



**NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AUTHORITY
BOARD MEETING**

Minutes of the meeting of the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (“NDA”) Board held on 18 January 2023 (“Day 1”) at the Aztec Hotel & Spa, Aztec West Almondsbury, Bristol, BS32 4TS and on the 19 January 2023 (“Day2”) at the Magnox Hub Bristol, Keypoint, Almondsbury Business Park, Great Park Road, Bradley Stoke BS32 4QQ

Present (Board Members):

Ros Rivaz (Chair)	Evelyn Dickey (Non-Executive Member)
*David Peattie (Chief Executive Officer)	*Francis Livens (Non-Executive Member)
Mel Zuydam (Chief Financial Officer)	Chris Train (Non-Executive Member)
Janet Ashdown (Senior Independent Director)	Alex Reeves (Non-Executive Member)
*Kathryn Cearns (Non-Executive Member) in part as noted in the minutes	

Apologies (Board Members):

K Cearns (for Day 2)

In attendance:

*[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (Group Accountant) in part	[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (Deputy Company Secretary)
*Mike Barber (HR Director - Group People Strategy) in part	Clive Nixon (Group Chief Nuclear Strategy Officer) in part
Martin Chown (Sellafield CEO) – in part	[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (Sellafield) in part
[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (Strategy Development Programme Manager) in part	*Frank Rainford (Group Chief of Staff and Security Officer) in part
[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (One NDA Programme Workstream Lead) in part	[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (Executive Programme Manager – Analytical Services (Sellafield)) in part
[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (Head of Nuclear Fuel Cycle) in part	Matthew Shaw (Acting Group General Counsel and Company Secretary)
[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (Head of Revenue & Services) in part	[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (Head of Central Reporting) in part
[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (Site Director (Sellafield)) in part	[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (Commercial Manager, Analytical Services (Sellafield)) in part
[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (Assistant Company Secretary) in part	[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (Group Financial Controller) in part
*[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (Head of Sanction) in part	Paul Vallance (Group Director of Communications and Stakeholder Relations)
[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (Head of Stakeholder Engagement) in part	David Vineall (Chief Human Resources Officer) in part
[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] (Head of Non-NDA Liabilities) in part	

Apologies (Attendees):

Neil Harnby (Group General Counsel and Company Secretary)

* Denotes attendance via MS Teams

AGENDA ITEM

**Action
Owner**



	Day 1	
	<i>[The Board, M Shaw, [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] and [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] joined the meeting]</i>	
1.	Conflicts of Interest	
1.1	The Board considered the register of interests and APPROVED that all Board Members present could participate fully in the meeting.	
2.	Board and Committee Effectiveness Review	
2.1	The Chair reminded the Board of its request, at its meeting in November, for the initial themes from the 2022 Board and Committee effectiveness review to be revised for its further consideration. M Shaw and [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] explained the methodology applied to the review and how the revised areas for focus had been determined.	
2.2	The Board noted the summary of the revised themes and agreed with the Chair's suggestion that its discussion centre on two keys areas: (i) the focus and use of Board time; and (ii) the relationship between the NDA and OpCo Boards.	
2.3	<p>The Board had a detailed discussion on how well it spent its time and made several observations, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The demand on Board Member time to discharge NDA business was high. Efforts to reduce the number of Board meetings had only been successful in part. There were occasions when some matters were not fully resolved despite the time dedicated to them. The impact of a heavy Board and Committee calendar on Executive time was also noted. (ii) There were presently areas of overlap and duplication in responsibility between the Board and its Committees that should be addressed. The Board and each Committee should have sufficient time to discharge its remit. Taking an above and below the line approach to agendas could make a positive difference. (iii) It's expectations that the Committees would discharge their delegated responsibilities on behalf of the Board and escalate on points of principle as necessary. Comprehensive updates from Committee Chairs to the Board would be required to support this approach. (iv) There was a correlation between the quality of materials presented to the Board and the effective use of its time. The Board was strongly supportive of the work planned by the Corporate Governance team to improve the Board and Committee paper template and that this be accompanied by training on writing for boards and committees. Board Members offered their support, as appropriate, in reviewing papers on a "critical friend" basis and were supportive of a harder line being taken where papers were not fit for purpose. (v) The Board would benefit from insight into the challenge and observations raised at other governance forums, enroute to itself. This could be built into the paper template and would assist in reducing the volume of information escalated. This was particularly relevant to the Programmes & Projects Committee. The Board noted the ongoing work to improve the Sanctions approval process and the need for this to clarify responsibilities and accountabilities at each stage in the process. (vi) A clear forward plan of Board business was an effective tool for identifying areas of focus and ensuring the Board received the right information at the right time. (vii) NED only sessions prior to Board meetings could assist in streamlining discussions at meetings. 	



