

Waste Issues Group

Meeting Report: 3-4 April 2007

Report issued: 11 April 2007

Document Details:

This report is predominantly a transcript of the live flipchart recording undertaken during the meeting in full view of all participants, by the independent Convenor facilitators. Note that the record is meant as an aide-memoir for participants rather than a definitive record of detail. We have added notes in boxed italics to explain what was happening during each stage of the meeting.

Convenors: Rowena Harris rowena@3kq.co.uk
Rhuari Bennett rhuari@3kq.co.uk
Hannah Vernon hannah@dialoguebydesign.com

Contact: Telephone 020 8683 6833
Convenor for NDA stakeholder engagement
8th Floor, Ambassador House, Brigstock Road
Thornton Heath, Surrey, CR7 7JG

The Convenor

The Convenor is an independent third party that engages stakeholders in the NDA's business of cleaning up the nuclear legacy. The Convenor is a partnership between two organisations:



3KQ focuses on consultation, dialogue and conflict management, having particular strengths in designing, organising and facilitating meetings and workshops



Dialogue by Design focuses on using new technologies to engage stakeholders, for example via consultation over the internet

Contents

1. Executive Summary	1
2. Agenda and Ground Rules	2
3. Clarifications from last Meeting Report	2
4. Updates	3
5. Process Review	7
5.1 Presentation	7
5.2 Discussion into process review	10
6. Final Report	11
6.1 CoRWM opportunities/threats	11
6.2 Possible recommendations for WIG final report	12
6.3 Further discussion around possible recommendations	12
6.4 Existing recommendations discussion	14
6.5 Report sign-off process after today	15
7. Reflections on WIG	15
8. NDA Announcement	16
9. Actions	16
10. Way Forward	17
Appendix 1 - Attendees and Apologies	18

1. Executive Summary

Updates. Phil Davies (NDA) covered NDA progress. Ex-Nirex staff are now formally part of NDA, and a restructure has formed a Radioactive Waste Management Directorate under Richard Waite. A Life Time Plan is being drawn together for repository implementation. ILW optimisation work suggests a potential case for some optimisation opportunities, although minimal. The new government LLW Policy is now released. MRWS consultation is due this summer, covering site selection and criteria, community engagement and community definition: CoRWM are advising on aspects of this. Other updates were given on Polonium 210, the CIRIA conference, and Low Level Radiation including discussion around the NDAs position on LLR. It was highlighted that OCNS is now part of the HSE.

Process Review. Richard Harris (Convenor) gave a preview of emerging findings of the review of all NDA stakeholder engagement. Wide stakeholder input has been canvassed over the last 3 months including all NSG and SSG members. Key findings and changes that were discussed include the following. First, engagement needs to be built around actual decisions that the NDA needs to take, so an Engagement Plan is being compiled to ensure timely and clear inclusion of engagement in NDA projects - as well as clarity for stakeholders as to what engagement they can expect to see. Second, some areas of NDA culture need developing to be more 'stakeholder friendly', so a capacity development programme is being put in place to specifically address this. Third, a range of questions exist around the operation of local engagement arrangements (including SSGs), so a review is proposed this summer/autumn. The full findings and a draft Engagement Plan will be put out to consultation online to all NSG members before the NSG meeting in July 07, followed by further discussion and consultation at the NSG meeting.

WIGs Final Report. A draft Final Report was amended to accommodate key conclusions and recommendations the group wished to make. Recommendations cover key areas of content such as WIGs work on ILW Storage, and work on the opportunities and threats posed by CoRWMs recommendations. Recommendations also point towards areas of process such as: the NDA considering a national group to address waste issues with a flexible membership; proper time allowance being built into NDA projects in advance to allow meaningful engagement; a clear opportunity for stakeholders to set the agenda for engagement in addition to the Engagement Plan being built around the NDAs decisions. The Final Report will be circulated to all NSG members in advance of the NSG meeting in July 07.

Reflections on Waste Issues Group experience. With WIG coming to an end, members reflected on their experience of participating. People highlighted the need to implement the new Engagement Plan as soon as possible to prevent a gap in engagement, and overall look forward to engaging with the NDA further in future.

