

West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Partnership



Meeting Report

From 29th July 2011

At Wigton Market Hall

Document No:	215
Status:	Adopted
Title:	Meeting Report from West Cumbria MRWS Partnership, 29 July 2011
Author:	3KQ (see note overleaf)
Notes:	Published on 22 nd August 2011

Note:

This report is a summary of discussions at the meeting. It is compiled by independent facilitators 3KQ, operating on behalf of all participants. Note that it is meant as an aide-memoire for participants and a means of update to non-attendees, rather than a definitive record of every detail.

Facilitators/Authors: Richard Harris, Rhuari Bennett, Jane Dalton

Contacts: richard@3kq.co.uk
rhuari@3kq.co.uk
jane@3kq.co.uk

Telephone 01539 739 435

3KQ Ltd
93 Serpentine Road
Kendal
Cumbria
LA9 4PD

3KQ Ltd
Pantiles Chambers
85 High Street
Tunbridge Wells
Kent TN1 1XP

3KQ Ltd is a company that helps organisations engage the public and stakeholders around contentious issues within the environmental sector. For more information see www.3kq.co.uk.

The front cover image is a photo montage showing how the surface part of the final repository for spent nuclear fuel may look in the future at Forsmark in Östhammar municipality (Sweden). The image was supplied courtesy of SKB/LAJ Illustration. See <http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/page/108/International-experience.htm> for further information about Forsmark and other overseas facilities.

Executive Summary

Overview. The 19th meeting of the West Cumbria Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Partnership took place on 29th July 2011. 36 people attended with 10 members of the public present to observe the meeting. The main objective of the meeting was to form a collective view regarding the degree to which three of the criteria in the Work Programme are met (Safety, Security, Environment and Planning; Community Benefits and Impacts; and the Siting Process).

Updates. Future Partnership meeting dates have now been confirmed. It has been agreed that geology will be given the same status as the other criteria in PSE3, but that critical views will be highlighted in the Consultation Document. The Steering Group has agreed that it will be decided whether a collective submission to the Department of Energy and Climate Change's (DECC's) consultation on its national framework for site assessment is needed once the Partnership has agreed its own position on the siting process. The Minister of State at DECC has asked the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) to look at options for accelerating the geological disposal programme.

PSE Updates. The Partnership continues to hold exhibition stands in town centres and at events across West Cumbria ahead of PSE3. PSE3 will include the introduction of a Webinar and two extra Community Drop-in Events, in Cockermouth and Egremont. The Residents' Panel workshop will be used, if possible, to pilot the consultation. The opinion survey expert review has been put out to tender.

Assessment of Criteria. This was an assessment meeting at which the Partnership was making preliminary judgements against the following criteria in its Work Programme:

- **Criterion 1 – Safety, Security, Environment and Planning.** The Partnership provisionally agreed that it is satisfied *at this stage* with the regulatory processes that are in place or are being developed, and the acceptability of the NDA's research programme and its processes for making an environmental safety case and assessing geology at potential sites. Some concerns were, however, raised about how planning processes might work in future stages of the process.
- **Criterion 3 – Community Benefits and Impacts.** Discussions focused on the response from the Government to the principles for Community Benefit, and the work that is now planned for protecting the brand of the area and mitigation of early impacts. Concerns were raised about over reliance on the nuclear industry, the impacts that a GDF might have on job creation and diversification and the need to consider the wider community of interest for the National Park. It was agreed that this criterion will be revisited at the next Partnership meeting (originally scheduled for 25th August but now due to take place on 20th September) following further discussion between DECC and the Partnership regarding the principles for Community Benefit, in particular DECC's formal response to them.
- **Criterion 5 – Siting Process.** This criterion will now be revisited at the next Partnership meeting following a further meeting between representatives from the three Councils and the Cumbria Association of Local Councils to discuss a set of guidelines for organisational arrangements.
- **Criterion 7 – Ethics.** It was provisionally agreed that no further work is needed on ethics at this stage in the process.
- **Overall way forward.** A draft Consultation Document will be available for discussion and potential adoption by the Partnership at its next meeting on 20th September 2011.

For future meeting dates and more information please see the Partnership's website www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk.

1. Introduction

1.1 – Objectives

Specific objectives for the day were to:

- Form a collective view regarding the degree to which three of the criteria in the Work Programme are met:
 - Safety, Security, Environment and Planning (Criterion 1).
 - Community Benefits and Impacts (Criterion 3).
 - Siting Process (Criterion 5).
- Guide drafting and preparation of the Partnership's consultation document for use in the third round of public and stakeholder engagement (PSE3).

The full agenda is in Appendix 1.

1.2 – Attendance

36 participants¹ attended at Wigton Market Hall on 29th July 2011. A full list of those in attendance is in Appendix 2. The meeting was open for the public to observe and 10 members of the public attended.

2. Updates

2.1 – Partnership meeting date changes

The new dates and venues for future Partnership meetings have now been confirmed – see Section 7.6 or <http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/meetings.asp> for details. Please note that the meeting that was originally scheduled for 25th August 2011 has been cancelled and the planned agenda will now be covered at the meeting on 20th September.

2.2 – Geology seminar follow-up

As requested at the Partnership meeting on 23rd June 2011 (see Partnership meeting report, Document 198, Section 4.4), the PSE Sub-Group has looked at how best to cover geology in PSE3. It has been decided, along with the Steering Group, that the best option is to give equal status to all criteria in PSE3, but that critical views on geology warrant highlighting in the Consultation Document so that they are clearly visible to members of the public. Additionally, the suggestion is to:

- Ask Dr Jeremy Dearlove to attend all events to help independently answer geological questions.
- Offer the Cumberland Geological Society a briefing on Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS).
- Secure Partnership attendance if David Smythe speaks at Loughborough conference.

¹ Plus 6 from the facilitation team and secretariat.

2.3 – Documents published

Since the last Partnership meeting the following documents have been published in the Documents section of the Partnership website at:

http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/all_documents.asp.

214. Contact Note from Exhibition Stands Summer 2011
211. Ipsos MORI Response to Michael Baron's Questions, Ipsos MORI
210. PSE Sub-Group Meeting Notes 5 July 2011
208. PSE Sub-Group Meeting Notes 24 June 2011
207. PSE Sub-Group Meeting Notes 7 June 2011
205. Contact Note from Meeting Regarding Youth Engagement 16 June 2011
204. Further Analysis of Longer-term Manpower and Skills Requirements June 2011, NDA
203. Briefing Note on the MoDeRn Project June 2011, NDA
202. Letter sent to Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth and CORE 27 June 2011
201. Protection of the Marine Environment - Clarification from DECC June 2011, DECC
200. Report from Geology Seminar 20 June 2011
199. Letter sent to Partnership by Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth and CORE 2 June 2011
196. Preliminary Assessment Report Criterion 4a - Design and Engineering 23 June 2011
195. Preliminary Assessment Report Criterion 2 - Geology 23 June 2011
192. Email Exchange Between CALC and the NDA re Areas Excluded by the BGS Screening January to June 2011
187. Preliminary Assessment Report Criterion 4b - Inventory 23 June 2011
186. Preliminary Assessment Report Criterion 5 - Siting Process 23 June 2011

2.4 – DECC consultation on Stage 4 siting process

The Steering Group believes that a collective submission to the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) consultation on its national framework for site assessment may be warranted. This will be decided once the Partnership has agreed its own position on the siting process (now due to take place at the Partnership meeting on 20th September 2011 – see also Section 6 below).

