

**MINUTES OF COMMITTEE ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT (CORWM) PLENARY
16TH SEPTEMBER 2015, EDINBURGH**

Venue: Novotel Edinburgh City Centre, 80 Lauriston Place, Edinburgh, EH3 9DE

Timing: Wednesday 16th September 2015, 10.00am – 16.00pm

Attendees: Laurence Williams (Chair), Francis Livens (Deputy Chair), Brian Clark, Helen Peters, Stephen Newson, Simon Harley, Paul Davis, Lynda Warren, Janet Wilson, Mojisola Olutade (Secretariat), Hollie Ashworth (Secretariat),

Apologies: Gregg Butler, John Rennilson, Dharshana Sridhar (Secretariat)

Agenda Item 1: Meeting Open and Welcome

1. Chair opened the meeting and welcomed members of the public. He explained the protocol, which allows members of the public to ask questions at the end of the meeting. However, the chair indicated that any member of the observing public could contribute to the ongoing discussion by indicating their interest and he would ask them to make their point.

Agenda Item 2: Declarations of Interest

2. Helen Peters informed the Committee that she has received new instruction from NDA involving advice on confidential work on licensing. However this does not involve the stake of CoRWM.
3. Janet Wilson informed the Committee that as at 1st October 2015, she would be leaving Horizon, but will be an adviser to Horizon for the next 6 months.
4. The Chair noted these declarations and stated that if Janet was no longer an executive on Horizon, she could contribute to Welsh matters on a case by case basis, noting that she has been excluded prior to this development.

Agenda Item 3: Chair's Update

5. Meetings: The Chair reported that he had attended a number of meetings since the last plenary meeting in Cardiff.
 - a) 29th June & 4th August - he attended the CoRWM Triennial Review meeting - the Chair indicated that CoRWM was an NDPB and as such was subject to review every 3 years to test for the continued need for its form & function;
 - b) 2nd July - he attended the Geological Disposal Programme Board;
 - c) 8th July - he met with the new Director of the Office of Nuclear Development at DECC;
 - d) 21st July - he met with the Chief Executive of Radioactive Waste Management Limited (RWM). The Chair noted that he had regular meeting with the CE of RWM to keep in touch. At the meeting the Chair raised RWM's response to the CoRWM Triennial Review consultation as he wanted to better understand why RWM had been somewhat negative about the need for CoRWM to continue. The CE responded by indicating that RWM was not

negative and supported CoRWM. Other issues discussed related to the licensing and regulation of a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF), "Letters of Compliance" and waste acceptance criteria; storage strategy, the need for 3 distinct generic Safety Cases and the emerging findings of the triennial review, especially the new terms of reference for CoRWM. The CE invited CoRWM to visit RWM at Harwell for an update on Safety Case work and on RWM organisation development.

- e) 24th August - he attended a meeting with the CoRWM Sponsors. The Sponsors meetings are regular meeting for the chair to report how CoRWM is delivering its work programme and for the Chair to be updated on the views of its Sponsor Ministers. At this meeting the Chair reported that CoRWM:
- i. published its Annual Report for 2014/15;
 - ii. published a report on spent fuel and nuclear materials;
 - iii. responded to the Scottish Consultation and held a follow-up meeting;
 - iv. responded to the Welsh consultation;
 - v. participated in stage 2 of the CoRWM triennial review covering new Terms of Reference, future membership of the Committee and future recruitment needs;
 - vi. continued to scrutinise the Implementing Geological Disposal process especially the work streams on "Communities" and planning;
 - vii. held an open plenary meeting in Cardiff;
 - viii. Chair met with the chief executive of RWM;
 - ix. Member was due to attend an OECD/NEA workshop on GDF regulation and licensing in Helsinki;
 - x. Rebecca Lunn had resigned; and
 - xi. Manchester University had kindly offered to second a PHD student for 6 months to help the CoRWM secretariat.

