

**Regulatory Interface Management (RIM) Group Meeting**  
**30 January 2009 (Warrington)**  
**Minutes**

**Attendees:**

Nuclear Decommissioning Authority Radioactive Waste Management Directorate  
(NDA RWMD, Chair & Secretary)  
Department for Transport (DfT)  
Environment Agency (EA)  
Health and Safety Executive (HSE)  
Local Government Association Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum (NuLeAF)  
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)

**Observer:**

Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC)

**Apologies:**

Communities and Local Government (CLG)  
Planning Inspectorate (see agenda item 2 below)

**1. Introduction and opening remarks**

The Chair welcomed the attendees, and provided an update on progress in the Government's Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) programme: Government had received 'without commitment' expressions of interest in participating in the process from Copeland Borough Council and Allerdale Borough Council, and also from Cumbria County Council in respect of those areas. It was also noted that although Cornwall County Council had decided not to express an interest, a small number of councillors had mounted an unsuccessful challenge to that decision.

**2. Minutes and actions from the previous meeting (3 October 2008) and the additional ad hoc meeting to discuss NDA's Permissions Schedule, generic assessment & staged regulation (14 November 2008)**

The version of the minutes of the previous meeting (3 October 2008) placed on NDA's website on 27 November 2008 was accepted as a true record.

Previously-distributed draft minutes of the additional ad hoc meeting to discuss NDA's Permissions Schedule, generic assessment & staged regulation (14 November 2008) were accepted as a true record subject to a minor clarification (the meetings of the RIM Group would provide a mechanism for the sharing of regulatory advice, rather than the formal route for the provision of summary regulatory advice).

**Action RIM2009/1: RIM Group Secretary to amend and reissue the minutes of the additional ad hoc meeting to discuss NDA's Permissions Schedule, generic assessment & staged regulation (14 November 2008).**

The Secretary reported that the Planning Inspectorate had decided that it was not appropriate for it to enter into a scrutiny agreement with NDA. It had been viewed that giving advice on policy and procedures, especially on environmental statements, at an early stage in the process could be seen to jeopardise the Planning Inspectorate's appellate role should a subsequent appeal in respect of an NDA proposal fall to be determined by the Inspectorate. Given this decision, the Planning Inspectorate had decided to withdraw from membership of the RIM Group. The Planning Inspectorate had advised that contact should instead be made with the Government's Planning Advisory Service.

**Action RIM2009/2: RIM Group Secretary to discuss the possibilities for future engagement with the Planning Advisory Service.**

It was noted that the relevant sections within Defra and BERR that had previously attended RIM Group meetings in an observer role had both been transferred into the new Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC).

**Action RIM2009/3: RIM Group Secretary to amend and reissue the RIM Group Terms of Reference to reflect recent changes in membership.**

30 January 2008

**RIM2008/1** NDA to provide when finalised a new organisational chart for geological disposal implementation - **ongoing**.

13 June 2008

**RIM2008/20** NDA to provide RIM Group members with a paper for comment containing initial proposals for shadow SLC working arrangements for NDA RWMD - **complete**.

**RIM2008/22** NDA to liaise with EA in relation to extending the scope of its management prospectus to include environmental management arrangements - **complete**. A meeting between NDA and EA had been held on 5 November 2008.

**RIM2008/25** NDA to create and maintain an up-to-date table of ongoing and future consultations relevant to the RIM Group - **closed**. Prior to the meeting, it had been agreed that DECC would maintain on its website the list of MRWS-related consultations as part of an overall list of nuclear-related consultations.

**RIM2008/26** RIM Group members to provide the RIM Group Secretary with suggestions for additions to the table of relevant consultations - **closed**. Future suggestions are to be provided to DECC. DECC advised NDA RWMD that its proposed consultation on mechanisms for updating the baseline inventory should not proceed at that time, as DECC wished to consider whether this area of work should be carried out by Government rather than NDA.

**Action RIM2009/4: RIM Group Secretary to distribute to the RIM Group contact details in DECC for MRWS-related consultations to be added to its website.**

13 August 2008

- SRIM2008/3** NDA to amend its proposal for RIM Group involvement in the update to the PIP - **superseded**. Revised proposals were presented at agenda item 3 below.
- SRIM2008/4** RIM Group members to provide the RIM Group Secretary with comments on NDA's PIP assumptions paper - **complete**. NuLeAF had provided comments on 15 September 2008.
- SRIM2008/5** NDA to develop a draft version of the PIP consistent with the MRWS White Paper and with appropriate context, and distribute to RIM Group members for comment - **superseded**. Revised proposals were presented at agenda item 3 below.

