

## **COMMITTEE ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT (CoRWM) OPEN PLENARY MINUTES**

**Venue:** MWB, 10 Greycoat Place, Victoria, London, SW1P 1SB

**Timing:** Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2015, 10.00am – 16.00pm

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

Apologies: Gregg Butler

### **Agenda Item 1: Meeting Open and Welcome**

1. Chair opened the meeting and welcomed the public attendees. The format of the meeting was explained, and attendees were invited to ask questions at the end of the meeting.

### **Agenda Item 2: Declarations of Interest**

2. Lynda stated that she was no longer a board member of Natural Resources Wales (NRW).
3. Janet stated an imminent change; previously she noted that she had been excluded from commenting on Welsh matters due to working for Horizon Nuclear Power. She reported that she is no longer an Executive of Horizon and she is retained as an advisor until she leaves in March 2016.
4. The Chair noted the change of position and indicated that as Janet is no longer a decision maker at Horizon she could now contribute to Committee discussions on Welsh matters.
5. All other members stated no change.

### **Agenda Item 3: Chair's Update**

6. The Chair reported that he had not attended any meetings with officials or Ministers since the last CoRWM plenary meeting.

7. He highlighted the recent Triennial Review Report that he has seen. The report is still to be approved by the Cabinet Office, and so he could not disclose the conclusions publically. He did however draw attention to some changes the Cabinet office proposed via DECC to the Committee Member's Code of Practice, in Annex E.
  - Paragraph 1: it was noted that CoRWM was not a scientific advisory body, but CoRWM's code of conduct does comply with those codes. All members accepted this.
  - Paragraph 22: when handling conflicts of interest, members should make Ministers aware of future appointments and whether conflicts may arise. Members are not to use information obtained through CoRWM confidential work. The Committee accepted the change.
  - Paragraphs 25 & 26: Laurence reinforced that if members feel something is going wrong with the Committee, there are safeguarding channels through the Department. The Committee agreed the change.
  - Laurence will relay that the Committee is content with the suggested changes.

#### **Agenda Item 4: Formal Approval of Minutes**

8. The minutes of the Edinburgh plenary meeting were not approved. Members are to send amendments to minutes to Moji, and they will be approved at the next open meeting.

**ACTION 1: Members to send their comments on the minutes of the Edinburgh Plenary Meeting to Moji by end of November.**

**ACTION 2: Secretariat to ensure the agreement of the Edinburgh minutes are put on the agenda of the next open Plenary Meeting.**

#### **Agenda Item 5: Members' Updates**

CoRWM Response to National Geological Screening (NGS) Guidance Consultation – Simon Harley

9. Simon discussed the questions and CoRWM's responses to the consultation. He highlighted CoRWM's advice to include positive attributes that contribute to safety of a GDF in the screening guidance i.e. discussion of surrounding rock type. He also reiterated that CoRWM felt that the screening process would be greatly improved by a trial output i.e. maps and narratives for one area, how the information would be used, and the conclusions that could be drawn. It was noted that this was previously suggested in 2014 also. This would allow BGS and RWM to obtain feedback from

the public and gauge what was understood from the outputs. It would also demonstrate the uncertainty that will arise from the screening process.

10. Francis noted this is important in order to be able to manage the expectations of the public. A way to do this would be to have the worked example prior to the main outputs so that people are less concerned with their own situation.
11. The Chair noted the wording just says 'trial' outputs, and suggests explaining this more fully in the CoRWM response.
12. It was suggested that this could also be raised in the upcoming RWM meeting (18<sup>th</sup> November). If RWM agrees, it would be useful if BGS could put a test output together soon, as there is concern that the 6-month period available once screening is finished would be too short to conduct a successful trial.
13. Francis suggested it is likely that someone in BGS will have a good idea of the form of the outputs and so thinks a trial would be possible.
14. Simon noted CoRWM agreed that the proposed outputs were consistent with the intent of the White Paper, but not all should be treated with equivalent status in terms of relevance to safety i.e. seismicity in UK is not a real concern. It was noted that as an example groundwater, and seismic activity at the proposed depth of a GDF was not always important. Simon thought it was important for there to be some visual representations of geological uncertainty.
15. Paul suggested that different experts could create different outputs from the same data to assess public interpretation and understanding. Simon thought that this would be possible with the expertise that BGS has access to. Janet thought this could allow the public to form a 'right' and 'wrong' scenario, and make people think some bias is included in the outputs, dependent on which expert had formed them.
16. Francis noted the importance of communicating that a number of different outputs exist, but highlighting the question of whether the little differences are either important and/or relevant to the safety. He related this point back to fracking. Some companies have drilled experimental holes for fracking but then decided not to proceed further, and Francis felt that this could be used to illustrate the impact of geological uncertainty.
17. Simon noted it was important to make the distinction to the public that this is not the siting process, and just an assessment of the geology.
18. The Chair questioned whether RWM understands how to effectively communicate uncertainty. He also questioned whether RWM was listening to scrutiny from the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) and Paul's suggestions regarding screening

