

MINUTES OF CORWM MEETING, 8 NOVEMBER, LONDON

Secretariat

Present: (CoRWM): Laurence Williams (Chair), Francis Livens, Brian Clark, John Rennilson, Gregg Butler, Rebecca Lunn, Helen Peters, Janet Wilson, Stephen Newson, Simon Harley, Paul Davis, Lynda Warren, Laura Butchins (secretariat), Sapna Nessa (secretariat).

Declarations of Conflicts of Interest

1. Rebecca Lunn reported that her research group had been successful in receiving an Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) grant under the 'Distinctive' programme on Nuclear decommissioning in partnership the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) and Sellafield Ltd. The research will be to look at hydraulic barriers for inhibiting radionuclide barriers under a contract of £0.5M starting in February 2014.

Chair's Update

2. The Chair had recently chaired an international meeting of the Chairs of advisory committees to governments (NEA ABG meeting) which was attended by Chairs from the US, Sweden, Switzerland, Germany and the NEA representative. He remarked that only a few countries have advisory bodies such as CoRWM. Key themes of the meeting were: the importance of retaining independence, the ability to have an open dialogue with Ministers and the ability to set the agenda for discussions, scientific and technical competency and independence of interests of membership and transparency. The lessons for CoRWM were the need to guard independence, and to ensure transparency so that respect was earned from the public in addition to providing advice to the sponsor Ministers. CoRWM should remain open to answering questions from the public.
3. The Chair had met with Baroness Verma on 24 October 2013. The Minister had thanked him on behalf of the committee for the valued work that the committee had done and challenge that the committee provided. He updated the Minister on the changes that had taken place since the changeover of membership within the committee. The Chair briefed the Minister on the issues that CoRWM had raised in CoRWM's 2012/13 annual report, these including; legacy ponds and silos, waste containers, the Magnox operating plan and implications for the cessation of reprocessing, the radioactive waste inventory and the NDA's research and development board. CoRWM had made comments on how the board could be improved and would be working with the NDA's Head of Strategy and Chair of the board to put these recommendations in place.
4. The Chair had provided the Minister with an overview of CoRWM's 2013/14 work plan and preliminary views on CoRWM's response to GDF siting review consultation. He had set out CoRWM's view of the process highlighting the slight differences to that set out in consultation document and the need to look at the licensing and regulatory framework.
5. The Chair reflected on the meeting between the Radioactive Waste Management Directorate of the NDA and the committee that had taken place on the previous day and said there was a

need to digest what the committee had heard and factor it in to CoRWM's consultation response.

6. The Chair raised the issue of the CoRWM website being not as user friendly as old one. Both CoRWM members and others had raised this as an issue. The website shared the same problem of all gov.uk websites in that there was a limit on the amount of information, which meant that historical records had moved to the national archives and were no longer easily searchable. It was thought that for a committee such as CoRWM, this was unacceptable as it was important to build continuity over years and not months as per other Government programmes.
7. Prior to the transition, the committee had debated the changeover to the gov.uk domain although the committee had had little choice over whether the site would transition as this was the policy for all NPDBs. It was agreed that the Chair would write to the UK Government sponsor minister to explain the committee's frustrations. In addition the secretariat would look into whether there was another way to provide the information without undue pressure on secretariat resource. Members and the secretariat would also look into who else had issues with the gov.uk website and see if the case could be made with others as a stronger voice.

Action 63: Chair to write to the UK Government sponsor minister to explain the committee's frustrations about the website. Members and the secretariat would also look into who else had issues with the gov.uk website and see if the case could be made via a separate collective voice.

Action 64: Secretariat to investigate another way to provide the historical information without undue pressure on secretariat resource.

Action 65: Members and secretariat to look into who else had issues with the gov.uk domain and see if the case could be made with others as a stronger voice.

Members Updates

Scottish Nuclear Sites

8. A member had attended the Scottish Sites meeting which takes place at 6 monthly intervals on 24th October 2013. The group's scope includes socioeconomic and operational issues. At the meeting there had been representation from all the Site Stakeholder Groups, SCORS, MoD, but not SEPA nor ONR which had been disappointing. SEPA were still under resourced with 3 full time members of staff focusing on Dalgety Bay.
9. It was reported that SEPA's terms of reference were to be updated next year although there would be little impact on their nuclear responsibilities. The MoD were likely to publish list of sites for which ILW waste would be sent to in the winter.
10. It was recommended that the committee continue to attend both the Scottish sites and the Scottish Government Chaired Implementation Board to keep abreast of activity. Scottish Government were likely to consult on their Implementation Strategy in 2014.