	<i>[David Peattie joined the meeting part way through this discussion]</i>	
2.4	The Board concluded that the relationship between the Executive and Non-Executive Board Members was in a good position but would be revisited at a later date. It was agreed that more could be done to enhance the Board's relationship with the OpCo boards. The Board discussed the proposal for a meeting of the Board and OpCo boards in July and were supportive of this. There was consensus that there must be a clear objective for the meeting and that it be pitched at an appropriate level of ambition. It was noted that the Chair and CEO were due to meet with the OpCo Chairs in February and would discuss the plans for the board-to-board meeting.	
2.5	The Board shared observations on some of the other areas that had been covered in the effectiveness review outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The rebuilding and repositioning of the Corporate Governance team. The Board agreed that good progress was being made and there was a clear plan for taking this further. The team should be allowed to continue its current trajectory. (ii) Board and Committee training. The Board discussed the benefits of good, focused training and the difference to familiarisation with the business. It was suggested that Board Members feedback their experiences to the Corporate Governance team in order that it could develop an appropriate programme. (iii) The general sharing of information with Board Members outside of meetings. The Board welcomed the "Weekly Update" email as means of reducing the volume of email traffic received each week and agreed that this should be reserved for sharing information and not seeking approvals from the Board. 	
2.6	It was agreed that the General Counsel & Company Secretary would support the Chair in finalising the actions from the Board effectiveness review and assigning action owners. The actions would be shared with the CEO and returned to the Board at its next meeting. It was agreed that the results of the Committee effectiveness reviews would be discussed at their respective Committees. An update on the outcomes and action plans agreed by the Committees would be provided to the Board in due course.	
	Day 2	
3.	Conflicts of Interest	
3.1	The Board noted that there were no changes required to the register of interests considered the previous day and no change in the conclusion that all Board Members present could participate fully in the meeting.	
4.	Chair's Observations	
4.1	R Rivaz highlighted the Berkeley Site visit that most of the Board had undertaken the previous day as being one of the best. The Board agreed with the Chair's observations on the excellent safety, behaviours and ways of working that had been demonstrated. It was noted that there were a number of additional site visits that the Chair wished to undertake and details of these would be shared with the Board. The Chair congratulated the team on the conclusion of the SOGIN deal and extended her thanks to those in the Executive who were currently engaging considerable time on special projects. The Board echoed the Chair's comments.	
4.2	The Chair briefed the Board on the planned next phase of her interaction with the CEO and [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal]; the positive meeting she had had with Minister Stuart; her takeaways from recent meetings with [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] and [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal]; and plans to meet with the First Sea Lord and Chief of Naval Staff. It was noted that the Chair had invited the former Chair of BNFL	



