

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION STATUS – Fully Open	NuSAC/03/2006
Nuclear Safety Advisory Committee (NuSAC)	
Minutes of the main meeting held on 3 November 2006 in the Normandy Suite, Holiday Inn, Portsmouth	
<p>Members Present Steve Vranich (Chair) Sheila Ashford John Billard Dick Bird Robin Bloomfield Andrew Clarke Roger Coates Barry Cripwell Pam Duerden Paul Haigh Bill Heafield Marion Hill Peter Manning Rod McKenzie Neville Moray Alan Muir Gordon Munro Anthony Webb</p> <p>Prospective New Independent Member Murray Sinclair</p> <p>Members Apologies Bryan Edmondson</p> <p>Acronyms AWE - Atomic Weapons Establishment BNFL - British Nuclear Fuels Ltd BNG - British Nuclear Group DRDL - Devonport Royal Dockyard Ltd DTI - Department of Trade and Industry EA - Environment Agency HPA - Health Protection Agency HSE - Health and Safety Executive MoD - Ministry of Defence NDA - Nuclear Decommissioning Authority NII - Nuclear Installations Inspectorate SEPA - Scottish Environment Protection Agency UKAEA - United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority</p>	<p>H M Chief Inspector of Nuclear Installations Present Mike Weightman</p> <p>Observers Present Alan Brandwood (BNG) John Crofts (UKAEA) Frank Francis (DRDL) Stuart Hudson (SEPA) Andy Layton (DTI) Andrew McFarlane (MoD) David Mason (BNG) Mary Morrey (HPA) Bobby Ronnie (Scottish Executive) Kevan Williams (AWE) Laurence Williams (NDA)</p> <p>Presenters Present Simon Marshall (Springfields Fuels Ltd) (Westinghouse) (UK)</p> <p>HSE Officials Present Colin Potter (Secretary) Kath Martin (Secretariat) Alma Edwards (Secretariat)</p> <p>Observer Apologies Neale Brittain (British Energy) George Hunter (SEPA), Andrew Jupp (AWE), Jim MacHardy (GE Healthcare), Joe McHugh (EA), Richard Mayson (BNFL), Clive Nurton (Welsh Assembly), Louise Robson (DTI)</p>
1	Welcome/Introduction
1.1	The Chair welcomed: new CBI nominated Member Alan Muir; Murray Sinclair who was attending as an Observer before deciding whether to join the

A P P R O V E D

	<p>Committee as an Independent Member next year; Stuart Hudson (SEPA) and Kevan Williams (AWE) who were representing George Hunter and Andrew Jupp respectively; Andy Layton who was representing DTI; and Simon Marshall from Springfields Fuels Limited (Westinghouse) (UK) who was presenting Item 9 on the Agenda.</p> <p>The Chair also wished to place on record his thanks to Peter Webster who had been British Energy's Observer until his recent retirement.</p>
2	Notes of the meeting held on 6 July 2006
2.1	The minutes were approved.
3	Actions Arising
3.1	<p>All actions had been cleared except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3/2/2006 – partially cleared. Only UKAEA's "Controlling Mind" guidance was still awaited. • 7/2/2006 – was to be treated as cleared. The NuSAC work plan was to be taken forward under Agenda item 5. • 10/2/2006 – ongoing. Initial discussions had taken place with BNGSL about a possible site visit by NuSAC in Autumn 2007. • 1/1/2006 – in response to a paper on Plutonium Contaminated Waste (PCM) tabled at the meeting on 13 October 2005 (paper NuSAC(2005)P15), NuSAC had endorsed the recommendation for a co-ordinated approach to PCM across all four sites involved. Implementation of the action had been delayed pending discussion at the deferred Radioactive Waste Policy Group meeting that had still not taken place. Rather than delay implementation further, the four Observers concerned were invited to liaise with Bill Heafield with a view to taking the matter forward and reporting back to the next NuSAC meeting in March 2007. <p>ACTION 1/3/2006: The three Observers (John Crofts, Dave Mason and Andrew Jupp) to report on progress towards producing a co-ordinated UK approach to the management of PCM on the four UK sites (Dounreay, Harwell, Sellafield and Aldermaston).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5/1/2006 – an update from DTI was still awaited about insolvency administrators' remit to safety and the impact on NII's regulatory role. • 9/2/2005 – to be treated as cleared. Since the Thorp case had been decided, it was for NII/BNFL to consider tabling a "lessons learned" paper at a future NuSAC meeting in 2007. • 11/2/2005 – to be treated as cleared. An update on the management of contractors at Sellafield was to be taken forward under Agenda item 11.
4	Nuclear Safety Performance (Update on HSE's policy and operational issues) and wider issues
4.1	<p>This was the first joint policy and operations report from HSE. HM CI introduced the report highlighting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In relation to the publication of the CoRWM report on waste matters, he was looking forward to progress being made across government. • The Minister's insistence of the need for improved governance/robust competence of licensees in his statement on the BNG sale was welcomed (a view fully supported by the NDA). • While BE had recently taken prudent action to shut down reactors this,