outputs. Simon noted that peoples' interpretations of the outputs cannot be pre-judged. The Chair noted he looked forward to engaging with RWM on this issue.

19. The Chair invited Andrew Craze (RWM), who was attending as a member of the public, to comment if he wished. Andrew stated that RWM was listening to feedback regarding the importance of highlighting uncertainty, and that it was a difficult challenge to produce this on a national scale.
20. Janet noted that members of the public are not necessarily used to uncertainty (from her experience in the Cumbrian GDF siting process), and therefore when they hear uncertainty they consider it as a negative response indicating that an expert does not know, or is simply lying. She conveyed that the public does not like it when experts do not give a definite answer. Francis stated that it was important for experts to account for uncertainty within their own responses.
21. Helen thought that BGS's 3D geological modelling video available on their website was an example of an effective way to provide a narrative to explain uncertainty particularly in relation to the development of the 3D model demonstrated by RWM at the recent screening events. There is no best way to explain this and a combination of approaches should be considered; text, visual and audio.

**ACTION 3: Simon is to expand what CoRWM mean by 'trial' outputs.**

22. Following this slight amendment, all members expressed their approval of the CoRWM response.

Natural Resources Wales Board Meeting 9<sup>th</sup> October, Cwmbran, Wales – Stephen Newson

23. Stephen said an explanation of the role of the board was given, and how it is accountable to Welsh Government. He restated that Lynda is a member of the board. He praised the way that complex issues had been presented, and that classification of the issues as red, amber and green was effective, with a focus centred on red issues. He noted the board faced a wide spectrum of issues.
24. Senior officials of NRW presented position papers to the board covering a range of topics such as developments of flood defences, and the state of reservoirs. He noted that NRW plays a dual role at times where it is both the owner and the regulator.
25. There was presentation on NRW roles and regulation, which included nuclear and non-nuclear regulation in Wales. The aim was to give Board Members background in radioactive substance regulation, international waste shipments, and incident and emergency procedures. It was noted that NRW retains responsibility for regulation.

26. Stephen noted a key part of the paper related to the new nuclear build programme at Wylfa in Anglesey. Issues connected to this discussed were the timeline for application process, the risks, and the expertise required. The meeting with CoRWM, regarding the resources required for this project was noted; there is competition between the new build programme and the regulatory side in recruiting a small pool of high-level expertise. Aspects of funding were covered and how potential operators pay for regulation; non-nuclear radioactive substances, had work paid for by application whereas nuclear costs are covered using cost recovery agreements with companies from the planning stages onwards. Policy funded through granting aid unless related to delivery of service.
27. The Chair asked whether GDF siting in Wales was discussed. Stephen confirmed it was discussed along with its implications. Stephen confirmed that NRW are aware that they could be involved in some regulation in future. Janet noted that work by the EA is reimbursed by industry, but was unsure if the same procedure was in place for NRW. Lynda stated that NRW can charge for work relating to regulation or a specific request from industry but cannot put charges to industry for general work on radioactive waste management, and that the Chief Executive of NRW feels that allocation of sufficient resources to this area of work could be a key difficulty going forward. Potential cuts to EA could question the availability of future support to NRW from EA. Members asked if the service arrangements between EA and NRW meant there were potential implications for influencing and shaping from EA and emphasised the need for the NRW to remain an intelligent customer of the services.
28. The Chair questioned whether NRW is involved in the review of implementing geological disposal. Brian indicated his impression was that Wales is largely dependent on advice from outside the country. Stephen stated that he had not picked up any Welsh idea to be different from England.
29. Francis expressed uncertainty over how regulators could support a potential volunteer community or communities in Wales. Lynda did concede that NRW might be caught unaware, but that it aims to support discussions with communities. The Chair felt it is important for NRW to be part of the work stream for GDF regulation. Lynda indicated that it could be useful to send a note of this discussion back to NRW, as the staff would be appreciative.