	to join the Board dinner on 15 February. She also updated the Board on training she had recently delivered at BEIS for new NEDs and the focus this helped to give the NDA as one of the larger ALBs.	
4.3	At the Chair's request, A Reeves provided an update on the proposed reappointment of the Chair for a further term and how the conclusion of that process was required before the terms of office of other Board Members could be addressed.	
5.	Safety Moment	
5.1	D Peattie provided an update on the bus crash the previous day involving workers being transported to Hinkley Point C. It was noted that a review of the use of double decker buses across the estate and as a policy point whether seatbelts should be fitted, was being carried out. The Chair of the Health, Safety, Security and Environment Committee (HSSEC) requested that the outcome of the review be shared with the HSSEC.	
5.2	P Vallance shared his recent observations of cars travelling in convoys and the dangers associated with this.	
6.	Board Administration	
6.1	Apologies	
6.1.1	Apologies for absence were noted from K Cearns. The Chair reported that K Cearns had shared several observations from the meeting materials with her, which she would relay to the meeting as appropriate.	
6.2	Minutes of previous Board Meeting	
6.2.1	The minutes of the meeting held on 22 and 23 November were APPROVED for signing, subject to the request of the Board that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) minute 3.3 be depersonalised; (ii) it be clarified at minute 7.3 that although the degree of formality required was dependent on the situation individual risk assessments were encouraged in all situations; (iii) it be clarified at minute 9.9.3 that A Reeves was to be consulted on the scope of the next Board and Committee effectiveness review in accordance with the recent Chair's letter. (iv) the minute of the virtual visit to Dounreay during the pandemic (minute 12.2.2) be removed as unnecessary to the record; and (v) its request for advance notice via the forward agenda planner of events it may find useful to attend, be minuted. 	
6.2.2	The Chair reported that K Cearns had queried whether the NDA had regular exchanges with the ONR and other regulators. It was noted that oversight of this activity was delegated to the Committees and that the Sustainability and Governance Committee received regular updates from the ONR and EA.	
6.2.3	The Board discussed the requirement to publish minutes of its meetings on the gov.uk website and noted that the General Counsel & Company Secretary would oversee the bringing back up to date of the record.	
6.3	Decision Log	
6.3.1	The record of decisions from the Board meeting held on 22 and 23 November 2022 was noted.	
6.4	Action Update	
6.4.1	The Board considered the update on actions arising from previous meetings and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) agreed that actions 1664, 1795, 1796, 1797 and 1800 be closed; and (ii) requested that action 1799 be edited to reflect that the Board would like to review the Integrated Assurance and Approvals Plan (IAAP) for the Hunterston 	



	Transfer Blueprint before it was finalised. The update would to be communicated to the action owners and an appropriate extended due date identified	
7.	CEO's Update	
7.1	<p>D Peattie thanked the Board for its support in recent weeks and the Board noted the CEO's anticipation for another fulfilling year ahead for the NDA, and other matters he wished to bring to the Board's attention, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) observations from his recent meeting with colleagues at EDF and BEIS officials on the AGRs and fuel handovers; (ii) an update from the Science and Technology Committee he had attended the previous day; (iii) developments in Great British Nuclear; and (iv) the topics discussed during his recent meeting with Minister Stuart. 	
8.	CFO's Update	
8.1.1	The Group CFO provided an update on key Finance activities including progress being made on the 2023-26 Business Plan; the Group Key Targets for FY2023/24; the interim and final audit work for the 2022/23 annual report and accounts; the revision of the Sanction and Delegations process; the Integrated Financial Framework and Finance's response to the Peakon survey.	
8.1.2	<p>The Group CFO presented the Period 8 2022/23 (P8) Board Performance Pack and highlighted several points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) It had been indicated to BEIS that the TDel NDA's supplementary estimate was on Vote for the year. (ii) The AME supplementary estimate had been submitted to BEIS reflecting the impact to the nuclear provision of the change in discount rates from negative to positive. [Minute redacted – s.43 Commercial]; (iii) The forecast net DEL expenditure of [Minute redacted – s.43 Commercial] was on budget. It was noted that when the supplementary estimate had been submitted to BEIS the impact of inflationary changes was anticipated to potentially generate an underspend, which in the event it arose the Executive indicated it wished to carry forward to 2023/24. Treasury had declined the request for this to be carried forward until earlier year's reserve claims have been repaid. (iv) Subsequent to submitting the supplementary estimate the OBRs inflation forecast update showed a reduction in inflation for the first time in 24 months. The Executive had adjusted its forecast accordingly. (v) Subsequently, the SOGIN deal had been successfully concluded, delivering [Minute redacted – s.43 Commercial]. The Executive was in discussions with HM Treasury about utilising this to address the anticipated potential underspend and repay earlier reserve claims. (vi) Good progress was being made on Project Victory. The Acting General Counsel & Company Secretary provided an update on the status of the five contracts in scope. The Board suggested that it would be timely and helpful to receive an update the status of the Group's material contracts. 	
9.	Safety & Performance Improvement Update	
9.1	In the COPIO's absence, D Peattie provided an update on safety and performance across the Group. The Board noted the follow-up action that would be taken following the bus crash en route to Hinkley Point C; [Minute redacted – s.36 Policy]; the refreshed longstanding MoU between the ONR and NDA would be signed shortly; and proposal to include a cyber risk awareness objective in employees 2023/24 objectives.	