together with the limited availability of the Sellafield evaporators, had demonstrated the fragility of ageing plant across the industry.

- The proposal to integrate OCNS into HSE was welcomed since he believed this would result in a more coherent approach to regulation. He suggested that NuSAC might wish to offer a view on the proposed integration.
- NII would be working with the NDA to undertake a review of 18 months experience of “Controlling Mind” issues.

4.2

The following points arose in response to the above and in general discussion relating to the report:

- On the BNG sale, NuSAC was concerned that the change in strategy now agreed by NDA and BNFL (ie restructuring of BNG, resulting in the sale of separate businesses, and earlier competing of Sellafield than originally recommended) had added to the uncertainty and risk to safe operation. However, Members agreed that the new strategy was the most sensible way forward from here, given the assurances in the Ministerial statement that he would insist on site licensee company governance arrangements and capabilities being strengthened.
- BNG confirmed that a decision on this change of direction was only taken after consultation with all the regulators. They recognised the need to retain key people in the various businesses to minimise any risks on safety. They believed there would be little effect on the SLCs’ staff, but mainly on the parent body. On the Magnox sale, the staff appeared to be ‘energised’ by the prospect and BNG thought the proposal would encourage staff retention. In relation to Sellafield, taking the organisation to managed competition rather than sale was not what key people had been brought in to do so there might be discontent. Consequently an incentivised, four-point package had been put in place to secure key people during the transitional period (available to around 50 people seconded from BNG) which included severance for those not offered a post by the new parent body.
- HM CI noted that the sale raised a licensing issue relating to intelligent customer capability ie separate SLCs will need to demonstrate that they have the in-house capability to be licensees and act as the intelligent customer for all services on their sites.
- BNG said that, in breaking up BNFL/BNG, a key priority was to ensure that licensees were properly resourced. Accordingly a resource review panel had been set up to ensure that licensees had the necessary strength in depth. The Magnox sale would be well underway by April 2007 (if not completed) by which time BNG was likely to be wound up. The Sellafield competition was likely to be completed by mid-2008.
- NDA confirmed that it was not possible to sell on the existing NDA contracts.
- Members were concerned that the many problems identified at BE sites indicated systemic weaknesses. HM CI reiterated that plant showed signs of ageing and that NII welcomed the fact that BE had taken prudent action to deal with the acute safety issues.
- NuSAC supported the integration of OCNS with HSE, which would remove an unnecessary interface, and could see no disadvantages for either organisation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In relation to “Controlling Mind” issues, NuSAC Members welcomed the NDA papers to be discussed under Agenda item 10 and confirmed they would be keeping a close eye on developments. The length of the papers indicated that the issue was complex and problematical. • On the issue of NII resources, HM CI confirmed that NII had resource problems. They were looking at: how best to use current resources more effectively; recalling Inspectors from policy posts; and drawing in non-nuclear specialist support from elsewhere in HSE. However, this would not resolve the problem and, with HSE Chief Executive support, he was in discussion with HMT about the possibility of improving the reward package for Inspectors. Other budgetary pressures impacting upon HSE would not adversely affect the ability of NII to discharge its functions. • A pragmatic solution to NDA’s concerns about the revised Construction Design and Management Regulations (relating to risk of the NDA Board being accountable for matters over which they had no control) had been achieved. For the purposes of CDM, SLCs were the “client” when awarding the top tier contracts but not afterwards, if the contracts were properly worded and. NDA did not undertake any activity that might undermine that position. • There was no agreed closure date for Thorp, which would need to continue to operate until contracts had been fulfilled. • In relation to Magnox reprocessing there had been an assumption that B205 would close in 2012 but the plant might need to continue if there was still fuel to be treated. However HM CI stressed that the operators would need to plan carefully for this to ensure that continued safe operation could be demonstrated.
5	Update on NuSAC Work Plan 2006/08
5.1	<p>In introducing this item the Chair explained that, following significant changes in membership, NuSAC now had a different range of expertise and was, for example, much stronger on radiological protection. The aim was to re-shape the work programme for the next two years (ie until reconstitution) to reflect this, giving it a more strategic focus across the work of the existing Review Groups (RGs) and taking account of stakeholder views - for which the Chair thanked those Observers who had contributed.</p>
5.2	<p>He outlined the mechanics of a draft matrix he had prepared in which he aimed at highlighting the work areas identified by Members as those in which NuSAC should take a strategic interest. The matrix showed that some work subjects were applicable across several parts of the nuclear industry and might indicate those best taken forward by setting up specific Task Groups. The matrix also reflected recent discussions with the HSC Chair who had:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • given a clear steer that the Commission would be looking to NuSAC to give advice on new build safety issues; • encouraged closer working with NII and DTI.
5.3	<p>The Chair invited initial thoughts on the proposals from RG Convenors in respect of their own emerging work plans (see Annex 1 for a list of RG allocations). Points made in discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>RG1 (Safety Management and Performance)</u> - Andrew Clarke said the

