

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION STATUS – Fully Open	NuSAC/02/2006
<b>Nuclear Safety Advisory Committee (NuSAC)</b>	
<b>Minutes of the main meeting held on 6 July 2006 in the Rose and Globe Rooms, Rose Court, London.</b>	
<p><b>Members Present</b>  Steve Vbranch (Chair)  John Billard  Dick Bird  Robin Bloomfield  Andrew Clarke  Sue Cox  Barry Cripwell  Pam Duerden  Bryan Edmondson  Paul Haigh  Marion Hill  Peter Manning  Rod McKenzie  Neville Moray  Gordon Munro  Steve Napier  David Owens  Anthony Webb  Jim Whiston</p> <p><b>Prospective CBI Nominated Member Present</b>  Roger Coates</p> <p><b>Members Apologies</b>  Sheila Ashford, Wynne Davies, Bill Heafield, John Knott, Susan Parry, John Rowse</p> <p><b>Prospective CBI Nominated Member Apologies</b>  Alan Muir</p> <p><b>Acronyms</b>  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><b>HSC Commissioner Present</b>  Hugh Robertson</p> <p><b>H M Chief Inspector of Nuclear Installations (HM CI) Present</b>  Mike Weightman</p> <p><b>Observers Present</b>  Alan Brandwood (BNG)  John Crofts (UKAEA)  Frank Francis (DRDL)  Andrew Jupp (AWE)  John Lownds (DTI)  Jim MacHardy (GE Healthcare)  Joe McHugh (EA)  Andrew McFarlane (MoD)  David Mason (BNG)  Bobby Ronnie (Scottish Executive)  Peter Webster (British Energy)  Laurence Williams (NDA)  Angela Wright (SEPA)</p> <p><b>Presenters Present</b>  Ian Hudson (NDA)</p> <p><b>HSE Officials Present</b>  Colin Potter (Secretary)  Kath Martin (Secretariat)  Alma Edwards (Secretariat)  Ami Badmus (Nuclear Policy)</p> <p><b>Observer Apologies</b>  George Hunter (SEPA), Mary Morrey (HPA), Richard Mayson (BNFL), Louise Robson (DTI)</p>

<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome/Introduction</b>
<b>1.1</b>	The Chair welcomed: new Members Pam Duerden, Marion Hill, Peter Manning, Gordon Munro, Anthony Webb; new CBI nominee Roger Coates who was attending in advance of formally taking up appointment; new Observers Frank Francis, Andrew Jupp and Jim MacHardy who were attending their first meeting; Angela Wright and John Lownds who were representing George Hunter and Louise Robson respectively; and Ian Hudson who was presenting Item 9 on the Agenda.
<b>1.2</b>	The Chair also welcomed Health and Safety Commissioner Hugh Robertson; he was attending for Bill Callaghan who had hoped to come personally. Hugh expressed thanks to the Committee, particularly the retiring Members, for the advice and support given to the HSC. The HSC had visited Sellafield last year and had found it an interesting experience. He said there was significant interest in the work of NuSAC; the Committee and the industry were facing changing and challenging times ahead, for example in response to the Energy Review. Also a project was underway looking at ending the separation of HSC/E. Although this would have implications for Advisory Committees (ACs), he did not expect the impact on them to be significant.
<b>1.3</b>	The Chair wished to place on record his thanks to retiring Members Sue Cox, John Knott (former Chair of the Sub Committee on Research and former acting Chair of NuSAC), David Owens, Wynne Davies, Jim Whiston, Steve Napier and Sue Parry for their valuable input to NuSAC and for their personal support. He hoped they would be able to attend the first NuSAC Open Meeting that would be held in July 2007.
<b>2</b>	<b>Notes of the meeting held on 23 February 2006 and matters arising</b>
<b>2.1</b>	The minutes were approved subject to the addition of a sentence to paragraph 5.20 to read "A final decision to restart Thorp would depend on NII's agreement."
