

**COMMITTEE ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT (CORWM)****OPEN MEETING****20 SEPTEMBER 2017, LONDON****Venue:** 39 Essex Chambers, 81 Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1DD**Timing:** 09:30-14.30**Chair:** Laurence Williams**Members:** Gregg Butler, Paul Davis, Melissa Denecke, Campbell Gemmell, Andy Hall, Joanne Hill, Stephen Newson, Richard Shaw, Stephen Tromans, Andrew Walters, Julia West and Janet Wilson.**Visitors:** RWM Chief Policy Advisor (RWM); Brian Clark (Aberdeen University); BEIS Head of Land Use Planning, BEIS HEO Geological Disposal Facility, BEIS ; Roy Payne (GDF Watch).**Apologies:** Melissa Denecke, Simon Redfern (CoRWM); Head of CoRWM Sponsorship Team (BEIS).**Secretariat:** CoRWM Committee Secretary, CoRWM Technical Secretary.**Agenda****Agenda Item 1: Meeting open and welcome**

1. The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed everyone present. He invited the public to contribute to the discussions.

**Agenda Item 2: Declarations of interest**

2. The committee declared, in turn, any changes regarding their interests.
3. Gregg Butler declared contributions to a systems analysis tool, the NIRAB Strategic Toolkit. The Chair found no conflict.
4. Gregg Butler declared provision of safety and environment figures for the NDA's analysis of options for plutonium solutions. The Chair will look into potential conflict from providing work to a body CoRWM overviews.

**ACTION 1:** Chair to review Gregg Butler's work in provision of safety and environment figures for NDA work on plutonium solutions, to ensure no conflict of interest.

5. The Chair declared he had accepted a new position as member of a Singapore Nuclear Safety Advisory Panel.
6. Janet Wilson declared she was involved in a bid for provision of advice to BEIS regarding nuclear new build. The chair found no conflict.
7. Stephen Tromans declared new work for DSRL. The Chair found no conflict.
8. No other changes in members' interests were raised.

**Agenda Item 3: Approval of Open Plenary meeting minutes of 15 June 2017**

9. Minutes from the Open Plenary meeting held in Cardiff were approved.

**Agenda Item 4: Actions**

10. There were a number of Actions remaining from the Open Plenary meeting on 22 March 2017.
11. **Action 8** regarding discussion of communications strategy with Andrew Craze has evolved due to events regarding a potential integrated BEIS/NDA/RWM communications team and is now closed.
12. **Action 9** is to be left open as an ongoing issue requiring scrutiny, due to committee concerns with the documents sent through by RWM.

**ACTION 2:** Subgroup 1 to discuss RWM communications strategy with Andrew Craze

13. **Actions 5, 11, 12 and 16** have been overtaken by subsequent actions and events and have been closed.
14. The committee reviewed the status of actions arising from the previous Open Plenary meeting held in Cardiff on 15 June 2017.

<b>Actions from 15 June Open Plenary Meeting</b>	<b>Updates</b>
<b>ACTION 1:</b> Secretariat to ascertain CoRWM's monthly spending patterns from previous years to inform the monitoring of this year's budget.	Ongoing
<b>ACTION 2:</b> Members to submit claims as soon as possible after expenses are incurred.	Ongoing

<b>Actions from 15 June Open Plenary Meeting</b>	<b>Updates</b>
<b>ACTION 3:</b> Subgroup 3 to meet with the ONR to discuss the current status of radioactive waste disposal prescription under the Nuclear Installations Act.	Ongoing
<b>ACTION 4:</b> Stephen Newson to produce a note of the readiness review meeting to be circulated to CoRWM members.	Closed
<b>ACTION 5:</b> Secretariat to liaise with Dounreay regarding the programme for CoRWM's visit.	Closed
<b>ACTION 6:</b> Secretariat to advise Robert Williams who would be attending and request information on the location and timing of the meetings and the agendas for each.	Closed – overtaken by events
<b>ACTION 7:</b> Secretariat to circulate to Members the calendar of subgroup meetings	Ongoing
<b>ACTION 8:</b> Secretariat to arrange visits to Sellafield and LLWR near Drigg.	Closed
<b>ACTION 9:</b> Janet Wilson to attend the BEIS NGO Nuclear Forum meeting in London on 18 July.	Closed
<b>ACTION 10:</b> Secretariat to send members the design for their cards to seek any further information they might wish to be included, before they were printed.	Closed
<b>ACTION 11:</b> RWM Head of SSEQ to send the CoRWM Secretariat a link to the European Commission's Report on the Progress of Implementation of the Radioactive Waste and Spent Fuel Management Directive.	Closed
<b>ACTION 12:</b> Steven King to forward the link to CoRWM members.	Closed

