

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES FOR 2012

Policy Statement 9 February 2012



Background

This Policy Statement sets out NuLeAF's strategic objectives for 2012. These were reviewed and adopted at the NuLeAF AGM in October 2011. The strategic objective on Major Accidents was approved at the Steering Group meeting in January 2012.

The Statement contains:

- An overview of objectives
- A tabular presentation of the review and development of objectives

The objectives cover the following topics:

- NDA strategy and operations
- Low Level Waste (LLW) strategy
- Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) siting
- Legacy management implications of potential new build
- Submarine Dismantling Project
- Community funds and socio-economic support
- Local engagement arrangements
- Major accidents

For each topic, the tabular review consists of the following columns:

- Issue as understood at the 2010 AGM
- Objective agreed at the 2010 AGM for 2011
- Subsequent actions and developments
- Comments relevant to the objective
- Proposed objective for 2012.

The style of font indicates whether or not it is proposed that an objective remain the same, be changed or added: the standard font represents no change; italic text shows where a change is proposed; and bold text indicates a new objective.

Overview of Strategic Objectives for 2012

NDA Strategy & Operations

1. Encourage NDA to *fully explain to stakeholders how the Value Framework is used to inform* decisions about priorities for spending
2. Encourage *NDA and SLCs to engage early and effectively with the relevant local authorities when considering options for centralised and multi-site approaches, and to only move forward with such approaches* where they are supported by the affected local authorities in the light of the overall balance of benefits and disadvantages.
3. Seek to ensure that proposals for new projects that may be simpler, faster or cheaper than current practices can be convincingly demonstrated to be the best practicable, taking into account a full range of life cycle, safety, environmental and socio-economic factors, and stakeholder views.

Low Level Waste Strategy

4. Seek to ensure that LLW strategy is implemented in ways that can inspire local authority and public confidence.
5. Encourage and assist the NDA, SLCs and the supply chain to take full account of the role and needs of the LA planning system in the implementation of LLW strategy
6. Encourage WPAs to develop policy in MWDFs on the management of LLW (and VLLW).
7. Encourage NDA to provide sufficient evidence base information and to engage in discussion about the potential for a more strategic approach to the siting of LLW management facilities.
8. Subject to site suitability and local community views, encourage development of local or multi-site LLW management facilities at or adjacent to existing nuclear sites, rather than at non-nuclear sites.

Geological Disposal Facility Siting

9. Liaise effectively with any LA that may wish to consider, or makes, an expression of interest in the GDF siting process and to provide assistance as appropriate.
10. Work with Government, the NDA, CoRWM, regulators and member authorities to help ensure that the approach based on voluntarism and partnership works robustly in practice.
11. Ensure member authorities are briefed and up-to-date on developments in the GDF siting process.

Legacy Management Implications of Potential New Build

12. Seek to ensure that proposals for radioactive waste management and decommissioning of new nuclear power stations are appropriate and do not prejudice effective management of the nuclear legacy

13. If proposals for new nuclear build continue to move forward, promote debate and thinking about the ways in which this could be done to the benefit of nuclear legacy management and in accordance with the Polluter Pays Principle, including how a more coordinated 'across site' approach could be taken in locations that have or are proposed to have multiple licensed nuclear sites.
14. Liaise effectively with the New Nuclear Local Authorities Group and with local authorities addressing the radioactive waste management implications of new build and provide assistance as appropriate.

Submarine Dismantling Project

15. Encourage any member authority that may be affected by the management of the radioactive wastes from laid up nuclear submarines to participate in consultation on the proposed way forward
16. Encourage MoD to adopt clear objectives and good practices in the consultation on options for managing radioactive wastes from the Submarine Dismantling Project
17. Seek to ensure that the approach taken to the implementation of the Submarine Dismantling Project is consistent with developments in the civil nuclear industry

Community Funds and Socio-Economic Support

18. Seek to ensure that a consistent, proportionate and transparent approach can be taken to the establishment of Community Funds associated with key radioactive waste management facilities.
19. To promote good practices in applications to NDA for socio-economic funding.
20. Encourage member authorities with licensed nuclear sites to ensure that effective engagement arrangements with SLCs and NDA are in place, either through the SSG or direct engagement.

