

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION STATUS – Fully Open	NuSAC/01/2007
Nuclear Safety Advisory Committee (NuSAC)	APPROVED
Minutes of the Main Meeting held on 22 March 2007 in Rose Court, London at 1045 hours.	
<p>Members Present: Steve Vranch (Chair) Sheila Ashford John Billard Dick Bird Malcolm Bonnet Andrew Clarke Roger Coates Pam Duerden Bryan Edmondson Paul Haigh Bill Heafield Marion Hill Peter Manning Rod McKenzie Neville Moray Alan Muir Gordon Munro Murray Sinclair Anthony Webb</p> <p>Members Apologies: Barry Cripwell and Robin Bloomfield</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 ND - Nuclear Directorate NDA - Nuclear Decommissioning Authority NII - Nuclear Installations Inspectorate OCNS - Office of Civil Nuclear Security SE - Scottish Executive SEPA - Scottish Environment Protection Agency UKAEA - United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority URENCO -</p>	<p>Mike Weightman - H M Chief Inspector of Nuclear Installations (HM CI) Gary Booth – Nuclear Directorate</p> <p>Observers Present Alan Brandwood (BNG) Neale Brittain (BE) John Crofts (UKAEA) Graham Day (AWE) Frank Francis (DRDL) Geoff Gill (Springfields Fuels Ltd) Bryen Martin, BNFL) David Mason (BNG) Jim MacHardy (GE Healthcare) Peter Wakefield (BE) Louise Robson (DTI) Joe McHugh (EA) Andrew McFarlane (MoD) Laurence Williams (NDA) Stuart Hudson (SEPA)</p> <p>Presenters Present Roger Brunt, OCNS Andrew Buchan, BNGSL</p> <p>HSE Officials Present Colin Potter (retiring Secretary) Graham Collins (new Secretary) Alma Edwards (Secretariat)</p> <p>Observer Apologies Mary Morrey (HPA) Bobbie Ronnie (SE) Clive Nurton (Welsh Assembly), Andrew Jupp (AWE) George Hunter (SEPA) Jenny Chalmers, (URENCO)</p>

Minutes of the main meeting of NuSAC held on 22 March 2007 in Rose Court, London, commencing at 10.45 hours.	
1	Welcome/Introduction
1.1	<p>The Chair welcomed: Murray Sinclair and Malcolm Bonnet as new members; Neale Brittain, BE and Graham Day, AWE (representing Andrew Jupp); Stuart Hudson, SEPA (representing George Hunter) as observers. He also welcomed Bryen Martin, BNFL and Geoff Gill, Springfields Fuels, who were both new observers but had presented papers to the Committee in the past.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Neville Moray for all the work he had done during his time as a highly valued Committee member. He noted that Neville proposed to attend the next meeting, if possible, and that would be his last.</p> <p>The Chair placed on record his thanks to Colin Potter, Secretary of NuSAC for his support. Colin was moving from the Policy side to the Operational side of NII. The Chair welcomed Graham Collins, the New Secretary of NuSAC. He also welcomed Gary Booth who will be providing technical support to NuSAC.</p>
2	Notes of the meeting held on 3 November 2006
2.1	With the amendment of Action 1/3/2006 to read "Observers to report back to March 2007 meeting on progress towards a coordinated approach to the management of PCM", the minutes were approved.
3	Actions Arising
3.1	<p>All actions had been cleared except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action 9/3/2006 - HM CI/NDA to report progress on the review of Controlling Mind issues at future meetings – Outstanding • 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 – Outstanding. • Action 1/3/2006 – Bill Heafield reported that during 2005 NuSAC had prepared a paper based on extensive contributions from Dounreay, Harwell, BNG and AWE regarding inventory and planned treatment and storage of the UK's holdings of PCM. One of the NuSAC paper's conclusions was that there should be a co-ordinated national response, especially with regard to high-force compaction, cementation and either ceramicisation or other thermal treatment to meet possible disposal criteria. The paper had been discussed and

agreed by NuSAC at its November 2005 meeting. Since then, nothing appeared to have happened. The action should therefore remain with the licensees but it would be helpful if the RWPG could give a lead.