2.5 – Exhibition stands

The Partnership continues to hold exhibition stands in town centres and events across West Cumbria ahead of PSE3. All Partnership members are asked to assist on the stands – see <http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/meetings.asp> for details of dates/venues.

2.6 – PSE3 Plan revised and published

There have been a number of changes to the PSE3 plan since it was adopted by the Partnership including:

- Introduction of a Webinar.
- Expanded offering to schools to encourage involvement by young people.
- Two extra community events, one in Cockermouth and one in Egremont.
- The Residents' Panel workshop will be used, if possible, to pilot the draft consultation, after the Consultation Document has been signed off by the Partnership.

2.7 – Opinion Survey expert review

The expert review of the Opinion Survey has been put out to tender and the PSE Sub-Group is hoping to appoint reviewers shortly.

2.8 – NDA: Clarification of acceleration of timescale

Charles Hendry, Minister of State at DECC, has challenged the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) to look at options for accelerating the geological disposal programme. The NDA has committed to providing the Minister with an assessment of the options for accelerating the programme before the end of 2011. The NDA recognises that the MRWS approach is based on voluntarism and partnership with local communities and that it can only move at a speed that local communities believe is reasonable. However, the NDA is looking at ways to increase resources allocated to the programme, undertake more work in parallel and transfer technology from more advanced programmes overseas.

An initial NDA/DECC workshop has been held to identify potential options for acceleration of the geological disposal programme. Groups of options will be assessed against the success criteria discussed at the workshop, and the views of regulators and other stakeholders will be sought. A paper identifying credible options is planned for the October meeting of the Geological Disposal Steering Group.

The Partnership noted that nothing formally came to the Partnership that this was going to be looked at. It was emphasised that the Government needs to be clear that asking questions outside the current process, particularly with regard to timescales, can cause problems with retaining community confidence.

2.9 – Update on NDA meeting regarding issues management

The NDA provided an update on improving its processes for issues management and engagement with stakeholders on contentious issues (as discussed at the Partnership meeting on 14th April 2011 (see Partnership meeting report, Document 165.1, Section 6)). An initial meeting, including NGOs and Partnership representatives, has been held to discuss these issues, and the NDA is considering the comments and advice from the meeting. The NDA is planning to publish a long list of issues in August, and then a shorter list of key issues in October. Their risks register will also be published in September. They are also looking at mechanisms for improving their engagement with stakeholders.

3. Assessment of Criteria

3.1 – Background and description of process

The Partnership is now in the stage of holding its assessment meetings, during which it will be making preliminary judgements against the criteria in its Work Programme (see Document 13.1). The Technical Review Group (TRG) has been meeting on the Partnership's behalf to pull together all of the work to date under the Work Programme in advance of each of the assessment meetings and prepare potential conclusions on each criterion. A preliminary assessment report has been produced for each criterion to support the assessment of progress against the criteria.

At the meetings on 24th May and 23rd June 2011, the Partnership made its preliminary assessments against Criteria 2, 4, 5 and 6 (see Partnership Meeting Reports from 24th May and 23rd June – Documents 176 and 198). Criteria 1 and 3 were considered at the meeting today and Criterion 5 was also due to be revisited. The next meeting on 20th September will consider any outstanding issues, with a view to the Partnership agreeing its preliminary conclusions and finalising its Consultation Document.

As part of the preparation for the assessment process, Partnership members had previously been asked to consider a briefing note from 3KQ and the TRG, outlining what they and their member organisations need to do to prepare for this stage of the Partnership's work (see Document 176, Appendix 3 for a copy of the briefing note). A worksheet to aid further preparation for the criteria under discussion today was also circulated in advance of this and the previous meeting (see Appendix 3).

For each criterion, there was an opportunity to clarify anything in the assessment report, followed by a period of free time/reflection for Partnership members to discuss the criteria with colleagues in the room, including observing members. Each member organisation was then asked to express its *preliminary* view on its level of satisfaction against each criterion in turn as follows:

- ✓ We believe the criterion has been met sufficiently at this stage.
- ? There are outstanding questions needing discussion.
- X We do not believe the criterion has been met sufficiently at this stage.

This was followed by a plenary session to discuss any concerns, comments or conditions to be applied, with an aim of agreeing a Partnership view on the degree to which each criterion has been met. These plenary discussions are summarised in sections 4 to 6 below. Please also see Appendix 4 for a table summarising the indicative responses from each organisation for each of the criteria under discussion (note that these responses do not constitute 'votes').

Member organisations that were not present were:

- GMB/Unite.
- Prospect Union, although they had submitted their views to the Programme Manager in advance and their responses are therefore included in Appendix 4.

4. Assessment of Criterion 1 – Safety, Security, Environment and Planning

4.1 – Background and overview

The preliminary assessment report (PAR) for Criterion 1 (Document 209, Draft 1) had been circulated in advance of the meeting. A summary of the regulators' views on the NDA's generic Design Systems Safety Case (DSSC) was also circulated (see Appendix 5).

There are two criteria under Criterion 1:

Criterion 1a) – For the Partnership to be: 'Satisfied that suitable regulatory and planning processes are in place or being developed to protect residents, workforce and the environment.'

As outlined in its Work Programme (Document 13.1), under this criterion the Partnership is looking for:

- a) 'Confidence that necessary regulatory bodies and processes exist or are being developed.'
- b) 'Adequate communication links between regulators and community are present and working.'
- c) 'Acceptability of the planning aspects of the early stages in the siting process.'

Criterion 1b) – For the Partnership to be: 'Satisfied that NDA Radioactive Waste Management Directorate (RWMD) has suitable capability and processes in place to protect residents, workforce and the environment.'

Under this criterion the Partnership is looking for:

- a) 'Acceptability of the NDA's process for making an environmental safety case.'
- b) 'Acceptability of the NDA's research programme.'
- c) 'Acceptability of the NDA's process for assessing geology at potential sites.'

4.2 – Member organisation responses regarding satisfaction against the criteria

- **Criterion 1a)** – Three member organisations (Barrow Borough Council, Eden District Council and the Lake District National Park Authority (LDNPA)) responded with ?, all others with ✓.
- **Criterion 1b)** – Two member organisations (the Cumbria Association of Local Councils (CALC) and LDNPA) responded with ?, all others with ✓.

4.3 – Concerns regarding the planning system

With regard to Criterion 1a, Barrow Borough Council advised that their concerns are to do with the overall effect that changes to the planning system would have on this project. Whilst this is not a deal breaker, they wanted the concern to be noted.

The LDNPA made reference to the section in the PAR on the Planning System (see Document 209, page 5) and noted that they would like the Consultation Document to make it clear that participation in the current process does not fetter the responsibility of planning authorities, if/when they are asked to determine a planning application for a borehole or facility. It was agreed that this could be included in the Consultation

Document for any of the local authorities that potentially may act as a planning authority in the process.

There was also a reminder that if development of a geological disposal facility (GDF) is judged to be a nationally significant project, it will go down the route of the Infrastructure Planning Commission (or its successor).

4.4 – Further information from CoRWM

With regards to Criterion 1b, the LDNPA referred to the report that the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) issued in 2009 on research and development (R&D) (see page 7 of Document 209) and asked whether CoRWM could add anything further to this based on what they know now.

CoRWM acknowledged that a lot has happened since they issued this report and the Government has responded to their recommendations and is acting on most of them. They noted that the R&D agenda is given a lot of emphasis in current work and the topic is discussed in DECC's annual report, CoRWM's annual report and a recent report of the House of Lords. Reference was made to the fact that the NDA now has a Research Board, the Nuclear Waste Research Forum, and an Advisory Panel with an independent chair. At the recently held meeting to discuss issues management (see 2.9 above) it was clear that there was an appreciation of the urgency of the R&D agenda.