Major Accidents

21. With regard to the implications of the Fukushima accident for nuclear legacy management in the UK, to encourage the Government and the Office for Nuclear Regulation to ensure that appropriate actions are taken and improvements sustained, and to regularly communicate progress to stakeholders.

| TOPIC | ISSUE [as at AGM 10] | 2011 OBJECTIVE | ACTIONS AND DEVELOPMENTS | COMMENT | 2012 OBJECTIVE |
|------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| NDA Strategy and Operations | <p>During 2009 a Government review of NDA funding models had been underway. By the time of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) in 2010, the emphasis was on making the existing model work, by identifying options for "improving effectiveness and affordability". At the time of the 2010 AGM the outcome of the CSR was not known.</p> | <p>1 Encourage development of funding models for NDA, and specific radioactive waste management projects, that enable progress to be made in legacy management (dependent upon openness and transparency, effective engagement, robust regulation and due regard to the long term)</p> | <p>The outcome of the CSR for the NDA was considered "positive", given the current financial climate. It allows the NDA to maintain an expenditure of £3b per year for the next 4 years. The NDA states that it has focused on "driving efficiency and value for money across the estate". As part of this, an organisational effectiveness review resulted in staff reductions of around 30%. The NDA has also continued to pursue commercial opportunities, for example, the transfer of the Springfields site to Westinghouse.</p> | <p>In the light of the CSR outcome, neither the NDA nor SLCs are considering alternative or innovative funding models.</p> | <p>-NA-</p> |
| | <p>In the light of the impending CSR settlement, there were concerns that NDA should explain the implications of the CSR outcome and the basis for subsequent decision-making about priorities for spending.</p> | <p>2 Encourage NDA to explain to stakeholders the implications of the outcome of the CSR for nuclear legacy management, and the basis for its resultant decisions about priorities for spending.</p> | <p>NuLeAF comments on the NDA's draft Business Plan (BP) requested further clarification of how the NDA's assessments informing the CSR settlement had been translated into proposals in the BP. The BP states that "within affordability constraints, we will seek to maintain progress and maximise value for money by focusing on the highest hazards and risks and by seeking to prioritise funding where possible". It adds that the spending review process used criteria drawn from the NDA's Value Framework to evaluate options and that these criteria will inform the management decisions to be taken in the process of allocating available funding over the Business Plan period.</p> | <p>Further information about the 'value framework' was requested at the June engagement meetings with NDA and SLCs and should be available by the follow-up meeting on 11 November. It should be noted, however, that NuLeAF has made various requests over the last few years for NDA to explain in more detail – and in publicly available documentation - how the Value Framework is used to inform decisions about spending priorities. Now that the outcome of the CSR is known, a change of emphasis in the objective is required to reflect this need.</p> | <p>1 Encourage NDA to <i>fully explain to stakeholders how the Value Framework is used to inform</i> decisions about priorities for spending</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| | <p>Proposed NDA Strategy highlighted that centralised and multi-site approaches to radioactive waste management should be considered where they are advantageous. NuLeAF had urged NDA to develop appropriate implementation strategies, taking into account the requirements of the Aarhus Convention. The NDA subsequently prepared a draft 'framework for handling new developments'. At the time of the 2010 AGM it was not clear how discussion about the proposed framework would be taken forward.</p> | <p>3 Encourage development of (a) an appropriate framework for handling new developments and (b) centralised and multi-site approaches where they are supported by affected LAs in light of overall balance of benefits and disadvantages.</p> | <p>NuLeAF was subsequently informed that the NDA did not intend to "promulgate such a framework as a definitive statement". NuLeAF's comments on the NDA's draft strategy expressed disappointment and pointed out that this might prove to be a missed opportunity to promote sound decision-making principles to SLCs and the supply chain. In its response, NDA stated that proposals for waste consolidation are at a very early stage and that it will engage with stakeholders as it moves forward in considering options. A preliminary discussion about waste consolidation took place at the June engagement meetings with NDA and SLCs. A further detailed discussion is to take place at the follow-up meeting on 11 November.</p> | <p>Waste consolidation at a smaller number of sites raises a range of issues, including community acceptability, coverage in MWDFs, whether planning permissions are required and community benefits. Amendments to the objective are required to reflect NDA's decision not to pursue development of a formal framework, and to highlight the importance of effective engagement with local authorities.</p> | <p>2 Encourage <i>NDA and SLCs to engage early and effectively with the relevant local authorities when considering options for centralised and multi-site approaches, and to only move forward with such approaches</i> where they are supported by the affected local authorities in the light of the overall balance of benefits and disadvantages.</p> |
| | <p>Proposed NDA Strategy highlighted that NDA was exploring the possibilities of developing alternative waste treatment capabilities for higher activity wastes. NuLeAF had commented to the NDA that it was important for potentially affected local authorities are involved in a timely way in option assessments.</p> | <p>4 Seek to ensure that proposals for new projects that may be simpler, faster or cheaper than current practices can be convincingly demonstrated to be the best practicable, taking into account a full range of life cycle, safety, environmental and socio-economic factors, and stakeholder views.</p> | <p>The final version of the Strategy reiterates that NDA is exploring options and states that a business case analysis is required to assess the benefits of different treatment options, which will consider multi-site opportunities.</p> | <p>It is appropriate to retain the objective.</p> | <p>3 Seek to ensure that proposals for new projects that may be simpler, faster or cheaper than current practices can be convincingly demonstrated to be the best practicable, taking into account a full range of life cycle, safety, environmental and socio-economic factors, and stakeholder views.</p> |