2. Agenda and Ground Rules

The aims of the meeting were:

- Agree final report (and clarity on drafting process)
- Respond to Convenor's process review
- Reflect on the WIG experience
- Share information via updates

Day 1	Day 2
11:00 Actions & matters arising Updates	8:30 Continue on final report Review WIG
12:30 LUNCH	12:30 Lunch & depart
Process review Final report	
5:00 Close Day 1	
6:30 Drinks with Terry Selby	

A few ground rule reminders:

- Mobiles off
- Keep an eye on the wall record
- One person at a time
- Welcome "new" faces

The agenda and ground rule reminders were agreed before proceeding

3. Clarifications from last Meeting Report

Some amendments were made to the last meeting report:

1. Page 4, Updates. The LLWR contract is to be let *autumn* 2007, not spring 2007.
2. Page 8, Graphite bullet 3. Baseline practice is that graphite is removed, packaged and disposed of as *ILW*, not LLW.
3. Page 9, Repository bullet 1. Strategy team is to be strengthened by taking in Nirex team from Harwell. Also under bullet 2, the *packaging advice skills* will be under Laurence Williams in the NDA.
4. Pg.10, 'CoRWM advice to be submitted by April 31'
5. References to graphite are assumed to refer to 'bulk reactor graphite'

4. Updates

Polonium 210

1. 650 cases screened in all, only 10-15 were of concern to investigate further
2. Dealt with at Harwell
3. Ultimately found no harm to members of the public
4. Organisation learnt how to handle issue on this scale... Led to a large blip in workload of HPA
5. No specific information is provided on the costs of the operation. But cost info is important for organisations to assess risks and for their planning in future

CIRIA Conference

1. SAFEGROUNDS & SD: SPUR conference held in March '07
2. Presentations and papers will be posted on line

NDA Update (including discussion)

1. ILW storage optimisation work suggests a potential case for some (but not large) optimisation opportunities mainly in South England
2. Chapelcross small volume of waste: efficient to build another store for this?
3. NIREX staff are now NDA staff although staying geographically where they are
4. Technical and scientific staff now sit under RadWaste Management Directorate under Richard Waite. Has responsibility for Letters of Compliance as well as safety case work.
5. Want to produce an LTP for geological disposal including:
 - a. Costs
 - b. Time
 - c. Scope
 - d. Risks
6. Plan needs to be strengthened as it is carried forward
7. Regulatory Schedule exists, outlining issues to discuss/engage with regulators on to enable smooth progress
8. NDA subsidiary may be formed to implement the repository....could become the SLC and therefore later the contract could be competed
9. Base case maybe "co-location" for purpose of producing the LTP
10. Options need to be compared against a 'baseline'
11. LTP will be put together over next year
12. 'Midlothian question' for ILW not yet sorted out
13. Scenarios and options will be developed....including scenario which includes new build to accommodate these implications
14. House of Lords has sought legal opinion on merger of Nirex into NDA...not yet resolved
15. However, Ministers are content with the current decisions and their legality e.g. with respect to the Energy Act
16. Would be useful for the NDA to respond to this legal opinion to provide clarity

17. Legal opinion was responded to by the Ministerial statement back in October '06
18. Monitoring of sites is ongoing

Implementation of Repository/s

Issue Government consultation in June



3 month consultation



3 month analysis & policy making

1. NDA is helping to project manage the preparation of the consultation document (Jo Ali)
2. Topics include: site selection, criteria, community engagement, community definition
3. Consultation process will be a public process....anyone can be included. Various meetings are already discussing how to be engaged, particularly Local Authorities.
4. 'Pre-consultation' workshop is being held to discuss the consultation document and questions (run by DEFRA)

LLW

1. Drigg Parent Body Organisation (PBO) is being competed...3 strong tenders being checked and researched
2. Appointment in autumn '07
3. New government LLW Policy gives NDA a clearer role including:
 - i. Must provide clear plan on site
 - ii. Diverse solutions including off site options
 - iii. Explore options for replacement
 - iv. Support Government in managing non-nuclear producers and strategy development
4. NDA met with NuLeAF and Cumbria County Council on these kinds of updates

LLR

1. Issue has come up over life of WIG at various times
2. NDA has put down their position in a written statement
3. CoRWM intends to look at how risk factors can be included in safety case. Must be addressed as it is a likely concern of public/communities.
4. Need to consider how this could be picked up in future NDA engagement arrangements
5. LLRC not happy with NDAs statement....does not address the initial proposition. Agree that there is too much detail to go into now today but needs to be addressed in future.