15. There was a discussion on monitoring CoRWM's budget. Steven King confirmed that expenses (i.e. days worked) would contribute to the budget allocation of the financial year in which they were executed, rather than the financial year in which they were submitted.
16. The Chair reminded Members that underspend in the budget was undesirable. He thought that if the budget could be managed effectively it was possible that the Committee would be able to visit the Finnish GDF site, Onkalo.

**ACTION 3:** Secretariat to send members regular information regarding their spending, in order that they may better plan their work.

#### **Agenda Item 5: Chair's update**

##### **a) *Meetings attended since the last meeting***

17. The Chair provided an update on meetings he attended since the last plenary meeting:

##### *CoRWM Sponsors, 5<sup>th</sup> July*

18. The Chair reported his attendance of a regular meeting with CoRWM's sponsors (BEIS, Northern Ireland, Scottish and Welsh Governments). The meeting provided an update on the committee's status and the sponsors' views.

##### *NuLeAF, 19<sup>th</sup> July*

19. The Chair reported on a presentation he gave for NuLeAF. This was largely an introductory presentation to relatively new members of NuLeAF.

**ACTION 4:** The Chair to circulate slides from the presentation given to NuLeAF on 19<sup>th</sup> July.

##### *Geological Disposal Programme Board meeting, 8<sup>th</sup> August*

20. The Chair noted that attendance of the meetings had increased, the quality of the documents analysed was comprehensive, and that there had been an acceleration of activities. The Chair believed that monthly GDPB meetings were sensible given the rate of progress and the challenging timescale. He reiterated the importance of CoRWM's observer status.
21. Campbell Gemmell asked for clarification on BEIS/RWM changes regarding the Strategic Board, Siting Delivery Board, and GDPB, in order to ascertain that all aspects are being covered comprehensively going forwards. Stephen Tromans asked for an organogram of the updated structure.

**ACTION 5:** Secretariat to contact BEIS for an organogram and terms of reference showing the activities of and relationship between the three committees: Geological

Disposal Programme Board (GDPB), Geological Disposal Strategic Co-ordination Group (GDSCG) and Siting Delivery Board.

22. Gregg Butler noted that this information should be available, Janet Wilson noted that it may be included in the Program Business Case being developed, Stephen Newson also noted that a draft version of such information may be available.
23. Campbell Gemmell raised that the IPA review of RWM may not take into account CoRWM views. The Chair agreed, as the IPA had not asked for CoRWM's presence at interviews or comment on the outputs.

**b) *CoRWM visit to Dounreay, 25<sup>th</sup> July.***

24. The Chair reflected on the committee's visit to Dounreay. He commented that the visit was highly useful, but lacked contact with senior management of DSRL. The visit was well organised and demonstrated the key areas of interest.
25. The Committee acknowledged DSRL's reply to CoRWM's letter sent regarding the visit. The Committee were happy with the information provided and believed the reply to be comprehensive. SG5-Scottish Government Activities will continue to monitor the issues regarding Letters of Compliance and the current Interim End State date.

**ACTION 6:** Secretariat to publish DSRL's response to CoRWM letter.

**ACTION 7:** SG5 to monitor DSRL activities regarding the Interim End State date and the suitability of LoC to near-surface disposal.

