

**COMMITTEE ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT (CORWM) PLENARY
27TH APRIL 2016, LONDON**

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

Timing: Wednesday, 27th April 2016, 10.00am - 15:00pm

Attendees: Laurence Williams (Chair), Lynda Warren, , John Rennilson, Brian Clark, Helen Peters, Janet Wilson, Gregg Butler, Paul Davis, Simon Harley, Mojisola Olutade (Secretariat).

Apologises: Francis Livens (Deputy Chair), Stephen Newson

Agenda Item 1: Meeting Open and Welcome

1. The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed the members of the public. He informed members of the public that they would have an opportunity at the end of the meeting to make comments but if anyone wanted to make a contribution during the meeting they should indicate this to the Chair.

Agenda Item 2: Declarations of Interest

2. All members declared nil change.

Agenda Item 3: Chair's Update

Work Programme

3. The Chair confirmed that the 2016/17 Work Programme is completed and was submitted to DECC Ministers and the Devolved Administrations on 31st March. The Committee now awaits Ministers response, but will carry on with activities as stated in the Work Programme unless advised otherwise.

CoRWM's Recruitment

4. The Chair reported that following the Ministers decision to open up all 11 Members post in CoRWM to competition, the selection process was under way. A Selection Panel has been convened and the application sift meeting had taken place on 7th April. The Chair noted that there had been a total of 177 applications and the Panel had selected 32 applicants for interview. The Chair reported that there had been a very strong field of candidates. He also reported that DECC had decided that existing CoRWM members who could not complete a minimum of 2 years of service would be excluded from consideration for interview. The interview process is still ongoing and the Panel's decision on eligible candidates will be made as a recommendation to Ministers. Ministers will make the final decision on appointments and appointments will be staggered between 2-4 years, with some successful candidates being asked

to commence as soon as possible after the beginning of June, and others commencing in November / December.

5. The Chair noted that the Committee is likely to have a shortfall of 5 members after May 2016. In view of this, the Chair has put forward a contingency plan to DECC officials with the proposal to offer secondments to existing members whose terms of office has run out. This is to ensure continuity for critical on-going work. The plan is to use the CoRWM budget for this until new members are in place. Discussions are still on-going with the DECC on the proposal and the Chair will follow up next week. The Chair emphasised that if the proposal is declined, the Committee is likely to be in a difficult position to carry on with work as usual, as it will take time to get new Members up to speed.

CoRWM's ways of working post May 2016

6. The Chair proposed the Committee discuss how CoRWM's work will move forward post May 2016, when 4 members will no longer be in post. He noted that, in the event the pending proposal with DECC to co-opt members was successful; it is unlikely that old members will be able to Chair their relevant sub-groups. In view of this, the Chair proposed new nominations for vacant sub group leads.
 - Paul Davis is new lead on National Geological Screening sub- group. He replaced Simon Harley
 - Lynda Warren is new lead on Working with Communities subgroup. She replaced John Rennilson
 - Gregg Butler is new lead on Developer led Communications. He replaced Brian Clark
 - Janet Wilson is new lead on Scottish Activities. She replaced John Rennilson.

All new leads accepted their nominations. Other existing sub group leads not affected by this change will continue in post.

Geological Disposal Programme Board

7. The Chair reported that he had attended the Geological Disposal Programme Board (GDPB) meeting where he sits as an observer. He commented that the GDPB was effectively driven by Lee McDonald, who is the Senior Responsible Owner (SRO) for the GDF programme.

Agenda Item 4: Plenary Minutes

8. Minutes from March plenary meeting was formally agreed subject to some minor corrections suggested by Members. Minutes of the March meeting will be put on the website as soon as possible after the corrections have been made. The Actions from the March plenary meeting were reviewed, closed out or where relevant updated.

ACTION 1: Secretariat to publish March plenary meeting minutes on CoRWM's website.

ACTION 2: Secretariat to feedback to members after NPS meeting with Keith Duncan.