6. NDA statement sets out their responsibilities in relation to other key partners....doesn't mention its potential influence on policy
7. NDA considering how it will be taken on board in the repository safety case

NDA Statement: new final bullet to replace current wording

This issue is ultimately a matter for the Government: who will decide on any required policy or legislative changes. The role of the regulators is to carry out their statutory function within the policy framework set by Government. (Agreed by regulators and NDA)

Engagement Liaison Group

1. Group to discuss nuclear consultation ongoing to ensure no clashes
2. Used to meet but haven't for about a year
3. CoRWM used to bring this group together
4. NDA/Convenor shall be convening group from now on
5. Group likely to meet for 2-3 hours every few months
6. Keen to have Dti etc involved in group

CoRWM & MRWS Process

1. 13 work packages exist, of which CoRWM are advising on 3:
 - a. community volunteering
 - b. Partnerships & support/community packages
 - c. Staged decision making process
2. Reports and inputs being completed on these
3. Elizabeth Atherton is helping Government with the work packages on voluntarism issues that will incorporate CoRWM's work
4. CoRWM advice to Government will be published
5. One of CoRWM's principles is 'fairness' so in theory any community could express a willingness to participate or 'volunteer'. An awareness programme will be initiated so that all LAs are aware of volunteering opportunities and the MRWS process: want to make sure communities have a fair opportunity to consider participating
6. Any type or size of community could volunteer....as long as it is bounded by a currently recognised boundary e.g. Parish/es, District, County, etc
7. Not being prescriptive about what a community is
8. Questions also exist around:
 - a. Who volunteers for a community
 - b. How you check real willingness in the community
9. Real issues around how real 'willingness' to participate is expressed and how it can be assessed to be genuine
10. CoRWM advocating 'deliberation' throughout the process
11. Arbitration by Government is a last resort, as CoRWM advocates partnership working within and between communities: disagreements need to be worked on and sorted out
12. NuLeAF briefing paper 6 looks at the role of the planning process in the process of volunteering
13. Input to documents is on website

BNG

1. At the last WIG meeting BNG presented their process of waste strategy development
2. WIG gave input on how stakeholders could be involved
3. BNG responded now by generating two tables of expectations:
 - a. Lay person
 - b. Expert stakeholder
4. Asking for WIG input on these via e-mail

Regulator update

1. OCNS is now part of HSE
2. Will transfer into old nuclear safety directorate but is being renamed "Nuclear Directorate"
3. Some DTI 'safeguard staff' are also transferring
4. Steve circulating written Q&A to WIG via e-mail
5. Bringing safety and security together should improve any conflicts of interest (this kind of restructure is also suggested in the Hampton Review)

5. Process Review

5.1 Presentation



Why have a review now?

- 18 months experience
- New Convenor in place
- Evolution & improvement is possible



Process Review:

- Input received from
 - National Stakeholder Group
 - Waste Issues Group
 - Materials Issues Group
 - Site Stakeholder Groups
 - NDA staff
- Ongoing

CONVENOR FOR NDA
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Quick preview of some emerging findings:

- *Engagement needs to be led by the issues*
- *Use a wider range of methods*
- *Engage more people and communities*

- *NDA organisational culture*
- *NDA to demonstrate influence of engagement*
- *Review the local arrangements (SSG's)*
- *Improve communication*

CONVENOR FOR NDA
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

- **An “Engagement Plan”**
- Currently gathering Issues/topics for engagement over coming 1-3 years from NDA
- Compiling plan with aims, methods, timescales, decision points
- NSG becomes “punctuation” in a constant engagement process
- Common calendar (including Liaison Group)
- Online consultation before, and then discussion at, NSG in July
- Implementation and ongoing review

CONVENOR FOR NDA STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

- **NDA Culture**

- The organisation has developed and moved fast
- Engagement has commonly been reactive
- Engagement needs to be more integrated with projects and plans, with more clarity and more “front loaded” work
- Capacity development is needed
- Programme being developed

CONVENOR FOR NDA STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

What next

- Complete the review
- Finish the draft engagement plan
- Online consultation
- Results of process review will be discussed at NSG in July

5.2 Discussion into process review

After the presentation, WIG members discussed the following three questions around their tables:

Any questions/surprises?

Any disappointments/concerns?

Anything you particularly like the sound of?

Comments were then discussed in plenary session.