John Crofts reported that he had chased this matter up and was awaiting a response internally. He would respond to the Committee at a future meeting.

Action 1/1/2006 – NuSAC Secretary to arrange a report back on the joint HSE/NDA paper on a coordinated approach to PCM presented to the RWPG meeting in May 2006.

Mr Potter reported that the RWPG meeting planned for May 2006 had been postponed and that specific consideration of PCM issues had not taken place. However, the CoRWM recommendations did take into account the need to address storage/disposal of PCM, and the next stage of the Government's process (Managing Radioactive Waste Safely) is currently being discussed /drafted. This action was considered discharged, but in response to requests from the Committee, HSE undertook to report back to a future meeting on progress with national policy on PCM.

ACTION 1/1/2007: HSE to report on progress with development of national policy on management/disposal of PCM.

- **Action 5/1/2006** – NuSAC Secretary to report at the July 2006 meeting about insolvency administrator's remit to safety and impact on NII's regulatory role.

Colin Potter reported that DTI had been undertaking some work on the aspects of this relating to potential new nuclear power station build. It was likely that the Government would introduce legislation on this. Regarding the more general issue of licensee insolvency, this was still with DTI. He apologised for HSE's slowness in getting a substantive response to this matter.

Andrew Clarke said that the situation regarding Action 5/1/2006 was unsatisfactory and that a response was needed.

ACTION 2/1/2007: Graham Collins to provide a progress report on the insolvency administrator's remit.

- **Action 3/2/2006** – John Crofts reported that UKAEA did not have separate guidance on the "controlling mind" issue. He said that UKAEA refers to the guidance issued by NII. Action closed.
- **Action 3/3/2006** -The Chair thanked Louise Robson, DTI for the Policy Brief provided. The Committee asked for the Policy Brief Report to be a Standing Item at each meeting.

ACTION 3/1/2007: That a Policy Brief from DTI be provided to each meeting of the Committee.

- **Action 5/3/2006** – Discussion took place on the issue of insurance cover for ambulance workers. Louise Robson said that the issue had been raised at the Nuclear Emergency Planning Liaison Group (NEPLG) and its members had indicated that they were not aware of the problem. Department of Health had agreed to follow up. It was believed that there were no insurance difficulties for other emergency workers.

Louise Robson provided an overview on the DTI's views on a prioritisation process for new nuclear reactor designs:

- The plan was simple, open and transparent
- It would be announced alongside the White Paper/consultation document
- The aim is to have a most three designs for detailed regulatory assessment
- Vendors would need the endorsement of “credible operators”
- Criteria would be needed to determine which design proponents were “Credible operators”

NuSAC suggested it might be in a position to assist with the process. Members foresaw problems with defining a “credible operator”. Mike Weightman commented that the NSD resource planning had been based on the assumption of only 3 designs being taken through the full generic design assessment process. Any more resource would take proportionately longer.

Andrew Clarke asked about the House of Lords debate on the EC “Nuclear Package”. Louise Robson said that the current position was that the UK remains firmly with other EU nuclear power states in its view that further legislation from the EC in the area of nuclear safety is unnecessary.

- **Action 6/3/2006** – This action was cleared by circulation of the NDA competition schedule. Members should consult the NDA website (www.nda.gov.uk) for updated versions
- **Action 7/3/2006** – Laurence Williams reported that NDA's guidance documents are now available on the NDA website (www.nda.gov.uk – document library - search under “Guidance”). Action cleared.