CoRWM is continuing to scrutinise the NDA's R&D programme, and, whilst it is recognised that many issues cannot be resolved at the moment, it is their impression that there has been considerable progress, and a realisation by all parties of the significance of R&D. The general feeling is therefore that R&D is being given far more strategic significance than when the issue of R&D was raised in 2009.

Further, more detailed information was offered on request.

4.5 – NDA peer review process

With regard to Criterion 1b, CALC noted that their only outstanding issue was in relation to the comments made in the PAR about the learning that the NDA is taking on board as a result of the peer review of its generic DSSC (see Document 209, top of page 7). CALC suggested that, if this is going to go into a chapter of the Consultation Document, there is a need to know more specifically what the learning is.

The NDA referred back to the presentations on their issues management process at the 14th April 2011 Partnership meeting (see meeting report, Document 165.1, Section 6) in which they described the process for gathering and assessing issues that affect the development of a GDF. The NDA is now gathering and going through all of the issues that have been raised, including the peer reviewers' comments. These will all be included in the long list of issues which is due to be published in August (see 2.9 above) and any issues that are judged as being significant will be included in the list of key issues that will follow in October, including how they will be dealt with. It was also noted that a set of internal issues had been identified following production of the generic safety case documents, and the NDA is looking at how these issues feed into the issues management process. Development of the safety case suite of documents will take all relevant issues into account.

CALC confirmed that this response satisfied the point that they had raised.

4.6 – Further info from the NDA

It was confirmed that the NDA's responses to the points raised by Professor Stuart Haszeldine have now been published (available in Document 217 at:

http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/all_documents.asp – see page 9 for a summary of the actions).

4.7 – Agreements and way forward

The two criteria under Safety, Security, Environment and Planning were provisionally accepted as having been sufficiently met at this stage in the process, subject to the issues outlined above. The PAR for this criterion (Document 209) will go forward for drafting of the PSE3 Consultation Document, and will also now be published on the Partnership website with reference to this meeting report for a summary of the discussions at the meeting.

The full Consultation Document will come back to the Partnership for discussion and agreement before publication.

5. Assessment of Criterion 3 – Community Benefits and Impacts

5.1 – Background and overview

There are four criteria under Criterion 3:

- **Criterion 3a)** – ‘Whether the Partnership is confident that an appropriate community benefits package can be developed.’
- **Criterion 3b)** – ‘Whether the Partnership is confident that appropriate possibilities exist to assess and manage environmental, social and economic impacts appropriately if they occur.’
- **Criterion 3c)** – ‘Whether the Partnership is confident that the possibility of a repository fits appropriately with the overall direction of the relevant community/ies.’
- **Criterion 3d)** – ‘Whether the Partnership is confident that accepting a GDF at some point in the future, and committing the host area to a nuclear future for many generations to come, is economically advantageous and will contribute to economic sustainability.’

As outlined in its Work Programme (Document 13.1), under this criterion the Partnership is looking for:

- **3a)** – ‘Acceptable process in place to secure additional benefits – beyond those that derive directly from the construction and operation of a facility.’
- **3b)** – ‘Acceptable process is in place to assess and manage environmental, social and economic impacts appropriately if they occur.’
- **3c)** – ‘Support for the possibility of a repository in relation to other documented long-term priorities.’
- **3d)** – ‘Satisfied that there is sufficient prospect of the development of other job-creating investments complementary to a repository that will provide sustainable employment in the long-term.’

The draft preliminary assessment report for this criterion (Document 212) was circulated in advance of the meeting.

5.2 – Update on principles for Community Benefit

There was a reminder that the principles for Community Benefit were agreed by the Partnership at its meeting on 24th May 2011 (see Partnership meeting report, Document 176, Section 4). The Partnership has now had a formal response from DECC (see the PAR, Document 212, Appendix 1).

DECC’s response was considered by the Steering Group at its meeting on 22nd July. There was immediate concern that DECC’s response did not go far enough at this stage, and, in particular, did not do enough to say which principles DECC were agreeing or not. Principle 4 (Additionality) was given as an example of where the Partnership should be very clear and determined about what it wants.

The Community Benefits Sub-Group advised that it will liaise with DECC based on the Steering Group discussion and discussions at the meeting today.

DECC advised that, following further discussions this week about the principles and DECC’s response to them, they do not think that there is a problem and that some of the responses simply need to be written better to make them clearer or stronger. The

intention is for this to be done and completed in the next few weeks. It was also acknowledged that, as some of the principles are statements about what needs to be agreed in the future, there is little that can be said at the moment other than an acceptance/agreement that these are the things that need to be accepted or satisfied before West Cumbria commits to anything.

The Community Benefits Sub-Group welcomed this response from DECC, specifically on Principle 4. There was also, however, a note of caution about needing to see the detail before a final view can be taken on the criterion, and Partnership members were assured that, in addition to discussions today, they would be given the opportunity to see the final response from DECC at the next meeting on 20th September before a provisional judgement on this criterion is reached.

5.3 – Update regarding work on mitigation for early impacts

The Community Benefits Sub-Group advised that progress had been made on mitigation, and it has been agreed with DECC that a new strand of work will take place to look at the effect that a decision to participate (DtP) in the MRWS siting process might have on the brand of the area, focused mainly on tourism and the food and drinks industry. Cumbria Tourism and Cumbria Chamber of Commerce have agreed to manage this piece of work for the Partnership, alongside other partners such as the LDNPA and the NFU who will also need to be closely involved. This work will run in tandem with PSE3, and will focus on what mitigation measures might be appropriate, at least during Year 1 of Stage 4 if a DtP is taken.

The LDNPA welcomed the opportunity to join the group, although they also expressed some surprise that these issues had not been considered at an earlier stage, and they were also disappointed that they had not been included before now. They asked to be consulted before anything further is commissioned. It was confirmed that all Partnership members will be asked to comment on the specification for the work, and that the LDNPA will be more closely involved from now on.

Cumbria Chamber of Commerce considered that the speed at which this work has been agreed is very good, especially considering that the issues were only first raised at the 24th May 2011 Partnership meeting. They noted that, whilst they and Cumbria Tourism have got the task of putting the work together, they welcome the support of other members including the LDNPA and the NFU in particular. They also noted that this piece of work needed to be taken forward for Cumbria Chamber of Commerce to be actively engaged in the Partnership and that it needs to be carried out as soon as possible as it will affect their views on making a recommendation about a decision about participation.

5.4 – Development of an evidence base

It was noted that any future Community Siting Partnership (CSP) would need to consider how to develop an evidence base against which pre-development impacts could be measured in order to agree specific mitigation or compensation measures. A question was asked about whether the work on brand protection and early impacts will include development of this evidence base or whether it would be developed after a decision about participation.

In addition, CALC asked whether it would be possible for this piece of work to look at property blight in the early stages of the MRWS siting process.

Copeland BC agreed that it would be useful to have some form of baseline, including aspects such as property values, to be able to monitor whether impacts are having a positive or negative effect in the early stages and throughout the process.

Cumbria Chamber of Commerce confirmed that this is outside the scope of the current work, but agreed that it is a piece of work that needs to be done. They agreed to look into the possibility of carrying it out as an additional element of the current work, subject to agreement of funding etc. An update will be provided at the next meeting on 20th September.

