



**COMMITTEE ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT (CORWM)
OPEN MEETING
10 JANUARY 2018, LONDON**

- Venue:** BEIS Conference Centre, 1 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0ET
- Timing:** 09.00 – 13.00
- Chair:** Campbell Gemmell (Acting)
- Members:** Andrew Hall, Andrew Walters, Gregg Butler, Janet Wilson, Joanne Hill, Julia West, Melissa Denecke, Paul Davis, Richard Shaw, Stephen Tromans
- Attending:** Brian Clark (Former Member), RWM HSSE director, RWM Head of HSSEQ Systems, BEIS Head of CoRWM Sponsorship
- Apologies:** Simon Redfern, Stephen Newson (Members)

Summary

The Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) is an independent group of (currently) 13 experts which provides scrutiny and advice to the UK governments on the long-term management of higher activity radioactive wastes. CoRWM meets six times each year in plenary to discuss its work.

This note contains minutes for the CoRWM Open Plenary in London which occurred on 10th January 2018. CoRWM Open Meetings encourage participation and input from the public and other stakeholders. One main development from this meeting was the creation of a CoRWM Subgroup to examine the Committee's role in future stakeholder engagement.

CoRWM plenary meetings often provide update on the work of Subgroups which examine key areas of interest to stakeholders, and in this instance included scrutiny of the UK and Welsh Governments plans to launch consultations on a GDF, examination of 'National Geological Screening' information prepared by RWM, and how the Euratom exit will affect radioactive waste management. CoRWM also developed the draft Work Programme for the coming year.

Agenda Item 1: Chair's Update

1. The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed members of the public.
2. The Chair gave an update to the recruitment timetable for the new Chair's appointment. It is unlikely that the new Chair will be in place for the March Plenary meetings, but may be in place for the May Plenary.
3. Julia West had agreed to act as interim Deputy Chair.
4. The Annual Report 2016/17 and Work Programme 2017-2020 were published on the CoRWM website on 02 January 2018. The Secretariat had plans in place seeking to prevent publication delays.
5. A BEIS Governance Sponsor had been appointed to work with CoRWM, to complement the existing Policy Sponsor.

ACTION 1: Secretariat to share CNRD Organogram with members.

6. The Chair wished to publicly thank the new Secretariat for the changes and improvements initiated since their appointment.

Agenda Item 2: Declarations of Interests

7. The Chair provided an update to the register of interests. He had been asked by Scottish Government to chair a group tasked with providing an initial report on environmental governance in Scotland post-Brexit. The Chair would flag any conflicts if they emerged.
8. Janet Wilson indicated she was about to be engaged to undertake work related to nuclear new build. As matters became clearer she would alert to any possible conflict but this appeared unlikely at this stage.
9. There were no other declarations.

Agenda Item 3: Approval of minutes and status of actions from November 2017 Open Plenary

10. The minutes of the November 2017 Open Plenary were approved.

ACTION 2: Subgroup 1 to analyse BEIS plans and expectations for addressing consultation responses and report on these at the May plenary. The group would also lead on initial assembly of the Committee's response to the BEIS consultations, as appropriate.

11. The action list from the November 2017 Open Plenary was updated.

Agenda Item 4: Subgroup Activities and Plans

Subgroup 1:

12. Subgroup 1 gave an update on 08 January 2018 meeting with BEIS GDF team and RWM on consultation plans for WWC and NPS.
13. Subgroup 1 was encouraged by RWM work conducted prior to launch supporting the BEIS consultation and siting process.
14. Subgroup 1 agreed on the need for rapid communications to determine which members will be available to attend stakeholder workshops.

Subgroup 2:

15. Subgroup 2 had met with RWM to discuss NGS and public-facing safety documents on 24 November 2017.
16. The Subgroup has provided ongoing advice on the public-facing safety documents and NGS, and is waiting for final versions before bringing these to the plenary where it was hoped that CoRWM recommendations can be closed out.
17. The documentation was near completion, and RWM will circulate the final versions to CoRWM.

ACTION 3: Paul Davis to circulate public-facing safety documentation to the Secretariat for distribution when received.

ACTION 4: Subgroup 2 will compare the public-facing safety documents with the 2016 generic safety case to ensure the validity of the documentation.

