

**Minutes of the Open meeting held on 3 July 2008
at Rose Court, 2 Southwark Bridge Road, London SE1 9HS**

Members Present:

Steve Vbranch (Chair)
Sheila Ashford
John Billard
Malcolm Bonnett
Andrew Clarke
Roger Coates
Marion Hill
Peter Manning
Peter McIntyre
Rod McKenzie
Alan Muir
Anthony Webb
Robin Bloomfield
Pam Duerden

Members Apologies:

Bryan Edmondson
Dick Bird
Murray Sinclair
David Horsley
Paul Haigh

Presenters:

Louise Robson (BERR)
Mike Weightman (ND)
David Senior (ND)
John Highton (ND)
Mark Wareing (NDA)

HSE Officials:

Robin Dahlberg (Non-Executive
Board Member)
Andy Lindley (ND)
Chris Holliday (ND)
Robbie Gray (ND)
Chris Snaith (ND)
Kevin Allars (ND)
Graham Collins (Secretary)
Shila Patel (Secretariat)

Observers Present:

Jeremy Western (BE)
Jenny Chalmers (URENCO)
Jim MacHardy (GE Healthcare)
Frank Francis (DRDL)
Geoff Gill (Springfield Fuels Ltd)
Dave Mason (BNG)
George Hunter (SEPA)
Heather Young (AWE)
Andrew McFarlane (MoD)
Joe McHugh (EA)
Derek Lacey (BERR)
Fiona Mettam (DEFRA)
Mike Potts (UKAEA)
Alan Rae (NDA)
Nick Wall (NDA)

Observer Apologies:

Keith Spooner (MEL)
Peter Wakefield (BE)
Mary Morrey (HPA)
Alan Brandwood (MEL)
Kevin Friis (WA)
Bobby Ronnie (SE)

Acronyms

AWE	-	Atomic Weapons Establishment
BE	-	British Energy
BERR	-	Department of Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform
BNG	-	British Nuclear Group
DRDL	-	Devonport Royal Dockyard Ltd
EA	-	Environment Agency
HPA	-	Health Protection Agency
MoD	-	Ministry of Defence
MEL	-	Magnox Electric Limited
ND	-	Nuclear Directorate
NDA	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
SE	-	Scottish Executive
SEPA	-	Scottish Environment Protection Agency
UKAEA	-	United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority
WA	-	Welsh Assembly

1 Welcome and Introduction

1.1 The Chair informed members of Barry Cripwell's resignation due to ill health and thanked him for his valuable experience in radiation protection and significant contributions to NuSAC in the eight years he served.

1.2 The Chair welcomed:

- Members of the public;
- Presenters: Louise Robson (BERR); Mike Weightman (ND); David Senior and John Highton (ND); Mark Wareing (NDA); and
- Observers: Heather Young (AWE), Nick Wall (NDA) and Fiona Mettam (DEFRA).

2 Minutes of the meeting held on 10 April 2008

2.1 The minutes were approved with the following amendments:

- Pages 4, 3rd bullet, 3rd line: delete "duration of problematic issues" insert "impact on safety". Delete last sentence in this bullet point and replace by "It was considered essential to ensure any uncertainty associated with the transition to the new PBO is minimised";
- Page 6, para 7.3. 1st line: delete "there had beenyears" Insert "although there had been improvements in safety performance over the years, it was recognised that further improvement was required. Recent initiatives have led to the improvements being sought and the accident rate had halved in recent years."

and would be published on NuSAC's web pages.

3 Matters arising/Actions

3.1 There were no matters arising from the 10 April 2008 meeting.

3.2 All outstanding actions had been completed, or would appear as agenda items for subsequent meetings.

4 Annual report

4.1 The Chair presented the annual report which took on board criticism that the last report lacked detail.

- A minor amendment to the Chair's Foreword on page 2, para 5: change "reduction" to "allocations"; and

- The annual report as amended would be published on NuSAC's web pages.

5 BERR Policy Brief [NuSAC (2008) P09]

5.1 Louise Robson presented BERR's 'Policy Brief'. The following points were raised in discussion:

- The Nuclear Industry Association had submitted an application to justify a number of new build designs;
- A consultation on draft Strategic Siting Assessment Criteria would be published in July; and,
- The Energy Minister had written to the Treasury to progress the setting up of the National Nuclear Laboratory;

6 Chief Inspectors Report [NuSAC (2008) P10]

6.1 Mike Weightman highlighted the points below in the presentation:

- HSE and EA had started stage 3 of the Generic Design Assessment (GDA) process;
- Sizewell B was running well after the recent trip that affected the grid; and
- At Sellafield ND expected the new preferred contractor to be announced soon. In the interim, ND were encouraging arrangements to ensure that uncertainty in the transition period did not impact on safety.

6.2 The following points were made during discussion:

- Grid reliability assumptions in safety cases should be checked, following the Sizewell B trip;
- NDA and Magnox were considering whether there is a case to extend generation at Oldbury beyond the end of 2008;
- Sellafield's LTP08 had been drawn up against funding expectations that were higher than actually received. Sellafield was working to meet regulatory expectations in the time available;
- In three cases, ND had not been content with decommissioning proposals. Some of these related to arrangements under LC35(i);
- ND supports the use of safety passports where they helped to enhance co-ordination on sites;

- ND had been promoting transparency in the regulatory process for some years, e.g in publishing the Chief Inspector's report and other documents on the website.