5.5 – Member organisation responses regarding satisfaction against the criteria

- **Criterion 3a)** – Four member organisations responded with ✓, eight with ? and three with X.
- **Criterion 3b)** – Seven member organisations responded with ✓ and eight with ?.
- **Criterion 3c)** – Seven member organisations responded with ✓, seven with ? and one with X.
- **Criterion 3d)** – Nine member organisations responded with ✓, five with ? and one with X.

See Appendix 4 for full details of the member organisation responses.

5.6 – Assessment of Criterion 3a

5.6.1 – The need for an agreed response from the Government to the principles for Community Benefit

Whilst it was agreed that there was some encouragement from the progress made between the Government and the Community Benefits Sub-Group in developing a set of agreed principles for Community Benefit (see 5.3 above), several members noted that, without an agreed set of words, they cannot determine whether the criterion has been satisfied or not.

Concerns were also expressed that the history of receiving benefits in West Cumbria shows that, whilst there have been promises, they have rarely been fulfilled.

5.6.2 – Wording of the criterion

Carlisle City Council (who responded with a ?) advised that, in their view, the question sets an impossible task, and that the key issue for the future is about delivery rather than development of a benefits package.

5.6.3 – Definition of community in the wider context of the National Park

The LDNPA (who responded with a X) advised that their concern is primarily about the definition of what a community is, and the difficulties of defining benefit in that context. For the National Park, the community is much broader than West Cumbria, and includes not just the whole of Cumbria but national and international interests. The LDNPA therefore noted that they need further work to be done on this aspect.

It was suggested by another Partnership member that this issue is not specifically relevant to Criterion 3a, in that the principles do not define the area or location of the host community. The LDNPA acknowledged this point, but stated that they have also not seen anything that addresses the wider issue which, whilst being a general point, is particularly related to the benefits package.

It was acknowledged that, whilst the conversations have always been about West Cumbria *and beyond*, this does not necessarily come through in the principles, and it was suggested that a small alteration to the principles could be made to address the

LDNPA's concerns. Reference was also however made to Principle 9 (Distribution) which refers to the equitable distribution of benefits 'in terms of the scale of the impact on different stakeholders, both locally and nationally' and it was felt by some that this should be enough to cover the issue.

It was agreed that the LDNPA would liaise with the Community Benefits Sub-Group to determine whether the current principles address their concerns or not.

5.6.4 – Seeking wider opportunities for West Cumbria

Copeland BC (who responded with a ?) suggested that, with regard to wider opportunities, it would be useful to look into policies and pilot schemes of the Government and identify opportunities where, for example, West Cumbria could be given special consideration when projects and/or pilot studies are being looked at. This would partly be in order to address community confidence in the Government, and would also address the issue of benefits being perceived as being a "cheque book".

The Community Benefits Sub-Group advised that, in their view, this kind of thing will come out of the work that is already being done. DECC gave a reminder that Principle 4 (Additionality) recognises things that are already happening, and confirmed that their response to this principle shows that the Government does recognise the need for additionality.

Concerns were expressed by other members that the Partnership needs to be mindful that any community benefits package must be over and above any projects that are already being considered and that are separate to the development of a GDF, and that additionality must not be displaced or moved into other projects. There was also a reminder about previous commitments to projects that have been shelved in West Cumbria, including Building Schools for the Future, hospital development and other infrastructure improvements, and it was noted that the baseline for West Cumbria one year ago is different to now.

It was agreed that the Community Benefits Sub-Group will consider this issue further and provide an update at the next meeting.

5.6.5 – Agreements and way forward on Criterion 3a

It was agreed that this criterion will be revisited at the next meeting, following further conversations with DECC about their responses to the principles for Community Benefit, and further consideration by the Community Benefits Sub-Group on the issues raised today. The work on mitigation of early impacts and brand protection will commence, including consideration of widening the scope of the work to include development of an evidence base and impact on house prices due to brand damage.

5.7 – Assessment of Criterion 3b and the revised Schedule of Impacts

5.7.1 – Revisions to Schedule of Impacts

Reference was made to previous discussions about the Schedule of Impacts (Document 163, Appendix A) at the 14th April 2011 Partnership meeting (see meeting report, Document 165.1, Sections 3 and 8). The Schedule of Impacts has been revised since that meeting, and, in particular, it now contains more detail about how impacts might be addressed. It was noted that the majority of impacts would be assessed through the NDA's Strategic Environmental Assessment and this would not take place until after the current stage of work. The schedule will be republished shortly in a revised version of Document 163.

5.7.2 – Economic multipliers

The LDNPA (who responded with a ?) referred to paragraph 4.8 of Document 212 which discusses economic multipliers, and asked whether both positive and negative multipliers had been taken into account for impacts on tourism.

The NDA advised that their Manpower and Skills Report (see Documents 179 and 204) addressed multiplier effects i.e. how many indirect jobs a direct job produces. It was confirmed that the positive effects were looked at but that negative effects and tourism were not considered. They also reiterated that the answers for any calculations would be very site-specific.

A discussion was held about whether this could be picked up in the work on mitigation of early impacts and brand protection. Cumbria Chamber of Commerce stated that, whilst they would hope to be able to look at the overall negative effect, to come up with an equation could be difficult and potentially quite dangerous as there is currently no mechanism to look at a negative assessment.

It was noted that significant negative indicator work has been carried out in relation to shop jobs lost in Barrow, however, it was also acknowledged that the impacts of discussions about GDF development are not about absolute job losses. The NDA confirmed that there are models for job losses, but there are no definite multipliers to assess what the negative impact on jobs in one industry might be if jobs are created in another industry.

5.7.3 – Wording of the criterion and existence of assessment processes

It was noted by Churches Together in Cumbria (CTiC) (who responded with a ?) that they were unable to say that they are satisfied that this criterion has been met as it states that the Partnership is looking for acceptable/appropriate processes to *be in place* to assess and manage impacts, however there is no process in place at the moment.

The NDA advised that there is essentially a process in place in that, if a DtP is taken, there is a statutory requirement for certain processes to be carried out including: a Strategic Environmental Assessment; Social, Economic and Environmental Impacts Assessment (which will assess all of the things that are in the schedule); Strategic Transport Assessment; and a Habitats Regulations Assessment if any of the plans impact on an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or other specially designated sites.

It was suggested that the assessments that would happen need to be made clearer at this stage, and it was therefore agreed that the NDA will provide a summary of the assessment processes that would take place in Stage 4 if a DtP is taken.

5.7.4 – Negative wording

CALC referred to the final sentence of 3b) on page 8 of Document 212, and noted that the wording needs to be reconsidered for the Consultation Document as it is expressed as two negatives which does not fit very well with the positive wording of the criterion.

5.7.5 – Agreements and way forward

It was agreed that Criterion 3b had been provisionally satisfied, subject to the concerns noted above and the completion of the summary of assessments by the NDA.

5.8 – Assessment of Criterion 3c

5.8.1 – Concerns regarding over reliance on the nuclear industry and concerns about the impact of a GDF on diversification

Allerdale BC (who responded with a X) advised that as Criterion 3c is about whether a GDF 'fits appropriately with the overall direction of the relevant community/ies', they feel that it has not yet been satisfied as the general direction over the last 25 years has been to move away from dependency and reliance on the nuclear industry and into diversification.

Cumbria County Council (who responded with a ?) advised that they have a lot of sympathy with this viewpoint, and whilst this has not translated into a X against the criterion, they also have concerns about the lack of diversification and development of a monoculture. They acknowledged that, whilst diversification has been the intent over the last few years, some parts of the nuclear industry are not helping and may be damaging to that intent.