3 October 2008

- RIM2008/30** RIM Group members to consider responding to NDA RWMD's consultations on its PSE Strategy, its Framework for Sustainability & Environmental Assessment and its R&D Strategy - **complete**.
- RIM2008/31** RIM Group Secretary to arrange for the agreed minutes of the 13 June and 13 August meetings to be placed on NDA's website - **complete**.
- RIM2008/32** RIM Group Secretary to distribute the adopted Terms of Reference - **complete**.
- RIM2008/33** RIM Group members to provide the RIM Group Secretary with comments on the specification for NDA RWMD's Safety & Environmental Management Prospectus by the end of October 2008 - **complete**. Comments had been received from EA (3 November 2008) and HSE (13 November 2008).
- RIM2008/34** RIM Group members to provide the RIM Group Secretary with comments on NDA's proposals for a generic assessment process for geological disposal by the end of October 2008 - **complete**. Comments had been received from EA (7 November 2008).
- RIM2008/35** RIM Group Secretary to add 'Cumbria Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF) hearing sessions' to the agenda for discussion at the next RIM Group meeting - **complete**.
- RIM2008/36** RIM Group Secretary to confirm the date and venue of the next meeting - **complete**.

14 November 2008

- ARIM2008/1** EA and HSE to consider establishing a joint regulators' geological disposal website that would contain among other things regulatory advice provided to the delivery organisation - **ongoing**.
- ARIM2008/2** RIM Group Secretary to report to the next full RIM Group meeting that EA and HSE had agreed to proceed with NDA RWMD in the development of the proposed generic assessment process - **complete**. Reported at item 5 below.

**ARIM2008/3** EA and NDA to arrange a meeting in early December 2008 to discuss further proposals for staged regulation and regulatory interactions during the MRWS process - **complete**.

**ARIM2008/4** NDA to provide HSE with an initial view on the extent of regulatory advice likely to be sought during 2009/10 - **complete**.

**3. NDA RWMD's Provisional Implementation Plan (PIP) for geological disposal – an update**

NDA RWMD outlined to the group its proposals for developing the PIP for geological disposal. It was explained that the PIP was not the basis for Government funding decisions; instead the PIP set out a funded scenario based on certain assumptions and exclusions to be used for NDA's planning and internal costing purposes only. The PIP set out an estimate of the lifetime cost for geological disposal: the elements of NDA's Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) bid relating to geological disposal would be based on costings from the PIP, as would NDA RWMD's business plan for geological disposal. NDA RWMD's plan would need to be descriptive and high-level rather than fixed to a timeline due to current uncertainties in the timescales for the stages in the MRWS site assessment process. Although it was not anticipated that any 'cliff-edge' effects would result as a consequence of decision-making within the MRWS process, it was agreed that flexibility would need to be retained within NDA RWMD's planning work. It had been recognised that there was a need to align the waste emplacement assumptions within NDA's site licence companies (SLCs)' lifetime plans (LTPs) with the emplacement dates in NDA RWMD's PIP, which commenced at 2040 (for planning purposes only). It was intended that the assumptions in the PIP would be refined as the MRWS programme, and work on interim storage, progressed. NDA RWMD intended to produce in due course for stakeholders an explanatory document entitled 'Planning for Geological Disposal'.

**Action RIM2009/5: NDA RWMD to share outputs of its planning work with the RIM Group.**

The Group discussed how the PIP fitted within the totality of NDA's decommissioning programme, including storage. It was explained that NDA's strategy was being developed on a scenario-based approach. Although much of this was outside the scope of the RIM Group and NDA RWMD's remit, there would need to be effective links between NDA RWMD's work and NDA's strategic co-ordinating role. EA and HSE explained that the recently re-issued 'Joint Guidance' covered the regulation of storage, and that SLCs were encouraged to consider the lifetimes of their stores, and to have contingency planning in place to cover any strategic change of direction. NuLeAF suggested that there also needed to be an effective interface with the land-use planning system, as planning permission for certain stores was time-limited.