Agenda Item 4: Progress on the Triennial Review

6. The Chair reported on progress with the CoRWM Triennial Review. He noted that the review team had completed the report and that it was his understanding that the report would be sent to the Cabinet Office and hence any definitive outcome would depend upon the Cabinet Office acceptance. The key points to note from the meeting;
- There is support for the Committee to retain its current makeup of a Chair and 11 members
 - The funding of the Committee and hence the number of working days allocated to Members to deliver the work for the Committee was conditional on the outcome of the Government's Spending Review which should be available in November.
7. The Chair noted that when the budget is known it will be necessary for the Committee to consider the implications for both current and future work programmes. There was a discussion on how the Committee should react if the budget reduction was significant. The Chair noted that he had indicated to the Sponsors that the Committee had made significant efficiency savings of nearly 40% since 2012 without any loss in quality but any further reduction would mean the Committee could not continue to undertake its current levels of activity. The funding reduction could affect the current 2015/16 work programme as well as future work programmes. The Chair felt that a revision of the work plan may be necessary for this year; however it was best to wait on the outcome of the review before making any decisions. He

noted that if the funding reduction was severe it could have implications for the viability of the Committee to function effectively.

8. The sponsor team proposal is to recruit for half of the Committee every 2 years with an assumption to recruit all members once every 4 years. Next round of recruitment will be spring 2016.

Agenda Item 5: Annual Report

9. Francis Livens noted that lessons needs to be learnt from the process of the submission on the last Committees Annual Report. The process seemed rushed and members worked on the draft till last minute even though the Committee was given more time by sponsors. Lynda Warren suggested the Committee should charge a few its members with the task of drafting the Annual Report. The Committee suggested;
 - Producing its Quarterly reports, and recording minutes from subsequent meetings.
 - Quarterly reports to be organised with a structure relating back to the Annual Plan in order to improve compilation for the Annual Report.
 - eBulletin email database currently lost in DECC IT system to be retrieved and a restart on eBulletins, which makes the Committee more visible.

ACTION 1: Hollie is delegated to attend and record minutes for sub group meetings.

ACTION 2: Hollie is delegated with the task of having a live Annual Report which will be updated regularly throughout the year, so members can revert to it.

ACTION 3: June Plenary minutes are approved and should be uploaded on the website

Agenda Item 6: CoRWM response to RWM Consultation and Meeting Observation

10. Simon has been engaged with the RWM Consultation since 09/14. The Committee will provide a response to the 4 questions to arise from the consultation, with the response to be cleared at the next meeting.
11. RWM is holding open meetings across the country and CoRWM members are to attend some meetings in order to scrutinise and report back to the Committee. It was pointed out that there were no meetings in Wales, and another two regions included in the geological mapping.

ACTION 4: Members to send comments to Simon & Paul, who will produce a draft for the Committee to review at the October meeting.

ACTION 5: Secretariat to circulate list of meetings to members including details on the RWM meetings

ACTION 6: Secretariat to send note to RWM on the Committees' observation that none of its open meetings is scheduled in Wales and seek confirmation if the regional meetings will be broadcast on the web.

Agenda Item 7: Members UpdateRWMC-RF Workshop in Finland & Overseas experience on GDF & Licensing Approach in England (HP)

12. Helen noted only one person was present from the UK regulatory bodies. There were no delegate from DECC or ONR, which might be due to financial pressure. While the presentations were good and informative the workshops did not work well, as members of the group were not very participative, probably due to the sensitivity of these issues in their home countries.

Key points noted from the workshop that are relevant to the UK are:

- There is a need to develop confidence and acceptance of a GDF.
- There are lessons to be learned from the structure of the regulator. Radiological safety and environmental regulators are together in Finland with a separate body responsible for licensing. The UK has ONR and EA, which are different agencies for different radiological and nuclear regulations. Is the UK confident that both can work coherently together?
- Each country has regulation unique to itself with reasonable fluidity in the structure.
- The GDF acronym is used in the UK as opposed to GDR – Geological Disposal Repository. The GDF is not an internationally used term.
- Low and intermediate waste is being conditioned together in Hungary. It should be noted that the categorising of the waste might be different in England
- Important to gain early involvement of the regulatory body with the siting process.
- Finland has a construction license granted, possibly without approval of post-closure Safety Case.

13. The Committee noted that the relationship between the regulators is not obvious to the public. It recognises that there are many ways of structuring the regulatory framework and each country with the GD programme, sort out its regulatory framework differently. However, the Committee expressed concerns on the need for a robust regulatory framework which supports and encourages public confidence.