review group was:

- in discussion with NII about the effectiveness of Licence Condition (LC) 36. NII had agreed to provide a paper to NuSAC in March 2007 on how well LC 36 was working and Industry Observers' views on LC 36 would be welcome.

ACTION 2/3/2006: Industry Observers to send their views on LC 36 to NuSAC Secretariat and NSD before the next meeting in March 2007, by the middle of February

- interested in NDA's influence on SLCs' decommissioning programmes and would be taking that forward with Laurence Williams, visiting sites as necessary to look at implementation.
- maintaining an overview of plant safety performance at key sites such as Douneray and might revisit this site in spring.
- of the view that many incidents arose because of a failure to learn from experience. RG1 intended to pursue this next year, using Sizewell B as an example, with a view to learning from/sharing experience and providing feedback.
- interested in education and skills training programmes and, building on the useful visit to HMS SULTAN the previous day, would be inviting Cogent Sector Skills Council who were active in this area to give a presentation at a future NuSAC meeting.
- considering the longer-term future of NuSAC's annual safety performance overview paper, but for the present had concluded that it remained a worthwhile exercise. A paper on the 2005/06 safety performance statistics was scheduled for NuSAC in March 2007.
- RG2 (Fuel Cycle Operations and Interim Safety) - Bill Heafield explained that RG2's plans were not yet so well defined and some items would require involvement of other RGs. While some of the following were aspirational and might get deferred, he suggested that provisionally NuSAC/RG2 might look at:
 - the risk balance of treatment or storage of Hex tails. There was pressure to deconvert the Hex tails to an oxide form, but that process was not without risk.
 - the consequences of the residue recovery facility at Springfields being closed down leaving material that could not be processed elsewhere. There were also concerns regarding the treatment of unprocessed fuel residues at other sites (particularly Dounreay). RG2 may therefore seek to look at the overall UK strategy for dealing with such materials.
 - the effects on NEXIA of anticipated losses of key people to the Sellafield licensee and the formation of the National Nuclear Laboratory.
 - the interfaces between all the key players including the licensees, NDA, the regulators and DTI - where he foresaw a useful overview role for NuSAC.
 - the role NuSAC might play in contributing to the development of DTI's screening panel selection criteria for new build design proposals
 - Legacy Waste at Sellafield which remained a key issue.
 - the fragility of Magnox reprocessing. There were many parts of Sellafield that were needed to continue to operate reliably in order