#### 4. Development of RWMD into a “Prospective SLC”

NDA RWMD presented proposals for the future development of the organisation, indicating that it was aiming to complete by the end of March 2009 its plan for implementing the steps needed for the transition by December 2009 to ‘prospective SLC’ status. NDA RWMD set out several proposed criteria against which achievement of that status could be judged objectively. NDA RWMD intended to formally issue finalised proposals forming the basis for its organisational transition work. NDA RWMD recognised that its transition to ‘prospective SLC’ status would not represent a significant change in practice, as many of the organisational developments had already or were already occurring. An example of this was the proposed transfer into NDA RWMD on 1 April 2009 of the Repository Safety & Environment team which currently reported into NDA’s Assurance Division. No cost implications were anticipated from this change. The transition to ‘prospective SLC’ status would formalise organisational developments such as this ahead of the creation of a subsidiary.

NDA RWMD explained it had looked at the earliest possible date for the evolution of NDA RWMD into a subsidiary of NDA; if necessary it could also consider what might be the latest possible date, recognising that there were links to the permitting process, and this in turn would be dependent on progress in the MRWS process. For these reasons, it would not be possible to be definitive about the exact date for creation of the subsidiary; it would need to be considered carefully after the transition to ‘prospective SLC’ at which time the organisational development project would be reviewed.

NDA RWMD was also intending to issue its Safety & Environmental Management Prospectus (SEMP) for RIM Group comment in late 2009 for finalisation by December 2009. The SEMP was intended to define the core competencies needed to discharge Intelligent Customer and Design Authority responsibilities, and how they would be met (including whether they would need to be provided through permanent employees, or could be delivered through secondees). The SEMP would also set out arrangements to comply with regulatory requirements relating to the management of change (“Licence Condition 36 arrangements”). HSE advised NDA RWMD to liaise with Studsvik, a new nuclear site licensee, on these issues.

**Action RIM2009/6: NDA RWMD to liaise with Studsvik on the practical organisational transition aspects of nuclear site licensing.**

DECC explained that it had not been involved in the discussions on organisational development held most recently. It would need to be convinced of the value of an early move to a subsidiary organisation, and could offer qualified support only which would be subject to consideration of firm proposals with other Government departments. The issues that would need to be resolved were: (i) as the MRWS programme had a long timescale, whether there was any strong need for early changes to organisational status; and (ii) as there already existed a clear degree of separation of NDA RWMD within NDA, whether some of the ‘prospective SLC’ criteria set out in NDA RWMD’s proposals had already been achieved. DECC was particularly concerned about the effect on NDA RWMD staff of a further transfer of employment to another organisation for those who had already transferred into NDA from Nirex. HSE and EA agreed that this was a concern. DECC wanted to know whether the regulators could support NDA RWMD’s organisational development proposals, or had any specific concerns.

HSE suggested that there may be concerns around the public's perception if there were insufficient distinction between the organisation producing waste, and that responsible for disposing of it. It could be seen as inappropriate if these functions were both within NDA. There could be some difficulties in granting a nuclear site licence to NDA should this be proposed, although it was not impossible as NDA was a body corporate and was therefore a potential licensable entity under the Nuclear Installations Act. In summary, HSE was keen to avoid any unnecessary regulatory obstacles, and for early progress to be made, and was therefore happy to support the proposals.

EA said that it had been looking for an indication of commitment to organisational separation, and was working on the principle that the organisation would need sufficient integrity to be regulated, and to be established sufficiently early prior to submitting any application for an environmental permit. EA wished to audit the organisation's progress in its transition. It did not believe that there was currently a high degree of separation between NDA and NDA RWMD, and felt perception was important as had been highlighted in the most recent House of Lords Select Committee report on radioactive waste management. Nor was EA convinced on the extent of the role that secondees could play in the new organisation. EA felt that the subsidiary would need to consider carefully its 'fitness for purpose', and whether it was appropriate for certain functions such as IT to be provided to the subsidiary by NDA. Overall though it was content with the proposals as it felt that NDA RWMD was moving in the right direction.

DfT was content with the proposals.

NDA RWMD agreed with regulators that planning work for the establishment of the subsidiary organisation could be started ahead of December 2009 if necessary.

NuLeAF suggested that RWMD was not an appropriate name for the prospective SLC, as the name implied responsibility for the entirety of radioactive waste management issues, which would not be the case. NuLeAF agreed that it was also necessary for the implementation organisation to be a 'regulatable' entity for land-use planning purposes. It also suggested that there should be an additional criterion for meeting 'prospective SLC' status relating to effective community engagement, as the organisation needed to be able to respond to information requests from the community.

