



**COMMITTEE ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT (CORWM)
OPEN MEETING
21 JUNE 2018, CUMBRIA**

- Venue:** Boardroom, Sella Park Hotel, Calderbridge CA20 1DW
- Timing:** 11.00 – 15.30
- Chair:** Campbell Gemmell (Acting Chair)
- Members:** Andrew Walters, Gregg Butler, Julia West, Melissa Denecke, Paul Davis, Richard Shaw, Simon Redfern, Stephen Newson, Stephen Tromans
- Attending:** CoRWM Secretariat, Andrew Craze (RWM), Cherry Tweed (RWM), Ciara Walsh (Sellafield Ltd.), Roger Cowton (Sellafield Ltd.), Alun Ellis (Member of Public), David Brazier (Member of Public)
- Apologies:** Andrew Hall, Janet Wilson, Joanne Hill

Summary

During the Plenary held on 21 June, the interim Chair gave a brief overview of the recent visit of CoRWM to Sellafield and tour of the Dalton Cumbria facility. Members provided updates on subgroup activities, including the technical support they provided to the Welsh Government in the form of fact sheets and timeline on the history of nuclear power and waste management in the UK. The Committee discussed RWM's issues process and heard a presentation on the history of Sellafield.

Agenda Item 1: Chair's Updates

Update on visits surrounding the Plenary

1. The Chair welcomed the Committee, visitors from different organisations, and members of the public to the Open Plenary.
2. The Chair welcomed the new Technical Secretary to the CoRWM Secretariat.
3. The Chair acknowledged that the visit in Cumbria was very useful as it facilitated CoRWM's participation in three Subgroup meetings, a tour of the Dalton Facility and visit to Sellafield Ltd.
4. The Chair thanked Melissa Denecke and Dalton Cumbrian Facility (DCF) staff members for their tour of DCF. The DCF is a £20 million facility jointly funded by the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) and Manchester which carries out nuclear related research.
5. The Chair thanked Sellafield Ltd. for arranging and guiding CoRWM members around Sellafield, and for an informative discussion on Sellafield Ltd.'s organisational structure, current and future projects, and use of innovative technologies.
6. The Committee visited various facilities at Sellafield including the First-Generation Magnox Storage Ponds (FGMSP), Windscale Advanced Gas-cooled Reactor (WAGR) boxes, and Highly Active Liquor Evaporation and Storage (HALES).
7. The Committee considered preparing a letter to acknowledge the visit. The visit allowed the Committee to witness the progress since CoRWM's last visit in October 2017.

Update on Recruitment

8. The Chair provided an update on recruitment. A new Chair of CoRWM had been appointed and an announcement was expected. This would be the last Plenary for Campbell Gemmill as the interim Chair.
9. The previous Chair, Laurence Williams was presented an OBE in the Queen's Birthday Honours. This was a personal tribute, but also highlighted the value of the Committee. The Committee congratulated Laurence Williams.

10. The Chair provided an update on the Committee members whose term would come to an end in November. This could lead to significant changes to CoRWM's membership. Planning around renewals and recruitment had begun and the Committee would be updated before the September Plenary.

Tailored Review Update

11. The Chair provided an update on the Tailored Review. This is a Triennial review and it is the second review done in recent years. The Tailored Review had proposed some minor administrative actions, but it did not highlight any need for substantive changes. There were some issues highlighted with CoRWM's remit and terms of reference. The Committee planned to discuss the review in more detail once it has been completed. The Tailored Review will be completed over the summer and an update will be given at the next Plenary.

Annual Report

12. The Chair provided an update on the Annual Report. The report had progressed rapidly compared to last year and the Chair hoped it would move quickly through the publication process. The Committee thanked the Sponsors, Radioactive Waste Management Ltd (RWM) and Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) for their input into the Annual Report. The Secretariat plans to send a formal submission to the Government.
13. There were no formal recommendations in the Annual Report, but it highlighted the large amount of work done by the Committee over the previous year. The Annual Report highlighted the collaborative work occurring between the different subgroups and stakeholders.
14. The main issues raised in the Annual Report focused on the Working with Communities (WWC) and the Geological Disposal National Policy Statement (NPS) consultations. The Committee's responses to the consultations set out how they thought the process could be refined. There is a need for public communities to engage in the process as much as possible in an easy manner.