ACTION 3: Secretariat to plan a visit to WIPP, USA close to September for 2-3 members of CoRWM

ACTION 4: Lynda Warren is to give a presentation on the full overview of CoRWM's historical two visits to Bure, France to all new members of CoRWM in September.

Agenda Item 5: Progress on Annual Report

9. The Committee reviewed the proposed structure and content of the 2015/16 Annual Report. It was agreed there was still a good deal of work to be done to capture the work that had been undertaken by the Committee Members and the sub-groups. Members agreed to work on the Annual Report and send their contributions to the Chair by Friday 6 May.

ACTION 5: Members to submit their final comments and contributions on the Annual Report to the Chair and secretariat by Friday, 6th May

10. The Chair reported that his intention was to draft the Annual Report for discussion by the Committee at its closed meeting that is planned for the end of May. To achieve this it was important for Members to complete their contributions on time and in accordance with the agreed schedule.

ACTION 6: The Chair to send the final revised version of the Annual Report to all members a week before the May 25th meeting.

Agenda Item 6: Sub-group Updates

National Geological Screening (SH)

11. Simon Harley reported he had received the analysis of the responses from the RWM consultation on their National Geological Screening Guidance (NGSG). There were a total of 72 responses and these are grouped into themes that arose from the consultation. Simon thought the concept of theme analysis was good as were the subsequent follow up comments from RWM on each theme. He noted that RWM also based their comments around safety. Simon Harley reported that while there were still areas of the guidance that were vague, especially around people's expectations concerning "screening in/out", the guidance had been revised in light of CoRWM comments and overall, he was happy with it.

12. Lynda Warren commented that given that CoRWM has been critical of RWM going to consultation on the National Geological Screening Guidance, the feedback from the

subgroup on how they handled their responses is good. She suggested it could be a worthwhile exercise to investigate how RWM have been able to turn this around.

13. In the following discussion it was clear that the Committee had a number of concerns including: the scarcity of data at the depth of a GDF; why safety in the guidance has been linked to depth; who the guidance is written for; and the level of detail that would be available to communities who would need answers to specific questions.
14. In response to the Chair's question on the use of the 3D model as a communications dialogue tool, Simon Harley responded that the documents he had reviewed indicate that RWM will use the 3D model for rock types and distribution within an area, while also utilizing other geological information. It was noted that 3D Presentations could give the impression of knowing more about geology at depth than is the case and this needs to be explained carefully so as not to mislead the public.

ACTION 7: Secretariat to send members copies of documents received from RWM on the National Screening Guidance.

Working with the Community (JR)

15. John Rennilson reported that the last meeting on the Community Representation Working Group (CRWG) had been held on the previous Wednesday. A 42-page document was circulated to all members of the CRWG ahead of the meeting. The overall approach to the document was aimed at how to identify communities rather than how to define a community. The document set out the process for identifying communities. Overall, John Rennilson believed that there was a way forward and a preferred approach.
16. John Rennilson reported that DECC had requested that members of the CRWG send in their last comments on the document by for 29th April, after which DECC planned to produce a final report that would be submitted to Ministers for their consideration. John reported that it was not known if there would be a public consultation on what constituted a 'community' but if there was to be one it would be unlikely to take place before the autumn.
17. Following discussion it was clear that there were still issues surrounding who the affected community is and who represents them. The Committee thought that another key issue related to who makes the initial contact: a landowner, local authority or an individual, remains to be answered. John Rennilson thought that the proposal was not to rule out anyone. Brain Clark explained further that the thinking was moving away from defining a community to how a community will define itself.
18. The Committee noted that this was not an easy issue and acknowledged the large amount of work that the DECC team had put into trying to find a resolution to this vital issue. The Chair stated that he expected DECC to continue to engage with

CoRWM on both the development of the policy document and, if it is decided to hold a consultation, the consultation document.