<b>3</b>	<b>Actions Arising</b>
<b>3.1</b>	All actions had been cleared except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1/1/2006 – the proposed meeting had been postponed and had not yet been rescheduled.</li> <li>• 3/1/2006 – Jim Whiston reported that he would raise this with NDA outside the meeting and that it should now be treated as cleared.</li> <li>• 5/1/2006 – an update from DTI was awaited.</li> <li>• 6/1/2006 – Paul Haigh reported that he had heard nothing direct about Defra's consultation on Low Level Waste (LLW). It was understood that a final policy statement would emerge later in the year and he suggested that the item should be treated as cleared until the need re-emerged.</li> <li>15/3/2005 and 17/3/2005 – these would be cleared with NDA outside the meeting.</li> <li>• 9/2/2005 – was outstanding (sub judice).</li> <li>• 10/2/2005 – Laurence Williams reported that this action might have been overtaken by events. NDA had prepared three draft papers: setting out the roles of the site licence company and the parent body organisations; providing guidance on parent body organisation health, safety, security and environmental performance requirements; and setting up a new site</li> </ul>

	<p>licence company from an existing licensee. NuSAC Members were welcome to see and comment on these restricted policy drafts. NDA were also finalising a paper on “Controlling Mind” issues which would be copied to NuSAC in due course for circulating to Members for information.</p> <p><b>ACTION 1/2/2006: Laurence Williams to forward three draft papers to NuSAC Secretariat for circulation to Members for comment by 31 July 2006. Laurence also to forward the “Controlling Mind” paper for information when finalised.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION 2/2/2006: Comment on the NDA draft papers to be sent to Kath Martin by 26 July 2006.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION 3/2/2006: BNG/UKAEA to forward to NuSAC Secretariat their Licensees’ “Controlling Mind” guidance.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11/2/2005 – this paper was deferred until the November meeting.</li> <li>• 82/2/15 – this would be treated as cleared. NII had undertaken to consult NuSAC when the Licence Conditions were reviewed.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Nuclear Safety Performance (Update on HSE’s policy and operational issues) and wider issues</b></p>
<p>4.1</p>	<p><u>Policy Report:</u> In introducing his policy report Colin Potter highlighted the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HSE’s policy statement on interpretation of “no danger” had been issued, and NII were now well advanced in the preparation of its internal assessment guidance.</li> <li>• the Nuclear Reactors (Environmental Impact Assessment for Decommissioning) (Amendment) Regulations 2006 came into force on 6 April.</li> <li>• the National Audit Office were looking at the work of NDA and had visited HSE, among other stakeholders, to inform their research.</li> <li>• HSE had submitted written evidence to the Commons Trade and Industry Select Committee (TISC) inquiry into the NDA and UKAEA, and had given written and oral evidence to the TISC on the nuclear aspects of the Energy Review (report published on 10 July) and to the House of Lords EU Sub-Committee D looking into the management of radioactive waste and the safety of nuclear installations (report published on 6 July).</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION 4/2/2006: Secretariat to circulate a copy of the EU Sub Committee D Report (Volume 1) to Members.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology was looking into the issue of nuclear power station siting and had shown a particular interest in the role that NuSAC (and its predecessor advisory committees) had played in advising the Government on the existing siting policy for new nuclear power stations.</li> <li>• Members had seen HSE’s expert report that had been submitted to Government on 28 June in response to the Energy Review. Early feedback from stakeholders had been positive.</li> </ul>
<p>4.2</p>	<p>Members commended HSE on its written submissions to TISC and Sub Committee D and on its expert report in response to the Energy Review. In</p>

4.3	<p>response to questions, Mr Potter confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• internal discussions were taking place in HSE about the licensing and regulation of new low-level waste disposal facilities. Although the risks from low level waste disposal were relatively low, the application of the licensing regime to new facilities might have advantages, e.g. in promoting consistency and in providing greater public reassurance, as well as reflecting the scope of the Nuclear Installations Act. The issue for HSE was whether to license and regulate all new LLW disposal facilities or only the larger ones, and if the latter where to draw the line.</li> <li>• NuSAC may be asked to advise on the adequacy of the policy on siting new nuclear power stations.</li> </ul>