| TOPIC | ISSUE [as at 2010 AGM] | 2011 OBJECTIVE | ACTIONS AND DEVELOPMENTS | COMMENT | 2012 OBJECTIVE |
|---------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| LLW Strategy | LLW Strategy published in August 2010 stated that a high standard of public acceptability is central to implementation, and included a number of welcome points about interactions with planning authorities. The Strategy, however, raised a number of concerns, including an emphasis on the role of the supply chain and off-site solutions. The secretariat had produced a Briefing Paper on LLW Strategy to provide advice to waste planning authorities. Planning permission for LLW disposal to landfill at King's Cliffe in Northamptonshire had been refused in March and was subject to appeal. | 5 Seek to ensure that LLW strategy is implemented in ways that can inspire local authority and public confidence. | The Secretary of State's (SoS) decision on the King's Cliffe appeal was announced on 24 May. The SoS agreed with the Inquiry Inspector that the appeal against the refusal of planning permission should be allowed and granted planning permission subject to conditions. The Inspector downplayed the LLW Strategy's overarching expectation of a high standard of public acceptability, stating that "it would negate National Policy and Strategy if local public support or even acceptance were required as a pre-requisite of any such permission". | Although the LLW strategy provides a welcome focus on the need for early and pro-active stakeholder engagement, it does not elaborate on what should be considered to constitute a high standard of public acceptability, or how one might identify whether it has been achieved. Instead the strategy states that it is for the developer and the local authority to reach appropriate agreement on the acceptability of any new proposals. Further discussion is required about the intent behind policy and strategy commitments to high standards of public acceptability and how should they be interpreted in practice. This will take place at the LLW Programme Delivery Group in January and at the proposed NuLeAF seminar in March. It is appropriate to retain the existing objective. | 4 Seek to ensure that LLW strategy is implemented in ways that can inspire local authority and public confidence. |
| | | 6 Encourage and assist the NDA, SLCs and the supply chain to take full account of the role and needs of the LA planning system in the implementation of LLW strategy. | The ED continues to do this through participation in the LLW Programme Delivery Group (PDG) and engagement with LLWR Ltd and NDA. The issue was also the focus of NuLeAF's March 2011 seminar on 'Spatial Planning and the Implementation of LLW Strategy'. | Further opportunity will be provided by a presentation to the PDG in January and the proposed NuLeAF seminar in March. It is appropriate to retain the objective. | 5 Encourage and assist the NDA, SLCs and the supply chain to take full account of the role and needs of the LA planning system in the implementation of LLW strategy |
| | | 7 Encourage WPAs to develop policy in MWDFs on the management of LLW (and VLLW) | This was also done at NuLeAF's March 2011 seminar and is the subject of discussion in NuLeAF's Radwaste Planning Officer Group (RWPG). A preliminary review of current approaches has been undertaken with a view to issuing updated interim advice. | Some progress has been made. Further progress can be made by promoting good practice and providing opportunities for further discussion. The objective is still relevant and appropriate. | 6 Encourage WPAs to develop policy in MWDFs on the management of LLW (and VLLW). |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | <p>8 Encourage NDA to provide sufficient evidence base information and to engage in discussion about the potential for a more strategic approach to the siting of LLW management facilities.</p> | <p>LLWR have made considerable progress in developing inventory projections and intend to complete a 'capacity gap' analysis in early 2012. Information on projections was made available at the March 2011 seminar and was subject to subsequent discussion between LLWR Ltd and representatives of the RWPG.</p> | <p>It is anticipated that the proposed NuLeAF seminar in March 2012 will provide a major opportunity to consider LLWR Ltd's 'capacity gap' analysis and its implications. This should contribute substantially towards development of a sufficient evidence base and inform discussion of the potential for pursuing a more strategic approach. The objective is still relevant and appropriate.</p> | <p>7 Encourage NDA to provide sufficient evidence base information and to engage in discussion about the potential for a more strategic approach to the siting of LLW management facilities.</p> |
| | | <p>9 Subject to site suitability and local community views, encourage development of local or multi-site LLW management facilities at or adjacent to existing nuclear sites, rather than at non-nuclear sites</p> | <p>LLW Strategy states that it does not wish to prescribe whether disposal options on, adjacent to, or away from existing nuclear sites are preferred. However, this is undermined by commitments to early solutions and affordability, and the emphasis on the use of existing waste management capacity. These perspectives strongly suggest a preference for the use of existing landfill sites, rather than the development of new facilities whether on, adjacent or away from existing nuclear sites. It is understood, however, that Magnox are re-evaluating the case for on-site LLW disposal at the Hinkley site. Consideration may also be given to whether there is a case for on-site LLW disposal at Bradwell, Dungeness and Sizewell.</p> | <p>Against this background, local authorities that engage with their sites on development of their LLW management plan should seek to ensure that proper consideration is given to all potential disposal options, including the potential advantages of developing facilities on or adjacent to existing nuclear sites (for example, stronger adherence to the proximity principle and greater potential, at some sites, for public acceptability arising from the development of purpose-designed facilities under the supervision of nuclear site management). It should be noted, however, that some member local authorities do not favour on or adjacent to site options because of a desire to see early clean-up and de-licensing at their site. This is reflected in the qualified nature of the objective, which is still relevant and appropriate.</p> | <p>8 Subject to site suitability and local community views, encourage development of local or multi-site LLW management facilities at or adjacent to existing nuclear sites, rather than at non-nuclear sites.</p> |

