Meeting:	NuLeAF Steering Group, 7 July 2008
Agenda Item:	9
Subject:	Progress Report
Author:	Fred Barker
Purpose:	To provide updates on organisational developments, ISOLUS, COWAM in Practice, CARL and SD:SPUR

1 Organisational Developments

The following organisational developments have taken place since the last Steering Group:

- Enhancement of the 'member' pages of the NuLeAF website (accessible to contributing authorities only). These pages now feature a daily news digest and will shortly include access to a database of the issues being discussed at Site Stakeholder Groups (SSG).
- Issue of the first fortnightly e-mail newsletter to contributing member authority contacts, highlighting latest developments. This will complement the quarterly e-bulletin which is sent to contributing and corresponding member authorities following SG meetings.
- Mailings to corresponding and non-member local authorities inviting them to become contributing member authorities.
- Development of databases, including GDF, SSG and MP databases.

2 ISOLUS

Project ISOLUS was set up in 2000 to determine the means of managing radioactive wastes and other material from laid up nuclear submarines. The project is overseen by the MoD ISOLUS Steering Group (MISG), of which NuLeAF is a member. The project is advised by an Advisory Group (IAG) made up of a wide range of stakeholders.

The proposed future timetable for the project is:

2008	Undertake option studies and develop proposed way forward
2009	Consultation on proposed way forward
2011-12	Main investment decision

A technical options study is currently underway. This is assessing the three technical options for interim land storage, namely:

- the intact Reactor Compartment (about the size of two double-decker buses)
- the Reactor Pressure Vessel, and other large items
- size reduced and packaged ILW

A peer review team is being appointed for this study. A member of the IAG will be a part of the peer review process, acting as a monitor. The draft study findings will also be discussed in the IAG prior to finalising the study.

A generic siting assessment for submarine dismantling is also underway, assessing the relative pros and cons of using a Greenfield, Brownfield or existing nuclear licensed site.

Following dismantling operations, the resulting ILW could, in principle, be stored at the dismantling site or at another site (including existing nuclear licensed sites). Following a period of storage, the ILW would be disposed of to the proposed GDF (see agenda item 4).

The next meeting of the MISG is on 13 November.

3 COWAM in Practice

This project involves five countries: France, Romania, Slovenia, Spain and the UK. The aim is to support participants in their development of new governance arrangements for radioactive waste management.

As reported to the SG meeting in April, the second meeting of the UK CIP stakeholder group took place on 5 February. The meeting reviewed progress in the project, including a report from researchers on the proposed scopes of work to be undertaken on the governance issues identified as priorities by the first meeting. Opportunity was provided for the group to comment on the proposed scopes of work to influence development of the project. The report of the meeting will be published shortly at COWAM In Practice (CIP) UK National Stakeholder Group.

The next meeting of the UK CIP stakeholder group is on 4 September.

4 CARL Project

CARL is a social sciences research project into the effect of stakeholder involvement in decision-making on radioactive waste management. The name CARL comes from the four types of partners in the project: Citizens, Agencies responsible for radioactive waste management, Research social scientists, and Licensing and regulatory authorities. Participants come from Belgium, Finland, Slovenia, Sweden and the UK. The project is co-funded by participating agencies.

UK participants come from NuLeAF, Nirex, the University of East Anglia and the regulators. A Steering Committee meets twice a year. NuLeAF is represented on the SC by Councillor Tim Knowles from Cumbria County Council.

The final report from the project is now available at www.carl-research.org. The report covers ground of great relevance to the UK situation, particularly for the siting of a GDF. Three of the main observations from the project are:

- In many existing nuclear communities the dominant response to the prospect of hosting a repository facility tends to be one of 'pragmatic acceptance'. Both socio-psychological factors (eg trust in what you know) and structural factors (being there and nobody else wanting it) contribute to this attitude. But this pragmatic acceptance can never be taken for granted. It is constantly evolving, susceptible to changes over time and always conditional (eg on the existence of beneficial trade offs or feelings of personal empowerment or choice).

- Affected communities play a crucial role in ensuring that participation remains a required part of every aspect of the complex long-term process of siting and managing the waste, not merely a short-term tactical response to increasing scepticism and previous policy failures.
- The biggest challenge for the future lies in working towards a closer integration of the technical and social aspects and in finding ways of meaningfully opening up the technical 'black box' to the mutual benefit of both experts and society.

Discussions are currently taking place about whether there should be a further stage in the project.

5 SD:SPUR

A progress report on the SD:SPUR project is attached as an Annex. This report has been prepared by Sue Brett, who attends the project steering group on behalf of NuLeAF. Further updates will be reported to the SG as appropriate.