1. Engagement will be hung round real decisions that NDA have coming up....makes the engagement more meaningful
2. Our start point for identifying issues has been to talk to the NDA.....but, this does not preclude stakeholders suggesting issues. NDA will take a view on whether they will sponsor engagement on each.
3. Will need to prioritise the issues for engagement.....can't do everything at once
4. Engagement will have to happen at different levels:
 - a. National
 - b. Local
 - c. Or both simultaneously!
5. Looking forward to seeing the actual issues, by way of example of how future engagement may work
6. Local engagement will not necessarily be designed from the centre.....SSGs etc will have input and a clear role here
7. Cultural issue in parts of NDA....not open to working with stakeholders
8. Training/capacity development programme being built with the NDA....to spread knowledge and skills about stakeholder engagement
9. Capacity development is not just about delivering some training. It aspires to ensure NDA considering engagement across all their work/projects, in advance.
10. Will be a constant stream of engagement on some issues such as waste: updates etc with opportunities to input
11. What about what issues stakeholders want to discuss? Stakeholders will select which areas they want to be involved in, considering the range of issues under engagement at any one time
12. Stakeholders will always have the opportunity to add issues to the engagement plan
13. Situation is different to that of CoRWM
14. Need to engage people in the variety and range of NDA decisions, as well as be responsive to issues arising through a range of methods
15. Recording stakeholder input in an auditable way and the order of documentation needs considering to create transparency and clarity
16. Timeline of activity is essential so that components aren't missed and input isn't lost
17. Document management system will help here as well as a clear plan of engagement

18. NDA demonstration of influence is part of this clarity so stakeholders know whether input has been accepted/rejected/hold
19. SSG role: some question the function and performance of these, so are nervous about their role in delivering local consultation
20. The review of local arrangements aims to unpick and understand and improve some of this nervousness about SSG performance
21. Membership of SSGs need reviewing
22. SSG/local arrangements review needs to cover:
 - a. Role
 - b. Membership
 - c. Role in local consultation
23. This review needs to tap into local views outside SSGs
24. Aim is to continually improve the SSGs
25. Information requests could be put on website? Both the FoI request and response should be posted, although don't necessarily need to post the name of the requester.

6. Final Report

The group considered an early draft of their Final Report. Changes were made to the document as agreed during the meeting, and more complex suggestions were logged for drafting later.

6.1 CoRWM opportunities/threats

The group reviewed the NDA response to WIGs work on the opportunities and threats posed by CoRWMs recommendations. Short notes are provided below as suggestions to the NDA when updating this work.

After some discussion on specific alterations (see below) it was agreed that it would be more useful if the NDA could redraft the paper to more accurately reflect the discussion had by WIG, as some comments had not been responded to.

Resources

1. Bullet 2 – need to reconsider response
2. Review heading to “Response from NDA”

Process

1. Bullet 1: Consider inclusion of Copeland explicitly... consider sensitivity here
2. Check post-it on “new build/legacy waste boundary for repository” has not been lost
3. Bullet 5 – be more specific
4. Have lost the original WIG input
5. Must address all WIGs points: can't leave some out just because they aren't clear....need to ask what they mean and then respond
6. Phil consult with Elizabeth Atherton in making his further response

7. If we don't go any further then we need therefore to flag that WIG hasn't formally reviewed the NDA response to CoRWM's opportunities and threats work

May not be best to include all of NDA table in section 5 of report.....need to summarise activity and ask NDA to respond to that

6.2 Possible recommendations for WIG final report

The group were asked, in table groups, to identify any recommendations that they:

- *Disagreed with and wanted to change?*
- *Wanted to add?*

The potential additional recommendations are listed below followed by the detailed discussion on each (6.3).

1. Need for national engagement group to look at waste issues: small enough to have deeper discussion, and with strong representation of local constituencies
2. Highlight of CoRWM conclusions/recommendations on opportunities/threats
3. Information gained was useful, as well as insights from diverse stakeholder views both national and local
4. Link conclusions/recommendations to ToR bullets: did WIG achieve these?
5. Need opportunity for stakeholders to express concerns in NDA Strategy. Start with stakeholder concerns.
6. Resourcing information needs of technically challenged stakeholders
7. Highlight conclusions of ILW storage discussion
8. Proper time allowance for engagement in NDA forward planning
 - a. Decision/logic diagram
9. Don't underestimate how long it takes for a group to become effective (bear in mind for future work). Clarification of ToRs and setting its agenda etc.