14. Lynda Warren highlights the lack of contact between the EA, ONR and CoRWM, and suggests re-establishing regular updates. Helen Peters noted meetings have been proposed with the EA, but rejected. Further efforts will be made to re-establish this meeting.

ACTION 7: Slides & notes from Workshop in Finland will be circulated by Helen.

ACTION 8: Secretariat to chase up for a follow up meeting with ONR, proposing they set up the agenda.

ACTION 9: Secretariat to approach the EA, SEPA, NRW and get them along for a meeting with the relevant sub group

ACTION 10: Secretariat to arrange meeting with Richard Savage (CEO – ONR) and chair of CoRWM

Welsh Government Updates (LYW)

15. The Committee has put in a response to the recent Welsh consultation. The Committee expressed concern on issues around the use of the Welsh language and direct translations from an English developed policy. The Welsh sub group will meet with Welsh officials to express their concerns and respond to the Welsh government proposal on how the community engagement will work in Wales.

Scottish Government Updates (SH)

16. Scottish Programme Board had its last meeting in September and has been disbanded. The board has taken into account comments from industries and regulators. The board will publish its report in November 2015.
17. CoRWM has put in a response to the Scottish consultation. Comments from CoRWM are well received but CoRWM have not yet been officially asked to help Scottish Government with their response. The Committee will review its work plan in 2016/17, on how much time it would spend on Scottish government policy/strategy on geological disposal.
18. NDA is now looking to aid implementation of Scottish policy.
19. RWM currently does not deal with near surface disposal, only deep geological disposal and this raises the question on who will implement Scottish policy. CoRWM is unfamiliar with whether conditioning methods for deep or near surface disposal are different, and question the definition of 'near'.

ACTION 11: Scottish sub group should continue to have meetings with the Scottish government as the Committee has interest in the government's proposal for a near surface disposal and the issues surrounding it.

CRWG Update (BC)

20. The Committee highlighted that the key issue which dominated the White paper and consultation that is the definition of the word 'community' has not been well addressed. The question also remains over who the initial contact will be, and how RWM will establish official contact particularly in the case of individuals. The Committee however noted that it has been agreed that the community body should be 'all inclusive' in terms of age, industry figures, public and local authorities, regulatory bodies, with a 'neutral' chair.
21. The Committee discussed the terms of the Right of Withdrawal, and if RWM should hold this right. It highlighted the need for communities that come forward to trust that they do truly have the right to withdraw. There should also be robust process in place, such as mediation to try to resolve the issues triggering withdrawal.
22. The Committee is aware that volunteerism prior to 2017 will not be taken up by RWM, regardless of active interest in being a host community. Should a community come forward now, RWM will speak to them but will not accept an expression of interest

Updates on Safety Case (PD)

23. RWM still need to identify some research requirements.
24. CoRWM has been evaluating the Safety Case since 2010 and notes that Safety Cases should be integrated with the siting process. Currently RWM is designing one generic Safety Case for fractured hard rock (FHR), and the Committee is concerned that one generic Safety Case would probably not be fit for purpose or for research needs. CoRWM thinks multiple generic Safety Cases should be designed – one for each of the three rock types most commonly found in the UK (fractured hard rock, clay and salt).
25. A recommendation was made in CoRWM's Annual Report regarding the benefits of designing three generic Safety Cases. CoRWM feels this is so significant that there would be grounds to escalate this proposal to NDA or ministers following further inaction. Meeting is planned for November with RWM to tease out these issues.

ACTION 12: Meeting proposed for November 18th with RWM will address how the Safety Case can feed into the mapping and siting processes and how RWM proposes to evolve from developing GDF policy through to implementation.

Agenda Item 8: Questions and Answer Session

26. The member of the public who had observed the plenary meeting suggested the Committee be proactive and decide on what level of budget would be unacceptable in order for it to function well.
27. The Chair thanked him, and stated that the committee has clarified its position with the sponsoring department and any significant reduction in the Committee's budget below the current 280k provision will be unacceptable to the Committee and it would reconsider how it can deliver its work programme

Action no.	Action	Progress
<i>5th February 2015 (Minutes: CoRWM Doc 3204)</i>		
02/2015/002	Secretariat to follow up on arranging the meeting with MOD radioactive waste management team	In progress