4.4	<p><u>Operational Report:</u> Before outlining the key points in his report, the HM CI explained that there was no reference to the previous day's media coverage about core graphite cracking in some older reactors because his report reflected NII's activity, especially new issues, since the last meeting and was prepared in advance. He referred also to two points of detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• paragraph 87, page 16 contained an error and should have read "three regulatory hold points" not "two".</li> <li>• At paragraph 97 it would have been more accurate to say that public views on the Safety Assessment Principles (SAPs) had been sought.</li> </ul>
4.5	<p>The HM CI highlighted the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was important to maintain a sharp focus on delivering high levels of nuclear safety in the present climate of change.</li> <li>• NII was working to secure an improved safety culture at Sellafield.</li> <li>• NII was increasing its efforts in engaging with stakeholders for example in developing SAPs.</li> <li>• NI had also been proactive in holding meetings with Non Government Organisations and in improving communication channels within HSE, in addition to putting significant effort into the expert report contributing to the Energy Review.</li> </ul> <p>The following points arose in discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members expressed concerns about incidents at Dounreay (paragraph 1) corrosion at Hartlepool (paragraph 14) and the threat to BIL Solutions (paragraph 39). HM CI confirmed that NII would be monitoring Dounreay (NuSAC was also minded to re-visit) and increasing attention to establish whether the corrosion problems were confined to Hartlepool. He was also seeking to reinforce NII's ability to inspect on fire safety. NDA confirmed that it was not casting BIL Solutions adrift; but it was for the industry to ensure that all the necessary technical support services remained available.</li> <li>• UKAEA commented that Dounreay always welcomed visits from NuSAC. In relation to concerns about restructuring, they had worked closely with NDA and now had a much-improved programme in place for the longer-term. As a result of the recent personnel contamination incident at Dounreay (paragraph 78) management was working towards securing behavioural change across its UK sites.</li> <li>• In relation to Windscale (paragraph 80) UKAEA noted there had been another incident and further discussions with NII since HM CI's report was</li> </ul>

4.6	<p>written; all nuclear material moves had been halted as a result.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The figures quoted at paragraph 45 for the % increase in personnel at Hunterston A were ambiguous; it was confirmed that the increase was “significant” though BNG were unable to say that it was 36%.</li> <li>• The improvement notice at Sellafield (paragraph 50) was specific to the maintenance of the low active wastewater pipe, but failure of the support system for it could have affected nuclear plant. NII and BNGSL are now reviewing the maintenance regimes for all plant that is of low significance for nuclear safety, in the light of its strategic implications for continued safe operations.</li> <li>• Industry was well aware of the safety implications of bringing in large numbers of staff from outside the nuclear industry and abroad and had well developed procedures to deal with this.</li> <li>• HM CI responded positively to a request for his reports to say more about how NII monitored licensee performance in future eg in relation to safety cases. However, including more generic information about industry performance and about lessons learned from incidents would take more resource and may not be achievable in time for the next meeting.</li> <li>• NII were working with industry to develop a consistent set of safety performance metrics and would involve NuSAC in due course since it was essential to get this right.</li> </ul> <p>Members noted that the IAEA IRRS report had included a suggestion that NSD should clarify NDA’s responsibility for safety and whether NSD should regulate NDA. HM CI confirmed that the Energy Act had not modified the existing nuclear regulatory regime in any way; NDA had legal duties under HSWA. This included a responsibility to ensure that contactors were properly appointed and managed. But they were not the “Controlling Mind”. There had been little evidence of confusion on these issues but NSD/NDA would work together to review how best to ensure that everyone was aware of each other’s legal roles, and duties.</p>