#### Community Engagement – Brian Clark

30. Brian noted he and John will attend a meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> November with DECC and RWM to discuss what is happening with community engagement. He hopes this meeting will give a better indication of their strategies for community engagement. The Chair expressed a wish to have a brief on that meeting, in time for his meeting with sponsors, and the geological disposal programme board (GDPB).

31. Brian stated his belief that RWM is now taking education, awareness, and societal aspects involving ethical engagement with a community very seriously. He felt that a significant amount of effort is being focused on strategies for communication.

Scottish Policy: Responses to the Consultation on an Implementation Strategy for Scotland's Policy on Higher Activity Radioactive Waste – John Rennilson

32. John advised that all responses to the consultation were published on the Scottish Government's website; there were 24 responses, 2 with names redacted. He noted a response from Stirling, which has no nuclear facility in the council area, and listed other responses from a number of organisations such as RWM.
33. People remain concerned that the policy does not address all the waste arisings that require disposal and in particular those wastes that are not suitable for near surface disposal.
34. Other responses covered the availability of supply chain skills; there was a concern that the attraction of new build in England may remove people from decommissioning work in Scotland.
35. CoRWM was criticised by one respondent because a letter to Dounreay from the Chair did not appear on the CoRWM website for some months. This raised the issue again that the CoRWM website along with the Committee's activities and publications need to be more publicly visible.
36. One main criticism in the responses was that the 'Implementation Strategy' has taken so long to develop, with little that is new.
37. In relation to the conditioning of radioactive waste for disposal in Scottish facilities, the Chair noted it would be preferable to move away from Letters of Compliance (LoCs) to some form of 'waste acceptance criteria' that reflected the difference between near surface and deep geological disposal.
38. Francis noted that Scottish Government is aware of the necessity of defining what is meant by 'near-surface'.
39. John had been advised by Scottish Government officials that an analysis of the responses was likely to be available on the SG website in the week following the meeting and he undertook to look at the analysis and report back as appropriate.

**ACTION 4: Follow up arrangements for the Chair to meet with the Scottish Minister.**

CoRWM Observations of RWM Public Consultation on NGS Guidance

40. Three Members had observed RWM Public Consultation Meetings and presented their observations (Stephen, Bristol, 14<sup>th</sup> October; Brian, Carlisle, 20<sup>th</sup> October; Paul, Leeds, 21<sup>st</sup> October).

Bristol 14<sup>th</sup> October - Stephen Newson

41. Stephen discussed the format of the session and noted 18/19 attendees were not associated with RWM. He was introduced as a member of CoRWM, and representatives from EA and NRW were also introduced. It was a 4-hour programme including;

- 45 min presentation on the consultation document with some background technical information
- Demonstrations of geological features of porosity and permeability with biscuits;
- 3D model video of geology of England and Wales;
- Small group discussions to formulate answers to the 3 consultation document questions with 1h to report back.

42. Stephen noted the content of the presentation included a wide range of topics including;

- Surface geology
- Models and interpretation
- Volumes of waste
- Illustrations of what deep disposal means, the depths involved with comparison to the depth of the London Underground.
- The search for a suitable site, and that this requires a willing host community.
- A description of safety, with the point made that there is no 'best' geology, only suitable geologies dependent on the viability of a long-term safety case.
- A description of the involved bodies and roles.
- What the consultation document was about, the approach, and how the geological assessment was being done through 13 areas classified by BGS.

43. Stephen observed one group discussion and relayed the following observations. One attendee observed that many attendees were from older generations, and that there was a significant need for more involvement of younger generations. Questions were raised as to how the community get independent information in a form they understand, with a potential role for 'retired' experts. Attendees noted that there was a big emphasis that this is not screening in or out areas, so why has the process been called screening. Some attendees wanted to know what happened to the information collected from previous screening exercises, asking whether it was still relevant, and whether it would be used, but RWM stated it would not be included.

44. Stephen noted that many discussions were distracted from the focus of the meeting and suggested that the meetings could work on the basis that attendees have read the consultation prior to the meeting. This would have allowed a tighter focus on discussion of the questions as opposed to the consultation document itself.
45. Two district councillors and a parish councillor did not understand the aim of the meeting.
46. Overall, Stephen felt there was a lack of focus, and suggested that a professional facilitator would have been useful to keep the meeting on track. The Chair interpreted from Stephen's observations that perhaps the purpose of the exercise was a bit lost and needed more clarification.

