

Health and Safety Executive Board		Paper No: HSE/11/03	
Meeting Date:	26 January 2011	FOI Status: Open (publication embargo on Draft report until 22 February 2011)	
Type of paper:	Above the line	Exemptions:	
Trim reference:	2011/44114		
<b>Status report on Nuclear New Build Generic Design Assessment (GDA)</b>			

### Purpose of the paper

1. To provide the HSE Board with an update on progress with the Nuclear New Build GDA, and sight of an early draft of the GDA Quarterly Progress Report (attached) which is due to be published on 22 February. *(This early draft has not yet benefitted from full discussion and clearance within ND or from factual accuracy checking by the Requesting Parties (RPs). Board members will be sent a copy of the final Quarterly Progress Report ahead of it being published).*
2. This report will be our final substantial one before we are due to publish our GDA conclusions on 30 June. We will only produce a brief report for the next quarter, will likely not produce a report for the following one, but will then resume producing quarterly reports on the wider Nuclear New Build Programme from September 2011, and will include progress details on addressing the GDA Issues.

### Key messages for the HSE Board

3. The progress report is presented at a time of intense activity on GDA, with the time spent by the ND GDA team on GDA work averaging at over 87% of their available time. We have now secured funding commitments with both RPs that should allow us to recover costs to June 2011, and discussions have commenced to secure, early in 2011, the funding commitments to allow us to assess, and hopefully close, both the GDA Issues and GDA itself, post June 2011.
4. Pivotal and positive convergence meetings have now been held between ourselves and the RPs on all technical areas, with a view to ensuring a shared view on the state of our assessment, what still needs to be provided by the RPs, and also what may have to become GDA Issues for closure post June 2011.
5. The RPs have responded well to the continuing pace of our work. However, given that Step 4 report writing has now commenced, there is little time left for further assessment work, especially if this requires work by our Technical Support Contractors. We are trying hard to balance the report writing with the continuing assessment in key areas where further assessment will help to further de-risk our likely effect on the developing industry programmes, even if the short-term consequence of that re-prioritisation action is a short delay beyond June 2011 for publication of the relevant Detailed Technical Assessment Reports. We will, however, have completed, and recorded, sufficient assessment by June 2011 to support, or otherwise, the provision of an Interim DAC.
6. We are, at this late stage in Step 4, still identifying new technical issues that the RPs need to address within the scope of GDA. However, there has now been a notable reduction in the number of new technical issues, and we have also agreed ways forward for the majority of issues already identified. A full topic-by-topic review is included in the report. This, together with the metric information, is intended to give a balanced summary and improved visibility of the progress and trends in each technical area, the remaining challenges and the potential GDA Issues that might remain at the end of Step 4 in June 2011.

7. A key point to note is that we have not identified any showstoppers at this point, but, in addressing some of the issues, further design changes to the UK reactor designs are likely. In these cases we are seeking to agree the principal aspects of the changes within GDA Step 4.
8. Following very positive responses from EDF/AREVA, the GDA Regulatory Issue (RI) on the EPR C&I design has now been closed, and we signalled that an RI on the AP1000 C&I design has been avoided by Westinghouse's quality/timely responses. The civil engineering RI on the Westinghouse AP1000 is still in place, and on which we are assessing a number of recently received submissions.
9. Westinghouse's GDA responses overall have improved in both quality and timeliness. Some of the EDF/Areva GDA responses are disappointingly slipping, and this may affect some of our early deliverables on the Hinkley Point C build project. Following our continued early identification of the emerging issues, the RPs should be able to provide the information necessary to allow us to clear the issues at an early a stage as possible. In doing this we believe that in robustly exercising our regulatory independence we are also helping to de-risk any declared plans for building new reactors in this country, including the first of those plans declared by EDF NNB Genco for UK EPRs at Hinkley Point. Ultimately, however, no nuclear island safety-related construction will be allowed until the GDA Issues have been addressed to our satisfaction.
10. Subject to further positive progress in the next few months, we expect to be able to issue an Interim Design Acceptance Confirmation (DAC) for both the UKEPR and AP1000. This likelihood has now been publically recognised by both RPs. Those Interim DACs will be accompanied by publically available Summary Assessment Reports, a schedule of the GDA Issues still to be addressed, and Resolution Plans for the GDA Issues (produced by the RPs and agreed by us). The themes for most of the developing GDA Issues have been shared with industry (RPs and potential operators), and have been again increasingly signalled in the Quarterly Report.
11. We continue to engage well with the potential Licensees (operators), EDF NNB Genco and Horizon, and a useful opening meeting was held with NuGEN in December (the third new potential operator that was launched in November: it has the option on the land adjacent to Sellafield).
12. Regarding a second tranche of GDA on other potential nuclear power station designs, we have engaged further with DECC on its early thoughts. There are significant planning and resource implications for HSE and the Environment Agency. We have supported DECC's position that any second tranche of GDA should be organised in a way that avoids any conflicts with the present GDA work and other key regulatory activities, and should only be undertaken on a maximum of two designs, both of which should be supported by credible potential UK operators.

### **Actions**

13. None – this paper is for information.

### **Paper clearance**

14. Produced and cleared by Kevin Allars.