5	<b>NuSAC Work Plan</b>
5.1	<p>The Chair said that this would be a standing item at all future meetings. He recognised that the existing work plan was not user friendly and it was difficult to see how strategic issues were being addressed. He aimed to make the Plan simpler, strategic, and easily adaptable to reflect changing priorities.</p>
5.2	<p>The Chair recognised that there was now greater interest in nuclear power and there were significant challenges ahead for example in relation to waste management, fragmentation of the industry, decommissioning, societal expectations, competition and openness. HSC/E would need guidance and advice on strategic issues aimed at improving safety while managing change. NuSAC needed to engage with HSC (and HSE policy) to ensure priorities were aligned. He outlined the following strategic issues for possible inclusion in a revised plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• maintaining the skills base;</li> <li>• management of contractors;</li> <li>• safety performance metrics;</li> <li>• priorities for nuclear safety research – NuSAC would be looking at the role</li> </ul>

<p>5.3</p>	<p>of the Sub Committee on Research (SCR).</p> <p>The Chair invited Review Group Convenors, Members and Observers to update the current work plan and send amendments and suggestions for inclusion in the new work plan to the Secretariat. A revised draft plan would be drawn up by correspondence with a view to discussing and finalising it at the November meeting. In summing up he noted the importance of the current Review Groups in taking forward work plan topics but said that some of our work, in future, may not fit into this structure; it may be more suited to the task and finish approach adopted successfully by NuSAC on some past projects, and more widely used by other HSC advisory committees.</p> <p><b>ACTION 5/2/2006: Convenors/Members (especially retiring Members) to send details of any unfinished business/new topics for building into the revised plan of work to Kath Martin by mid August.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION 6/2/2006: Secretariat to circulate the existing work plan to observers to enable them to comment.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION 7/2/2006: Secretariat to table a new draft work plan at the November meeting.</b></p>
<p>6</p>	<p><b>NII presentation on the Energy Review/New Build issues NuSAC(2006)P10</b></p>
<p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p>	<p>Before inviting HM CI to present his paper, the Chair explained that NuSAC had provided input to the Energy Review that had been taken into account in the HSE expert report submitted to the Government. He hoped Members were pleased with the outcome and thanked them for their contribution.</p> <p>In introducing his paper HM CI:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• praised the IAEA International Regulatory Review Service (IRRS) for carrying out at short notice a limited scope review of HSE/NSD's regulatory effectiveness of existing nuclear power plants and its preparedness for new build. This had covered HSE's SAPs, processes and regulatory system and was the first ever IRRS review of a major western nuclear power state.</li> <li>• referred to HSE's expert report (in response to the Government's Energy Review), drawing attention to the 2 stage, multi-step approach to licensing. The proposed approach would make it possible to undertake assessments of generic designs on generic sites, which would make site-specific licensing assessments much simpler, and would reduce regulatory uncertainty.</li> <li>• confirmed that his aim was for transparency and openness in order to generate public confidence. He would wish to see safety cases put into the public domain so far as this was possible without compromising security and commercial confidentiality.</li> <li>• commented that in essence what was wanted was a process that was transparent, rigorous and robust that met stakeholder needs. The process and related guidance could not be further developed unless Government gave the signal for HSE to go ahead.</li> <li>• confirmed that HSE/NII had worked closely with other agencies (EA, Office of Civil Nuclear Safety, SEPA etc). There had been high level</li> </ul>