Chairs Meetings

15. The Chair had an informal and constructive meeting with Malcom Morley, Chair of RWM. It allowed the Committee and RWM to take a fresh approach to their work and highlighted the need for strong collaboration between the two organisations.

16. The Chair attended the NDA supply chain meeting at the Scottish Parliament, Edinburgh on 15 May 2018. This meeting was attended by the Chair and CEO of the NDA, Chair of CoRWM, MPs and MSPs from constituencies with nuclear sites. The meeting revolved around the waste management challenges mainly associated with Scotland.
17. The Chair attended BEIS and RWM Risk Management Workshop held on 31 May 2018. The workshop reset the discussion on risk issues which will go into BEIS and RWM risk management strategies. These strategies were progressing towards prioritisation and assessment of different risks and took a broader and somewhat longer-term forward look. The resulting report would be shared with the Committee.
18. The Chair discussed the Infrastructure Projects Authority (IPA) Project Assessment Review (PAR) process which focused on RWM's ongoing readiness to deliver a major project. This gave an update of the report from November 2017 and several recommendations. The IPA PAR process recognised that there was a good response to many items in the November report, and progress was made. The Chair suggested that the Committee should play a role in the continuing IPA PAR process.

Agenda Item 2: Declaration of interests

19. CoRWM's register of interests can be found online.¹
20. Campbell Gemmell planned to finish his work for the World Bank and the Scottish Government at the end of June 2018. A report on the latter governance project post-Brexit would be published.
21. Stephen Tromans had been asked by BEIS to participate in the Red Team Review. BEIS, NDA, RWM and CoRWM agreed there were no conflict of interests.
22. Stephen Tromans was working on several projects relating to nuclear new build. None of the projects were related to radioactive waste and posed no conflict of interests to CoRWM.
23. There were no other changes to interests expressed.

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/register-of-members-interests--3>

Agenda Item 3: Approval of minutes and status of actions from May 2018 Open Plenary

24. The minutes of the May 2018 Open Plenary were approved.
25. The action list from the May 2018 Open Plenary was updated.

Agenda Item 4: Subgroup Activities and Plans

Subgroup 1: Working with Communities and Communications

26. Julia West provided an update on Subgroup 1 activities. The GDF Team from BEIS sent a summary document of the responses to the WWC consultation. Janet Wilson provided feedback on behalf of the subgroup to BEIS via a teleconference.
27. The Committee decided to turn the note prepared by Janet Wilson from the meeting with BEIS GDF Team into a position paper. Subgroup 1 were planning to finalise a draft and circulate it to the rest of the Committee.

Subgroup 2: Safety Case and Geology

28. Paul Davis stated that the major issues from the last CoRWM Plenary, the National Geological Screening and Public safety case, were closed out.
29. The next focus of the subgroup was to explore RWM's acceleration of a GDF. This revolved around reducing the budget and time for construction of a GDF and subsequent first waste emplacement. An overview meeting was held with officials from RWM on 19 June 2018 to establish contact on this and discuss background information with RWM.

Subgroup 3: Planning and Regulation

30. Stephen Tromans provided an update on the meeting with the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) on 3 May 2018. This meeting was attended by the Chair and members of Subgroups 2 and 3. This meeting re-established contact between CoRWM and the ONR and both organisations agreed to set up annual meetings to maintain engagement.
31. Stephen Tromans felt it would be productive to set up these types of meetings with the environmental regulators: Environment Agency (EA), The Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) and National Resources Wales (NRW).