| TOPIC | ISSUE [as at 2010 AGM] | 2011 OBJECTIVE | ACTIONS AND DEVELOPMENTS | COMMENT | 2012 OBJECTIVE |
|-------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| GDF Siting | Expressions of Interest from Copeland BC, Allerdale BC and Cumbria CC. West Cumbria MRWS Partnership established. ED participating in the Partnership. No EoIs from other areas. EoI process open for foreseeable future. | 10 Liaise effectively with any LA that may wish to consider, or makes, an expression of interest in GDF siting process and to provide assistance as appropriate. | Participating in West Cumbria MRWS Partnership. ED has assisted with formulation of PSE programmes and preparation of assessment reports on key topics. Partnership close to signing-off consultation document seeking public and stakeholder views on its preliminary findings. As far as is known there has been no further interest from LAs in other areas. | Continued progress is being made in West Cumbria. A substantial programme of work has been undertaken by the Partnership, which will inform decisions about participation in the siting process by the principal local authorities. It is anticipated that continued assistance will be provided through participation in the Partnership. This is likely to come to an end when the Partnership submits its report to the principal local authorities in the first half of 2012. The secretariat will also respond to any request for advice or assistance from other local authorities. Objective still relevant and appropriate. | 9 Liaise effectively with any LA that may wish to consider, or makes, an expression of interest in the GDF siting process and to provide assistance as appropriate. |
| | | 11 Work with Government, the NDA, CoRWM, regulators and member authorities to help ensure that the approach based on voluntarism and partnership works robustly in practice. | Liaison meetings with Govt and NDA being held once every three months. Participating in the Geological Disposal Implementation Board and Regulatory Interface Management meetings. Liaison with CoRWM continues. Raising issues as appropriate in accordance with objective. | There is a continued need to input as outlined. Objective still relevant and appropriate. | 10 Work with Government, the NDA, CoRWM, regulators and member authorities to help ensure that the approach based on voluntarism and partnership works robustly in practice. |
| | | 12 Ensure member authorities are briefed and up-to-date on developments in the GDF siting process. | Progress reported regularly to SG and in e-bulletin. GDF section on NuLeAF website kept up to date. | Objective still relevant and appropriate. | 11 Ensure member authorities are briefed and up-to-date on developments in the GDF siting process. |