Action 66: Secretariat to request advanced site of the implementation strategy consultation from Scottish Government.

NDA Stakeholder Event

11. A member of the committee had recently attended the NDA stakeholder event. Issues that had been discussed were the move to care and maintenance for Magnox plants which would no longer have permanent staff once completed. There was still work to be done to address how sites would be monitored once transitioned. Bradwell and Trawsfynydd were being accelerated for care and maintenance sooner than previously planned although some areas remained in which it was not clear how this would be achieved in a compliant way.
12. At the event, Adrian Simper had provided a brief on the changes required to the lifetime plans for Scottish Sites to bring them in line with Scottish Government policy.
13. A movement of ILW from Torness to Hunterston had been discussed. The NDA would be proposing preferred options for ILW interim storage shortly which would look to consolidate ILW across the NDA estate into three groups; Wales, the South West and the South East. The committee briefly discussed consolidation and thought that concept was good generally, but that the process of site selection and engagement with Site Stakeholders and transport would need to be considered. The implications of any consolidation policy should also be considered for any materials that had not yet been designated as waste. This led to a short discussion on waste ownership, i.e. are the owners where waste arises, or where the waste is designated as such? It was suggested that CoRWM consider the NDA's work in the area of waste consolidation in next year's work plan.

Action 66: Secretariat to request slides from NDA Stakeholder Event and distribute to members.

NDA Spent Fuels and Nuclear Materials

14. Two members had met with the NDA on 23 September 2013. The NDA had provided an update on the Magnox operating plan, options for reprocessing and plutonium management. The conversation had been very open and wide ranging.
15. In the afternoon, storage had been discussed. Guidance had been issued to store operations and work was being done to identify how guidance was being followed in practice including at Scottish Sites. An update on the NDA's upstream optionneering programme had also been provided.
16. The meeting had not covered ILW storage planning with GDF timescales and any risks posed from this. It was agreed that this could be something that the committee asked the NDA at a follow on meeting as part of CoRWM's 2014/15 work programme in addition to a meeting with Sellafield Ltd. and site visit. A report of the meeting would be circulated shortly.

CoRWM's Consultation Response

17. CoRWM then discussed the views that they would be putting forward in their response to the GDF Siting Consultation. Members had previously exchanged views on the CoRWM response at the September plenary (document 3135), at a closed meeting in October and by email exchange.
18. The committee agreed to use the wording 'implementing organisation' throughout the response instead of the *delivery body*, *developer* or any other name for the organisation responsible for implementing geological disposal.

19. The Committee then discussed some outstanding issues where they had either developed their thinking, or where there was disagreement with the current draft position.
20. There remained some disagreement amongst members as to whether a referendum was the appropriate instrument to measure community support. The Committee noted that the Ipsos-Mori work had been the subject of some criticism in Cumbria and in any event was based on sampling opinion only amongst 4200 residents of Cumbria. Whilst the majority believed the fairest way to resolve this would be by referendum, a minority of members believed that there was inadequate evidence in support of a referendum. The appropriateness of a referendum at the local scale for an issue of national importance was questioned. In addition, there was little precedent for using referenda in the UK for issues such as this and therefore it was difficult to know if it would be a successful tool. However it was agreed that the principle of "One person-one vote" would be the best approach, and that every adult in the community should have the opportunity to have their view counted.
21. In addition it was agreed that certainty on the method was needed early in the process and that the representative authority of any community would need to be very certain that their decision-making had the backing of the local population. Questions remained over the way that the inclusiveness of the measure of public support would be defined.
22. CoRWM agreed that however community support is established, if the result was against a GDF then this should be binding on the Representative Authority.
23. CoRWM had produced a draft diagram of the way they thought the siting process should be carried out. This was commented on significantly. It was agreed that a diagram would be a vital way of communicating the process. It must be clear that information was being investigated to inform the safety case, and that geological information was only a part of this.
24. It was agreed, within CoRWM's proposed siting process, that the point at which communities could no longer withdraw from the process would be after site characterisation with boreholes. The narrative should make clear what the role of public would be after right of withdrawal, for example in raising and tracking issues.
25. The point at which safety case and socioeconomic reports are produced should be added to diagram.
26. CoRWM discussed the way in which geological information should be provided in the context of the safety case and so that it did not mislead communities in to misinterpreting the models as real data. In particular, any information provided at the launch should not include 3D models which would be misleading, although it was conceded that geology information would almost certainly be requested from communities at an early stage so information would have to be provided. Alongside the geological information, it would be important to provide information on the engineered barriers that may be appropriate for each rock type.
27. On planning, CoRWM agreed that in their consultation response, they would recommend that more information would be needed in any new White Paper setting out what would happen when and in what order regarding planning.
28. CoRWM discussed how any additions to the inventory after planning permissions, permits and licences had been issued. They thought that initially, the applications should be made for the

maximum potential inventory that is supported by the safety case to avoid the need for subsequent applications until much later in the process.