Annex: SD:SPUR – Work Progress

Background to SD:SPUR

- SD:SPUR = **S**ite **D**ecommissioning: **S**ustainable **P**ractices in the **U**se of **R**esources
- it is an established multi-stakeholder learning network, which develops and disseminates guidance on the sustainable management of assets and decommissioning wastes on nuclear and defence sites
- it began in 2002, when the Safety Issues Task Force identified a need for guidance - a scoping study was undertaken in 2003, which led to a full project being initiated in 2004
- SD:SPUR guidance, published in September 2005, provides information on the explicit inclusion of sustainability considerations within asset and decommissioning waste management decision making. Specifically it provides:
    - information on the range of options available for managing assets and decommissioning wastes;
    - decision trees to guide the identification, screening and analysis of asset and waste management options;
    - sustainability indicators (derived through extensive stakeholder consultation) for use in options assessments;
    - a planning model and case study for the UKAEA site at Dounreay.
- SD:SPUR Learning Network has the following aims:
    - promote and maintain SD:SPUR guidance
    - develop further SD:SPUR supporting documents
    - provide information and address barriers on policy, regulatory and technical issues
    - provide a forum for debate and encourage stakeholder participation.

Membership

The range of members of the Project Steering Group (PSG) meetings, which are held approximately 3 times a year, include;

- AWE (MoD)
- NDA
- UKAEA
- British Energy
- Sellafield Ltd
- Oxford Research Group (academia)
- University of Warwick (Paul Dorfman, with an NGO-type stance)
- NuLeAF (Sue Brett from Cumbria CC)
- HSE
- SEPA
- C&EWG
- WRAP
- independent consultant(s)
- CIRIA

Work Plan

The work plan, as set out in the November 2006 minutes, was broken down into six main tasks that were developed by the PSG, building upon the outcomes of previous work;

- Task 1 – Develop key principles
- Task 2 – Develop practical flow diagrams

- Task 3 – Produce a regulatory framework paper
- Task 4 – Collect and summarise information to support the comparison of waste management options and techniques
- Task 5 – Develop specification for the update of the SD:SPUR guidance
- Task 6 – Develop and implement a plan for engagement with NGOs, CBOs and local site stakeholders

During 2007 the project lead at CIRIA left the company and the work fell into abeyance until early 2008, when a new project management team had been established. Towards the end of this interim period, an independent nuclear consultant, Marion Hill, was commissioned to produce a review of developments that might impact upon SD:SPUR's future work programme, plus a study outlining the current scope and purpose of SD:SPUR. In consultation with the PSG, she also identified the work programmes of Government Departments, Regulators, nuclear industry organisations and other bodies, that could be of interest to SD:SPUR – these were then categorised by relevance to the project and an indication of whether SD:SPUR could contribute was added.

The resulting paper (available on request) was discussed at the PSG meeting in May 2008.

PSG Meeting - 1 May 2008

Discussion covered three areas:

- review of a generic process diagram, identifying specific issues

  It was agreed that the real need was a 'catalogue' that could provide information on processes, their implications, e.g. dose to workers, value for money, difficulty, lifecycle economics, etc. Different users would need different levels of information, so it was suggested that 'deeper' detail could be signposted or accessed via links.

  The NDA rep pointed out that some areas, such as non-radwaste, wouldn't be looked at by the national LLW Strategy Group, so this was a topic that could be researched by SD:SPUR and fed into the overall waste strategy.

  All discussion points were captured and a subsequent online consultation of PSG members was carried out for any additional thoughts or solutions.

- consideration of how the SD-SPUR guidance could be developed further

  The guidance on the website needs updating, though it is an informative background document as it stands. It was agreed that it should be further developed to provide more of a working document. It was also agreed that the first step to improvement would be to map current available guidance.

- review of the range of nuclear initiatives/work programmes set out in Marion Hill's paper.

  It was agreed that it was important for SD:SPUR to maintain a watching brief on the work programmes and consultations being undertaken by the various organisations. Of especial interest would be those programmes that had been identified as most relevant to SD:SPURs work and where a valuable, if not unique, contribution could be made.

  It was decided that a simplified, combined version of the two tables in Marion's paper should be placed on the SD:SPUR website. Furthermore, a means should be established by which it could be regularly updated. Specific actions identified were;

- contact DEFRA regarding their future consultation on Exemption Orders – early input, such as convening a technical workshop, seems relevant to SD:SPUR
- continue dialogue with NDA about progress on their strategies for the management of LLW and on the operational strategy for the LLWR - is there a need for guidance to consignors on LLW segregation?

Forward Plan

It was agreed that CIRIA should undertake the following actions and prepare a forward plan;

Specific actions

- CIRIA to circulate a note of the May meeting to SD:SPUR members
- CIRIA to contact DEFRA regarding technical workshop collaboration
- CIRIA to research 'Science Wise' – interest in funding development of policy.
- Scope the possibilities of SAFESPUR involvement – wide 'contractor' audience.
- SD:SPUR to collectively respond to NDA Stakeholder paper in advance of publication.

Development of work plan

- CIRIA to draft and circulate a work plan including the following elements of a mapping exercise, to identify;
  - what existing guidance is available for site facing teams?
  - what is already covered by SD:SPUR guidance?
  - what guidance can be adapted from SAFEGROUNDS?
  - where are the gaps in guidance?
- Implement a mechanism to periodically review the scoping paper on the website.

Sue Brett
19 June 2008