26. RWM Chief Policy Advisor asked the Chair if the response would be published on the CoRWM website. The Chair stated that it would be. The Chair believed that the issue regarding the relevance of Letters of Compliance to near-surface disposal is an issue that needs open discussion. He also believed that DSRL have acknowledged that the 2033 interim end date is challenging but have provided a reasonable response.
27. The Chair thought that it the Committee should consider making visits to Dounreay an annual occurrence given the importance of the site and the radioactive waste management challenges.

**c) *Submission of CoRWM Work Programme and Annual Report to Sponsors***

28. The Chair reported that the Work Programme had been submitted on time, but the sponsor had not submitted it to Ministers due to the recent election. The delay enabled the Chair updated it to reflect budget changes.

29. The Chair reported that the Annual Report had also been submitted on time, but again sponsors had not submitted it to ministers. BEIS confirmed this, stating that they are working on a response to recommendations and coordinating with Wales and Scotland. It is believed the report will be sent to ministers in the next few weeks.

**d) *Recruitment of CoRWM Chair***

30. The Chair reported that BEIS has agreed to launch the process of appointing a new CoRWM Chair. He noted that the process was not likely to conclude until at least January and as such an Interim Chair should be appointed once he leaves office at the end of October.

**e) *Tailored Review of CoRWM***

31. The Chair provided detail on the Tailored Review of CoRWM which was planned for November /December.

**Agenda Items 6 and 7: CoRWM Scrutiny Activities (progress against Work Programme)**

**a) *SG1-Working with Communities (Janet Wilson)***

32. Janet Wilson detailed a communications meeting held with RWM on 11<sup>th</sup> July. The main topic of discussion was on public facing documents. A further meeting has been arranged for 26<sup>th</sup> October but may be rescheduled.
33. Janet Wilson detailed how the subgroup was awaiting the final drafts of these documents.
34. The Chair asked that Subgroup prepare a response in consultation with SG2 on the 3 public facing policy documents for discussion at the November plenary meeting.

**ACTION 8:** SG1 to prepare draft responses to RWM public facing documents, and circulate these to other members, for discussion at the November plenary meeting.

**b) *SG2-GDF Safety Case and Geology (Paul Davis)***

35. Paul Davis questioned RWM's draft Screening Narratives and thought that they were not satisfactory. He reported that RWM has acknowledged the subgroup's comments, but had not yet provided the Committee with amended documents.
36. The Chair asked for detail on how the Regional Narratives were produced with the BGS. Paul Davis explained that the RWM review team had set out their requirements for the Regional Narratives to BGS. RWM had communicated to CoRWM that BGS would produce these, but had then produced them in-house.

37. CoRWM has provided advice to RWM that the narratives should not preclude areas from siting in this stage of the process, and that judgement on suitability should be led by the safety case rather than geology. The Committee was concerned that generalised statements on suitability will discourage communities from coming forward.
38. The Chair thought that screening out of unsuitable areas should not be left until late in the process and areas that are clearly unsuitable should be easily identifiable. Paul Davis thought that screening out large areas as unsuitable may be incorrect as there may be areas within these that offer suitable host geology.

**ACTION 9:** SG2 to monitor RWM's response to advice on the Technical Information Reports, the Sub-Regional Narratives, and the Regional Narratives.

39. The BGS Technical Information Reports have not yet been published, pending BGS's internal quality review process. Bruce Cairns confirmed that that these will not be published without RWM's consent. Paul Davis said it would be appropriate to publish the narratives alongside other public facing documents.
40. The Chair thought that it would be helpful for BEIS and RWM to communicate their plans regarding planned publishing dates for these documents. This would enable CoRWM to plan their scrutiny activities and provide advice to RWM and BEIS at an appropriate time.

**ACTION 10:** SG1 and SG2 to liaise with the new integrated BEIS communications team to ascertain the planned publishing of public facing documents.

**ACTION 11:** Janet Wilson to contact Jess Ellis to ensure SG1 representative is invited to Integrated Communications Team meetings.