A further discussion was held about why this viewpoint did not also lead to a X for Allerdale BC against Criterion 3d, however they advised that they interpreted 3d as being about the economic impact of a GDF itself and as a GDF would create jobs both in itself and further down the supply chain, this criterion was provisionally satisfied in their view.

Copeland BC (who responded with a ✓) acknowledged the concerns about over reliance on the nuclear industry, but explained that they were provisionally satisfied that this criterion had been met, as a GDF would reduce the reliance on what West Cumbria already has at this point in time.

The NFU (who responded with a ?) advised that although a GDF clearly does not fit with agriculture and rural industries, as Sellafield already exists they felt that it was not particularly helpful to respond with a X to this criterion.

5.8.2 – Emerging conclusions

The LDNPA (who responded with a ?) advised that they could not support paragraph 4.11 and emerging conclusion 3d) (see pages 6 and 7 of Document 212) as they are too broad/sweeping and the phrase 'broadly compatible' does not provide enough comfort regarding diversification and fit with e.g. agriculture and tourism. They also noted that their policies and plans would not support this part. There was a reminder that this had also been raised at the previous meeting and they asked for this paragraph to be redrafted to take their concerns into account.

It was noted by the Programme Manager that paragraph 4.11 relates only to West Cumbria, and it was acknowledged that some scenarios do not fit the planning policies of the LDNPA. It was agreed that the LDNPA's concerns would be reflected in the Consultation Document, as covered in the 23rd June meeting.

5.8.3 – Differential between urban and rural areas

CALC (who responded with a ?) noted that the differential between impacts on urban and rural areas needs to be more clearly defined in the emerging conclusion, as the current wording does not make the position clear, and siting a GDF in a rural area is far from compatible with the current plans and visions for rural areas.

5.8.4 – Agreements and way forward

It was agreed that these points would be considered in the drafting of the Consultation Document and that Criterion 3c will be reconsidered at the next Partnership meeting alongside the draft chapter.

5.9 – Assessment of Criterion 3d

5.9.1 – Concerns re impact on job creation and diversification

The LDNPA (who responded with a X) noted that their concerns here are related to the point made in 5.8.2 above, and reflect a general concern about job creation, diversification and other things that the National Park has responsibility for/interest in.

It was suggested and agreed that it would be useful to include reference to the National Park alongside other longer-term plans/priorities including e.g. Britain's Energy Coast (see page 6 of Document 212).

5.9.2 – The need for more work to be done

CALC (who responded with a ?) noted that, for them, neither 3c nor 3d have been fully satisfied, however, as the preliminary conclusions also reflect the need for more work to be done on both of these topics if the process moves forward into Stage 4, they are satisfied with the conclusions.

5.9.3 – DECC input

There was a reminder from DECC that many of the areas relating to the whole subject of benefits will need a lot more work, and that the details can only be dealt with at a later stage, and when there is a CSP in place.

5.9.4 – Agreements and way forward.

It was agreed that the above points will be reflected in the Consultation Document and that Criterion 3d will be revisited at the next Partnership meeting.

5.10 – Agreements and way forward

It was agreed that all of the criteria under Criterion 3 will be revisited at the next Partnership meeting on 20th September 2011. Further discussions will take place in the meantime between the Community Benefits Sub-Group and DECC regarding the Government's responses to the principles for Community Benefits, and the work/research on brand protection and early mitigation will commence. The issues that were raised at this meeting will be incorporated into a draft chapter of the Consultation Document for consideration by the Partnership at the next meeting.

6. Other items covered

6.1 – Further assessment of Criterion 5: Siting Process

At the last Partnership meeting on 23rd June 2011, the Partnership carried out an initial assessment of Criterion 5: 'Whether the Partnership is confident that the siting process is sufficiently robust and flexible to meet their needs' (see Document 198, Section 6 for details of the discussions at the meeting). Agreement had not been reached, so officers of the principal authorities and CALC met on 21st July to discuss organisational arrangements, and are planning to meet again with member representatives on 18th August to determine a way forward.

This criterion will therefore be revisited at the next Partnership meeting, and a drafted chapter of the Consultation Document and a set of recommendations based on the outcome of the meeting on 18th August will be prepared for consideration by the Partnership.

6.2 – Ethics

Criterion 7 in the Partnership's Work Programme (Document 13.1) is 'Broad understanding of what the ethical issues are, and reassurance that they can be addressed in future (as appropriate).'

The TRG advised that the original intention was to treat ethics as a separate topic, however it has become clear that ethical issues come out in all of the other criteria. It has therefore been agreed that ethics cuts across the other criteria and should be considered against all other aspects and not on its own.

The following questions in relation to ethics were discussed by Partnership members to determine whether any issues have been missed, and whether there are any ethical issues arising out of all of the work that has been done to date:

1. Do we have sufficient broad understanding?
2. Are there any additional issues that we need to discuss before a decision about participation?

The resulting discussions are summarised below:

6.2.1 – Need for a better understanding of the ethical issues

It was felt by some that there could be a much better understanding of the ethical issues involved. Retrievability in particular was discussed as an issue that has been looked at as a design issue, but there are also ethical issues involved in whether it is good or bad to keep a repository open. CTiC also noted that ethical issues, not just practical issues, are in people's minds and that many people are asking ethical questions.

6.2.2 – Suggestion for an ethics audit

A suggestion was made by the LDNPA that an ethical audit could be carried out to review the Consultation Document in order to gain a professional/ethicist view of the work that has been done. There was a reminder that Professor Andy Blowers presented on ethics at the 19th January 2011 Partnership meeting (see meeting report, Document 139, Section 5) and it was agreed that the Programme Manager would provide an update on the content of Professor Blowers' work to members of the LDNPA who were not in attendance.

Others felt that ethics had been looked at enough already, and that bringing it up again at this stage and “back fitting” it into a process which has almost reached maturity, might make people feel better but would not add anything to the process.

6.2.3 – Ethics of the West Cumbria MRWS process

It was felt by Cumbria CC that the way that the Partnership has been set up and operated, demonstrates that it has adopted strong ethical standards and acted ethically, particularly with regard to its procedures, processes, and the rigour of the work that has been carried out. It was acknowledged that there will always be accusations of bribery and conflicts of interests, but Cumbria CC are willing to stand behind the “veracity” of the Partnership and its work.

6.2.4 – Other research

The NDA advised that the following research on ethics has also been carried out:

- *Compensation in Radioactive Waste Management – Ethical issues in the treatment of host communities, May 2002*, available at: <http://www.nda.gov.uk/documents/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&pageid=47526>.
- *Ethical issues in the Disposal of Radioactive Waste, December 2011*, available at: <http://www.nda.gov.uk/documents/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&pageid=47521>.

6.2.5 – Communication with members of the public

It was noted that the academic papers that the Partnership has are not necessarily understandable/accessible for members of the public and it was therefore suggested that the Partnership needs to consider how to present information and ask questions in ways that people can understand.

6.2.6 – Agreements and way forward

It was provisionally agreed that the work that has been done to date on ethics is enough at this stage in the process. Ethical issues will be covered in the Consultation Document, taking account of the comments made above.

6.3 – Overall assessment of the work done to date

Whilst it was acknowledged that Criteria 3 and 5 still need to be revisited, it was considered that it would still be useful at this stage to step back from the focused criteria discussions and consider how all of the work that has been done to date is emerging, and whether there are any overall issues that need to be addressed before PSE3 begins.

The following broad questions were considered by Partnership members:

1. Issues missing that need discussing?
2. Issues arising from the net effect of criteria?

The resulting discussions are summarised below:

6.3.1 – Involvement of MPs

A new member expressed his surprise at the absence of contributions or involvement from local MPs, and was also surprised that MPs were neither present nor being proactively asked to engage to both represent local interest and also feed into the national debate.