6.3 Further discussion around possible recommendations

Recommendation 1:

1. Focus is more specific on a particular issue of waste but more widely representative
2. Membership must reflect the issue under question including people critical of NDA
3. But issues are interconnected
4. Could maintain a group like WIG but also set up individual topic focussed groups
5. Need a stronger accountability of local constituency views and feedback. But need to recognise some feedback and constituency representation does exist already.

6. More clarity on forward plan would allow local representation to be more effective (to feed topics and canvas views from SSGs in advance)
7. Representation can cycle and change
8. NDA must plan in time and engagement into each project early on
9. Recommend NDA/Convenor/review incorporates creation of a group to consider waste issues nationally.....constitution (including local representatives) of the group may change according to the issue under discussion (requires a forward plan for this to be effective)
10. Focus on generic approaches to IWS (for example)
11. Convenor to draft recommendation

Recommendation 2:

1. Highlight value of this work
2. Some don't agree it should be highlighted
3. Caveat needed for some members not necessarily supporting CoRWMs recommendations: Add caveat in to table section 5?
4. Work on CoRWM was not complete or conclusive but still useful
5. Need to do justice to WIGs work on this

Highlight it as a good example of how WIG could contribute to national thinking from a range of stakeholder expertise, but also add caveats

Recommendation 3:

1. Add into list of benefits. Knowledge for local stakeholders, improving ability to scrutinise NDA & SLC work

Recommendation 4:

1. ToRs highlight 3 areas:
 - a. Providing information
 - b. Acting as a sounding board
 - c. Influencing NDA thinking

2. WIG felt these were met although found it difficult to adopt the approach outlined especially identifying issues early on
3. Didn't commission work, but although discussed, there wasn't agreement amongst stakeholders in WIG to do this in its programme

Recommendation 5:

1. In addition to issues in NDA work plans, stakeholders should be given opportunity to identify issues that they want to input to in a timely way
2. Need to create the right environment so that these concerns arise
 - a. Maybe NSG is the wrong place?? Too large a group

Recommendation 6:

1. Much consultation going on simultaneously
2. Difficult for lay people to assimilate and trust information if it has been generated by industry
3. See SAFEGROUNDS guidance on community engagement
4. NDA should provide resources for various specific areas of information provision and access

5. Don't want to specify too closely though
6. NDA recognise value of information to stakeholders and see it as part of their role to do this
7. but information provided by NDA may not be seen as trust worthy
8. Ongoing engagement work should maintain the ability to commission work independently....resourced by NDA
9. In order to level out the differing amounts of knowledge so that people can participate
- 10.Resource should be made available to allow access to independent information
- 11.info should be pitched at the right level e.g. public audiences
- 12.Factsheets to summarise different issues

Recommendation 7:

1. Highlight because it's a good example of how WIG operated and influenced NDA thinking

Recommendation 8:

1. Include directly

Recommendation 9:

1. Took a long time to get going and sort out the process early on

6.4 Existing recommendations discussion

Recommendation 6.1

- Delete and rewrite according to today's discussion regarding the ToRs (see above)

Recommendation 6.2

- Delete
- Replace with "NDA include time to engage explicitly in their work to allow timely engagement" or similar
- Maintain "horses for courses" element of the paragraph, as well as opportunity for stakeholders to challenge the type of engagement chosen
- Links to clarity on the opportunities to influence the NDA
- NDA see engagement as necessary on all its work, although is not prescriptive on how it goes about engaging
- Need to acknowledge that engagement means succeeding in getting stakeholder inputnot just offering the opportunity

Recommendation 6.3

- "Stakeholders found it difficult to see how they had influenced NDA decisions"

Recommendation 6.4

- Add "hard copies should be available on request"
- Documents should be numbered and catalogued clearly
- Consider 'freephone number'

Recommendation 6.5

- Implies that some issues have been “finished”
- Delete

Appendix 2

- Add in both names where some people share a place or have taken over the seat due to staff change
- Put in organisation alphabetical order
- Mark Bentley: CIRIA/SAFEGROUNDS
- Sue Crisp: NuLeAF

6.5 Report sign-off process after today

WHAT	BY
Convenor/NDA update report and circulate to WIG	4 th May
Comment (2 weeks)	18 th May
Amend and circulate to WIG for information	25 th May
Circulate to NSG	8 th June

7. Reflections on WIG

WIG members were asked to reflect on their experience of the Waste Issues Group. Five questions were used to prompt thinking:

1. What part have you played in WIG meetings?
2. If you could wind back the clock to February '06 what would you do differently?
3. Best thing about WIG?
4. Worst thing about WIG?
5. How do you feel about these WIG meetings coming to an end?