32. The Chair thanked Rob Campbell from the ONR, and his colleagues for hosting the meeting, being so open to engagement and agreeing to meet regularly, probably annually, hereafter.
33. Stephen Tromans provided an update on the meeting with BEIS GDF Team on 5 June 2018 to discuss the NPS and the forthcoming Select Committee hearing on 10 July 2018. There would be further meetings with BEIS GDF team following the Select Committee hearing.
34. There was no major news to report with regards to site licensing of a GDF from the BEIS GDF Team. The BEIS GDF Team are moving to a quantitative approach and will write a paper for CoRWM to review.

Subgroup 4: Organisational Development

35. Steve Newson provided an update on the progress Subgroup 4 had made since the May 2 Open Plenary. The subgroup was tracking progress with recommendations from the IPA review on RWM readiness. The IPA review needs to go through the Geological Disposal Programme Board (GDPB) to show that the plan is reported. There was a series of recommendations, and the approaches to answering these recommendations were agreed.
36. The subgroup met with RWM on 21 June to discuss RWM's Letters of Compliance (LoC) process for the generic GDF designs. CoRWM recommended that "RWM should ensure that the LoC process is applicable to GDFs in all 3 rock types" in its 13th Annual Report. The meeting discussed the recommendation and the subgroup will decide whether their recommendation had been addressed and report back to RWM if there are any further questions.
37. The Chair stated the meeting with RWM highlighted the large breadth of available waste packages which accommodate the many types of decommissioning wastes the Committee observed at Sellafield on 20 June 2018.

Subgroup 5: Scottish Government Activities

38. Campbell Gemmell provided an update on Subgroup 5 activities. There was no major group activity update to report since the 2 May Plenary. There had been a teleconference with the Scottish Government on 19 June to discuss Euratom and possible UK non-compliance with Directives. The IAEA Joint Conventions UK inspection visit was also mentioned.

39. The European Commission had issued a formal notice about UK non-compliance with the EU Radioactive Waste Directive. The Committee is waiting for BEIS to provide more details regarding the European Commission's concerns.
40. The Scottish Government had asked for a supplementary report to "Radioactive waste: implications of UK withdrawal from Euratom and the EU". This will be a document created by Subgroup 5 supported by Subgroup 8. A meeting was planned in August in Edinburgh with the Scottish Government and other stakeholders to clarify this task and discuss wider issues.

Subgroup 6: Welsh Government Activities

41. Gregg Butler discussed the Welsh Consultation. Subgroup 6 had previously helped the Welsh Government with three drafts of the Welsh consultation document and were currently helping the Welsh Government answer any technical questions resulting from the consultation responses. The timescale for CoRWM's answer to the technical questions had not been set up.
42. The Committee discussed the work carried out by the original Committee (CoRWM 1) work from 2003 to 2006. This was highly technical work and the current Committee needs to be able to back-track to the documents the original Committee used to reach their recommendations.
43. To track the history of nuclear energy and radioactive waste management in the UK, a spreadsheet containing key events will be created, with links to websites, and pdf files if online documentation is available.
44. Subgroup 6 proposed to answer the Welsh technical questions by creating a series of fact sheets answering frequently asked questions. A list of questions was developed, and the Committee was planning to discuss whether they are appropriate for CoRWM to answer them, or whether they should be sent to RWM, regulators or BEIS instead. Gregg Butler will start drafting these questions to be reviewed by the Committee at the next Plenary in September.
45. The Committee discussed whether any similar information is already available at other organisations (e.g. NDA, RWM).
46. The Chair discussed the National Archive documentation of CoRWM and asked the Secretariat to find out what the domain will look like and how accessible and useful the documents would be.