41. Julia West thought that it may be useful to have a CoRWM presence on the Integrated Communications Team. However the Chair said that this would not be possible as CoRWM needed to remain independent.
42. Paul Davis discussed RWM's response to CoRWM recommendations in using the safety case to inform the public on screening methodology, in particular by providing public facing safety cases for each rock type. He attended a meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> of July where RWM expressed their agreement with this.

**ACTION 12:** SG2 to enquire as to the status of public facing safety cases for each rock type, then analyse the effectiveness of these documents.

**c) *SG3- Planning and Regulation (Andy Hall)***

43. Andy Hall discussed comments provided to the ONR regarding their joint publication with the EA, 'Regulating Geological Disposal'. The subgroup believes the document skirts around the issue of a planning system, and also ignores criteria for licensing and delicensing. ONR responded in that the

document was limited to safety and environmental concerns, and would address these comments in future.

44. The Chair suggested that the relationship between licensing, environmental permitting and planning was important. He also stated that licensing and delicensing needs to be clear and effective to secure public confidence.
45. Andy Hall stated that the ONR did not give a timescale for addressing these issues. BEIS Head of Land Use Planning stated that BEIS documents such as the NPS may provide more detailed guidance on planning issues.
46. Stephen Tromans thought that it would be helpful to see all these documents in context. Andy Hall stated that they exist in draft but have not yet been made available.

**ACTION 13:** SG3 to analyse the NPS and draft a CoRWM response to the consultation for discussion at the November plenary meeting.

**ACTION 14:** SG3 to meet BEIS to ensure their proposals maintain a comprehensive regulatory framework after the UK's exit from Euratom.

47. Stephen Tromans thought that it would be helpful for CoRWM and the public to have a document that explained the various roles of published documents, in order to demonstrate that all issues had been addressed and all areas covered.

**d) *SG4-Organisational Development (Stephen Newson)***

48. Stephen Newson gave details on the IPA assurance review of RWM. Two briefing days are planned, one day analysing the organisational design and readiness to launch and the other to analyse Communications, Stakeholder Engagement and Community Engagement Plans. Two CoRWM members will be present as observers.
49. The subgroup has analysed the draft terms of reference, and commented the belief that these were focused too heavily on the short term, and that more reference should be made to evidence from outside of the NDA and RWM.
50. A further subject yet to be analysed comprehensively is RWM's ability to change from a scientific and engagement body into an active delivery organisation as the project progresses.
51. Outcomes from the IPA review are believed to be binary decisions on each area of readiness analysed, and thus the IPA is not likely to propose an alternative structure of RWM.
52. The Chair commented that CoRWM should analyse RWM's ability to deliver a GDF as well as its current suitability to launch the siting process. Stephen Newson agreed. The Chair thought that CoRWM should scrutinise RWM's skills; resources; capabilities; professional view; planned and ongoing



company evolution; and readiness to respond to changes in delivery timescales.

53. Stephen Newson believed that personnel changes at RWM have brought forward issues of organisational capability into greater consideration. He believes it is important for the public and project to be aware of the work needed, with lifetime plans documents being continually updated.
54. The Chair noted that John Corderoy has been tasked with delivering and maintaining these Lifetime Plans.

**ACTION 15:** SG4 to monitor the IPA review and provide feedback to the IPA and CoRWM.

**ACTION 16:** SG4 to liaise with John Corderoy on the status of RWM's Lifetime Plans.

**ACTION 17:** SG4 to ask RWM to provide updated details on the structure of the organisation, such as through a new organogram.

55. Stephen Newson reported that the subgroup was due to meet RWM on 9th October.

**e) *SG5-Scottish Government Activities (Campbell Gemmell)***

56. Campbell Gemmell gave an update on the work of SG5-Scottish Government Activities. No meetings had occurred since the previous CoRWM plenary.
57. Campbell Gemmell noted that having Martin Macdonald (Scottish Government) join CoRWM in the visit to Dounreay was very useful. A follow up meeting was planned.
58. Campbell Gemmell gave details on the Near Surface Implementation group being established, which would focus on waste management issues in the Scottish context. A meeting was planned for 2<sup>nd</sup> October, where CoRWM would act as members.
59. The Chair stated that it would not be appropriate to be members of this Implementation Group as CoRWM needs to be able to offer independent advice, but it would be appropriate to attend as observers. Campbell Gemmell thought that CoRWM could provide benefits through their expertise. Taking an active role would benefit both groups and fulfil the view of Scottish ministers that waste management should take an integrated approach. However, the Chair reiterated that CoRWM must be independent but this did not preclude CoRWM Observers providing both formal and informal advice to the Scottish Government.