4	Nuclear Safety Performance (update on HSE's policy and operational issues) and wider issues
4.1	<p>Mike Weightman highlighted the following issues from his report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• With reference to Action 2/3/2006, Mike Weightman apologised to the Committee for the withdrawal of the paper on LC 36 from the Agenda of the meeting. A paper would be put to a future meeting.• A public report on the investigation into the Thorp leak had been published. The Chief Inspector said that the report contained 'lessons learnt' for driving improved safety culture throughout the nuclear industry. Following discussion of the 'lessons learnt', it was agreed that it would be useful for NII to make a joint presentation with BNFL to the Committee later. <p>ACTION 4/1/2007: Dr Weightman and Mr Mason agreed to return to the Committee in October 2007 to each make a presentation on the 'lessons learnt' from the Thorp incident.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Judicial Review: A Government statement relating to the challenge by Greenpeace to the consultation exercise before the publication of the Energy Review report has been published. The Energy White Paper is expected to be published in May 2007. A further process of consultation will also be undertaken on the future of nuclear power.• The Office of Civil Nuclear Security and the DTI's Safeguards Operational function will be amalgamated into HSE from 2 April 2007. From that date, the Nuclear Safety Directorate (NSD) will be renamed as HSE's Nuclear Directorate to reflect its wider responsibilities.• During the last three months, both reactors at Hinkley Point B were shut down. At Hunterston B both reactors have remained shut to undergo boiler inspections and repairs.• Sizewell B: Refuelling outage 8 went well. The Chief Inspector was pleased with the way the overall project was handled.• Wylfa: Noted the length of time taken to address the problem of water leakage into the dry fuel store. Work had originally started in 1990 but was now being actively pursued. There are concerns over the retrieval of a number of partially corroded fuel elements. <p>Andrew Clarke commented on the issues still outstanding from the 2004 Wylfa Periodic Safety Review. The Chief Inspector said that these were long term issues and that the programme of work was extensive, but acknowledged that the delay in dealing with these issues was too long.</p>

4.2	<p>The Chief Inspector gave an overview on nuclear New Build to the Committee. He outlined the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four phases of New Build: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review regulatory Strategy ○ Prelicensing ○ Construction/Commissioning ○ Operation • Four steps of pre-licensing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Design and safety preparation of fundamental safety overview ○ Overall design safety review ○ Detailed Assessment • Risk Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Environment ○ Strategic Approach ○ Governance arrangements and the effectiveness of the processes. <p>International Standards: Nuclear Directorate had benchmarked its Safety Assessment Principles against the IAEA standards. Nuclear Directorate was in discussions with the Finnish, French and US regulators with regard to sharing experience in design assessment.</p>
4.3	<p>The Chief Inspector was asked about the number of additional inspector resources needed for new build assessment. The Chief Inspector said that an additional 40 inspectors were likely to be needed to undertake detailed assessments of up to 3 designs. Currently, resources were being gained from other parts of HSE, but external recruitment will be necessary to back fill the posts of the experienced ND staff that are required for this work.</p>
4.4	<p>The Chair said that he wished formally to record that the Committee was very supportive of the Chief Inspector's endeavours to secure the recruitment of the necessary specialist staff.</p>
5	Update on NuSAC Work Plan 2006/8
5.1	<p>The Chair noted that the draft work plan had been issued to members for comment. The Plan will be finalised shortly and circulated to all attendees. Unlike previous work plans, the published plan will not be detailed, but will address a smaller number of key, strategic, issues or themes. A number of Task Forces had been identified on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interfaces Task Force - covers the breadth of industry • Regulatory Framework Task Force - will engage with NII on licence conditions and review international dimension • Task Force on New Build of Reactors (if new build goes ahead). • Task Force on Safety Culture focusing on how safety culture can be