<p>5.4</p>	<p>to ensure successful reprocessing; RG2 were keen to develop work in this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>RG3 (Nuclear decommissioning Authority and Decommissioning Policy)</u> - Anthony Webb thanked NDA for taking on board NuSAC's comments on a range of issues including those on their strategy. He confirmed RG3's intention to operate more strategically for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ nuclear safety policy and practice across the sites. ○ the Memorandum of Understanding between HSE and NDA. ○ NDA's competition strategy. <p>He acknowledged overlaps, particularly between RG1 and RG3, and looked forward to setting up Task Groups across the RGs with the appropriate expertise and skills to address particular topics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>RG4 (Emergency Arrangements)</u> - Barry Cripwell confirmed they would be looking, for example, at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the quality and scope of national level emergency arrangements. Much of NuSAC's input was through participation in the useful Nuclear Emergency Planning Liaison Group (NEPLG) and attendance at emergency planning exercises, where RG4 often provided the only independent overview. RG4 were also looking forward to being involved in an MoD exercise. ○ public information, OCNS and security issues. ○ safety series documents currently going through IAEA. ○ continuing to monitor and comment on amendments to International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) recommendations. • <u>RG5 (MoD)</u> – Dick Bird said that he and his group had been getting to grips with the defence sites and priority issues. He would be taking up invitations for discussions with AWE and Andrew McFarlane (MoD) and had had informal discussions with DNSC members on the margins of the HMS SULTAN visit about how best they could address issues of common interest and avoid overlap. He would be populating the work matrix shortly. <p>The Chair confirmed his intention of producing a fully populated work plan for discussion at the next meeting. He invited views from Observers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDA extended an invitation to the Convenors of RG1, RG2 and RG3 to visit NDA to discuss: the decommissioning programmes for Magnox; Legacy Wastes at Sellafield; and the NDA Strategy respectively. • DTI believed they could be of help to NuSAC in identifying strategic issues, for example, impact of government policies. One issue currently exercising DTI was how to keep the right people in the right place at the right time, for example at NEXIA and NIREX. Members welcomed DTI's offer of providing regular "policy briefs" for future NuSAC meetings. DTI also recognised there could be a useful role for NuSAC in helping with the formulation of policy. <p>ACTION 3/3/2006: DTI to provide policy briefs for future NuSAC meetings.</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>Update on NuSAC Annual Report 2006/07</p>
<p>6.1</p>	<p>The Chair confirmed that a short (3/4 pages) Annual Report, would be published on the NuSAC page of the HSC/E web site. The aims of the</p>

	<p>document were to: update HSC on NuSAC activity; publicise the work undertaken by the Committee to stakeholders (in the spirit of openness); act as a performance review mechanism for Members. It would highlight that Members were unpaid. Observers were invited to contribute to the report. The Chair also reminded Members and Observers that the first Open meeting of NuSAC would be held in July 2007.</p> <p>ACTION 4/3/2006: Observers to send suggestions for inclusion in the Annual Report to NuSAC Secretariat prior to the next meeting in March 2007.</p>
7	NuSAC Representation at events and responses to consultations
7.1	Gordon Munro had represented NuSAC at NSD's Joint Regulators' Workshop on new nuclear reactor design assessment on 17 October 2006. He congratulated NSD for putting the regulators' plans for new build into the public domain and for organising what had been a useful event.
7.2	<p>Two key issues arising were the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adequacy of NII resource to undertake multiple design assessments. NuSAC had already heard from HM CI about the steps he was taking to address resource issues (paragraph 4.2 refers). • surprise announcement of DTI's proposed pre-screening process of reactor design applications. NuSAC felt it could usefully contribute to the screening panel constitution and the development of the sift criteria to be used. DTI welcomed this since they were currently pulling together thoughts on all new build issues and had no wish to develop policy in a vacuum. DTI also acknowledged the need to keep NuSAC informed of proposals/developments in future.
7.3	<p>Andrew Clarke reported that NuSAC had had two extremely useful, informative meetings with NDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the first of these it had been especially valuable to hear from Laurence Williams how his team was interfacing with licensees; Members were generally encouraged on the way NDA was settling down. • The second meeting with Terry Selby, NDA's Director of Strategy, focused on NuSAC's comments on NDA's Strategy and Members were pleased by his intention to seek the views of NuSAC on future strategy documents. <p>NDA stated that they expected NuSAC to take a keen interest in their activities and were pleased to help the understanding of Members wherever possible.</p>
8	Matters that the Sub Committee on Research (SCR) and Review Groups (RGs) may wish to raise with licensees or other Observers
8.1	Neville Moray, Chair of SCR, outlined the origins of SCR which had quasi-independent status and a remit inherited from DTI. Its key functions were to review the Nuclear Research Index (NRI) – now an impossible task given the volume - and to give assurances to the HSC on the overall adequacy of the nuclear safety research programme. But the industry and environment had changed and it was time to be realistic about what SCR could reasonably achieve and where it could add value.