National Land Use Planning (LW)

19. Lynda Warren reported that progress was still on-going on Land Use Planning, and the team awaits feedback on the NPS.

Developer Lead Communications & Engagement (BC)

20. Brian Clark reported that RWM employed the services of consultants "MHP", to help draw up its strategy. Some of the work to be delivered include; communications strategy, website and branding. Brian reported that the proposed strategy was currently sitting with RWM management for approval.
21. Brian Clark noted that there was greater need for collaboration between RWM and DECC, especially as there is a DECC communications team. Brian Clark thought that overall the communications work stream was evolving with a growing awareness that there is a lot left to be done.

ACTION 8: Brian Clark to approach Jessica Ellis for copies of the Strategy and Communication plans.

GDF Regulations (HP)

22. Helen Peters confirmed she has sent the notes of the last meeting held with EA & ONR to both organisations and members for comments. The note of the meeting is a closed document to be kept for CoRWM record purpose only. Helen reported that she has requested a follow meeting with both organisations and is awaiting feedback. As the process for setting up these meeting has been difficult in the past, Helen welcomed comments from Members on the different set of people that could be contacted. The Chair suggested Helen should contact Mina Golshan in ONR.

Welsh Activities (LYW)

23. Lynda Warren reported that there were no updates on Welsh activities. The Chair suggested a catch up meeting between himself, Lynda and the Welsh Government sometime after the May 7th Welsh elections.

ACTION 9: Secretariat to arrange a meeting between with Robert Williams, Laurence Williams and Lynda Warren

Scottish Activities (JR)

24. John Rennilson reported that the sub group is still awaiting the analyses of the last Scottish consultation responses, which are caught up in purdah and Scottish elections. John confirmed that the Scottish Nuclear Sites meeting, which is usually

scheduled to take place twice a year, suspended its meeting in April. All details on the meeting have now been passed unto Janet Wilson, who is the new lead for the work stream.

Interim Storage (GB)

Gregg Butler reported that there is likely to be 280 tonnes more spent fuel due to the extension of the AGR life. Gregg informed Members that while there are no set timetables for meetings, he has plans to follow up discussion with Danny Fox around June/July

Safety Case Development (PD)

25. Paul Davis re-emphasised that while the Committee has continued to engage with RWM on their gDSSC, there are still questions on which audience it is for and its overall use. He also noted that while the Committee had made some progress concerning the need for RWM to produce GDF safety related documents for the 3 rock types.
26. Paul Davis confirmed the Committee is still awaiting a response on the two questions proposed to RWM on the link of the Safety Case to “Disposability Assessments” and “Identifying Research Needs”.
27. After discussion it was agreed that the Committee remains concerned that CoRWM and RWM have different ideas on what the Safety Case is and what it should be used for. It was noted that CoRWM has previously suggested that RWM evolve its generic safety case into a site specific case but RWM has resisted this suggestion. Members agreed further meetings are needed with RWM to explore the possibility of achieving a common understanding of what a GDF Safety Case is.

ACTION 10: The Secretariat to arrange a half day Safety Case meeting with all Committee members for May 25th

ACTION 11: The Secretariat to send details of TAP Meeting to Paul Davis

Agenda Item 7: NuLeAF RWPG meeting

28. Helen Peters reported that she had been invited to attend the NuLeAF Radioactive Waste Planning Group meeting on 12 April, 2016. The meeting covered the following matters:
 - development of a single radioactive waste strategy for the NDA Estate - James McKinney, Head of Integrated Waste, NDA;
 - consultation on the control of former nuclear licensed-site following the surrender of RSA permit - Bob Smith, Environment Agency;
 - update on Geological Disposal Facility; and
 - update on national developments in radioactive waste management.