9.2	The Board discussed its continued concerns around safety and cyber risk at Sellafield, [Minute redacted – s.36 Policy] It was noted that the CEO was in regular communication with the Sellafield Chair and CEO regarding the situation and the concern of the NDA Board. The Board noted that the Sellafield Chair was joining its meeting in February and requested that he be asked to provide an update on safety and cyber security at Sellafield.	M Shaw
A – Programmes & Projects		
10.1	P&PC report	
10.1.1	<p>C Train provided an update on the key matters considered at the Programmes & Projects Committee (“P&PCo”) meeting held on 10 January. The Board noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) PPP’s safety campaign and formation of a Safety Hub at Sellafield. It was being investigated whether Sellafield should be part of this. (ii) A detailed performance report had been provided on all projects including on risks to delivery. (iii) P&PCo’s consideration of the Low Active and Very Low Active Analysis OBC. The Committee did not consider it necessary, as a procurement tender, for the OBC to go through all the governance forums it was currently required to, including P&PCo and the Board. This had reiterated the need to review the sanction process to streamline similar procurement cases. P&PCo had been satisfied with the responses received to its challenges particularly whether the market was sufficiently competitive; the rationale for the structure of the proposed delivery of the services; and how this would interact with RAP. The Committee had endorsed the onwards transmission of the OBC. (iv) The outcomes from the root cause analysis following the requirement to extend some elements of Sellafield’s IT Services Agreement (ITSA) contract with Atos. The Board discussed the potential for similar issues to reoccur if there was not sufficient oversight of contract reviews before they expired and the importance of appropriate delegation levels. <p>[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal], [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal], [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal], [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] and [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] <i>joined the meeting</i></p>	
10.2	Low Active and Very Low Active Analysis OBC	
10.2.1	The Board noted the request to endorse the Low Active (LA)/ Very Low Active (VLA) Analytical Services Open procedure tender, [Minute redacted – s.36 Policy].	
10.2.2	[Minute redacted – s.36 Policy]	
10.2.3	The Board was comfortable with the additional information provided by the Sellafield team and RESOLVED TO ENDORSE: (i) onward transmission to HMG for permission to issue of the tender and (ii) to seek delegation of the Full Business Case (FBC) approval from HMG to NDA.	



	[[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal], [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal], [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal], [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] and [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] left and C Nixon and [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] joined the meeting]	
10.3	Update on Civil-Defence Nuclear Collaboration	
10.3.1	<p>The Board noted the update on the work done to date in response to BEIS' request that the NDA support collaboration between BEIS and the MOD on nuclear liabilities management. D McQueen explained the background of collaboration that existed and outlined recent developments in this area including the formation of a cross-Whitehall Nuclear Collaboration Board. The Board noted the nature of the planned programme of enhanced collaboration, including: the strategic objectives, the benefits, the scope, the principles for transfer and the proposed principles for the management of the collaboration programme with a planned launch for Q1 23/24. The Board appreciated the need for civil-defence collaboration on nuclear liabilities management and sought assurance as to the benefits from an NDA perspective.</p> <p>[[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] left and [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] and [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] joined the meeting]</p>	
10.4	Pu Disposition SOBC update	
10.4.1	<p>The Board noted the mature draft of the Executive Summary of the Plutonium Disposition SOC, and intention to submit the SOC to BEIS by the end of March 2023. It was noted that the SOC had been discussed extensively with stakeholders across Government, regulatory bodies, and the relevant OpCos. D Fox highlighted key points from the Executive Summary and the findings of the IPA style Gate 1 review which had reviewed the SOC and found universal support across stakeholders for the option for the final disposition of UK-held plutonium which the NDA had assessed to best meet the Government's objective in line with Green Book requirements and the way the Programme had collaborated across organisations.</p>	
10.4.2	<p>The Board discussed the update and sought assurance from the Executive on number of points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) [Minute redacted – s.36 Policy]. (ii) [Minute redacted – s.36 Policy]. (iii) [Minute redacted – s.36 Policy]. 	
10.4.3	<p>The Board commended the team for the thoroughness of its engagement on the business case and APPROVED IN PRINCIPLE the Plutonium Disposition SOC and delegated final sign off to the NDA Accounting Officer, D Peattie, subject to the draft SOC being uploaded to the Board portal ahead of the Group Investment Committee meeting at which the SOC was to be considered.</p> <p>[C Nixon, [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] and [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] left and [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] joined the meeting]</p>	M Shaw
10.5	Sanction Forward Plan	
10.5.1	<p>The Board noted the overview of upcoming sanction proposals due to be presented to the Group Investment Committee, P&PCo, Board and HMG up to December 2023. J Maxwell highlighted the changes which had been made to the submission timetable in recent weeks.</p> <p>[[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] left and [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] joined the meeting]</p>	
	B – Governance and Culture	
10.6	Results of the NDA Stakeholder Survey	