47. Cherry Tweed discussed RWM's history timeline in terms of technical and policy terms which extends to 1976. There is a glossary with two definitions, one technical version and another distilled version. This is a well referenced glossary, based on work carried out by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). RWM are happy to share this timeline with CoRWM. RWM's FAQ is work in progress and the final document will be shared with CoRWM and BEIS.
48. CoRWM asked the RWM representatives about their time at Nirex (the organisation which became RWM) and RWM's records of CoRWM's documents. All the reports which came to a Nirex desk were documented. Internal records of engagement with CoRWM were not publicly available but the results of this engagement were publicly available.
49. The Chair suggested that it was necessary to get BEIS' views on the role of CoRWM, for example acting as quality assurers of the RWM and Nirex records.

Subgroup 7: Storage of Radioactive Waste, Spent Nuclear Fuel and Nuclear Materials

50. Gregg Butler provided an update on Subgroup 7's interaction with the NDA Waste Inventory team with regards to the NDA's proposed Waste Integration Strategy. This strategy deals with the waste from all UK NDA sites together, allowing for repurposing of facilities and re-classification of waste. It leads to a greater fluidity, with the requirement of a continuous way to record progress.
51. The NDA and Subgroup 7 agreed to look at how to report the progress of waste inventory retrieval to the public and the UK Government. This must include what the NDA can tell the public. The NDA had a workshop with regulators on 4 June 2018 to discuss this further.
52. The NDA are working with the Low Level Waste Repository (LLWR) to understand how LLWR successfully reported their waste in the form of a dashboard document. The Committee felt that the dashboard was very useful.
53. The Committee discussed communicating hazard and risk in more detail. Hazard and risk need to have strict definitions and to be the same across

all organisations. The key risks need to be clearly stated to the public and Government without using the large numbers employed in SED.

54. The preparatory steps for waste retrieval need to be clarified with the public, as this is progress. This could be communicated by showing the strategy to deal with the risk, and what the preparatory steps are. Advancement in technologies such as remote operated vehicles should also be reported to the public.
55. Sellafield Ltd. highlighted that it was difficult to report progress in numerical terms. For example, the progress of moving WAGR boxes to the LLWR might not be as important as the fact that it frees up space to take waste out of the ponds.

Subgroup 8: Euratom Exit Implications for Radioactive Waste Management

56. Stephen Tromans QC provided an update on the work surrounding Euratom. As discussed in paragraph 40 the subgroup was tasked by the Scottish Government to provide a supplementary document to CoRWM's Euratom report.
57. In terms of leaving Euratom, the task appears extremely slow on the surface, but changes happened rapidly, for example with the EU Commission report for non-compliance.
58. Subgroup 8 would develop a supplementary report to present at the next plenary.
59. The Chair asked whether the subgroup received any indirect feedback on the Euratom report. There was no formal feedback from BEIS. The Scottish Cabinet Secretary had welcomed the report.

Subgroup 9: CoRWM Outreach

60. The Chair provided an update on the status of the subgroup. Subgroup 9 is a new group and CoRWM is waiting on the Sponsors to decide what they would like the group to do.

Agenda Item 5: Questions from Public (David Brazier)

61. David Brazier (EA) could not attend the afternoon session and therefore provided feedback on the morning discussions.

62. David expressed interest in the parameters on reporting progress with decommissioning and waste storage. The EA helped the NDA shape their 2009 HAW storage review on the status of waste packaging and storage. The EA continues to support the NDA's environmental performance indicators working group. This includes the development of waste indicators.
63. The Chair asked if there would be any formal feedback from Juliet Long on her time working for BEIS. Gregg Butler stated she was also involved with the NDA progress reporting relevant to Subgroup 7. David Brazier agreed to contact Juliet Long to see if she had any feedback. The Committee would like to set up a meeting with the EA.
64. David Brazier provided the current Committee with the 2004 and 2005 public outreach documents CoRWM had produced, discussing who CoRWM was. The Committee thanked David Brazier for the documents and asked the Secretariat to add them to the CoRWM Archive.

Agenda Item 6: Invited Speakers

65. Since the 2 May Open Plenary, CoRWM had invited speakers to discuss various aspects of radioactive waste management. At the 21 June Plenary, Andrew Craze from RWM discussed RWM's issues process, and Roger Cowton from Sellafield Ltd. discussed the history of Sellafield.