	<p>implemented and sustained. The importance of which is shown in the NII's report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radiation Protection – including ICRP recommendations. <p>The existing Review Groups would continue, and would develop their own work programmes, including the new Review Group 6, which had taken over the work previously done by the Sub-Committee on Research.</p>
6	Update on NuSAC Spring Review 2007
6.1	Steve Vranich informed the Committee that the Spring Review would be delivered at the NuSAC Open meeting on 5 July 2007.
7	NuSAC representation at events and responses to consultations
7.1	HSC/E consultation on Governance. NuSAC had not commented on the consultation exercise.
7.2	Gordon Munro attended the NII Safety Assessment Principles seminar on 26 January at John Moores University. He said that the seminar was well attended. Participants felt that the SAPs document was well thought out and provided good guidance for inspectors. Benchmarking to IAEA standards had been useful and NII were satisfied with reactions to the document. The additional guidance cross-referencing the new SAPs to the old SAPs would help with implementation.
7.3	Mike Weightman said that the event was very useful because it afforded NII the opportunity to interact with stakeholders.
8	Matters that the Sub Committee on Research and Review Groups may wish to raise with licensees or other observers
8.1	<p>Neville Moray, Sub-Committee on Research said this was his last report to the Committee. The Sub-Committee on Research had become Review Group 6. The ways of working and the terms of reference were reviewed and unanimously agreed by NuSAC Members and Prof Moray thanked all those members who had helped in their preparation. Neville Moray reported that Peter Manning would be taking over the Chairmanship of Review Group 6.</p> <p>Arising from the SCR's last meeting, it was recommended that the new HSE Chief Scientist be invited to attend a future NuSAC meeting and present his views. Also arising from that meeting, it was recommended that DTI be invited to make a presentation to a future NuSAC meeting setting out their vision for the future National Nuclear Laboratory.</p> <p>Action 5/1/2007: The Chair to write to HSE Chief Scientist inviting him to make a presentation to a future meeting on his views on the best use of science.</p>

	<p>Action 6/1/2007: DTI to make a presentation to a future meeting on their vision for the National Nuclear Laboratory</p> <p>Prof Moray noted that it was the time of the year for SCR to write to the HSC setting its views on the adequacy of the industry's nuclear safety research programmes. This year a number of caveats will be flagged up on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nuclear Research Index – there were a number of things that were wrong. The Index was not well-managed – there were mistakes. The recommendations were accepted by Peter Storey.• Problem understanding the research on human factors High priority project but nothing is being done. <p>The setting up of the Ergonomics Society nuclear industry group was good for human factors in the sector.</p> <p>Peter Manning noted that the SCR had been very pleased to be invited to attend the NDA's research board meetings. He thought this would prove to be a very fruitful collaboration.</p>
8.2	<p>Andrew Clarke reported on the following:</p> <p>At the invitation of Laurence Williams, a joint visit of RG 1 and RG3 to the NDA HQ took place on 20 February. NuSAC was represented by John Billard, Anthony Webb and Andrew Clarke. This was a very useful meeting at which a wide variety of topics were discussed (see the report). Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contractor dose control: NDA seeking to identify causes of outlying results. NuSAC suggested NDA look at does control practices at Sellafield and sponsor an industry workshop to facilitate sharing of good practice.• NuSAC were pleased to hear of the efforts being made to ensure budget cuts are properly managed. NuSAC may wish at some stage to advice HSC to make representations to Government if budget cuts are seen to be causing deterioration in safety management.• NuSAC noted the issues associated with accelerated Magnox decommissioning. This may prove technically feasible but practical restrictions (eg. on waste disposal capacity) may prevent this.• Good work was being undertaken on the treatment of contaminated metal waste, including melting and reuse.• There are concerns that NDA and its management contractors are in unwelcome competition for contractor/project management resources due to the staffing up of the 2012 Olympic project teams. <p>RG1 had a meeting with British Energy's new Director of Safety, Peter Wakefield. The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss future communications between NuSAC and British Energy following the departure of Roy Anderson.</p>