Action 01/2/2008: ND to confirm the grid reliability assumptions in nuclear safety cases remain valid following the Sizewell B trip.

7 Regulatory Nuclear Interface Protocol [NuSAC (2008) P11]

7.1 Mike Weightman presented the Regulatory Interface Nuclear Protocol which was signed on 29 April 2008 between key stakeholders. He made the following points:

- The protocol was about having an effective and efficient relationship with stakeholders; and having a common vision amongst the differing roles and responsibilities;

Action 02/2/2008: ND to provide an update in a year's time on the practical experience with the Regulatory Nuclear Interface Protocol.

8 Siting of Nuclear Installations in the United Kingdom [NuSAC (2008) P12]

8.1 David Senior presented this paper and made the following points:

- The work outlined in the paper was work in progress; slides and an addendum to the paper would be posted on the web; and,
- ND had adopted a generic approach that applied to any nuclear facility; and
- He thanked members of Task Force 5 for their contributions.

8.2 In discussion the following comments were made:

- Members praised the way two disparate sources have been brought together ;
- It was important not to mix siting policy and emergency planning issues, and to ensure the paper takes account of incentives on licensees to put in high safety standards;
- ND proposed to work up an example which takes account of the demographic range and the risk acceptable at the lower range;
- ND needed to clarify the assumptions regarding people's behaviour in the paper;
- In due course, the thinking behind the paper needed to be explained and adapted in forms suitable for members of the public, for a technical audience and for industry.

Action 03/2/2008: Members and Observers to provide written comments on the paper 'Siting of Nuclear Installations in the UK' by 31 July.

9 Review Groups and Task Group [NuSAC (2008) P13]

Liaison between CoRWM and NuSAC

9.1 Marion Hill presented this paper and there was general agreement to the recommendations in the paper.

9.2 Mike Weightman pointed out that, despite the proposed information interchange, safety would remain a matter for NuSAC whereas CoRWM would concern itself with programme, funding and R&D issues.

9.3 In addition, members agreed to periodic liaison meetings between the respective Chairs and selected members.

Action: 04/2/2008: Secretariat to set up joint meeting with NuSAC and CoRWM Chairs.

Review Group 6 (Research)

9.4 Peter Manning pointed out a lot needed to be done to ensure work is actually carried out to meet the research scheduled. ND could follow this up with duty holders.

Action 05/2/2008: Mike Weightman to ask dutyholders during site visits about R&D progress to programme.

10 Review of NDA Funding [NuSAC (2008) P19]

10.1 Anthony Webb presented this paper which would be considered with NuSAC (2008) P20) and made the following points:

- The paper concentrated on safety aspects of funding;
- Whilst the current level of NDA funding was sufficient to maintain safety in the nuclear industry in the short term, there were concerns regarding the potential effects on the longer term safety of the industry;
- The current allocation of funding to high hazard and risk areas was appropriate. However, for some sites the overall effect was that hazard reduction would take longer than originally envisaged, decommissioning would be deferred, R&D programmes would be reduced and longer term skills retention would be affected. These factors could impact on safety; and
- The “golden triangle” of relationships between the NDA, regulators and licensees needed to be significantly improved to ensure and demonstrate that decommissioning is effectively planned, budgeted and implemented safely;

11 Review of advice provided by HSC and NUSAC regarding the implementation plans for the formation of the NDA and its subsequent strategy [NUSAC (2008) P20]

11.1 In relation to his paper, Andrew Clarke pointed out:

- After three years, it was appropriate to prepare a 'stewardship' report on the advice given by HSC and NuSAC on the implementation of the NDA;
- The NDA had responded positively to the majority of comments and advice from HSE and NuSAC (which remained valid) and had amended its strategy accordingly; and,
- NuSAC retained its reservations about the separation of financial and safety responsibilities in the current NDA model.

In discussion of both papers, the following points were made:

- NuSAC endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of both papers;
- NDA and licensees should establish minimum funding levels to ensure that financial constraints did not undermine the programmes and resources necessary for long term safety;
- More effective working of the 'golden triangle' was needed;
- NDA were examining what detailed oversight was appropriate and were proposing to set up a strategy oversight group which included regulators; and,
- Members would welcome more information on the transfer of NDA governance to the Shareholder Executive.

Action 06/2/2008: BERR to provide an update on the Shareholder Executive's governance arrangements for the NDA.

Action 07/2/2008: NuSAC Chair to write to HSE Chair summarising the review of NDA Funding and the review of previous NuSAC and HSE advice in relation to the NDA's formation and strategy.

12 NDA prioritisation process and hazard baseline [NuSAC (2008) P21]

12.1 Mark Wareing gave a presentation on the NDA prioritisation process and hazard baseline. The following points were raised:

- The Safety and Environment Detriment score (SED) was used to compare facilities on a national scale;

- The SED could not be used to compare project benefit measures;
- Sellafield expressed support to the scoring as it gave broad compatibility against professional judgement and was seen as a decision *aiding* tool.

13 Questions/Answer session

13.1 No questions were raised.

14 Any Other Business

14.1 There were no additional items of business. The Chair thanked all those present for attending the meeting.