After a minute or so of reflection on each question, people discussed their responses at tables before capturing a few parting messages in plenary.

- WIG is a well established group, shame to begin again.....please make use of the people and experience in future
- “I saw through a glass darkly: then I saw clearly”
- Feel like I’ve been educated....but lots more to be learned
- Rotating chair system is tricky: hard to stay up to date and would have liked to attend every meeting
- Unclear on way forward in the process: must ensure the successor methods are put in place ASAP
- Some of both NDA & stakeholders did not have an “engagement culture” but now it is building....don’t lose this
- Rewarding on an emotional level
- Stimulus of differing perspectives
- Would be nice to have more SSGs involved
- Link between local and national views is very beneficial....hopefully can be built on in “issue led working” in the future engagement plan
- Thanks to Rowena as well for keeping us on track

"Thank you from NDA" to people who have participated....it has required a lot of time and effort on everyone's part. NDA has learnt a lot and will take this into the Process Review. Thank you!

8. NDA Announcement


- NDA Chair standing down at end of his 3 year term
- Full statement on website now

9. Actions

Action	Who	When
Circulate link for SAFEGROUNDS conference papers to WIG	Mark Bentley	
Point WIG to relevant legal opinion on Nirex/NDA	Phil	
Circulate statement from House of Lords regarding Nirex/NDA	Phil	
Circulate EA statement on LLR around WIG (from Andy Baker et al)	Hannah/Sarah	Done
Circulate the work specification on internal emitters to WIG	Steve	Done
Add clarification re Dounreay inventory remark in February WIG report	Convenor via Sandy	
Circulate Liaison Group ToR to WIG when agreed	Rhuari	
Send comments to John P (john.r.potter@bnfl.com) on the two BNG tables of stakeholder expectations	All	
Circulate Q&A document to WIG	Steve G	
Consider posting all FoI requests and responses on website	Richard M	
Phil, Jo, etc to update section 5 table: ensure clear read across from WIG input	Richard M & Convenor	
Meeting report	Sarah	13/4
Update and circulate final report for signoff	Convenor	End Apr
Ensure Louisa gets hard copies of reports both now and future	Convenor	Ongoing

10. Way Forward

Although WIG will not meet again with its current remit and membership, WIG members will hear of progress shortly. The following three blocks of activity are significant over the next 4 months, and alongside each is an indication of how and when you will be contacted.



Appendix 1 - Attendees and Apologies

Attendees – 3rd & 4th April

Name		Organisation
Richard	Bramhall	Low Level Radiation Campaign
Sue	Crisp	Cumbria County Council
Richard	Flynn	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Tony	Free	British Energy
Trevor	Hawkins	Sizewell Stakeholder Group
Rita	Holmes	Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group
Terry	Joslin	Harwell - Chiltern Campus Local Stakeholder Group
Sandy	McWhirter	UKAEA
Richard	Mrowicki	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
John	Potter	British Nuclear Group
Paul	Tinnion	GMB
Louisa	Whenday	Dungeness Site Stakeholder Group
Derek	Boden	SERA
Peter	Moorcroft	Springfields Site Stakeholder Group
Jean	McSorley	Greenpeace
Steve	Whittingham	DTI
Mark	Dutton	CoRWM
Sue	Brown	West Cumbria Site Stakeholder Group
Mark	Bentley	CIRIA
Eileen	Turner	British Nuclear Group

Attendees – 3rd April only

Name		Organisation
Phil	Davies	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Steve	Griffiths	Health & Safety Executive
John	Roberts	ISL – University of Sheffield

Apologies

Name	Organisation
Nathan Argent	Greenpeace
David Stone	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency
John Whitton	Nexia Solutions
Vanessa Smithson	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Joyce Rutherford	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate – HSE
Andy Baker	Environment Agency
Jim Cochrane	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency
Fred Dawson	Ministry of Defence
John Deighan	Dounreay Site Stakeholder Group
Doug Graham	UKAEA
Richard Griffin	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
June Love	Dounreay Site Stakeholder Group
Alastair MacDonald	Dounreay Site Stakeholder Group
Carni McCarron-Holmes	West Cumbria Site Stakeholder Group
Kenny McDougall	Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group
Lydia Meryll	SERA