Agenda Item 7: RWM Issues Process (Andrew Craze)

66. Andrew Craze introduced the Committee to the RWM Issues Management process. More detail was available online at <http://rwm.nda.gov.uk/issues>.
67. RWM's issues process is intended to enable interested individuals or groups with to raise issues about RWM's work which they believe could affect implementation of geological disposal. As part of this process RWM maintain an online issues register which captures the concerns raised externally and RWM's response to them. This allows RWM to show transparency in how it addresses the issues raised by stakeholders and in so doing build confidence in RWM handling of such issues.
68. RWM worked with stakeholders and regulators to develop the process and took their comments into account. RWM planned to continue seeking this feedback from issue raisers and others with an interest in the process so that they can develop and improve the process.

69. RWM use the term 'issue' to mean any challenge or concern that is raised by stakeholders or the regulators which could affect the technical implementation of a geological disposal system.
70. A range of organisations and individuals have raised issues. These may include those working in relation to geological disposal, including any individuals or groups who take an interest in RWM's work. The issues register shows the issues raised by different groups of issue raisers.
71. Andrew Craze showed the Committee the issues raised by CoRWM. These had initially been identified from CoRWM's reports during 2009 and 2010. However, in 2011 and 2012 RWM had further dialogue with the Committee to agree which issues should be managed through the issues process. Since then RWM had periodically written to the Committee to provide updates on these issues. RWM would like to know whether CoRWM would like further engagement around these topics and if so what form this engagement should take.
72. The Chair stated that the Committee made some progress since those issues had been raised, although some are likely valid. The Committee will all look at the raised issues and compare them to the Work Programme. Any issues related to the Work Programme would be discussed further with RWM.
73. The RWM representatives offered to meet with the Committee to arrange to progress this as necessary.
74. The Committee enquired whether the RWM issues register was used to manage internally identified issues. RWM replied that the issues register was only used for issues raised by external individuals or groups. Any potential issues identified internally would be answered using its internal management processes for example RWM's technical programme. Where an issue is identified both internally and externally, these would be included in the Issues Register. In such cases there would normally be an existing programme of work programme initiated in response to the potential issue by RWM and this would be referred to in the Issues Register.
75. Paul Davis enquired whether there is a category for the potential impact of the issues. RWM does not have a category as part of the issues process, but the impact is used to shape RWM's Work Programme.
76. Paul Davis asked whether there was a filter for what is relevant or irrelevant at a particular point of time. RWM stated that if an external

stakeholder had a concern they will discuss the issue and how they propose to address it with that stakeholder. If an issue cannot be addressed until a future stage of the programme it can be raised on the issues register but would be marked as non-active to distinguish it from the active issues currently being addressed by RWM.

77. Stephen Newson asked how the issues were prioritised, recognising they were working with a limited budget. RWM responded that they prioritised the work placed on the Work Programme, which is influenced by the RWM issues process. Prioritisation is not considered on RWM issues register.
78. The Chair concluded the discussion and thanked RWM representatives for sharing the issues register with the Committee that is a valuable resource.

Agenda Item 8: History of Sellafield (Roger Cowton)

79. The Chair welcomed Roger Cowton, Head of External Affairs at Sellafield Ltd and acknowledged that a structured overview of Sellafield history was very useful.
80. A summary of the history of Sellafield is described in the document published online:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/transformation-plan>
81. In the 1940's the UK decided to develop its own strategic defence programme and built the Windscale piles. These operated until the Windscale fire in 1957. Filters named Cockcroft's Follies were added to the top of the piles during construction and were important for containing the impact of the fire.
82. Calder Hall was opened on 17 October 1956. It was the first commercial nuclear power plant in the UK. The four reactors continued to support the military programme and the development of the civil power programme.
83. Facilities were constructed to store Spent Fuel (SF) between 1958 and 1972 including the First Generation Magnox Storage pond and Magnox Swarf Storage Pond. The Magnox reprocessing facility was constructed to reprocess Magnox SF and will complete its programme in 2020. It has reprocessed 65,000 tonnes of UK Magnox fuel, a significant proportion of the estimated 100,000 tonnes of the fuel (all types) reprocessed worldwide.
84. The final (and seventh) reactor to be built at Sellafield was the Windscale Advanced Gas Fuel Reactor (WAGR), this has been decommissioned and much of the internals have been placed in concrete boxes (WAGR boxes).