Leeds 21<sup>st</sup> October – Paul Davis

47. Attendees included only 8 members of the public.. The meeting was too imbalanced with an overwhelming number of RWM attendees compared to the public.
48. Those who were members of the public did not understand the context of the meeting, and were asking questions outside the remit of the meeting such as questioning the viability of geological disposal itself.
49. Paul noted there was a feeling of misinterpretation; the public appeared to be expecting engagement with a siting process, whereas RWM was trying to consult on the guidance they were to give BGS in producing outputs.
50. Paul felt that one of the main problems was with communication from RWM. He noted that interesting geology was spoken about but it was not conveyed that this would be bad geology for a GDF site, and felt that the public had been given the opposite impression. Visually 'nice' pictures did not agree with the message of appropriate geology for GDF.
51. There was a demonstration of three types of rocks, but the demonstration of permeability and porosity was not relevant to the rock characteristics. Paul thought that the public took most importance from the permeability demonstration, but this should not have been the main message. Paul felt that these demonstrations needed to be rethought and made relevant to the appropriate rock types for a GDF.
52. Paul expressed that the 3D model flyover of the country was not useful, and the presentation of it was not tailored to the audience. For instance, there was lack of clarity on terms used. A lot of the geology terms used were too technical. The diameter of boreholes was also misrepresented, leaving people with the wrong idea.



Paul noted that a Swedish public meeting had had a flyover of real rock and real terrain, down into a real repository rather than through a cartoon representation.

53. The presenter did not address what the 3D model would be used for. Paul felt it would have been more appropriate to demonstrate an example output, and obtain feedback from the public as to whether it was appropriate. Also, there was no link back to useful geology from the model.
54. One attendee noted that this all needed putting in the context of Safety Case.
55. Members were concerned that an RWM representative at the presentation is quoted as saying that depth was not important, as glaciation erosion could erode down to that level, and a site would not be chosen because it had no water, as glaciation could change that.
56. Groups wanted outputs to be in a simple colour coded system of red, yellow and green sites. Certain environments were highlighted in the document as red.
57. Paul did not share Stephen's view that the meeting needed more focus. He felt it was the first engagement of RWM with the public as 'the developer', and therefore thought it was suitable for any questions to be directed at RWM.

Carlisle 20<sup>th</sup> October – Brian Clark

58. Brian noted 42 participants, 11 of whom were from RWM. For the group discussion part there were 5 groups, and each group included 2 RWM representatives, some of whom made significant inputs.
59. Brian noted the format was the same as the other events but within a much shorter time period as it was an evening meeting. Also, the acoustics were bad and many complained that they could not hear, and food was timed poorly, just at the beginning of the presentation. He said these factors contributed to a lack of professionalism.
60. The first presentation was excellent, but too long and Brian suggested that upon email confirmation of attendance at the meeting, participants should be directed to read the consultation document prior to the date.
61. It was suggested that RWM needed to target their meeting to the expected audience. Attendees at the Carlisle meeting were knowledgeable due to the area having been involved with GDF siting previously.
62. The 3D video did not complement points made in the presentation.

63. He noted that the majority of the questions came from one person and felt that the meeting needed stronger facilitation to allow other input.
64. The RWM Chief Geologist was probed for previously advocating a clay environment as the preferred geology for a GDF, having now changed to advocate 3 rock types.
65. The amount of time left for discussion of the 3 questions was only 20 minutes, which was far too short. Outputs from the discussion group demonstrated a lack of trust towards RWM and the technical information. Some felt that there was not enough information in order to be content with the process. Attendees did not comprehend the aim of the meeting, and there was no proper conclusion.
66. Overall he felt the meeting was far too short, with an overload of information, there was confusion between the screening exercise, and geological information required at siting. Safety was only mentioned late on. Brian expressed concern that RWM need to get their public perception right, and suggested that stronger management of the meetings was needed, with more thought on how they would come across.
67. The Chair suggested that CoRWM might give DECC and RWM informal advice on their observations of the public meetings.
68. The Chair invited Andrew Craze (RWM) who was in the audience to comment on Member's observations. Andrew suggested it was better to be discussed at the next meeting between CoRWM and RWM on 18<sup>th</sup> November, but as there are only 4 meetings left, there was now little scope for change.
69. Francis commented that the previous round of RWM meetings were positive, and points out that it may be useful to look back, and see what has been done differently this time.