**Action RIM2009/7: NDA RWMD to amend its proposals for organisational development to include a criterion relating to effective community engagement.**

The next step would be to reach agreement on NDA RWMD's proposals at the forthcoming meeting of the Government's Waste Management Steering Group.

**Action RIM2009/8: NDA RWMD to distribute a diagram illustrating NDA RWMD's governance arrangements.**

## 5. Permissions Schedule update

NDA informed the Group of its progress in updating the Permissions Schedule for Geological Disposal. The previous February 2008 draft had been updated to accommodate the publication of the MRWS White Paper; a number of regulatory developments; greater detail on the expected programme of submissions and regulatory assessments; NDA's proposals for a generic assessment process for geological disposal; the possibility of changes to the Radioactive Substances Act 1993 under the Government's Environmental Permitting Programme proposals; EA's proposals for staged regulation of the implementation process commencing at the stage of intrusive surface-based investigations; NDA RWMD's approach to environmental and sustainability assessments when the outcome of its consultation became available; the possibility that the land-use planning permission regime for a geological disposal facility could be replaced in England by the development consent regime for nationally significant infrastructure projects set out in the recent Planning Act; and more detail on the land-use planning permissions required for surface-based investigation work.

NDA explained that it wished to incorporate regulatory views and asked whether other RIM Group members would also wish to review the draft revision. DECC and NuLeAF indicated that they would wish to help.

**Action RIM2009/9: NDA to distribute the draft revised Permissions Schedule for RIM Group comment.**

## 6. Regulatory scrutiny agreements

### EA – NDA

NDA explained that its regulatory scrutiny agreement with EA needed to be updated to include MRWS site assessment work, and scrutiny of NDA RWMD's disposability assessment work for new build wastes. EA had very recently provided NDA with a draft revised agreement for comment.

### SEPA – NDA

SEPA had written to NDA proposing a financial framework agreement to cover SEPA charging for activities such as NDA RWMD scrutiny; fixed-term projects such as the Near-Surface GRA and the Joint Guidance projects; and policy and regulatory advice in support of NDA's decommissioning and site clean-up programme. SEPA's regulation of SLCs was charged for under a separate statutory charging scheme.

### HSE – NDA

HSE explained to the Group that NDA RWMD was being charged by HSE for regulatory advice as a potential applicant for a nuclear site licence under the Health and Safety (Fees) Regulations.

## DfT – NDA

NDA explained to the Group that it had recently discussed with DfT the possibility for a potential agreement to cover DfT scrutiny of NDA RWMD's work. DfT had explained that although it has the power to charge for its work, normally its transport package approval determination work was funded from general taxation, rather than from the applicant. It had not ruled out the possibility that it could enter into an agreement with NDA RWMD but, under current arrangements, additional income through charging for its work would not necessarily result in additional resource being made available to do the work. In order to make a case for providing additional scrutiny resource, DfT would need evidence from NDA RWMD as to the likely extent of scrutiny work that would be needed.

**Action RIM2009/10: NDA to provide DfT with a programme of potential scrutiny work.**

## **7. Progress on NDA RWMD consultations**

### Sustainability Appraisal and Environmental Assessment Strategy for Geological Disposal

NDA RWMD updated the Group on progress on finalising the strategy after internal and external approvals had been obtained. It was explained that an assessment of the geological disposal facility (GDF) 'carbon footprint' would be carried out in support of the strategic environmental assessment (SEA).

### Public and Stakeholder Engagement and Communications Strategy for Geological Disposal

NDA RWMD had accepted a consultee suggestion that there was a need for the delivery organisation to be able to respond to non-technical comments, and this would be addressed in the finalised PSE Strategy, intended to be shared with Government and the RIM Group as a final draft in March 2009. NuLeAF suggested that since it was likely that the first application for a permission in the geological disposal programme would be for planning permission, the PSE Strategy should cover this area too.

EA suggested that the aim to achieve better decision-making would help to build confidence in the project.

NDA RWMD explained that NDA's National Stakeholder Group (NSG) would remain NDA's national forum for communicating with its stakeholders; there was no intention to set up another form of advisory group.