8.3	<p>Review Group 2: Bill Heafield commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RG2's legacy Waste Issue – paper was being presented later in the meeting. • Review Group 2 had visited Springfields. A key issue is the process route for dealing with uranium residues. Good progress had been made on “easy items”, but there was less clarity on way forward for more difficult residues. It seemed doubtful that the target date of 2010 for clearing this waste would be achieved. • There are residues elsewhere in the UK and there is a need for a national strategy for dealing with this. NII and industry were urged to get together to seek a way forward. RG2 would look at this issue again in a couple of years to see if any progress had been made.
8.4	<p>Review Group 3: Anthony Webb noted that the joint meeting with NDA with RG1 had been extremely useful. There was no separate RG3 report.</p>
8.5	<p>Review Group 4: Rod McKenzie reported on behalf of Review Group 4. Members had attended the Sellafield OSCAR 8 exercise which had generally gone well apart from the promulgation of information to the public via the media briefing centre. RG4 would wish to look at this issue again in future exercises.</p> <p>Andrew Clarke questioned to what extent emergency control centre back up facilities exist and are exercised. Louise Robson, DTI, confirmed that the back-up facility was used during the OSCAR exercise.</p>
8.6	<p>Review Group 5: Dick Bird reported that he had a very useful meeting with the Defence Nuclear Safety Regulator, Cdre Andrew McFarlane. A key topic discussed had been MoD's strategy for dealing with legacy wastes. He invited Cdre McFarlane to comment.</p> <p>Cdre McFarlane commented that he had hoped, before now, to have been able to present a paper to NuSAC on MoD's waste management strategy. Regrettably, this had been delayed because of MoD's wish to ensure that the strategy was fully bought into internally and by ministers before making any public announcements. Cdre McFarlane emphasised the importance of the issue for DNSC and a lot of work had been put into this internally. He hoped to be able to put a paper to NuSAC in the autumn and would liaise with RG5 in preparing that paper.</p>
9	<p>Safety Performance overview of Major Nuclear Licensees - Annual Update - January 2007 - covering period 2005-6</p>
9.1	<p>Andrew Clarke presented the paper – the eight annual report produced by NuSAC. The paper examined the safety performance of the Major Nuclear Licensees. The key features of the report were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally low radiation doses to employees and contractors. • Civil licensees showed improvements in industrial safety performance

	<p>(RIDDOR injury rate) for employees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor injury rates consistently worse than employees. Good practices in management of contractors for some licensees but great variability across the sites. • UK licensees don't seem to be able to maintain any improvements for very long – possibly due to frequent reorganisations and changes in management. • Average Sellafield contractor doses in this period were same as 1990. Raises the question whether practices at Sellafield are ALARP. Are best practice dose management arrangements being implemented? • Much safety performance data is now in the public domain, which is very welcome. But concerns that licensee acquisitions by overseas parent companies may lead to loss of data availability. <p>In conclusion, Andrew Clarke reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UKAEA recorded the highest recorded RIDDOR major injuries since 1997 • Unplanned reactor trip rate for Magnox Electric and British Energy were the lowest recorded • The improvement in GE Healthcare industrial safety data • The improving trend in RIDDOR injuries at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AWE ○ DML Devonport - however the number of major injuries had increased.
9.2	<p>John Crofts, UKAEA, said that the root causes for the increase in RIDDOR major injuries were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Failure to follow procedures ○ Tolerating defects ○ Misuse of equipment.
9.3	<p>In UKAEA most of the people undertaking the on-site work are contractors. Most UKAEA employees are office-based and this may explain why the figures for employees and contractors are different. Dr Crofts said the company has initiatives to encourage sustained excellence and he believed the company was “getting there”, but needed to strive to do better. This year is looking very much better (so far).</p>
9.4	<p>Commenting on the Sellafield data, Mr Mason said that when NuSAC visit the site in October they will be able to appreciate the great complexity of the work being undertaken – and also the significant progress being made. Sellafield doses are higher now simply because there is much more work being undertaken on decommissioning and clean-up. He accepted that BNG needed to ensure that best practices are being applied and that those practices are ALARP. BNG sets a dose budget for every job which should be set by ALARP analysis. The use of personal electronic dosimeters is also helping to ensure doses are properly controlled. He offered to provide a paper to a future meeting on this topic.</p>