<p>8.2</p>	<p>Following its next meeting in February 2007, it was therefore proposed to reconstitute SCR as standing Review Group (RG6) with a focus on the “Nuclear Safety Research” goal in NSD’s strategic plan. There would still be scope for looking strategically at the NRI and giving a strategic overview of/identifying gaps in, nuclear safety research activity across the industry. This would include an overview of research programmes undertaken/sponsored across government and its agencies and by the new National Nuclear Laboratory, once that had been set up.</p>
<p>8.3</p>	<p>Neville Moray sought the views of Members and Observers to the proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDA confirmed that the UK research programme had been coordinated by UKAEA until it became a licensee in 1990. At that time the Government had wanted an organisation to take an independent overview of, and give assurances about, the adequacy of the broad range of nuclear safety research across the UK. NuSAC reported directly to Ministers then and giving its Sub Committee on Research this responsibility was seen as a means of achieving the Government’s aims. SCR had done a valuable job and NDA were concerned that if it disappeared there would be a gap in coordinating the research programme and in giving any kind of guarantee that an integrated research programme was in place to underpin nuclear safety. NDA had only a limited remit in this area. • In response Neville Moray explained that SCR had only notionally been able to give such assurances. In the new arrangement, RG6 would still look at the NRI, though not in detail, and NII would continue to provide support by looking at the NRI and advising NuSAC. RG6 would focus on whether the procedures for drawing up research programmes were sensible and would aim to identify gaps. • In summing up the Chair said that Observers were right to voice concerns and encouraged them to bring to the attention of SCR/RG6 any areas where they believed research was needed so that NuSAC could bring pressure to bear accordingly.
<p>8.4</p>	<p>Issues relating to Review Group activities had been raised earlier in the context of the work plan discussion with the exception of the following:</p> <p><u>RG4 (Emergency Arrangements):</u> Barry Cripwell and John Billard reported on their recent observation of exercise “OSCAR” at Sellafield. The exercise had generally gone well, although the media briefing centre element of it had been poor (also picked up by NEPLG), for example with late and conflicting briefings. The latter was likely to have given a bad impression to 50 participating journalism students. Another issue of concern was that ambulance drivers who volunteered for attending radiological events had apparently been unable to secure normal life/mortgage protection insurance cover. It was suggested that this was an issue for NEPLG to ensure that the Department of Health issued consistent guidelines across the various ambulance services.</p> <p>DTI agreed there were lessons to be learned from this exercise, particularly in relation to communications. For the future there were challenges in injecting</p>

	<p>realism into exercises and in interacting more effectively with COBRA, the Cabinet Office committee on crisis management. DTI would be reviewing how best improvements could be made and would report progress to NuSAC. DTI's offer to take up the issue of insurance cover for emergency responders was welcomed.</p> <p>ACTION 5/3/2006: DTI to give a progress report to future NuSAC meetings on their review of exercises and the issue of insurance cover for ambulance workers who volunteered to attend radiological events.</p>
9	Plans and challenges at the Springfields site (NuSAC(2006) P17)
9.1	The Chair welcomed Simon Marshall, Head of Commercial, Springfields Fuels Ltd, who gave a slide presentation in support of his paper on the plans and challenges at the Springfields site.
9.2	<p>Points arising from the presentation and subsequent discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Site Licensing Company had been owned by Toshiba since October 2006. • A "priorities matrix" had been drawn up for the site in case of a shortfall in funding from NDA but so far it had been pleasing to note that no such shortfall had arisen. • There had been a notable reduction in the number of time lost incidents due to a strong drive in partnership with the trade unions and staff. • A recent staff survey had indicated that staff rated safety highly. The site had adopted the strap-line "Safe by Choice, not by Chance". • NuSAC RG Members had visited the site in spring and had been impressed by their management of change and good practice which Members commended to other licensees. • Although there appeared to be a large number of initiatives underway, some of which were long-term, there was strong ownership of them because the initiatives had been moulded into a programme that helped everyone. • A reference in the slides to "behavioural differentiators" was explained as achieving a behavioural difference in interaction with customers that gave a competitive edge and was difficult to copy.
10	NDA's HSSE Annual Report, Competition Schedule and Update on NDA's Spent Fuel Management Review
10.1	The Chair invited Laurence Williams FREng, Director of the NDA Nuclear Safety Security and Environment Directorate (NSSSED) to introduce the above topic, and to be prepared to discuss four NDA Guidance Notes on Competition Model/Controlling Mind issues that had also been circulated prior to the meeting. An explanation of the roles and responsibilities of NSSSED was tabled during the meeting showing its lines of reporting, including the Director's direct access to the Board, and to DTI Officials/Ministers if he had concerns about the safety and security of NDA's activities.
10.2	NuSAC agreed that Laurence would take questions on those papers circulated prior to the meeting (a presentation was not necessary on these) and that he should give a presentation on the latest draft (Version 4) of NDA's Competition Schedule which had not been circulated. Laurence explained that the Competition Schedule would change following the recent

