

Respondent Details	
Name:	Jonathan Squire

Please select the category below which best describes who you are responding on behalf of.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Business representative organisation/trade body
<input type="checkbox"/>	Central Government
<input type="checkbox"/>	Charity or social enterprise
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Individual
<input type="checkbox"/>	Large business (over 250 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Legal representative
<input type="checkbox"/>	Local Government
<input type="checkbox"/>	Medium business (50 to 250 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Micro business (up to 9 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Small business (10 to 49 staff)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Trade union or staff association
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please describe):

The consultation document sets out the Government's proposed approach to the longer term management of the UK's plutonium stocks for public scrutiny and consultation. Comments on any aspect of this issue are welcome, but the key questions posed in this consultation are:

No	Question
Q1	Do you agree that it is not realistic for the Government to wait until fast breeder reactor technology is commercially available before taking a decision on how to manage plutonium stocks?
Response	<p>The issue is purely economic. Fast reactors will continue to not be cost-effective at current uranium prices, however the plutonium will become less economic (Am in-growth) while waiting for fast reactors.</p> <p>The government is right not to wait.</p>
Q2	Do you agree that the Government has got to the point where a strategic sift of the options can be taken?
Response	<p>The government is right to make a decision now but care should be taken not to be overly sensitive to the NPT concerns. As the review meeting has prompted this consultation that does not mean the non-proliferation criteria should be the most heavily weighted.</p>
Q3	Are the conditions that a preferred option must in due course meet, the right ones?
Response	<p>The DECC conditions are correct. Although, technical maturity should not count against any option as this can be improved with increased R&D spend. Technical maturity is the result of previous decisions and not necessarily the difficulty of the option.</p> <p>To me, the NDA criterion of 'reversibility' sits at odds with the purpose of this strategy – disposition of the UK plutonium stock. Any decision made should be permanent.</p>
Q4	Is the Government doing the right thing by taking a preliminary policy view and setting out a strategic direction in this area now?
Response	<p>Yes. A focused effort will produce better results quicker.</p> <p>Does this mean other options will be allowed to atrophy? At what</p>

	point will options be firmly ruled out?
Q5	Is there any other evidence government should consider in coming to a preliminary view?
Response	Care should be taken when buying 'off the shelf' processes. CF experience with the vitrification plants.
Q6	Has the Government selected the right preliminary view?
Response	Yes. The idea of using what you can and immobilising the rest has always been considered the most practical.
Q7	Are there any other high level options that the Government should consider for long-term management of plutonium?
Response	<p>Has the government considered a purpose built MOX power station? The land adjacent to the Sellafield site (most likely place for a MOX fabrication facility) has approval for new build and the benefits of an integrated fuel supply chain may outweigh initial costs. The plant would be billed as a 'plutonium disposal facility' and the electricity generated could be sold as a bonus.</p> <p>Cement should not be considered again for plutonium disposition. It is not a sensible option.</p>