**Action RIM2009/11: NDA RWMD to seek comment from Government and the RIM Group on its final draft PSE Strategy.**

**Action RIM2009/12: RIM Group members to provide comments on NDA RWMD's final draft PSE Strategy.**

### NDA RWMD's R&D Strategy

NuLeAF suggested that the Strategy would benefit from the inclusion of a statement about ensuring Community Siting Partnership (CSP) needs were addressed. NDA RWMD was considering whether this point should be covered in the R&D Strategy or the PSE Strategy, or both.



#### 'A Proposed Framework for Stage 4 of the MRWS Site Selection Process'

NDA RWMD explained that although the document had been published to provide early information to stakeholders on the proposed process, active consultation on this document had not yet started. It was not intended to finalise the process until volunteer communities had been identified and could be involved in its further development.

#### **8. Key Assumptions for the GDF Generic Disposal System Safety Case**

NDA RWMD set out its proposals for how key uncertainties regarding the inventory, geological environments and geological facility (GDF) design were intended to be managed within its work programme. It was explained that co-location of ILW and HLW/spent fuel disposal was being considered, and that the implications of maintaining retrievability of wastes were planned to be assessed. It was reiterated that the assumption had been made that waste producers would be responsible for transport of waste to the GDF, but that this assumption could be subject to change as transport system design work progressed. DECC advised that any 'cliff-edge' effects relating to possible future decisions on the management of waste covered by current Scottish Government Policy would also need to be considered. NuLeAF suggested that differentiation of the implications resulting from disposal of wastes from new nuclear build would be needed, in terms of whether it would all be possible to be included in a single geological disposal facility, and NDA RWMD agreed that it would be possible to do this. DECC stressed the need to avoid prejudging future decisions on the management of spent fuel to maintain flexibility in relation to the management and transport of spent fuel and in particular the location of spent fuel management activities, e.g. encapsulation. NDA RWMD explained that the proposed high-level assessments for the illustrative geologies of lower strength sedimentary rock and evaporates were intended to provide a platform for future more detailed assessments to be carried out as necessary.

#### **9. Recent interactions with CoRWM**

##### NDA

NDA explained that it had received 110 requests from CoRWM to date ranging from the provision of already published material, through requests for meetings to discuss a range of questions, to the production of new reports. The 'single point of contact' etiquette had not been followed in all cases and this had led to complications. Key interactions had been on NDA's national radioactive waste storage review; the Letter of Compliance process; plans for the next stages in the MRWS process; NDA RWMD's framework for sustainability appraisal and environmental assessment; NDA RWMD's R&D Strategy; funding arrangements for geological disposal; and plans for NDA RWMD's Disposal System Safety Case. NDA was encouraging CoRWM to be less ambitious in the extent of work it undertakes in future to reduce the demand on NDA's resources. The relationship between CoRWM and NDA continued to be generally good, with CoRWM providing NDA with valuable feedback.

##### NuLeAF

CoRWM and NuLeAF had discussed potential scrutiny of local arrangements; decision-making in two-tier areas; and benefit packages. The two parties would be meeting at the end of April to discuss CoRWM's geological disposal facility (GDF) report to Government.

## DECC

DECC had discussed several issues with CoRWM including its workload and working arrangements; R&D; and interim storage.

## EA

EA had held meetings with CoRWM on nuclear materials & spent fuel (jointly with HSE); and on interim storage (jointly with SEPA). It was noted that CoRWM had been examining the detail of certain current regulatory issues.

## HSE

HSE's discussions with CoRWM had covered spent fuel; interim storage; and R&D. HSE's perception was that CoRWM had been doing its best to minimise the impact of its information requests on HSE; current HSE resource levels remained tight in this area. HSE felt that CoRWM's meeting reports had been fair and well-written.

## SEPA

SEPA had raised with CoRWM the potential for near-surface disposal of naturally-occurring radioactive material (NORM). This was a significant issue for SEPA who believed it to be currently outside the scope of the Government's LLW Strategy. The issue was expected to become more urgent when sea discharges of these materials cease, but CoRWM deemed it to be outside of its remit.

## DfT

DfT had met with CoRWM in December, and referred the Group to the report of the meeting.