<p>6.3</p>	<p>discussions to ensure that the further development of processes would be taken forward in a well-planned and integrated way, through project teams, if new build went ahead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• stressed the importance of maintaining good relationships with international regulatory colleagues; there was possibly scope for some joint working.</li> </ul> <p>HSE/NSD was congratulated on an excellent set of papers and on the IRRS report. Discussion points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern as to whether Step 2 (Fundamental Safety Overview) could realistically be done before Step 3 (Overall Design Safety Review). HM CI confirmed that this needed to be looked at in more detail.</li> <li>• The perceived lengthy timescale for the 4 step design acceptance process (around 4 years); Members were interested in the extent to which the overseas experience could be brought to bear and whether this could shorten the process. HM CI said that 4 years for a robust process was not long. HSE had a duty to secure best judgement about the adaptability to the UK of overseas experience and to ensure risks were reduced SFAIRP. Differences between countries meant it was not just a question of following overseas regulators. The UK was after all in the unique position of having been benchmarked against IAEA standards.</li> <li>• Openness, resources and planning issues were important and needed more thought and detailed work. Lessons could be learned from the Sizewell B experience.</li> <li>• In relation to integrated working, it was noted that HSE/EA had aligned their submissions to the Energy Review, acknowledged the need for close cooperation on prelicensing work, and had given joint evidence to TISC.</li> <li>• How multiple applications for new build would be dealt with was a management and resource issue. The step-wise approach to the prelicensing process would give HSE time to build up resources.</li> <li>• The question was asked whether NII should be levying a charge on applicants for pre-licensing reviews. HM CI confirmed that NII would be looking to charge for the work done but whether that could be done under the Nuclear Installations Act was questionable.</li> <li>• The report had raised the issue of the length of time that HSE's design "authorisation" would be valid; HM CI believed that 10 years was an appropriate period for this.</li> </ul> <p>6.4</p> <p>The Chair thanked HM CI and his team for their paper and congratulated the NII team on the successful outcome of the IRRS review.</p>
<p><b>7</b></p>	<p><b>NuSAC Representation at events and responses to consultations</b></p>
<p>7.1</p>	<p>The Chair thanked John Billard for standing in for Barry Cripwell and presenting a paper on radiation compensation schemes in Cologne.</p>
<p>7.2</p>	<p>Neville Moray confirmed that, on a trial basis, he had represented NuSAC at the NDA Research Board (NDARB) and would be attending their induction day the following week. NDARB was fielding an observer at NuSAC's Sub Committee on Research. This exchange had the hallmarks of a promising relationship.</p>

7.3	John Billard had attended the recent successful NSD workshop on prelicensing assessments on behalf of NuSAC; he thanked NSD for organising it. The diversity of attendees demonstrated how much the industry had changed in the last 20 years. Outcomes from the workshop had been taken into account in HSE's expert report response to the Energy Review.
8	<b>Matters that the Sub Committee on Research (SCR) and Review Groups (RGs) may wish to raise with licensees or other Observers</b>
8.1	Neville Moray, Chair of SCR, confirmed that he had reported to HSC that SCR was satisfied with its programme for research.
8.2	Neville invited Members and Observers views on whether, in the changed environment in which it was now operating, the SCR – under its existing Terms of Reference (ToR) - was the best means of advising the HSC on the adequacy and balance of the nuclear safety research programme. SCR's ToR had been set by the DTI pre-NDA and were outdated. Industry had changed and some safety-related research was also now being commissioned by the NDA. Historically SCR had looked at the nuclear research index (a substantial document) and more recently also at the lengthy research programmes of NDA licensees to identify gaps in research; the resource demands of this approach meant it was simply no longer feasible to fulfil the SCR role in this way. It was therefore time to review and clarify NuSAC's role with regard to research, Members endorsed Neville's views and stressed the need for the scope of the research programme not just to be technically focussed but also to include human factor and management issues.