**f) SG6-Welsh Government Activities (Gregg Butler)**

60. Gregg Butler gave an update on the work of SG6. The subgroup had provided comment on the draft Welsh equivalents of the National Policy Statement, Working with Communities, and Third Part Expert View Mechanism. No significant issues had been raised with the drafts, and thus this work was relatively complete.
61. The next phase of work is on forming the Welsh policy response to the consultations for these documents in England, for which the subgroup would collaborate with SG1-Working with Communities.

**ACTION 18:** SG6 to work with SG1 to clarify potential differences between policy documents.

62. Janet Wilson highlighted differences in the Welsh documents such as a less promotional role in siting, and in the Third Party Expert View Mechanism. She further highlighted how TCPA would be included, and that policy would have to account for Welsh Language Impact Assessment.
63. RWM Chief Policy Advisor suggested that the Working with Communities publication would be published on a similar timescale to the English equivalent, although some differences existed in the definitions of electoral colleges, parish councils, and volunteer communities as to their status. He highlighted that whilst these publications would go to the Welsh assembly, this was generally a shorter process than in England.
64. BEIS Head of Land Use Planning noted that a sustainability assessment would be required for the TAD.
65. Gregg Butler believed that the timescale will be largely similar to the English timescale, but will confirm this with Robert Williams.
66. The Chair noted that differences between Welsh and English policies should be minimal such that CoRWM's formal response should be consistent.

**g) SG7- Storage of Radioactive Waste, Spent Fuel and Nuclear Materials (Gregg Butler)**

67. Gregg Butler gave an update on the work of SG7 since the last plenary meeting. He reported that the subgroup will meet with the NDA on 29<sup>th</sup> of September.
68. He reported that the subgroup had provided 6 pages of comment regarding the NDA's annual report. No great changes had occurred, but some work had developed on uranium and particularly near-surface disposal thereof.

69. Gregg Butler believes some work is required to update policy and guidance on the issue of raw waste retrieval and its conditioning.
70. The Chair noted how the CoRWM 2009 report had reference to unconditioned waste. Gregg Butler reported that a great deal of waste packaging had occurred at Magnox, and CoRWM should maintain an oversight of these activities.
71. The Chair noted it was important to link the choice of waste container utilised and GDF design. He noted the NDA and RWM needed to ensure GDF receipt and emplacement facility requirements were in place to ensure efficient container selection upstream.
72. Stephen Newson noted how GDF design was integral to this, with an immediate example being that the GDF host rock dictates size restrictions for containers.
73. Janet Wilson noted how site licensees believed they were bound by the Letters of Compliance system. The committee agreed that the LoC system requires scrutiny in order to be efficient for waste producers and that it is informed by the requirements of GDF design.

**ACTION 19:** SG4, informed by SG2, to ensure next year's Work Programme includes a detailed evaluation of the Letter of Compliance process.

#### **h) SG8 - Euratom (Chair)**

74. The Chair gave an update on his work as SG8– Euratom. A list of legislation, treaties, and directives from the UK, IAEA, Euratom has been compiled. The intention was now to compare the extent of the overlap between these to identify any gaps when the UK withdraws from the EU and Euratom.
75. The Chair's noted that in relation to nuclear safety his view was that UK law, regulation, ONR's procedures and IAEA requirements, are such leaving Euratom will have no material effect. However, work is ongoing to assess the impact on radioactive waste management.
76. A new Chair of Subgroup 8 will be needed when the current Chair leaves in order to complete the advice for Government. The Chair hoped he would be able to circulate the initial results of the mapping exercise before he leaves at the end of October.