**The Deputy Chair Francis Livens assumed position of Chair.**

Community Representation Working Group (CRWG) – John Rennilson

70. John highlighted the aims of CRWG were to provide the definition of community, determine what the test of public support for GDF siting should be, and how the community benefit monies might best be managed. He noted the group has been meeting for a year, with 4 meetings remaining until March 2016. The aim is to concentrate each meeting on concluding each separate topic.
71. There was a discussion as to whether CoRWM can truly carry out its scrutiny function if the Committee is only getting oral accounts from John and Brian, without access to relevant documents. Questions were raised as to whether CoRWM was satisfied that CRWG's work programme is being carried out in an open and

transparent way. It was felt that CoRWM may need to make DECC aware that the process is not open enough. The Deputy Chair questioned if there was a definition of 'open and transparent' in this instance, or any criteria to assess the process. Members felt that CRWG needs to be generally more open and transparent perhaps by producing fuller minutes, and having an expanded website that sets out the work programme with when it is hoped decisions might be reached on the major questions. This along with clearer advice as to how DECC would aid transparency, and reduce the risk of the public being distrustful of the conclusions of the group.

**ACTION 5: The Chair is to enquire about the possibility of access to CRWG documents for all CoRWM members to allow CoRWM to be able to perform its scrutiny function.**

**ACTION 6: Chair to propose CoRWM's view to DECC that CRWG should be more open and transparent.**

72. The conclusions of the stakeholder engagement call for evidence (Implementing Geological Disposal: Working with Communities) has not yet been seen.

73. The aim of CRWG's next meeting is to try to agree the definition of a community. John conveyed that previously meetings have only allowed 2 hours for substantive discussion, and felt that this was not making efficient use of members' time. He had raised this matter with officials and it now appeared that subsequent meetings would be longer.

74. Brian noted that it is unlikely that there will be a universal definition of community, and that the definition will require subtly different interpretations depending on individual community factors. John agreed stating he imagines the definition will be in the form of a 'menu', allowing communities to choose options defining aspects in a relevant way to them. The Deputy Chair noted that this would need to be a set of very clear principles.

75. The Deputy Chair questioned the possibility of CRWG attending a CoRWM meeting. Brian proposed that a member of DECC could come and talk to CoRWM instead.

**ACTION 7: Request via DECC that this Committee would like to meet with the Chair of CRWG, and invite him to the next CoRWM meeting.**

#### Licensing – Helen Peters

76. Helen gave an update on actions from Edinburgh. Actions 8 and 9 are yet to complete. For Action 10, a request has been sent to ONR to set up a meeting between Richard Savage (Acting Chief Nuclear Inspector of ONR) and Chair of CoRWM.

77. Helen will circulate the slide pack from the Helsinki international conference to the rest of the Committee (after appropriate formatting). She felt the presentations were particularly useful as an update on each attendee's national programme.

#### Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum (NuLeAF) – John Rennilson

78. John noted that the same people were in attendance for the topic of geological disposal from councils and organisations, and felt there was great need to branch out to obtain a different audience. Not many out of 100+ NuLeAF members felt the need to attend.

79. There was the expectation that community investment of £1 million was not enough to encourage a community to volunteer to enter into discussions. If communities are to be involved in hosting a GDF, there was a feeling a larger investment would be needed to counter the inevitable bad publicity attached to the community during the initial stages.

#### Technical Advisory Panel – Simon Harley

80. Simon attended the latest meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> October. A number of topics were selected by RWM upon which presentations were given to TAP, whose role is to critique and give advice and feedback on them. RWM also give updates on recent activity to TAP.

81. There was an update on disposal system specification including high level and technical requirements, and how to manage them.

82. There was a topical session on non-radioactive chemotoxins and the Groundwater Daughter Directive, which has implications for a GDF. TAP asked how RWM would look into this and include the transport of radioactive substances, pollutants, and other toxic wastes.

83. There was a presentation on preparation for siting, with a main focus on public communications, looking at how to present a GDF as a transformative process to develop an area, rather than as a burden. RWM will look into this as overall strategy for approaching siting.