<p>10.3</p>	<p>decision to compete Sellafield and confirmed that Version 5, due later in November, would be sent to NuSAC. He therefore gave a brief overview of the sale and competition of BNG, illustrating all the key projects involved.</p> <p>ACTION 6/3/2006: NDA to send to NuSAC Secretariat for circulation Version 5 of the Competition Schedule when it was available.</p> <p>The following points arose in discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>BNG/BNFL Sale/Competition</u>: NDA had discussed resource issues with the industry and regulators and were satisfied they had the necessary resources to deliver the competition programme. NDA had been restructuring/reorganising itself to ensure that they could deliver the Government's targets. Some issues had yet to be resolved with the regulators. NDA wanted a robust licensee company in place that could exist independently of its Parent Body Organisation. • <u>NDA Guidance Notes</u>: on Controlling Mind issues etc were living documents that would be reviewed at least annually in the light of comments and experience. NuSAC comments on these would therefore be welcome. <p>ACTION 7/3/2006: NuSAC Members and Observers to send comments on NDA's Guidance Notes to Laurence Williams via NuSAC Secretariat as they arose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>NDA First Year Achievements</u>: in this document, it was confirmed that the reference to "£124m savings delivered through 7% target" represented work additional to that contracted which had been undertaken by contractors during that period. • <u>NIREX Transfer</u>: CoRWM had recommended that an independent body should oversee the repository programme. DTI explained that they had to consider the most efficient and effective means of implementing CoRWM's recommendations. In their judgement, NIREX was not, in itself, sufficient to be the independent body, and there was no desire to create another NDPB. So the choices for NIREX were limited and they concluded that the best way forward was to move NIREX to the NDA given their overlapping interests. DTI were looking to ensure that the transfer is achieved without damaging the valuable expertise held in the company. • NDA confirmed that if the transfer went ahead, discussions with NIREX staff would be handled sensitively to preserve NIREX knowledge and expertise. • NDA commented that there was some confusion about the NIREX role; some people believed they were regulators but that was not the case. NIREX would be responsible for the repository development programme and for giving independent advice on the conditioning and packaging of radioactive waste (issuing Letters of Compliance etc). DTI commented that they were alive to potential conflicts of interest with NDA but, after discussion with the regulators, had been assured that these issues could be resolved. NIREX's independent advisory role would continue after transfer and would be achieved by ring-fencing them within NDA. • <u>HSSE Annual Report</u>: Members commented that the use of events recorded against the INES scale was not the ideal indicator for licensees' nuclear safety statistics. Work in hand by the regulators and
-------------	---