**ACTION 20:** Secretariat to organise a handover meeting for Euratom exit work for the end of October.

**Agenda Item 8: Planned Subgroup Activities for 2017-18****a) SG1-Working with Communities (Janet Wilson)**

77. Janet Wilson gave details on planned subgroup activities for the coming months. The subgroup is mainly concerned with advising on BEIS workshops and public consultations. The subgroup will continue to scrutinise the communications plan, and the new Integrated Communications Team that will deliver it.
78. The Chair added that the subgroup will be expected to provide a large contribution to the CoRWM annual report.

**b) SG2-GDF Safety Case and Geology (Paul Davis)**

79. Paul Davis gave details on planned subgroup activities. He highlighted the usefulness of visits to facilities abroad such as Onkalo.
80. Paul Davis highlighted the usefulness of open dialogue with other countries. He noted that Germany was at a similar stage in GDF delivery to the UK and that their work and knowledge on down-selection criteria may be very useful.

**ACTION 21:** SG2 to include communication with Germany regarding down-selection criteria on next year's work programme.

81. The Chair noted that the Secretariat should be able to provide projections regarding spend, and hence inform on the possibility of a visit to Onkalo.

**ACTION 22:** Secretariat to examine budget for the possibility of a visit to Onkalo.

82. Paul Davis thought that the planned 20 years of time allocated to the siting process may be insensitive to external factors.

**c) SG3-Planning and Regulation (Andy Hall)**

83. Andy Hall gave an update on planned subgroup activities. In the coming months the subgroup will respond to the NPS consultation and provide comment on the draft Statutory Instrument.
84. In the coming year, the subgroup will work on licensing policy regarding regulations, and planning aspects of the NPS.

**d) SG4-Organisational Development (Stephen Newson)**

85. Stephen Newson gave an update on planned subgroup activities. In the coming months the subgroup would observe the IPA review of RWM, liaise with John Corderoy regarding RWM organisational structure plans.
86. The subgroup will also focus on LoC, and in conjunction with subgroup 2 will liaise in particular with Ann McCall and Paul Skelton on the applicability of the

LoC process to all three rock types and its integration with GDF design and safety case.

87. The Chair asked the subgroup whether the IPA review would comment on RWM's suitability for GDF delivery. Stephen Newson confirmed the review would only be concerned with the next 2 years and RWM's suitability to launch. He believes that RWM's suitability beyond this is an open question.

**e) *SG5-Scottish Government Activities (Campbell Gemmell)***

88. Campbell Gemmell reported that he had covered his subgroup's future activities in his earlier update item (paras 56-59).

**f) *SG6-Welsh Government Activities (Gregg Butler)***

89. Gregg Butler gave an update on planned subgroup activities. In the coming months the subgroup will focus on coordinating CoRWM comments on the English and Welsh consultations with SG1.
90. The Chair highlighted the role of CoRWM in providing policy advice and assistance to Welsh government, and Gregg Butler agreed that this was beneficial.

**g) *SG7-Storage of Radioactive Waste, Spent Fuel and Nuclear Materials (Gregg Butler)***

91. The Chair asked if CoRWM should draft a formal comment on the decision to close THORP, given the statement in the Annual Report suggested this may constitute the foreclosing of an option for the future management of spent fuel. Gregg Butler thought that this was not necessary as the point was made in the Annual Report. He thought the long term storage of spent fuel was an issue of interest to CoRWM.
92. The Chair agreed especially in the context of whether or not long-term storage of spent fuel in a wet pond was consistent with the regulatory goal of passive safety. Gregg Butler thought that term "passive safety" was not clearly defined.
93. Janet Wilson thought that the Committee should examine the concept of dry fuel storage for AGR spent fuel.
94. The Chair believed that a CoRWM view on the safety of long-term storage of spent fuel in wet ponds was necessary. Gregg Butler thought that SG7 should revisit the 2009 CoRWM Report on the interim storage of spent fuel and other radioactive waste pending disposal. The Chair agreed this would be a sensible idea and it should form part of the 2018-19 work programme.