84. A topic on communications for the siting process followed which went through documents for key events in the next 18 months. Aspects of the siting process that were highlighted included looking at the communication of uncertainty, risk, societal aspects of large programmes and the research that has been done into this, as well as partnerships and representation.

85. Simon noted there will be only one more meeting of TAP before the end of its term, however he believes there will be a successor. As the remit of TAP has included a range of topics that are not specifically technical, he feels it will change from a technical advisory panel to an advisory panel for RWM's whole programme, reflecting RWM's role not just in the science and technology behind a GDF, but as the developer.
86. Simon observed that RWM does adopt feedback from TAP, and that TAP does highlight aspects that need to be discussed further and this is welcomed. Perhaps the panel needs to incorporate expertise on societal matters, to give advice where they felt it was needed due to the expanding scope of all areas of operation and strategy.
87. TAP is due for review, but Simon notes that RWM feel its contribution is important, and so suspects it is likely to continue in some form.
88. Steve, Janet, and Paul all volunteered to attend the final TAP meeting on February 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> 2016 in Oxford.

#### Safety Case – Paul Davis

89. There is an upcoming meeting between CoRWM and RWM on 18<sup>th</sup> November. In preparation Paul sent a request for an update on RWM progress with regards to Safety Case, and from the response feels that the meeting will require more than the scheduled 1-hour slot. It was suggested to have the afternoon of November 17<sup>th</sup> dedicated to discussion of the safety case otherwise a separate meeting will be needed.
90. Paul mentioned that RWM have produced one draft publication called the safety case manual. He felt it would be useful to review a copy prior to the meeting, as from first glance it looks as though some previous concerns have been answered.

#### **ACTION 8: RWM to share safety case manual with CoRWM Members.**

#### Welsh Government (WG) Policy – Lynda Warren

91. Lynda submitted CoRWM's comments on the progress of the Welsh draft policy on 21<sup>st</sup> October including some rewording suggestions to WG.
92. Comments from CoRWM on Chapter 2 of WG's Response to the main themes from the consultation responses are yet to be finalised. Members need to check where CoRWM has been mentioned and referenced. There was particular concern over a reference to a CoRWM document in a footnote; this appeared to have an incorrect title as it referred to the benefits of disposal.

**ACTION 9: Secretariat to identify the source for the misleading headline, and see if it can be removed from the CoRWM document 3122. Document is linked to from the WG footnote no. 5. The referenced document (3122) should be put back up on the website under a corrected headline. Advise WG to link to new reference.**

93. Members were concerned that other documents on the website available to the public may have misleading headlines.

**ACTION 10: Secretariat to arrange for the CoRWM discrete archive to be recovered and made available on the Website.**

#### **Agenda Item 7: AOB**

94. Helen Peters raised the recent NDA press release regarding research advances in packaging ILW. The Deputy Chair explained that up until this point anything that had been in contact with plutonium would be managed as ILW. The press release indicates a move towards more sophisticated and appropriate waste allocation is in place.

**ACTION 11: The Committee proposed to invite DECC to its next closed meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> December, to discuss progress on the Geological Disposal programme and all its work streams.**

#### **Agenda Item 8: Observations and Questions**

95. Andrew Craze (RWM) noted he would be happy to discuss the LoC process.

**Close of Meeting.**

**Action Update****16th September 2015 (Minutes: CoRWM Doc 3231)**

<b>Action Number</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Status</b>
09/2015/001	Hollie is delegated to attend and record minutes for sub group meetings.	On-going: time ends with Secretariat 1st April 2016
09/2015/002	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	On-going: time ends with Secretariat 1st April 2016
09/2015/003	June Plenary minutes are approved and should be uploaded on the website	Complete
09/2015/004	Members to send comments to Simon & Paul, who will produce a draft for the Committee to review at the October meeting.	Complete
09/2015/005	Secretariat to circulate list of meetings to members including details on the RWM meetings	Complete
09/2015/006	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.	Complete
09/2015/007	Slides & notes from Workshop in Finland will be circulated by Helen.	Complete
09/2015/008	Secretariat to chase up for a follow up meeting with ONR, proposing they set up the agenda.	Complete
09/2015/009	Secretariat to approach the EA, SEPA, NRW and get them along for a meeting with the relevant sub group	Complete
09/2015/010	Secretariat to arrange meeting with Richard Savage (CEO – ONR) and chair of CoRWM	Complete
09/2015/011	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.	On-going