18. Subgroup 2 reported that RWM believed they have specific legal requirements to fulfil with regard to the NGS, and this may limit their ability to incorporate changes.

ACTION 5: Subgroup 2 to consult legal expertise within CoRWM to offer their advice regarding RWM's legal requirements for the NGS.

19. Subgroup 2 has been shown the updated RWM website, and noted the clear improvements that have been made.

Subgroup 3:

20. Subgroup 3 has previously raised issues regarding the statutory instrument to be used for licensing.
21. Subgroup 3 now understands a qualitative description of GDF will be used, and anticipates seeing a draft SI this month.
22. Subgroup 3 was prepared to respond to this document when received in a meeting with BEIS scheduled for February.

Subgroup 4:

23. Subgroup 4 welcomed the output of the IPA review of RWM, especially considering the scope and time available for the review.
24. Subgroup 4 agreed that progress was being made on issues raised, however areas such as culture change and organisational development must be considered as RWM transitions to a delivery body.
25. CoRWM agreed to submit a letter to BEIS via the Chair of the Committee regarding the outcomes of the review.

Subgroup 5:

26. Subgroup 5 reported good interaction with colleagues in Scottish Government on areas of interest, and have sought a meeting with Scottish Cabinet Secretary. This was hoped to occur in Q4 of 2017/8.
27. Subgroup 5 reported that Scottish Government was interested in looking at the common challenges and issues faced across the UK with regard to near-surface disposal.
28. Subgroup 5 reported that Scottish Government was considering issues regarding the repatriation of overseas waste to its original source. Campbell Gemmell was asked to explore this during a recent trip to Australia, and has fed his observations back to the Scottish Government.

Subgroup 6:

29. Subgroup 6 reported that it has provided comments to the Welsh Administration on its communications consultation document.

ACTION 6: Chair to seek meeting with Welsh Ministers during consultation period.

30. CoRWM has been asked by the Welsh Administration to analyse the responses to the consultation.
31. Janet Wilson raised that Subgroup 1 will need to provide Subgroup 6 with support during the analysis of the consultation responses in Wales.

Subgroup 7:

32. Subgroup 7 reported on a meeting with the NDA on waste storage and nuclear materials. NDA is continuing with on-going processes, including updating existing waste inventories.
33. Subgroup 7 has requested a clearer picture of what waste conditioning is being undertaken, and where waste inventories are situated. Subgroup 7 has a meeting with the NDA scheduled for February in which these issues will be discussed.

34. A meeting will be held with, inter alia, BEIS and NDA representation to discuss ongoing review of waste disposal methods and technologies which could complement geological disposal.

Subgroup 8:

35. Subgroup 8 reported on the progress of its draft report on the possible legal implications of leaving Euratom.
36. The report was almost complete, with some further comments from CoRWM members required before circulation to BEIS and the DAs.
37. The paper was comprehensive and considered IAEA requirements, UK law, and whether leaving Euratom would leave any areas requiring Government attention.
38. The report included recommendations on any points requiring Government attention, and meetings will be offered to BEIS and DA partners to discuss this report.

ACTION 7: Members to provide Stephen Tromans with final comments regarding Euratom paper.

ACTION 8: Secretariat to scope possible meetings with BEIS and DA colleagues regarding Euratom paper.

ACTION 9: Secretariat to format final Euratom paper appropriately for final approval and distribution.

Agenda Item 5/6: Progress in 2017/18 Work Programme and 2018-2021 Work Programme

39. The Secretariat presented a working document, outlining tasks and outputs prescribed in the Work Programme, with the relevant status and document numbers associated with each. This would work as an on-going annex, liable to be used in work plans and annual reports, for CoRWM to work from, and partners to observe and, when available, access what has been produced. This was warmly welcomed.

ACTION 10: Secretariat to develop a structure of outputs to be used by Committee.

ACTION 11: Secretariat to produce one page summaries of tasks/outputs.

40. Gregg Butler raised that prior to the new Secretariat, lots of publications or documents had not been archived, and that correcting this problem would add greatly to the ease of assessing the Committee's contribution.
41. Janet Wilson put on record CoRWM's appreciation to the new Secretariat for progressing most of these issues.