| TOPIC | ISSUE [as at 2010 AGM] | 2011 OBJECTIVE | ACTIONS AND DEVELOPMENTS | COMMENT | 2012 OBJECTIVE |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| <p>Legacy Management Implications of Potential New Build</p> | <p>NuLeAF's remit enables it to consider the radioactive waste management implications of potential new build, particularly for nuclear legacy management.</p> <p>At the time of the 2010 AGM, it was anticipated that the Government would re-consult on the draft Nuclear National Policy Statement (NPS) later that year. The New Nuclear Local Authorities Group (NNLAG) had been formally established as a Special Interest Group of the LGA, with Somerset County Council in a lead role.</p> | <p>13 If Government continues to encourage the building of new nuclear power stations, to seek to ensure that its National Policy Statement is open and transparent about the interactions between new nuclear build and nuclear legacy management.</p> | <p>NuLeAF submitted comments on the revised Draft Nuclear NPS in January 2011. These comments addressed: confidence that geological disposal will be implemented; the storage of higher activity waste; the role of the IPC in relation to arrangements for radioactive waste management; & LLW management. The revised Energy NPSs were laid before Parliament in June & were adopted in July.</p> | <p>With adoption of the final Nuclear NPS the objective is no longer relevant.</p> | <p>-NA-</p> |
| | | <p>14 Seek to ensure that proposals for radioactive waste management and decommissioning of new nuclear power stations are appropriate and do not prejudice effective management of the nuclear legacy</p> | <p>Initiatives have included responding to consultations on DECC's proposed Funded Decommissioning Programme & Waste Transfer Pricing Methodology (both in March 2011). Decision making for managing spent fuel from new nuclear power stations was also discussed with the Nuclear Industry Association & DECC at Steering Group meetings in January & April.</p> | <p>The objective is still relevant and appropriate.</p> | <p>12 Seek to ensure that proposals for radioactive waste management and decommissioning of new nuclear power stations are appropriate and do not prejudice effective management of the nuclear legacy</p> |
| | | <p>15 If proposals for new nuclear build continue to move forward, promote debate & thinking about the ways in which this could be done to the benefit of nuclear legacy management and in accordance with the Polluter Pays Principle, including how a more coordinated 'across site' approach could be taken in locations that have or are proposed to have multiple licensed nuclear sites.</p> | <p>NDA Strategy states that with Government agreement NDA will supply advice and information to utilities to ensure an integrated approach to radioactive waste management. It also states that NDA will develop commercial opportunities to deploy existing facilities and resources to its advantage. It states that some of these opportunities may arise from the UK's new reactor programme.</p> | <p>There has been some limited discussion about the extent to which, & ways in which, it might be appropriate to exploit the potential synergies between new build & nuclear legacy management. The issue was raised in discussion with DECC at the April Steering Group & with NDA at the June engagement meetings. Authorities concerned about the issue were advised at the latter to raise the matter directly with their local site</p> | <p>13 If proposals for new nuclear build continue to move forward, promote debate and thinking about the ways in which this could be done to the benefit of nuclear legacy management and in accordance with the Polluter Pays Principle, including how a more coordinated 'across site' approach could be taken in locations that have or are proposed to have multiple licensed nuclear</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | directors. The Objective is still relevant and appropriate. | sites. |
| | | 16 Liaise effectively with the New Nuclear Local Authorities Group and with local authorities addressing the radioactive waste management implications of new build and provide assistance as appropriate. | The ED has liaised with the NNLG secretariat concerning the radioactive waste management aspects of new build. The discussions that took place before the 2010 AGM with officers from Somerset CC about a NuLeAF input to a potential work programme on the radioactive waste management aspects of proposals to develop a new nuclear station at Hinkley Point have not, to date, led to development of a work programme. Similar preliminary discussions with officers from Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Coastal District Council have also taken place. | The objective is still relevant and appropriate. | 14 Liaise effectively with the New Nuclear Local Authorities Group and with local authorities addressing the radioactive waste management implications of new build and provide assistance as appropriate. |