10.6.1	<p>[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] presented the results of the 2022 NDA Stakeholder Survey. The Board noted the explanation of the different stakeholders that had taken part and the methodology underlying the survey. J McNamara explained that the results showed significant rises in stakeholder approval of the NDA’s work, particularly among key stakeholders i.e., those with whom the NDA worked most closely, including site communities, local authorities, regulators, NGOs and BEIS/Devolved administrations. The Board also noted the areas identified for improvement including supporting greater understanding of the relationship between the NDA and OpCo and exhibiting that relationship more.</p>	
10.6.2	<p>The Board congratulated the team on an excellent set of results. It was supportive of the areas identified for improvement and made several observations and sought further insight on aspects of the results, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The reasons behind the rise in stakeholder support. (ii) The need to capitalise on in-person meetings and increase digital engagement with stakeholders (iii) The risks associated with seeking feedback on subjects that were unknown to some stakeholders and engaging with new audiences. (iv) The need to carefully monitor for shifts in stakeholder perceptions as civil-military cooperation on nuclear liabilities gains momentum. (v) That it could be worthwhile to reflect on whether it was clear to all participating stakeholders whether they should complete the survey in respect of solely the NDA, or the Group including the NDA. The Executive would do this. <p><i>[[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] left and D Vineall, [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] joined the meeting]</i></p>	
10.7	Group Key Targets for 2023/24	
10.7.1	<p>The Board noted the update on the development of the Group Key Targets for 2023/24 and the timeline for the work required to present the GKTs to the Board for approval in April.</p>	
10.7.2	<p>The Board sought assurance from the Executive on its ability to deliver the GKTs for approval in April and that the targets would be stretching. The Board commented on the importance and benefits to the Group of ensuring the workforce was engaged on the GKTs and understood how their work contributed to individual GKTs and the Mission. The Group Director of Communications and Stakeholder Relations would give consideration to how best to achieve this.</p>	
10.7.3	<p>The Board considered the themes it was anticipated BEIS would expect to see reflected in the GKTs and discussed the importance of the GKTs reflecting the role of the OpCos in the ‘golden thread’ and how it ran through themes identified by BEIS.</p>	
10.7.4	<p>The Board was pleased to see the outcomes from the workshop reflected in the development of the GKTs and cautioned the Executive not inadvertently increase the number of sub-targets as a by-product of reducing the number of GKTs. It was suggested that proposed GKT 8 (Projects delivery) required further clarification and that further consideration be given to GKT 14 (Sanction and Assurance) could be turned into a target. The Board noted that it would expect to see more emphasis on technology and innovation in the GKTs. The Executive would reflect on the Board’s feedback for the next iteration of the GKTs.</p> <p><i>[D Vineall, [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] and [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] left and [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] joined the meeting]</i></p>	
10.8	2022/23 NDA Annual Report and Accounts	