Agenda Item 7: Forward Look – 2017/18 Annual Report

42. Members were asked at the November 2017 Plenary to provide draft materials to Janet Wilson, which some had, and the Chair reminded members of this requirement.

ACTION 12: Members to provide Janet Wilson with information to populate Annual Report 2017/18 by 02 February 2018.

43. The Chair suggested the Annual Report could be downsized with a different tone, and allow other avenues of advice and publication to be used as part of a coherent and complementary approach.

ACTION 13: Janet Wilson to work with Secretariat to bring forward a full working draft.

44. Janet Wilson provided an update on the state of the Annual Report. The Report will include a compressed executive summary to give a status update of the UK's radioactive waste management. The recommendations from the 2016/17 Report and the responses to those recommendations will be discussed.

Agenda Item 8: Forward Look – Plenary Meetings and Visits

45. The Chair reported that GDPB meeting dates have now been set.

ACTION 14: Committee to agree Plenary dates over the next 18 months at the March 2018 Plenary meeting.

46. Possible visits to Finland and Germany were discussed and the Committee agreed these visits would be beneficial. It was agreed that a subgroup of members would attend these visits, subject to skills and availability.

ACTION 15: Secretariat to scope budgeting and dates for these visits.

47. The Committee agreed on a visit to Dounreay, to coincide with the Edinburgh Plenary meeting. Possible visits to Sizewell and Sellafield were also discussed, ideally as adjuncts to plenary or subgroup meetings.

ACTION 16: Secretariat to scope budgeting and practicalities for potential Sizewell, Sellafield and Dounreay visits.

48. Julia West suggested inviting various experts from abroad to give talks to CoRWM, where members of the public could also be invited.

49. The Chair suggested this could be useful with an engagement dimension, but may also depend on clarification of CoRWM's role as part of the imminent Tailored Review.

Agenda Item 9: CoRWM Methods of Working

50. The Chair outlined the scope for CoRWM to strengthen further, through the Tailored Review process about to be undertaken, the Committee's methods of working to enhance its value.
51. CoRWM also hoped to use opportunity for change from the Tailored Review to improve the visibility of CoRWM's work.
52. Members commented on positive conversations with BEIS and the DAs regarding working relationships in recent meetings.
53. Melissa Denecke commented that communications could become challenging during long term programmes for a variety of reasons, but highlighted the value of Secretariat efforts to address this.
54. The Chair raised the need for CoRWM to be clear on where it has impacted on the development of government policy or departmental or RWM/NDA/partner practice, and where the Committee had fulfilled its quality assurance role. Often CoRWM's output is not outwardly visible, and discussions have been had with BEIS regarding more effectively recording this information. This could include more ways of providing outputs, rather than focusing solely on the Annual Report. There is also scope for CoRWM to focus more time on engagement, and this will be considered in the Tailored Review process.
55. Andrew Walters agreed and stressed the importance of maximising the effectiveness of the Committee and articulating work contributions. He suggested a workshop could be organised to determine this.
56. Members discussed the future of the subgroup model that is adopted by CoRWM.
57. The Chair raised the need to consider expertise management, in particular as the terms of members end. This should take into account future committee size and recruitment outcomes.
58. Paul Davis questioned if the same subgroups are required, and if CoRWM could be more flexible to ensure rapid responses to future events.
59. The Chair agreed the Tailored Review presents an opportunity to explore what subgroups are required, the subgroup working methods, and the expertise required.
60. The Chair suggested that, when prompted by events, limited life 'task forces' could be set up to respond to specific issues and actions.
61. Members agreed that the innovations already brought in by the new Secretariat over the last two meetings will become more valuable with time.

Publication options and tools available to the Committee should enhance as Secretariat further beds in.

62. The new document sharing system available to the Committee was discussed.

Agenda Item 10: CoRWM Communication Plans

63. The Committee noted that the CoRWM website is now more active, and the Secretariat confirmed that regular updates can now be expected.

64. The Committee agreed that a protocol for Twitter is required before tweeting can be undertaken, given the need to ensure it can be operated usefully including a news mechanism and a way of directing users to interesting material and help. It will be important to get capacity and responsiveness designed in.

ACTION 17: Secretariat to draw up Twitter protocol for members to approve.