	Action 7/1/2007: Mr Mason to provide a paper on dose control and use of ALARP at Sellafield
9.5	<p>Malcolm Bonnet said he would like to know the root causes of the higher contractor injury rates. In particular, were there any problems with foreign workers and were there fewer good safety representatives in contractor organisations? It was suggested that the Safety Directors' Forum might be able to answer these questions.</p> <p>Action 8/1/2007: The Chair to write to the Safety Directors' Forum to enquire about the reasons why contractor injury rates are higher than for employees.</p>
10	OCNS Review
10.1	<p>Roger Brunt, the Director of OCNS, presented his report for 2005-6 on the effectiveness of security in the civil nuclear industry. He covered the four areas that OCNS regulates: site security, transport security, information security and personnel security.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The use of site security plan 'schedules of improvements' was proving helpful to site inspectors and to licensees. There had been both high-level and shop-floor talks to get the message across. Site security exercises were very useful and the intention was to carry out joint safety and security exercises once OCNS has moved into HSE. (ii) Following the incident at Willesden, improvements had been made in the use of wardens at train crew change overs. It was also (iii) intended to carry out explosive tests on fuel flasks. (iv) On information issues, there is a need for continued vigilance to ensue that laptops are not lost or stolen. (v) On personnel, the backlogs in security vetting had largely been cleared since the Defence Vetting Agency had been contracted to assist them.
10.2	Roger Brunt welcomed the move of OCNS into HSE, which he felt would lead to greater efficiency. He was seeking to recruit more inspectors to cope with the current workload and allow additional effort on NDA matters and threat assessments. He thought that OCNS would be ready for new build.
10.3	In his previous report, Roger Brunt expressed the view that unauthorised access to nuclear licensed sites was not a criminal offence. This situation had been rectified in the Terrorism Act 2006; amendments had also been made to the Nuclear Industries Security Regulations, for example to include more on software. In his view the civil nuclear industry is now effectively and proportionately regulated.
10.4	In response to questions on ways of charging for security clearance and whether vital security areas had been identified. Roger Brunt said that 96%

	of OCNS costs are recoverable. OCNS had raised the security stakes. For example, at Sellafield, single occupancy vehicles were not allowed on site.
10.5	The Chair thanked Mr Brunt for his paper.
11	Legacy Waste - NuSAC(2007)P5
11.1	<p>David Mason, BNG and Andy Buchan, BNGSL, presented the paper to give an overview and update of the issues related to the Legacy Waste facilities at Sellafield. The legacy waste facilities concerned were the :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pile fuel storage pond • First Magnox pond • Magnox fuel cladding silo • Pile fuel cladding silo.
11.2	<p>There is a significant safety imperative to remove the wastes and process them into a form suitable for passively safe storage and eventual disposal. David Mason said that a huge amount of work has taken place to allow upgrade or installation of new facilities to enable waste recovery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of modular effluent treatment plant • Gantry refurbishments system to allow upgrade of a major pond retrievals crane • West End Crane replacement in the Magnox Cladding Silo • The clean-up of compartment 7 which was heavily contaminated • Excellent Conventional Safety Performance and establishment and maintenance of a positive Safety Culture • Radiological Safety maintained at a high level. <p>Much had been achieved but much remained to be done before waste removal and hence hazard reduction could begin.</p>
11.3	<p>In reply to questions David Mason said that considerable work had been done to meet the specifications required by the Nuclear Installations Inspectorate (NII). The specifications provided the right focus on clean up, but there might be a better solution given the positive progress to date and that BNGSL were in constructive dialogue with NII. There was a new focus on delivery against scope schedule and cost with delivery to 90-95% of planned targets. BNFL would prefer the specifications to be replaced by items in Sellafield's 'near-term workplan (NTWP) for the NDA.</p>
11.4	<p>Mike Weightman said that regulatory legal requirements would not be replaced by contractual controls. The contract was about delivery.</p>