In response, it was noted that the Partnership has a direct link with the Government and that local MPs are therefore not necessarily needed to have such a link. A distinction was, however, made between Government and Parliament, and it was

acknowledged that whilst the Partnership may have very good links with the Government, MPs are there to look after local interests and it was suggested that the Partnership may not have been sufficiently proactive in engaging them.

It was confirmed that all of the Cumbrian MPs have been sent regular updates, all have been offered briefings, and Copeland BC regularly meet with the Copeland MP to keep him informed. It was felt by several members that the Partnership has done enough to try to engage with MPs and it was noted that the MPs have not (until recently in some instances) shown a great deal of interest in engaging in the process.

6.3.2 – The use of a referendum

The same new member also expressed surprise that a referendum was not going to happen and he suggested that the only way that people can express what they believe is by asking the direct question through a transparent, democratic, electoral process.

There was a reminder from Partnership members that this issue has been discussed and considered by the Partnership and by members of the public/stakeholders in PSE2, in quite some detail. As a result of these discussions and public input, it has been decided that, *at this stage* of the process, the best way to find out the view of Cumbria is to carry out a statistically representative opinion survey. This matches the public's view that, whilst a referendum may be appropriate, it is only fair to hold it when all the facts are available about siting, impacts and benefits. The Partnership has specifically left open the option to hold a referendum in the future.

6.3.3 – Level of awareness nationally

It was noted that disposal of the UK's radioactive waste is a big national issue, and concerns were expressed that, too often, the perception is that West Cumbria is only participating because it wants the money. A question was also asked about whether the rest of the country is aware enough of what Cumbria is doing. Whilst nuclear power is being used across the country, it was felt that the nation has not been made as conscious as it should be about the responsibility that comes with this, and it was suggested that this could be made clearer through publications etc.

6.3.4 – Level of focus on MRWS

It was noted by some members that there are other issues for their constituencies that are as important, if not more important, than MRWS, and that they would like to be able to put as much focus on some of these other issues. It was also suggested that MRWS might have been given a predominance that it does not warrant.

6.3.5 – Learning for the future

It was suggested that the Partnership could have taken some of the learning on board earlier and more quickly, and that this learning should be considered for a future CSP. For example, it might have been more useful and easier to have done some of the work in discrete sections to aid memory and understanding. It was also noted that the Partnership might have been overly distracted by geology, and that it should potentially have allowed itself to determine when and how this should be looked at.

6.3.6 – Better understanding of Plan B

It was noted that it would have been helpful during the discussions of the Partnership to have a better understanding of what 'Plan B' was.

6.3.7 – Questions about the voluntarism approach

The issue of whether voluntarism was the right process to adopt was raised, and the question of whether any other area was ever going to volunteer with so much waste already in West Cumbria was highlighted. It was also noted that it would be interesting

to know where the Government would choose to put the waste if it had a completely free hand.

6.3.8 – Clarity about decision-making arrangements

CALC advised that they would like, at some stage, to have some idea about how the decision-making arrangements for the three decision-making bodies (DMBs) are going to work, and asked when this will be determined. It was also noted that Prospect Union have advised that they would like decision-making arrangements to be clear and transparent, leaning on relationships that will need to be strong between the Principal Authorities, in particular if the process moves forward and the detail of a potential community benefits package is being discussed.

Copeland BC gave a reminder that Partnership members from the local authorities have to take things back to their members, and gave assurance all three authorities want what is best for the area. Whilst there are always obstacles to overcome, they stated that nothing is insurmountable, and confirmed that there have already been some very positive discussions about the work that is going to be carried out with regard to decision making in both this stage and Stage 4 of the process. The DMBs are therefore confident that there will be agreement about the way forward.

6.3.9 – Decision making for the Partnership and the need for consensus

It was confirmed that, with regards to decision making for the Partnership, whilst the aspiration is for the Partnership to reach a consensus, the Terms of Reference do allow for disagreement so long as it is clearly noted.

6.4 – Overall way forward

The next meeting will revisit Criteria 3 and 5 and will also consider the draft Consultation Document with a view to signing it off. The work programme is still on track for PSE3 to commence in the autumn, but contingencies are also in place to deal with any delays in finalising the Consultation Document.

7. Way Forward and Actions

7.1 – Assessment of Criterion 1 – Safety, Security, Environment and Planning

Criteria 1a and 1b were accepted as having been satisfied at this stage in the process, subject to a number of considerations for the TRG to take into account in drafting the Consultation Document. A draft chapter will be prepared for consideration by the Partnership at the next meeting on 20th September.

7.2 – Assessment of Criterion 3 – Community Benefits and Impacts

It was agreed that all four criteria under this criterion would be revisited at the next Partnership meeting, following further discussion between DECC and the Partnership regarding seeking agreement on the principles for Community Benefits and commencement of the work on early mitigation and brand protection. A draft chapter of the Consultation Document based on the outcomes of these discussions and the issues raised in the meeting will be prepared for consideration by the Partnership.

7.3 – Assessment of Criterion 5 – Siting Process

This criterion will be revisited at the next Partnership meeting on 20th September 2011 following a further meeting between the principal authorities and CALC on 18th August to consider guidelines for organisational arrangements. A draft chapter of the Consultation Document and a set of recommendations based on the outcome of that meeting will be prepared for consideration by the Partnership.

7.4 – Ethics

It was provisionally agreed that enough work on ethics has been done at this stage in the process and that the ethical issues that have been raised will be covered in the draft Consultation Document.

7.5 – Overall way forward

No specific items that need further work at this stage were identified. The next meeting on 20th September will revisit Criteria 3 and 5, and will also consider the draft Consultation Document for use in PSE3. The timescales for PSE3 will be finalised following the outcomes of this meeting.

7.6 – Dates

The forward programme of confirmed meeting dates is provided below. Further details of Partnership meetings are available at <http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/meetings.asp>. *Please note that the Partnership meeting that was originally scheduled for 25th August 2011 has been cancelled and the planned agenda will now be covered at the meeting on 20th September.*

Members of the public are welcome to observe the Partnership meetings (right hand column). Please contact the Secretariat for details and registration on 0800 048 8912.

Steering Group meetings 2011:	Partnership meetings 2011:
10 August	
9 September	20 September (The Wave, Maryport)
10 October	3 November (Egremont Market Hall)
24 November	8 December (Copeland Centre, Whitehaven)

2012 dates:	2012 dates:
11 January	31 January (<i>Braithwaite Village Hall</i>)
7 February	21 February (<i>The Oval Centre, Salterbeck</i>)

7.7 – Actions. The following actions were agreed:

	Action	Who	By when
1	Consider compilation of an evidence base as part of the specification for the impacts mitigation work, including evidence to be able to assess property blight.	Community Benefits Sub-Group	25 August
2	Discuss how communities beyond West Cumbria might be included in the definition of wider community.	Judith Cooke/Paul Walker	25 August
3	Consider the suggestion for the Government to consider wider opportunities for West Cumbria in relation to community benefits.	Community Benefits Sub-Group	25 August
4	Produce a summary of the assessment processes that would happen in Stage 4 if a DtP is taken.	Elizabeth (NDA)	15 August
5	Forward meeting report and ethical review from the January 2011 Partnership meeting on ethics.	Rhuari to the LDNPA	23 August
6	Circulate draft meeting report to Partnership attendees.	Jane	8 August
7	Comment on draft meeting report.	All attendees	15 August
8	Circulate final draft of meeting report and publish on website.	Jane	22 August

8. Public Questions/Comments

8.1 – Concerns regarding early benefits and the distinction between benefits and compensation

Concerns were raised about the issue of early benefits and the pressures that these might put on a community to continue in the process. It was also noted that the benefits package was originally not going to be paid until the construction stage, and it was asked whether this has changed. The Partnership was also asked whether there is a distinction between benefits and compensation.