| TOPIC | ISSUE [at 2010 AGM] | 2011 OBJECTIVE | ACTIONS AND DEVELOPMENTS | COMMENT | 2012 OBJECTIVE |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| Submarine Dismantling Project (SDP) | Consultation on a proposed way forward for managing the ILW from laid up nuclear submarines was scheduled for 2011 | 17 Encourage any member authority that may be affected by the management of the radioactive wastes from laid up nuclear submarines to participate in consultation on the proposed way forward | The consultation will start shortly after the AGM on 28 October. Pre-consultation engagement with affected local authorities at potential dismantling sites (Devonport and Rosyth) has taken place. | The consultation will raise issues around the type and location of dismantling and storage, including the possibility of 'waste imports' to an existing licensed nuclear site. See also 3 rd row under NDA strategy and operations (and proposed objective 2). The objective still relevant and appropriate | 15 Encourage any member authority that may be affected by the management of the radioactive wastes from laid up nuclear submarines to participate in consultation on the proposed way forward |
| | | 18 Encourage MoD to adopt clear objectives and good practices in the consultation on options for managing radioactive wastes from the SDP | The ED has been participating in MoD SEA and Consultation sub-groups to further this objective. | Participation in the sub-groups has provided good opportunity to engage with MoD in discussion about the form of future engagement. The objective is still relevant and appropriate. | 16 Encourage MoD to adopt clear objectives and good practices in the consultation on options for managing radioactive wastes from the Submarine Dismantling Project |
| | | 19 Seek to ensure that the approach taken to the implementation of the SDP is consistent with developments in the civil nuclear industry | MoD is liaising with NDA who are examining the potential use of sites within their estate. | Objective still relevant and appropriate | 17 Seek to ensure that the approach taken to the implementation of the Submarine Dismantling Project is consistent with developments in the civil nuclear industry |

