.ec.europa.eu](https://joint-research-centre.ec.europa.eu)
- [27] Telecompaper, Amsterdam conditions, 2 Jul 2020 — [telecompaper.com/news/amsterdam-to-allow-new-data-centres-under-strict-conditions--1344982](https://telecompaper.com/news/amsterdam-to-allow-new-data-centres-under-strict-conditions--1344982)
- [29] Loudoun County, Data Centers: Land Use Considerations — [loudoun.gov/6410/Data-Centers-Land-Use](https://loudoun.gov/6410/Data-Centers-Land-Use)
- [31] CBC, Walkerton Inquiry Part Two, 23 May 2002 — [cbc.ca/news2/background/walkerton/walkerton\\_report2.html](https://cbc.ca/news2/background/walkerton/walkerton_report2.html)
- [32] Massachusetts General Laws c. 21D — [malegislature.gov/Laws/GeneralLaws/PartI/TitleII/Chapter21D](https://malegislature.gov/Laws/GeneralLaws/PartI/TitleII/Chapter21D)
- [33] Glencore, Raglan Agreement (1995) — [glencore.ca/en/raglan/raglan-agreement](https://glencore.ca/en/raglan/raglan-agreement)
- [34] Nunatsiag News, Voisey's Bay ratification votes, 28 Jun 2002 — [nunatsiag.com/stories/article/aboriginal\\_groups\\_say\\_yes\\_to\\_voiseys\\_deal/](https://nunatsiag.com/stories/article/aboriginal_groups_say_yes_to_voiseys_deal/)
- [35] Probe International, Seaborn Panel report, 13 Mar 1998 — [ep.probeinternational.org/1998/03/13/](https://ep.probeinternational.org/1998/03/13/)
- [36] NWMO, how the site selection process was developed — [nwmo.ca/Site-selection/How-it-was-developed](https://nwmo.ca/Site-selection/How-it-was-developed)
- [37] Highland Council, community benefit policy, 19 Dec 2011 — [highland.gov.uk/news/article/4705/](https://highland.gov.uk/news/article/4705/)
- [38] P2P Foundation wiki, Middelgrunden cooperative — [wiki.p2pfoundation.net/Middelgrunden\\_Wind\\_Turbine\\_Cooperative](https://wiki.p2pfoundation.net/Middelgrunden_Wind_Turbine_Cooperative)
- [39] ICAO Noise Certification Workshop 2004, historical development — [icao.int/Meetings/EnvironmentalWorkshops/Documents/NoiseCertificationWorkshop-2004/bip2\\_01.pdf](https://icao.int/Meetings/EnvironmentalWorkshops/Documents/NoiseCertificationWorkshop-2004/bip2_01.pdf)
- [40] NYS DEC, High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing in NYS — [dec.ny.gov/environmental-protection/oil-gas/high-volume-hydraulic-fracturing](https://dec.ny.gov/environmental-protection/oil-gas/high-volume-hydraulic-fracturing)
- [41] Ontario, Technical Guide to Renewable Energy Approvals, wind setbacks — [ontario.ca/document/technical-guide-renewable-energy-approvals/required-setback-wind-turbines](https://ontario.ca/document/technical-guide-renewable-energy-approvals/required-setback-wind-turbines)