**h) SG8-Euratom (Chair)**

95. The Chair detailed plans for engagement with BEIS and other sponsors regarding his work on Euratom, through the regular Sponsors meetings. The Chair suggested that outputs from this work be in place to brief sponsors before March 2018.
96. The Chair noted that SG8 would not address the issue of safeguards or nuclear safety but would concentrate only on radioactive waste implications. The intention is to map the current UK responsibilities deriving from European Directives and regulations against current UK law and regulatory practices and the UK's obligations under the IAEA Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel and the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management. The outcome would be the identification of any gaps following BREXIT and possible suggestions on how such gaps could be plugged.

**Agenda Item 9: CoRWM's Calendar Forward look 2017-18****a) Planned plenary meetings 2017-18**

97. Further plenary meetings are planned for 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> November in Edinburgh, 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> January in London, 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> March in London.

**b) Planned subgroup meetings**

98. The Chair noted that details of planned subgroup meetings had been circulated by the Secretariat. Members thought it would be helpful to have the calendar of planned CoRWM meeting circulated on a regular basis.

**ACTION 23:** Secretariat to send meeting calendar to CoRWM members each month for them to amend and update.

**c) UK site visits**

99. Janet Wilson suggested that a visit to Sizewell A be combined with a visit to the dry fuel store at Sizewell B. Gregg Butler agreed, with Julie West suggesting Spring 2018 would be an appropriate time for the visit.
100. Gregg Butler suggested that if visits to Sellafield are to be annual, it would be appropriate to examine different areas of the site each visit.
101. The Chair suggested that the 2018-19 Work Programme should include visits to Dounreay, Sellafield, and Sizewell. If budget allowed, a visit to Sweden or Finland would also be appropriate.
102. The Chair suggested that in the future, if communities expressed strong interest in evaporite or sedimentary host geology, a visit to WIPP (USA) or Bure (France) may be appropriate for members to familiarise themselves with GDF approaches in these geologies.

**Agenda Item 10: AOB**

103. No other business was raised.

**Agenda Item 11: Questions from the Public**

104. The Chair invited comments from the public.
105. Brian Clark, a former CoRWM member, encouraged the Committee to make every effort to improve its website which he thought was poor. He noted that it was very difficult, if not impossible to find the information. He suggested that it would be helpful if the Secretariat could produce a newsletter after each meeting and send it to existing recipients.
106. Brian Clark thought that more effort was needed to demonstrate CoRWM's independence.
107. The Chair welcomed Brian's suggestions and commented that significant efforts had been made to address the website issue but it was difficult given the requirement to use the UK.Gov platform.
108. Regarding CoRWM's visibility and independence the Chair stated that over the past few years the Governments priority had been to revise its policy on the siting of a GDF and launch a new siting process. This had driven CoRWM to focus on providing advice on this policy development process and this had reduced its visibility because much of the work CoRWM was doing was not in the public domain. This, together with the secretariat problems and the website and reduced CoRWM's visibility and perhaps led to the perception that CoRWM was not doing much and was too associated with government policy.

**Agenda Item 12: Next meeting**

109. The next open plenary meeting will take place at Jury's Inn Edinburgh, 43 Jeffrey Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1DH. The meeting will commence at 9am, 23 November 2017.

**Agenda Item 13: Meeting Close**

110. The Chair thanked members for their work and the public for their attendance.
111. The Chair stated that this would be his last plenary meeting as the Chair of CoRWM. He said it had been an honour and a privilege to chair CoRWM for the past 5 years. He believed much had been achieved and the Committee had played an important role in shaping the Government's policy on radioactive waste management in general and in the White Paper on "Implementing Geological Disposal" in particular. He thanked Members for the support he had given him during his term of office and wished them well for the future.

112. Campbell Gemmell led thanks from the room toward Stephen Tromans for hosting the meeting, the Chair for his work over the years, and Steven King for his work on the secretariat.