8.3	In summary the Chair confirmed the need for a review of SCR's ToR and questioned whether SCR was still needed or whether there was another way of assuring HSC on nuclear safety research matters. He said that Neville would be producing a detailed paper on the role, composition and remit of SCR for the November NuSAC and encouraged Members to help both by sending in their views direct to Neville and/or by joining SCR. It would be even more essential to maintain the research base in the event of new build. <b>ACTION 8/2/2006: Members and Observers to send their views on SCR and its ToR to Neville Moray in time to incorporate them into the paper Neville would be preparing for November.</b>
8.4	<u>RG1 (Safety Management and Performance)</u> : Jim Whiston reported that there had been three useful visits to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Springfields Fuels Ltd (SFL) where RG1 were pleased to have re-established contact. The team noted a good relationship between the site management and NDA. SFL would bring a paper to the November meeting on the plans and challenges of the site.</li> <li>• British Energy (BE) for a full and frank meeting with Roy Anderson; they had agreed that this would become an annual event in future.</li> <li>• Sellafield, where there had been a significant improvement in the relationship with NDA compared to the previous year. There was, however, some concern about the incident at Thorp. The team noted that the US Department of Energy were keen to learn from BNGSL's excellent</li> </ul>

<p>8.5</p>	<p>contractor safety programme. BNGSL would present an update paper in November.</p>
<p>8.6</p>	<p><u>RG2 (Fuel Cycle Operations and Interim Safety)</u>: Paul Haigh reported on Bill Heafield's behalf, confirming that they were keen to move forward on their work plan following the allocation of new Members to the Group. In response to an invitation to present a paper on legacy wastes and an overview paper at the November meeting, BNGSL confirmed that this would be timely as they had recently produced an integrated waste management paper that looked at the long-term strategy for the site. As this was a big topic, it was suggested that it would be best to take matters forward in bite-sized chunks focusing first on B38 only.</p> <p><u>RG3 (Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and Decommissioning Policy)</u>: Andrew Clarke reported that the Review Group had provided substantive comments on NDA's draft Strategy. Much of the comment had been addressed in the published document; it was now a good document giving prominence to health and safety. A meeting with NDA would be arranged to take up the outstanding issues so as to help NDA when the Strategy was next revised. Examples of the items to be taken up included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the strategic decision making process and more detail on safety performance metrics;</li> <li>• pre-qualification criteria and the lack of a Quality/Nuclear Safety Policy;</li> <li>• issues around research capability and clarification on NDA expertise and funding in particular for safety-related projects;</li> <li>• concerns about the skills base for operating plant; the focus was currently entirely on decommissioning;</li> <li>• the need to foster a good safety culture;</li> <li>• clarification on risk assessment; NDA references to risk related primarily to economic not safety risk.</li> </ul>
<p>8.7</p>	<p>NDA were keen to facilitate such a meeting and would seek to clarify the issues in advance so that they could be fully addressed at the meeting. In response to a question about whether NDA's revised competition schedule was achievable within NSD's resources, it was confirmed NSD had looked at their likely resource needs but did not currently have all those resources in place.</p>
<p>8.8</p>	<p>After explaining the role of their research expenditure panel, NDA confirmed in discussion that site licence companies and NII (not NDA) determined what research should be undertaken to underpin nuclear health and safety. NDA's role was to ensure that licensees worked with NII but it was not for them to sponsor licensees' research directly. If specific safety research was needed HSC could commission it and levy the licensees. In response to concern that NDA's research programme might indicate that human factors research was not important despite it being at the root of most nuclear incidents, NDA reiterated that their research was technology, not safety, focused and they would attract criticism if it were otherwise. Finally, in response to concern as to whether NDA's target in its annual plan for contractors to achieve annual efficiency savings of 7% might compromise health and safety, NDA confirmed that safety was paramount and they would not allow contractors to put safety at risk in order to achieve savings.</p>

8.9	<p><u>RG4 (Emergency Arrangements)</u>: Barry Cripwell had attended the Nuclear Emergency Planning Liaison Group (NEPLG). DTI were looking at the function and structure of NEPLG, which was now a very large group of around 50. In response to a DTI suggestion NEPLG had begun to work through eight sub-groups; this was a positive move and should make its work more manageable. These sub-groups are in addition to the full meetings of NEPLG currently held twice a year.</p> <p><u>RG5 MoD</u>: Steve Napier confirmed that he would shortly be handing over this Group to Dick Bird and thanked Andrew McFarlane for all his support. Steve reported that a decommissioning and waste management strategy for MoD sites was still awaited and it was hoped that this would be achieved early in the New Year.</p>