29. Helen reported that the presentation by James McKinney was well received and a helpful update of the NDA's new strategy and in particular the Integrated Waste Strategy. He also mentioned the NDA's Value Framework – which explains how the NDA make decisions based on a comprehensive and consistent set of factors). There was a discussion on the availability of information from the SLCs to local authorities in relation to plans for interim end states, decommissioning and re-use. Bob Smith provided a helpful high-level summary of the GRR consultation. The meeting discussed the response to the environment agencies GRR consultation. It was reported that the RWPG will be submitting a response on behalf of NuLeAF. Philip Matthews then provided a verbal update on the Community Representation Working Group meetings in February and March 2016. There was a discussion about community representation and funding and the fact the outputs from CRWG and DECC's policy proposals would need to be adaptable bearing in mind the local government restructuring in 10 years' time.

Agenda Item 8: Summary of Actions /AOB

30. The Chair informed Members that CoRWM has a tight budget and it is necessary to submit monthly profile reports to DECC and hence it is important for Members to submit their expenses returns promptly.
31. Regarding the Annual Report the Chair noted that Members should check their biographies to ensure they are up to date.

ACTION 12: Members should send their updated biographies and pictures to be included in the Annual Report to the Secretariat

32. Paul Davis raised the question on the numbers of days per month, Members would be allowed to utilise before their contracts came to an end. The Chair confirmed that due to budget constraints, the maximum number of days still remains at 52 days per year, however given the reduced budget the average number of days per Member will be reduced. When the budget has been finalised it will be for the Chair to manage the budget and allocated the number of days for each Member.
33. Helen Peters stated she is yet to finalise her notes from the Helsinki visit. She intends to finalise this and send to the secretariat. She will also be sending a revised version of her contribution to the Annual Report to the Chair which will reference her notes from Helsinki.
34. The Chair expressed his gratitude to Francis Livens, Brian Clark, John Rennilson and Simon Harley who will be leaving the Committee at the end of May 2016. He remarked that each had given exceptional public service during their time on CoRWM. He also acknowledged that each had made a significant contribution to the management of radioactive waste in the UK.
35. John Rennilson and Simon Harley remarked that they had enjoyed working with every member of the Committee and are glad that CoRWM has been able to make valuable contributions to issues of radioactive waste management.

ACTIONS FROM MARCH PLENARY	UPDATES
ACTION 1: The Chair and the Secretariat to finalise the Draft Work Programme and send it to the Ministers in DECC and the Devolved Administrations by 31 st March.	Completed
ACTION 2: The Secretariat to arrange a meeting with RWM and the NDA to discuss the issues stemming their comments on the Work Programme.	Ongoing
ACTION 3: Secretariat to look into the feasibility of a visit to the WIPP facility in the US.	Ongoing
ACTION 4: Lynda Warren to look at the report from CoRWM's previous visit to Bure and update the Committee on any significant differences in relation to what can be learned from the French experience.	Ongoing
ACTION 5: Secretariat to request for the final draft of the NPS and send it to the NPS sub group.	Ongoing
ACTION 6: Secretariat to liaise with the Welsh Affairs Committee secretariat to see when the CoRWM response will be published on its website and then publish the CoRWM response on the CoRWM website.	Complete
ACTION 7: Secretariat to publish September and October plenary meeting minutes on the website.	Complete
ACTION 8: Members to submit their final comments on the draft quarterly reports to by Monday 21 st March so that they can be published on the website before the end of March.	Complete
ACTION 10: Chair to circulate the structure of the 2015/16 annual report along with drafting allocations for Members.	Complete
ACTION 11: Members to draft their allotted sections and return to the Chair and Secretariat as soon as possible before Friday 22 April	Complete
ACTION 12: Secretariat to arrange a meeting room for 26 th May, 9am-4pm for Committee to finalise the Draft Annual Report.	Complete

36. A member of the public present, wanted to draw the Committees attention to the issues of Radioactive Waste Transport. He pointed out that this was a big issue that seem not to be getting a lot of attention in the GDF Programme. The Chair explained that the United Kingdom has safely transported radioactive waste around the country for decades