	<p>industry to develop more effective safety indicators was welcomed. NDA were requiring licensees to improve their safety performance and would aim to incentivise good practice, taking care not to disincentivise accident and incident reporting. NDA were mindful of the pace of change in the industry and the adverse impact this could have on safety. SLCs were encouraged to tell NDA whenever they felt that their contractual obligations were putting them under too much pressure.</p> <p>ACTION 8/3/2006: Members and Observers to send comments as they arose on any of the NDA papers to Laurence Williams via NuSAC Secretariat.</p>
11	Sellafield – Progress report including work with contractors and the NDA (NuSAC(2006)P18)
11.1	<p>The Chair invited David Mason to introduce this paper. It was a progress report on an earlier paper presented to NuSAC in July 2005 (paper number NuSAC (2005)P6 – Management of Contractors at Sellafield) and also offered observations following 18 months experience as a Tier I contractor to NDA. Of note was that BNGSL had retained its Controlling Mind duty and had continued to be the intelligent customer. This period had been a learning curve; there had been areas of disagreement which he considered had been pragmatically resolved.</p>
11.2	<p>Members were grateful for the paper but expressed disappointment that it did not update the performance figures given in July 2005 so it was difficult to judge the level of progress made. BNGSL's offer of an Addendum to remedy this was welcomed. In discussion it was confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There had been a deterioration in contractor safety last year for which the reasons were unclear; although speculation, one possible contributory factor put forward was BNGSL's input to the NDA extensive planning process which had stretched resources. All the site contractors had been brought together and their commitment secured to implement safety performance improvement strategies with good results. A further recent increase in accidents was possibly due to organisational uncertainty relating to the question of future ownership etc. NuSAC would be monitoring progress. • HM CI was discussing with NDA their interaction with licensees generally and would be visiting NDA to join in the project to review Controlling Mind issues. They would seek NuSAC's views as appropriate as part of this review and would report progress at future meetings. <p>ACTION 9/3/2006: HM CI to report progress on the review of Controlling Mind issues at future meetings.</p>
12	Any Other Business
12.1	<p>The Chair asked HPA whether they had any concerns about the forthcoming ICRP recommendations. HPA thought that publication of the recommendations was expected in February/March 2007 with one month for comments. There would be some conceptual changes but it was unclear whether these would have significant practical implications for the UK. Amongst others, there might be some issues relating to emergency response on which NuSAC might wish to comment. HM CI said he would welcome NuSAC's views on the implications of the recommendations for the UK's</p>

	<p>nuclear industry and regulation. HPA responded that ICRP's approach was to apply justification/optimisation/dose limits to all situations. There might be consequences for upper dose constraints. HPA believed the framework of dose constraints was unlikely to affect the way the UK regulated but this needed to be looked at further and NuSAC could usefully contribute. HPA was expecting to be invited to give a presentation on the implications of new ICRP recommendations for UK emergency planning to a future NEPLG meeting. Following which, presentation material would subsequently be made available for circulation to NuSAC.</p> <p>ACTION 10/3/2006: Following HPA's proposed presentation to NEPLG, Mary Morrey to send to NuSAC Secretariat the presentation for circulation to NuSAC Members and Observers.</p>
12.2	<p>In response to a request to update NuSAC on the revision of the Paris and Brussels conventions, DTI said this was a highly complex area. They had been trying to implement the revised convention over the last year or so but implementation was fraught with difficulties. Other Member States were also having implementation problems and further bilateral discussions were underway. The position was likely to become clearer in the next six months. The amendments would have significant consequences for liability claims and insurance.</p>
12.3	<p>The Chair reported that he had recently had a keeping-in-touch meeting with the Chair of HSC, Bill Callaghan (see item 5, paragraph 5.2).</p>
13	Date of next meeting
13.1	<p>The next main meeting would be held at 10.45 on Thursday, 22 March 2007 in the Rose and Globe Rooms, Rose Court, London (rescheduled from 8 March 2007).</p>
14	Close
14.1	<p>The Chair thanked all present for their contribution and closed the meeting at 12.45.</p>

APPROVED

REVISED REVIEW GROUPS OF THE NUCLEAR SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (NuSAC)

RG1 - Safety Management and Performance

Convenor: Andrew Clarke (CBI)

Robin Bloomfield (Ind)
Barry Cripwell (TUC)
Alan Muir (CBI)
Gordon Munro (Ind)
Anthony Webb (Ind)

RG2 - Fuel Cycle Operations and Interim Safety

Convenor: Bill Heafield (Ind)

Paul Haigh (Ind)
Marion Hill (Ind)
Peter Manning (Ind)
Neville Moray (Ind)
Gordon Munro (Ind)

RG3 - Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and Decommissioning Policy

Convenor: Anthony Webb (Ind)

John Billard (TUC)
Andrew Clarke (CBI)
Roger Coates (CBI)
Marion Hill (Ind)
Neville Moray (Ind)
Sheila Ashford (Ind)

APPROVED

RG4 – Emergency Arrangements

Convenor: Barry Cripwell (TUC)

Sheila Ashford (Ind)
John Billard (TUC)
Rod McKenzie (Ind)

RG5 - MoD

Convenor: Dick Bird (Ind)

Pam Duerden (TUC)
Bryan Edmondson (CBI) advisory capacity only
Rod McKenzie (Ind)

Sub Committee on Research

Chair: Neville Moray (Ind)

Paul Haigh (Ind)
Robin Bloomfield (Ind)
Peter Manning (Ind)
Alan Muir (CBI)
Gordon Munro (Ind)

**NuSAC Secretariat
November 2006**