10.8.1	<p>The Board noted the update on the preparation for the 2022/23 annual report and accounts (ARA) and considered the summary of feedback received on the 2021/21 ARA process; the draft storyboard; and draft timeline for the completion of the ARA. S Taylor explained that the ARA production team had carried out a detailed review against Treasury's guidance for the production of the ARA i.e., (The Government Financial Reporting Manual (FReM) and proposed to make the document more succinct by reducing repetition; making greater use of cross referencing; making continued use of technology; and summarising the performance analysis section. The Board was supportive of the proposals and made several observations for the team to take into consideration when drafting the ARA.</p> <p><i>[[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] left and F Rainford and M Barber joined the meeting]</i></p>	
10.9	Independent Review Panel Final Report and Recommendations	
10.9.1	<p>The Board noted the Independent Review Panel (IRP) Final Report and Recommendations, and the rationale for the close out of the IRP. C Train explained that if the close out was approved, the Terms of Reference of the IRP and subsequent actions identified for Phase 2 of the IRP's work would be transferred to the NDA Group Chief of Staff and Security Officer and the OneNDA team.</p>	
10.9.2	<p>C Train responded to questions including who would be permitted to review the IRP Final Report and how the Phase 2 workstreams would be handed over to the Executive and managed. The Board also sought assurance that despite the phase 2 actions being heavily focused on assurance, other areas for improvement identified in the IRP Final Report would be kept under review. F Rainford explained how upon handover to himself all actions and suggestions would be extracted from the IRP Final Report, mapped against the ongoing IRR work and plans developed to address any gaps. It was noted that K Cearns had made several observations on the IRP Final Report and C Train would discuss these points with her offline.</p>	
10.9.3	<p>The Board discussed in detail whether paragraph 8 of the IRP Final Report suggested a shift in the NDA's assurance role relative to the OpCos. The Board discussed the NDA's role in assuring delivery of the mission and Government's expectations that the NDA does this. The Board requested that the Chief of Staff and Security Officer and OneNDA team commence their work taking forward the recommendations of the IRP Final Report with reference to the report and formally recording the NDA's role.</p> <p><i>[[Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] and D Vineall joined the meeting]</i></p>	
10.10	IRR Quarterly Update	
10.10.1	<p>The Board noted the update on the progress of the Integrated Review Responses (IRR), including the expected pipeline of actions sought for closure through the Board and Committees up to April. M Barber highlighted the potential for a bottleneck to arise with 16 actions due to be considered by the Senior Officials Group (SOG) in February. The Board considered the IRR recommendations which were proposed for closure. In respect of DR16, it was noted that the implementation of the Group Operating Framework indicated the completion of the recommendation but that it was important to ensure compliance with the same. It was agreed this review should be carried out and recorded as phase two of the response to DR16. The Board was satisfied that as worded DR16 was complete, and that this status was not impacted by the introduction of a follow-up round of work. The Board RESOLVED TO APPROVE the closure of DR4, DR16, MI4.12 and MI4.40.</p> <p><i>[F Rainford, M Barber, [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal], D Vineall and [Minute redacted – s.40 Personal] left the meeting]</i></p>	
10.11	Corporate Governance Team update	



10.11.1	The Board noted the paper from the Corporate Governance team which set out the work it had done in 2022 and its priorities for 2023. The Board noted the progress the team had made and sought the views of the Governance team on its interconnectivity with the wider governance community across the OpCos. The Board suggested that it would be beneficial to build relationships with those in governance roles in other ALBs to understand what was important and relevant in public sector governance.	
10.12	Quarterly Group Litigation Report	
10.12.1	The Acting General Counsel and Company Secretary presented the Quarterly Litigation Report which was noted by the Board.	
10.13	Authorised Signatories Update	
10.13.1	The Board considered the update on the individuals currently authorised to sign documents on behalf of the NDA and to authentic the application of the NDA seal and the proposal to amend aspects of the current delegation. The Board RESOLVED TO APPROVE a proposal to (i) update the list of authorised signatories based upon role rather than individual post holders; and (ii) [Minute redacted – s.43 Commercial].	
10.13.2	The Board requested that a review be carried out in 12 months' time of [Minute redacted – s.43 Commercial]. This would be added to the forward agenda.	
11.	Forward Agenda	
11.1	The Board noted the forward agenda and that this would be updated by the Corporate Governance team to reflect the requests made throughout the meeting. The Governance team agreed to determine the appropriate governance route for Gender Pay Gap reporting and whether any of the items on the agenda for the March Board meeting could be brought forward to February. The Board requested that the forward agenda be updated with events the Board may be interested in attending e.g., QPMs and conferences.	
12.	Any Other Business	
12.1	The Board raised the requirement to ensure any rebranding of Magnox was aligned with the Group branding policy.	
13.	Board reflections	
13.1	The Board shared its reflections on the meeting including that it would be beneficial to allocate more time to the updates received from the Chair, CEO, CFO and COPIO, and certain documents that it would be useful to include in the main meeting pack from the performance reports.	
13.2	There being no other business the Chair closed the meeting.	