### **10. Cumbria Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF): Generic regulatory and permissioning issues relating to geological disposal emerging from the hearing sessions**

NDA RWMD reported that the two-week hearing had been held in public in Whitehaven in November, and had dealt with radioactive waste issues. NDA and the regulators had provided advice to the hearing inspector. The framework did not include any specific policy requiring Cumbria to have a geological disposal facility for higher activity radioactive wastes, but suggested that volunteer communities should expect planning applications to be sought at appropriate phases in the project. There were many references to the Nirex Rock Characterisation Facility (RCF) inquiry in the mid 1990s, and the issue of gas migration from a facility had been raised. Another point that had been raised in the hearing was the suggestion that any area with nuclear waste should have an appropriate policy for management within its framework.

It was expected that the relevant chapter to geological disposal in the framework would be revised as a result of the hearing, and would remain consistent with the Government's MRWS programme.

### **11. Issues for future discussion at RIM Group meetings**

Several potential issues including uncertainties; risks & opportunities; and NDA RWMD's business planning were discussed.

**Action RIM2009/13: RIM Group members to suggest issues for future discussion to the RIM Group Secretary.**

## **12. Any other business**

### Update on developments in Scotland

SEPA updated the Group on developments in Scotland. SEPA explained that the baseline inventory in the UK Government's MRWS White Paper and in NDA RWMD's PIP contained 'Scottish wastes'. The planning assumption in the LTPs of Scottish sites was that waste emplacement would commence in 2040. The Scottish Government had commenced the preparation of a strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of its emerging policy on the management of higher activity radioactive wastes, and SEPA was assisting in the development of options for this work. This SEA would be prepared under Scottish SEA legislation which is wider in scope than SEA legislation in the rest of the UK, and a consultation would follow in due course. It was not intended to carry out a sustainability appraisal as part of the SEA. It was agreed that the Scottish Government SEA consultation was relevant to the RIM Group's interests, and the SEA would need to consider geological disposal and its implications. SEPA was working on a statement on the emerging Scottish Government policy for its website to clarify the position for stakeholders.

NDA RWMD suggested that a lack of clarity in the proposed statement of Scottish Government policy could create problems in planning for implementation if it results in uncertainty in the volumes of material to be consigned to geological disposal. This will need to be considered further in light of the final policy statement and may result in changes to baseline inventory assumptions and alternative scenarios. It may also necessitate changes to the UK Radioactive Waste Inventory and/or the reporting status of wastes but radical changes to the inventory would require discussion with Government and agreement of DECC.

It was noted in line with the RIM Group's terms of reference and the emerging Scottish Government policy that SEPA attended RIM Group meetings to participate in discussions on issues relating to the packaging of waste (as they relate to long-term interim storage), and in the capacity of observer for other issues.

## **13. Proposed date of next meeting**

It was agreed that the face-to-face discussion had been more productive than the previous videoconference, and the next meeting was agreed to be held in Warrington.

**Action RIM2009/14: RIM Group Secretary to confirm finalised arrangements for the next meeting.**

## Summary of actions

---

RIM2009/1	RIM Group Secretary	Amend and reissue the minutes of the additional ad hoc meeting to discuss NDA's Permissions Schedule, generic assessment & staged regulation (14 November 2008)
RIM2009/2	RIM Group Secretary	Discuss the possibilities for future engagement with the Planning Advisory Service
RIM2009/3	RIM Group Secretary	Amend and reissue the RIM Group Terms of Reference to reflect recent changes in membership
RIM2009/4	RIM Group Secretary	Distribute to the RIM Group contact details in DECC for MRWS-related consultations to be added to its website
RIM2009/5	NDA RWMD	Share outputs of its planning work with the RIM Group
RIM2009/6	NDA RWMD	Liaise with Studsvik on the practical organisational transition aspects of nuclear site licensing
RIM2009/7	NDA RWMD	Amend its proposals for organisational development to include a criterion relating to effective community engagement
RIM2009/8	NDA RWMD	Distribute a diagram illustrating NDA RWMD's governance arrangements
RIM2009/9	NDA	Distribute the draft revised Permissions Schedule for RIM Group comment
RIM2009/10	NDA	Provide DfT with a programme of potential scrutiny work
RIM2009/11	NDA RWMD	Seek comment from Government and the RIM Group on its final draft PSE Strategy
RIM2009/12	RIM Group members	Provide comments on NDA RWMD's final draft PSE Strategy
RIM2009/13	RIM Group members	Suggest issues for future discussion to the RIM Group Secretary
RIM2009/14	RIM Group Secretary	Confirm finalised arrangements for the next meeting

---