12	Review Group 2: Review of Legacy Waste – NuSAC(2007)P7
12.1	<p>Bill Heafield spoke to the paper. He said that the engineering steps, especially Magnox Fuel Cladding Silo were a commendable achievement. However, the achievement of the NII waste recovery specifications appears challenged by::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problems of waste specification; • Interim storage leading to double handling; • Risk without clarity - any programme relating to time and cost is questionable. <p>To achieve satisfactory progress there needs to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear identification of controlling mind; • Sufficient resources in terms of numbers, skills, experience etc; • A ‘can do’ attitude rather than focusing on obstacles to success; • Solutions that are good enough rather than best; • Confidence over funding; • Rebuilding morale. <p>In summary, Bill Heafield said that there were questions about continuity of purpose and concerns over funding to allow delivery of these key and complex projects. He asked whether there was anything NuSAC could do to facilitate the work.</p>
12.2	<p>Peter Manning commented that it is not acceptable to wait for the repository to be specified, this would lead to a significant delay. Rather, BNG/regulators need to take a risk that the packaged waste form might not be acceptable for disposal. – but rather that than to do nothing in the meantime. The inventory in Magnox Fuel Cladding Silo is the same as 20 years ago.</p>
12.3	<p>Laurence Williams said that hazard reduction was the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority’s (NDA) first priority. There were no restrictions from NDA to progress with this work. In 1983, BNFL wanted to build an extension to the silos; NII refused and required all waste to be encapsulated. As the capability of the retrieval plant is delivered, the waste streams will be identified, encapsulated and stored ready for disposal. The retrieval capability is the key issue.</p>
12.4	<p>NII was determined to make it work this time. It may not be the best, or ideal solution, but there is a need to make progress. However, it must be done safely. The NuSAC paper spells out some key issues.</p>
12.5	<p>Joe McHugh wondered whether NuSAC needs to be closer to this work. A meeting of the regulators was held a few weeks ago to discuss progress with the wet silo. There was a good deal of agreement on the way forward. It might have been helpful to have had NuSAC at that meeting. Neville Moray encouraged the organisers to ensure that NuSAC is invited to such meetings in future.</p>

13	Date and arrangements for Open Meeting on Thursday, 5 July 2007
13.1	<p>The Chair noted that the open meeting will be held at the New Connaught Rooms, 61-65 Great Queen Street, Covent Garden, London WC2B 5DA at 1000 hours.</p> <p>The aim is to have a normal business meeting, with a non-public session following to consider the success or otherwise of the open session as well as to deal with any matters which are of a restricted nature. In the open session the aim is to include the Chief Inspector's report, the Review Group Reports, a report back on the Task Forces, plus a "theme", for which papers and presentations would be invited. The theme at this meeting would be education and training. In addition, NuSAC's annual (or Spring) review would be presented.</p>
14	Any Other Business
14.1	Cdre Andrew McFarlane informed the Committee about the tragedy on HMS Tireless, a nuclear-powered, conventionally armed submarine. The incident claimed two lives and seriously injured one, that day. He said that the incident had been factually reported in the Press.
14.2	<p>Laurence Williams reported that NIREX's staff would be transferring into the NDA from 2nd April. NIREX would then cease to exist as a separate organisation and becomes part of the Radioactive Waste Management Directorate under Richard Waite. They will build up a subsidiary company which will form the basis for the site licence company that will build and operate the repository.</p> <p>Mr Williams also noted that he had now been appointed the NDA's Chief Engineer, which means he will hold an engineering portfolio in addition to his safety, security and environment portfolio. He will appoint 2 deputy directors to assist him. In the event of any conflict of interest between the engineering and safety/security/environment roles, Mr Williams noted that he would revert back to the HSSD director on that particular issue.</p> <p>In response to questions, Mr Williams confirmed that his directorate was not responsible for setting engineering standards. These are the responsibility of the licensees. The Directorate is certainly not a design and delivery organisation.</p>
14.3	Alan Brandwood reported that from 31 March 2007, British Nuclear Group formally ceased to exist, with the component parts separated into different organisations. The reactor sites company is being sold; the Sellafield site management company is being put out to competition; project services will be a stand-alone company. In the interim, BNFL will become the parent body in place of BNG.
14.4	Rod McKenzie raised the issue that the interlinked nature of the remediation

	<p>projects at Sellafield was complex and that a high level project plan would be useful for members. In response, David Mason agreed to send members a copy of the latest Sellafield high-level Project Plan.</p> <p>ACTION 9/1/2007: Mr Mason to send a copy of the high level project plan for the Sellafield legacy ponds and silos projects to NuSAC Secretariat for distribution.</p>
14.5	Stuart Hudson, SEPA, reported that the Government's revised low-level waste policy was to be issued at the end of March and it will be on the Defra Website.
15	Date of Next Meeting
	NuSAC Open Meeting, Thursday, 5 July 2007 at the New Connaught Rooms, 61-65 Great Queen Street, Covent Garden, London WC2B 5DA. (See HSC Website for further details.)