Community Benefits Sub-Group response

The Community Benefits Sub-Group advised that they and the principal authorities recognise that there are bound to be some pre-development impacts that need to be mitigated and/or compensated for. The community benefits principles mainly address the larger scale and additional community benefits package that would come *after* the point that construction would begin, however, it was noted that there have also been conversations about whether the larger package should come earlier. At the moment it is worded that the benefits would only come after the right of withdrawal has been lost, but it was noted that, the package would need to be signed up for before that stage.

CALC noted that they had also had concerns about this issue, and their participation in the Community Benefits Sub-Group was paused whilst they considered this with their colleagues. Subsequently CALC agreed to re-participate, but they emphasised that these issues need to be watched quite carefully to make sure that they are not misunderstood.

8.2 – Question re dealing with trust in central government and local authorities

The Partnership was asked whether the discussions about securing a community benefits package were intended to address the lack of trust in central government (as detailed in paragraph 4.4 of Document 212). It was also noted that PSE1 highlighted scepticism about whether local government will listen to people's viewpoints, and the Partnership was asked whether it is intending to carry out a similar exercise to deal with these concerns.

Partnership response

It was confirmed that the Partnership is indeed seeking assurance that central government will honour its commitments.

It was also confirmed that the Partnership does not have a specific trust-raising activity planned to deal with the scepticism about local government, but it is aiming to carry out its work in a way that is robust and has integrity. It was noted that the Partnership is not trying to persuade people of something, and that the process will allow for people to say whether they agree or disagree with the Partnership's conclusions.

It was also noted that the Partnership is seeking to agree principles for how the local authorities would work with potential host communities after a decision about participation, and it was suggested that some of these principles might address some of the concerns that have been raised. CALC noted that they share some of the concerns raised and that they are being dealt with as part of the conversations that are happening at the moment.

The member of the public reiterated his view that, in addition to dealing with the issues about trust in central government, the Partnership should be putting specific steps in place to deal with the scepticism about local government.

It was noted that the issues relating to principles for the siting process will be discussed at the next meeting.

8.3 – Involvement of local MPs

The Partnership was asked about whether local MPs had been involved in the process, and it was suggested that they should be more proactively engaged.

Partnership response

The Partnership confirmed that they contacted all of the Cumbrian MPs at the start of PSE2 and offered them briefings, and that the same would happen again at the start of PSE3 (see also 6.3.1 above).

8.4 – Concerns regarding the bigger picture being lost

It was noted that several times today and throughout the debates to date, there has been “a lot of shelving” of issues until a site is identified. It was acknowledged that this is sometimes entirely legitimate, however, concerns were expressed that as more and more detailed research is carried out, the bigger picture is being lost. It was noted that the Partnership is discussing a massive building site in West Cumbria and there is therefore going to be a massive effect no matter where it is sited, specifically in relation to tourism.

Partnership response

Cumbria Chamber of Commerce advised that this is why they and Cumbria Tourism wanted the piece of work on early impacts to be carried out, and this work also recognises the fact that the *potential* for hosting a GDF could negatively impact on tourism and the food and drink industry.

Cumbria CC also noted that they and the other authorities are fully aware of the scale and impact of the issues in West Cumbria. They are also conscious of what might occur if the waste ends up being transferred elsewhere if the process does not conclude with a GDF in West Cumbria. They acknowledged that the overwhelming majority of the impacts can only be judged when specific sites are being considered, but reiterated that, in terms of West Cumbria, the implications are understood.

9. Acronyms/Abbreviations

ABC/Allerdale BC	Allerdale Borough Council
BGS	British Geological Survey
CALC	Cumbria Association of Local Councils
CBC/Copeland BC	Copeland Borough Council
CCC/Cumbria CC	Cumbria County Council
CoRWM	Committee on Radioactive Waste Management
CSP	Community Siting Partnership
DECC	Department of Energy and Climate Change
DfT	Department for Transport
DMB	Decision Making Body
DSSC	Disposal System Safety Case
DtP	Decision to Participate
EA	Environment Agency
EoI	Expression of Interest
FAQ	Frequently Asked Questions
FoE	Friends of the Earth
GDF	Geological Disposal Facility
GDIB	Geological Disposal Implementation Board
HSE	Health & Safety Executive
ILW	Intermediate Level Waste
IPC	Infrastructure Planning Commission
LDNPA	Lake District National Park Authority
LGA	Local Government Association
LLW	Low Level Waste
LLWR	Low Level Waste Repository
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRWS	Managing Radioactive Waste Safely
NALC	National Association of Local Councils
ND	Nuclear Directorate (a department of the HSE)
NDA	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
NEA	Nuclear Energy Agency
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NII	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate (of the HSE)
NNPS	Nuclear National Policy Statement
NWAA	Nuclear Waste Advisory Associates
NWDA	North West Development Agency
NuLeAF	Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum
NWAT	Nuclear Waste Assessment Team (of the EA)
OCNS	Office for Civil Nuclear Security
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
ONR	Office for Nuclear Regulation
PSE	Public and Stakeholder Engagement
RoW	Right of Withdrawal
RWMD	Radioactive Waste Management Directorate (of the NDA)
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SLC	Site Licence Company
ToRs	Terms of Reference
UKSO	UK Safeguards Office
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
WCSF	West Cumbrian Strategic Forum
WCSP	West Cumbria Strategic Partnership
WCSSG	West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group

Appendix 1 – Agenda for the 29th July 2011 meeting

Objectives of the meeting are to:

- Form a collective view regarding the degree to which three of the criteria in the Work Programme are met:
 - Safety, Security, Environment and Planning (Criterion 1).
 - Community Benefits and Impacts (Criterion 3).
 - Siting Process (Criterion 5).
- Guide drafting and preparation of the Partnership’s consultation document for use in PSE3.

Time	Item	Agenda Notes
09.00	Arrivals / Registration	
09.30	Welcome Agenda setting Updates and actions	Richard Harris, 3KQ
	Safety, Security, Environment and Planning	- Update on Schedule of Impacts (Document 163 Appendix A) - Clarifications - Views: “Has the criterion been met?” - Discussion and preliminary decision (Document 209)
	Community Benefits and Impacts	- Clarifications - Views: “Has the criterion been met?” - Discussion and preliminary decision (Document 212)
	Public Questions	
12.45	Lunch	Approx. timing
	Siting Process	- Update from officers’ meeting - Views: “Has the criterion been met?” - Discussion and preliminary decision
	Holistic Assessment	- Conclusions across the whole Work Programme, including ethical considerations
	Way Forward and Actions	
	Public Questions	
16.00	Close	

Bold type indicates papers sent out in advance of the meeting.