| TOPIC | ISSUE [at 2010 AGM] | 2011 OBJECTIVE | ACTIONS AND DEVELOPMENTS | COMMENT | 2012 OBJECTIVE |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Community Funds and Socio Economic Support | <p>An announcement on the future of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was awaited from Government. It was anticipated that the potential NDA 'Framework for handling new developments' (see row 3 under NDA strategy and operations), would include a section on the s106 approach.</p> | <p>20 Seek to ensure that a consistent, proportionate and transparent approach can be taken to the establishment of Community Funds associated with key radioactive waste management facilities.</p> | <p>The Government has retained the CIL, which includes putting the three Circular 5/05 planning obligation tests on a statutory basis. Following representations from the Steering Group, the ED met with DECC officials to discuss the case for benefit packages that are separate and additional to S106 agreements. Although yet to be convinced of the applicability to radioactive waste management, Government had given the green light to a 'community benefits protocol' in the wind industry, which provides a framework for 'beyond s106' benefits. The Steering Group subsequently agreed in principle to support the development of a radioactive waste community benefits protocol. This is subject to further discussion at the 21 October Steering Group meeting.</p> | <p>The objective is still relevant and appropriate.</p> | <p>18 Seek to ensure that a consistent, proportionate and transparent approach can be taken to the establishment of Community Funds associated with key radioactive waste management facilities.</p> |
| | <p>Proposed NDA Strategy stated that its approach to socio-economics is 'mature'. It says that NDA will keep its 4 priority areas (West Cumbria, Caithness and North Sutherland, Anglesey and Meirionnydd and the Gretna-Lockerbie-Annan corridor) under review. It adds that it will explore with the SLCs the approach to delivering its socio-economic agenda.</p> | <p>21 To promote good practices in applications to NDA for socio-economic funding.</p> | <p>At the June engagement meetings, NDA reported that a new delivery model was currently under development, and that this will see an enhanced role for SLC contractors in initial assessment of applications for socio-economic support. Relevant applications will then be submitted to NDA and subject to a more stream-lined approval process.</p> | <p>The NuLeAF BP on applications to the NDA socio-economic fund was published in October 09. The need for an updated NuLeAF BP will be reviewed as more detail becomes available. The current objective is still appropriate and relevant.</p> | <p>19 To promote good practices in applications to NDA for socio-economic funding.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|
| Local Engagement Arrangements | There was a perceived need for improved local engagement arrangements so that the relevant local authorities are more closely involved in discussion about site restoration issues. Consideration was being given to the role that NuLeAF might play in facilitating these arrangements. | 22 Encourage member authorities with licensed nuclear sites to ensure that effective engagement arrangements with SLCs and NDA are in place, either through the SSG or direct engagement. | NuLeAF facilitated two engagement meetings (in June) between local authorities, NDA, SLCs and regulators (covering Magnox and RSRL sites in England and Wales). It was clear from discussion that there were a range of developments that should be addressed through direct engagement with sites. Where that engagement had not recently taken place, it was agreed that efforts should be made to re-invigorate it. The next engagement meeting with NDA, SLCs and regulators is on 11 November. | The current objective is still appropriate and relevant. | 20 Encourage member authorities with licensed nuclear sites to ensure that effective engagement arrangements with SLCs and NDA are in place, either through the SSG or direct engagement. |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|

| TOPIC | ISSUE [at 2010 AGM] | 2011 OBJECTIVE | ACTIONS AND DEVELOPMENTS | COMMENT | 2012 OBJECTIVE |
|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Major Accidents | NA | NA | NA | This objective was adopted by the Steering Group at its meeting on 25 January 2012 after considering a report on the UK response to the Fukushima accident (see the report on the NuLeAF website at item 9 UK Response to the Fukushima accident. | 21 With regard to the implications of the Fukushima accident for nuclear legacy management in the UK, to encourage the Government and the ONR to ensure that appropriate actions are taken and improvements sustained, and to regularly communicate progress to stakeholders. |