9	<b>Maintaining the Nuclear Skills Base</b>
9.1	<p>The Chair welcomed Ian Hudson, Head of Technology and Skills Development at NDA, who took NuSAC through his presentation (see paper NuSAC(2006) P14). He broadly: outlined NDA's skills Strategy, their balanced national and regional approach to training and development and some key issues for them such as demographics (eg an ageing and diverse workforce). He touched on NDA's national skills network and talked through some of the many excellent initiatives underway, outlining how these contributed to NDA's 5 year vision on skills and their investment in people.</p>
9.2	<p>Particular points made included how NDA had:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• required all sites to draw up plans for skills needs in the short, medium and long term, given that it was not possible to ensure that skills were available for the full life cycle of sites.</li> <li>• reviewed these plans with the aim of bringing all the sites up to a minimum acceptable standard.</li> <li>• incentivised site improvement plans for each site.</li> <li>• encouraged the sharing of many examples of good practice eg at Sellafield.</li> <li>• identified particularly high demand skills, such as programme and project management across the UK, and others where there were geographical shortages such as in health physics.</li> </ul>
9.3	<p>NuSAC Members confirmed they would continue to take a keen interest in this topic. In discussion NDA said they had used DTI's original 'nuclear skills' study figures to inform their strategy and were working towards developing a skills matrix. Although there was a focus on technical training, in some cases human factors issues were integrated into the various programmes. Much of the training was longer term and would take time to come through; NDA had therefore commissioned an independent report to look at shorter-term supply risks and had fed their views through to DTI. In relation to addressing health physics shortages a steering group had been set up chaired by HPA; NDA was supporting a range of modular training and funded bursaries. In terms of influencing younger people in the 14 to 19 age group to seek a career in the nuclear industry, NDA was working on the "Energy Foresight Programme" in England (and would be looking to do something similar for Scotland) and</p>

	<p>would focus on the attraction of environmental restoration and decommissioning, as well as the potential of new build, to persuade people there were longer-term career opportunities in the industry.</p> <p><b>ACTION 9/2/2006: Ian Hudson to provide a copy of the Health Physics Committee report to NuSAC Secretariat for circulation to Members and Observers.</b></p>
<b>10</b>	<b>Update on the arrangements for the first NuSAC Open Meeting</b>
<b>10.1</b>	<p>Kath Martin reported that the first Open Meeting would be held in Rose Court in July 2007. it would take the form of a normal business meeting with an introductory presentation and short Q&amp;A session at the end. Entry would be by ticket only, booked in advance on a first come first served basis. The meeting would be publicised on HSC/E's web site in addition to invitations being sent to key stakeholders. Observers were encouraged to attend. Members welcomed confirmation that there would be a closed session in the afternoon, for instance to consider any commercially sensitive matters.</p>
<b>11</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>
<b>11.1</b>	<p>David Mason noted NuSAC's interest in the safety performance of BNGSL and extended an invitation to NuSAC Members to visit Sellafield to take them through performance indicators etc. The Chair thanked BSNGL for the invitation.</p> <p><b>ACTION 10/2/2006: Secretariat to follow up with BNGSL the possibility of a Members visit to Sellafield.</b></p>
<b>11.2</b>	<p>Andrew Clarke reported that NDA had offered to provide data for NuSAC's annual safety performance review but that NuSAC had decided to retain the existing arrangements for collecting data via the Industry Safety Directors' Forum for the 2005/2006 fiscal year. Andrew had written to the secretary of the Forum accordingly. NuSAC had invited NDA to supply the data they had collected which would be reviewed at the same time.</p>
<b>11.3</b>	<p>The Chair reported that he would be attending a keeping in touch meeting with the HSC Chair in October.</p>
<b>12</b>	<b>Date of next meeting including update on the visit to HMS Sultan</b>
<b>12.1</b>	<p>The next main meeting would be held on Friday, 3 November 2006 at the Holiday Inn, Portsmouth following the Members' site visit to HMS Sultan. It would be a morning only meeting to allow time for travel home. Dates for 2007 would be finalised shortly.</p>
<b>12.2</b>	<p>Observers were advised that the Secretariat would book accommodation in Portsmouth on their behalf, if asked, but that they would be responsible for settling their own accounts.</p>
<b>13</b>	<b>Close</b>
<b>13.1</b>	<p>The Chair thanked all present for their contribution and closed the meeting at 14.15.</p>