65. The Secretariat outlined the return of the CoRWM e-bulletin, and laid out approval deadlines for this communication tool. This will be a regular publication between plenary meetings.
66. The Chair expressed the opinion that plenary meetings, by default, should be open. The Committee needs to develop methods of being more open, and spending less time, more productively in plenary meetings.
67. Members raised various points with regard to CoRWM's potential to communicate and engage more widely. The Committee agreed to set up a working group of Melissa Denecke, Joanne Hill, Andrew Hall, Andrew Walters, Paul Davis and Gregg Butler to consider its future openness and engagement. BEIS would be invited to participate.

ACTION 18: Working group on engagement to report back to Janet Wilson and feed findings into Annual Report by 12th February 2018. Group to feed back their findings to members, ensuring this can be reflected in Tailored Review, future plans and CoRWM Terms of Reference as appropriate.

Agenda Item 11: Questions from the Public

68. Brian Clark emphasised the importance of the discussions on openness and engagement. CoRWM should set up its working group and define what open means in the context of CoRWM. This would help shape meeting format and style.
69. Brian Clark also suggested that holding meetings at 09:00 in London is not practical for most members of the public.

70. RWM's HSSE Director welcomed the tone and content of this meeting as he hadn't attended for some time. He suggested CoRWM could have a more active role in terms of engagement, including internally helping to achieve greater coherence across government and partners. He also observed that CoRWM's Terms of Reference require CoRWM to engage with its stakeholders, but a structured process needed to be agreed.

Agenda Item 12: Any Other Business

71. There was no other business raised.

Agenda Item 13: Next Meeting

72. The next Open Plenary meeting will be held 23 March 2018, 1 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0ET

Appendix A – Abbreviations

BEIS	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
CNRD	Civil Nuclear and Resilience Directorate
CoRWM	Committee on Radioactive Waste Management
DAs	Devolved Administrations
GDF	Geological Disposal Facility
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IPA	Infrastructure Projects Authority
NDA	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
NGS	National Geological Screening
RWM	Radioactive Waste Management

Appendix B – Actions

Actions from the Open Plenary		Status
Action 1	Secretariat to share CNRD Organogram with members.	Closed
Action 2	Subgroup 1 to analyse BEIS plans and expectations for addressing consultation responses and report on these at the May plenary. The group would also lead on initial assembly of the Committee's response to the BEIS consultations, as appropriate.	Closed
Action 3	Paul Davis to circulate public facing safety documentation to the Secretariat for distribution when received.	Closed
Action 4	Subgroup 2 will compare the public-facing safety documents with the 2016 safety case to ensure the validity of the documentation.	Ongoing
Action 5	Subgroup 2 to consult legal expertise within CoRWM to offer their advice regarding RWM's legal requirements for the NGS.	Closed
Action 6	Chair to seek meeting with Welsh Ministers during consultation period.	Closed
Action 7	Members to provide Stephen Tromans with final comments regarding Euratom paper.	Closed
Action 8	Secretariat to scope possible meetings with BEIS and DA colleagues regarding Euratom paper.	Ongoing
Action 9	Secretariat to format final Euratom paper appropriately for final approval and distribution.	Ongoing
Action 10	Secretariat to develop a structure of outputs to be used by Committee.	Ongoing
Action 11	Secretariat to produce one page summaries of tasks/outputs.	Ongoing
Action 12	Members to provide Janet Wilson with information to populate Annual Report 2017/18 by 02 February 2018.	Closed
Action 13	Janet Wilson to work with Secretariat to bring forward a full working draft.	Ongoing
Action 14	Committee to agree Plenary dates over the next 18 months at the March 2018 Plenary meeting.	Closed
Action 15	Secretariat to scope budgeting and dates for these visits.	Closed
Action 16	Secretariat to scope budgeting and practicalities for potential Sizewell, Sellafield and Dounreay visits.	Closed
Action 17	Secretariat to draw up Twitter protocol for members to approve.	Closed

Action 18 Working group on engagement to report back to Janet Wilson and feed findings into Annual Report. Group to feed back their findings to members, ensuring this can be reflected in Tailored Review, future plans and CoRWM Terms of Reference as appropriate. Closed