The reactor was used for a lot of experimental fuel development including mixed oxide fuel (MOX) and supporting research carried out at Dounreay.

85. The 1980's and 1990's is often referred to as the commercial area. Sellafield was considered the largest construction project in Europe during THORP construction. Commercialisation led to the need to be able to deal with the waste in near real time with facilities being constructed to do this.
86. Sellafield were currently in the decommissioning phase. The highest hazard and risk facilities at Sellafield are the four storage ponds and silos.
87. Innovation is a key process at Sellafield. This can range from low technological fit for purpose solutions to highly advanced remotely operated vehicles that have been adapted for use at Sellafield from other industries.

CoRWM Questions

88. Paul Davis asked about the end state of Sellafield, and the timescale and budget for reaching this. The timescale for release was 2120, though the level of decontamination was still under discussion.
89. Paul Davis asked what timescales are assumed for the availability of a GDF. These timelines were 2040 for beginning of ILW emplacement, 2075 for spent fuel emplacement and 2089 for high level waste emplacement.
90. Andrew Walters pointed out that the local community may not want a greenfield site, and rather have it treated as a heritage site. It would be good to keep an iconic section of Sellafield for the future.

Agenda Item 9: Final Round-up

91. The Chair and Committee thanked the speakers.
92. The outgoing Chair closed the meeting with some remarks. The Chair enjoyed working with everyone on the Committee during his period as Interim Chair and thanked Julia West for her support as the interim Deputy Chair.

Agenda Item 10: Any Other Business

93. None raised.

Agenda Item 11: Next Meeting

94. The next Open Plenary meeting will be held on Tuesday 18 September 2018, in Cardiff at the Clayton Hotel
95. Please contact corwm@beis.gov.uk for details on how to attend CoRWM plenaries or visit our webpage² or meetings calendar.³

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/committee-on-radioactive-waste-management>

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/corwm-plenary-meeting-dates-and-locations-2018>

Appendix A – Abbreviations

BEIS	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
CoRWM	Committee on Radioactive Waste Management
DAs	Devolved Administrations
DCF	Dalton Cumbrian Facility
EA	Environment Agency
FGMSP	First-Generation Magnox Storage Ponds
GDF	Geological Disposal Facility
GDPB	Geological Disposal Programme Board
HALES	Highly Active Liquor Evaporation and Storage
HLW	High Level Waste
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IPA	Infrastructure Projects Authority
ILW	Intermediate Level Waste
LLW	Low Level Waste
LoC	Letters of Compliance
NDA	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
NPS	National Policy Statement
NRW	Natural Resource Wales
ONR	Office for Nuclear Regulation
RWM	Radioactive Waste Management
SED	Safety and Environmental Detriment
SEPA	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency
WAGR	Windscale Advanced Gas-cooled Reactor

WWC

Working with Communities

Appendix B – Actions

Actions from the Open Plenary		Status
Action 1:	Prepare Letter to Sellafield Ltd.	In process
Action 2:	Arrange meeting with Kate McCready (BEIS) to discuss putting CoRWM documents on National Archives	In process
Action 3:	Speak to RWM communications team to discuss RWM's timeline on history of nuclear power and waste management	In process
Action 4:	Ask BEIS for feedback to CoRWM Euratom report	In process
Action 5:	Ensure that CoRWM's issues on RWM issues registers are updated	In process