### Actions – Open Plenary Meeting, 20th September 2017

Actions from 20th September 2017 Open Plenary Meeting	Updates
<b>ACTION 1:</b> Chair to review Gregg Butler's work in provision of safety and environment figures for NDA work on plutonium solutions, to ensure no conflict of interest.	<b>Closed</b>
<b>ACTION 2:</b> Subgroup 1 to discuss RWM communications strategy with RWM Head of SSEQ.	<b>Superseded</b>
<b>ACTION 3:</b> Secretariat to send members regular information regarding their spending, in order that they may better plan their work.	<b>Closed</b>
<b>ACTION 4:</b> The Chair to circulate slides from the presentation given to NuLeAF on 19 <sup>th</sup> July.	<b>Closed</b>
<b>ACTION 5:</b> Secretariat to contact BEIS for an organogram and terms of reference showing the activities of and relationship between the three committees: Geological Disposal Programme Board (GDPB), Geological Disposal Strategic Co-ordination Group (GDSCG) and Siting Delivery Board.	<b>Open</b>
<b>ACTION 6:</b> Secretariat to publish DSRL's response to CoRWM letter.	<b>Closed</b>
<b>ACTION 7:</b> SG5 to monitor DSRL activities regarding the Interim End State date and the suitability of LoC to near-surface disposal.	<b>Ongoing</b>
<b>ACTION 8:</b> SG2 to prepare draft responses to RWM public facing documents, and circulate these to other members, for discussion at the November plenary meeting.	<b>Closed</b>

<b>Actions from 20th September 2017 Open Plenary Meeting</b>	<b>Updates</b>
<b>ACTION 9:</b> SG2 to monitor RWM's response to advice on the Screening Narratives.	<b>Closed</b>
<b>ACTION 10:</b> SG1 and SG2 to liaise with the new integrated BEIS communications team to ascertain the planned publishing of public facing documents.	<b>Ongoing</b>
<b>ACTION 11:</b> Janet Wilson to contact Jess Ellis to ensure SG1 representative is invited to Integrated Communications Team meetings.	<b>Closed</b>
<b>ACTION 12:</b> SG2 to enquire as to the status of public facing safety cases for each rock type, then analyse the effectiveness of these documents.	<b>Closed</b>
<b>ACTION 13:</b> SG3 to analyse the National Policy Statement and draft a CoRWM response to the consultation for discussion at the November plenary meeting	<b>Ongoing</b>
<b>ACTION 14:</b> SG3 to meet BEIS to ensure their proposals maintain a comprehensive regulatory framework after the UK exit from Euratom.	<b>Ongoing</b>
<b>ACTION 15:</b> SG4 to monitor the IPA review and provide feedback to the IPA and CoRWM.	<b>Closed</b>
<b>ACTION 16:</b> SG4 to liaise with John Cordoroy on the status of RWM's Lifetime Plans.	<b>Ongoing</b>
<b>ACTION 17:</b> SG4 to ask RWM to provide updated details on the structure of the organisation, such as through a new organogram.	<b>Ongoing</b>
<b>ACTION 18:</b> SG6 to work with SG1 to clarify potential differences between Welsh and English equivalent policy documents.	<b>Ongoing</b>

<b>Actions from 20th September 2017 Open Plenary Meeting</b>	<b>Updates</b>
<b>ACTION 19:</b> SG4, informed by SG2, to ensure next year's Work Programme includes a detailed evaluation of the Letter of Compliance process.	<b>Ongoing</b>
<b>ACTION 20:</b> Secretariat to organise a handover meeting for Euratom exit work for the end of October.	<b>Closed</b>
<b>ACTION 21:</b> SG2 to include communication with Germany regarding down-selection criteria on next year's work programme.	<b>Closed</b>
<b>ACTION 22:</b> Secretariat to examine budget for the possibility of a visit to Onkalo.	<b>Superceded</b>
<b>ACTION 23:</b> Secretariat to send meeting calendar to CoRWM members each month for them to amend and update.	<b>Ongoing</b>