Question and Answer Session

- 29. Members of the public who had observed the meeting were asked if they had any questions for CoRWM.
- 30. Rita Holmes, a member of the Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group remarked that she had also attended the NDA Stakeholder Event and was surprised to hear the CoRWM report that there would be a movement of Tourness to one of their sites in the West. Rita thought that this proposal had been abandoned and would be following this up with the NDA.
- 31. Rita Holmes also thought that the word “developer” should not be used had negative connotations. It was agreed that “implementer” or “delivery body” would be better.
- 32. Stewart Kemp from Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum (NuLeAF) thought that it was important to build on the work that had been carried out in West Cumbria. He thought that a sense of where community is going would need to be considered in any learning phase of the siting process. He added that NuLeAF would also like to see consideration of a national strategy on Higher Activity Waste (HAW) which pulled all the different strands together from both the NDA estate and wider industry. This could be done as part of the initial year of national awareness raising. He stated that he thought CoRWM had a role to scrutinize this national strategy.
- 33. Phil Davis from Sussex University asked for some details of an analysis carried out by Nirex and the British Geological Survey that was referred to in an historical CoRWM doc. 1797. No CoRWM member knew whether the analysis had been carried out at the time and suggested contacting the BGS or RWMD. The CoRWM secretariat agreed to send on Phil Davis’ request to RWMD.

Action 67: CoRWM secretariat to forward Phil Davis question to RWMD.

AOB

- 34. The committee agreed to meet once more to agree the final draft of the document.

CLOSE

Action no.	Action	Progress
2-3 July 2013 (Minutes: CoRWM Doc 3121)		
07/2013/047	Members to ensure that all external meetings, deliverables, work under tasks and items tabled for plenaries were included in the In Year 2013-14 Work Plan and to send any updates to the secretariat.	On going
07/2013/048	Members to submit all future claims with fees allocated under three categories: 1) work and travel for plenaries, 2) work on task groups and 3) other engagement by the 5 th of the following month.	On going

September 2013 (Minutes: CoRWM Doc 3135)		
09/2013/49	Secretariat to arrange meeting with Regulators in November.	On going
09/2013/50	Secretariat to send job description to CoRWM members.	Completed
09/2013/51	Secretariat and those who attended the visit to complete the note of the visit and send around the committee together with the hosts' presentations (also send around RWMD's international review) and safety case.	On going
09/2013/53	secretariat to send both sets of presentation slides on planning and GDF legal obligations to members.	On going
09/2013/54	secretariat to request updated permission schedule from RWMD and circulate to members.	Complete
09/2013/55	secretariat to organise open meeting and publicise on website /send out ebulletin.	Complete
09/2013/56	Secretariat to write up views on timing of consultation events and email them to DECC.	Complete
09/2013/57	Secretariat to ask Swedish authorities how community support had been tested in Sweden.	Compete
09/2013/58	Members to email secretariat with topics to discuss with RWMD.	Complete
09/2013/59	Members to inform secretariat of their availability for meeting with the option of dialling in or attending in person, by 27 September 2013.	Complete
09/2013/60	Members to email any points to raise to the secretariat by 4 October 2013.	Complete
09/2013/61	Members to identify which of DECC's engagement events they can attend as soon as they are available.	Complete
09/2013/62	Members to complete the appraisal template and submit to secretariat by 18 October 2013.	On going
8 November 2013 (Minutes CoRWM doc. 3139)		
11/2013/63	Chair to write to the UK Government sponsor minister to explain the committee's frustrations about the website.	
11/2013/64	Secretariat to investigate another way to provide the historical information without undue pressure on secretariat resource.	
11/2013/65	Members and secretariat to look into who else had issues with the gov.uk domain and see if the case could be made with others as a stronger voice.	
11/2013/66	Secretariat to request advanced site of the implementation strategy consultation from Scottish Government.	
11/2013/67	CoRWM secretariat to forward Phil Davis question to RWMD.	Complete