Appendix 2 – Attendees on 29th July 2011

Richard Griffin	Allerdale Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
Michael Heaslip	Allerdale Borough Council	
Carni McCarron-Holmes	Allerdale Borough Council	
Ken Williams	Barrow Borough Council	
Guy Richardson	CALC	
Geoff Smith	Allerdale CALC	
Chris Shaw	Allerdale/Copeland CALC	(Steering Group member)
Keith Hitchen	Copeland CALC	(Steering Group member)
Peter Mason	Carlisle City Council	
Revd Dr Lindsay Gray	Churches Together in Cumbria	
Allan Holliday	Copeland Borough Council	
Steve Smith	Copeland Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
Paul Walker	Copeland Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
Elaine Woodburn	Copeland Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
Rob Johnston	Cumbria Chamber of Commerce	
Marie Fallon	Cumbria County Council	
Tim Knowles	Cumbria County Council	(Steering Group member)
David Southward	Cumbria County Council	
Ian Stephens	Cumbria Tourism	
Mike Tonkin	Eden District Council	
Robert Allison	Lake District National Park Authority	
Judith Cooke	Lake District National Park Authority	
Robert Morris-Eyton	National Farmers Union	
Fred Barker	NuLeAF	
Ian McPherson	South Lakeland District Council	
Simon Rowley	South Lakeland District Council	
Observing Members		
Bruce Cairns	DECC	
John Dalton	DECC	
Brian Clark	CoRWM	
John Rennilson	CoRWM	
Doug Ilett	Environment Agency	
Elizabeth Atherton	NDA RWMD	
Alun Ellis	NDA RWMD	
Mick Bacon	ONR	
Apologies		
Harry Dyke	Allerdale Borough Council	
Tim Heslop	Allerdale Borough Council	
Charles Holmes	Allerdale Borough Council	
Alan Smith	Allerdale Borough Council	(Steering Group member)
Yvonne Clarkson	Copeland Borough Council	
Ian Curwen	Copeland Borough Council	
John Kane	Copeland Borough Council	
Mark Dutton	CoRWM	
Paul Feehily	Cumbria County Council	

Gerald Humes	Cumbria County Council	
Stewart Kemp	Cumbria County Council	(Steering Group member)
Tony Markley	Cumbria County Council	
Richard Greenwood	Cumbria Tourism	
Gavin Thomson	Environment Agency	
Peter Kane	GMB/Unite Unions	(Steering Group member)
Paul McKenna	Isle of Man Government	
Marcus Swift	Prospect Union	
Clare Feeney-Johnson	South Lakeland District Council	
David Moore	West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group	

Facilitators, Secretariat and Presenters

Rhuari Bennett	3KQ (Programme Manager)
Richard Harris	3KQ (Facilitator)
Jane Dalton	3KQ (Report Writer)
Cath Little	Copeland Borough Council (Secretariat)

Other

Paul Gardner	Osprey Communications (Communications Adviser)
Stuart Smith	Wood Holmes (Partnership Evaluators)
Helen Fisher	3KQ (Consultation Document Writer)
Jenny Willis	3KQ

Members of the Public and Stakeholders who attended for all or part of the meeting

Diana Spencer	
David Wood	
Ruth Balogh	
Jean McSorley	
David Haughian	
Richard Sargent	DECC
Jay Redgrove	NDA RWMD
Mark Gough	NDA RWMD
Helena Harding	NDA RWMD
Andrew Craze	NDA RWMD

Appendix 3 – Assessment Meetings Worksheet (sent out in advance of the meeting to aid preparation)

Worksheet for Assessment Meetings

You may wish to use this worksheet to help structure your response to the **key question for each criteria**: “To what degree has this criteria been met?”

Structure of the Assessment Meetings

Each of the meetings will have a similar structure. Basically the assessment of each criterion will be done in a few simple stages:

1. In plenary, asking questions of clarification concerning the Partnership Assessment Report (PAR)
2. “Freetime” to discuss the criteria with colleagues (including Observing Members) in the room and expressing your organisations preliminary view (see below) - *this will be done on the day using a flipchart table on the wall*
3. Plenary discussion aiming to agree a partnership view on the key question – “To what degree has this criteria been met?”
4. Agree the way forward

Whose View am I Giving?

You are providing a view from your organisation's perspective, knowing its priorities and interests. We recognise that this cannot be a formal or final view of your whole organisation. These views, and the resulting consensus that we aim to build in the Partnership meetings will guide the work of the Partnership and its preliminary conclusions, to be consulted upon in PSE3.

To bring focus to the discussion at the meeting we will ask you to express your views as a:

- ✓ We believe the criteria has been met (sufficiently at this stage)
- ? There are outstanding questions we feel need to be discussed
- X We do not believe the criteria has been met (sufficiently at this stage)

Outputs

Please remember that we are aiming to reach consensus on a **preliminary Partnership view for consultation in PSE3**. We suggest you bear the following points in mind during your preparation:

- Please avoid simply preparing a hard ‘position’ in advance – think about how others will view the criteria and your views
- Come prepared to offer suggestions to overcome possible blocks to agreement that may occur, not just to repeat positions (reinforcing blocks)

	Criteria	What we are looking for	Preliminary View <i>(please circle)</i>
1	Safety, Security, Environment and Planning		
1a	Criterion: "Satisfied that suitable regulatory and planning processes are in place or being developed to protect residents, workforce and the environment"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Confidence that necessary regulatory bodies and processes exist or are being developed</i> ▪ <i>Adequate communication links between regulators and community are present and working</i> ▪ <i>Acceptability of the planning aspects of the early stages in the siting process</i> 	<p>✓ <i>We believe the criteria has been met to our satisfaction (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p> <p>? <i>There are outstanding points we feel need to be discussed</i></p> <p>✗ <i>We do not believe the criteria has been met (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p>

Comments:

	Criteria	What we are looking for	Preliminary View <i>(please circle)</i>
1	Safety, Security, Environment and Planning		
1b	Criterion: "Satisfied that NDA RWMD has suitable capability and processes in place to protect residents, workforce and the environment"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Acceptability of the NDA's process for making an environmental safety case ▪ Acceptability of the NDA's research programme ▪ Acceptability of the NDA's process for assessing geology at potential sites 	<p>✓ <i>We believe the criteria has been met to our satisfaction (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p> <p>?</p> <p><i>There are outstanding points we feel need to be discussed</i></p> <p>✗ <i>We do not believe the criteria has been met (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p>

Comments:

	Criteria	What we are looking for	Preliminary View <i>(please circle)</i>
3	Community Benefits		
3a	Criterion: "Whether the Partnership is confident that an appropriate community benefit package can be developed"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Acceptable process in place to secure additional benefits - beyond those which derive directly from the construction and operation of the facility 	<p>✓ <i>We believe the criteria has been met to our satisfaction (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p> <p>?</p> <p><i>There are outstanding points we feel need to be discussed</i></p> <p>✗ <i>We do not believe the criteria has been met (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p>

Comments:

	Criteria	What we are looking for	Preliminary View <i>(please circle)</i>
3	Community Benefits		
3b	Criterion: "Whether the Partnership is confident that appropriate possibilities exist to assess and manage environmental, social and economic impacts appropriately if they occur"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Acceptable process is in place to assess any negative impacts and mitigate them 	<p>✓ <i>We believe the criteria has been met to our satisfaction (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p> <p>? <i>There are outstanding points we feel need to be discussed</i></p> <p>✗ <i>We do not believe the criteria has been met (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p>

Comments:

	Criteria	What we are looking for	Preliminary View <i>(please circle)</i>
3	Community Benefits		
3c	Criterion: "Whether the Partnership is confident that the possibility of a repository fits appropriately with the overall direction of the relevant community/ies"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for the possibility of a repository in relation to other documented long term priorities 	<p>✓ <i>We believe the criteria has been met to our satisfaction (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p> <p>?</p> <p><i>There are outstanding points we feel need to be discussed</i></p> <p>✗ <i>We do not believe the criteria has been met (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p>

Comments:

	Criteria	What we are looking for	Preliminary View <i>(please circle)</i>
3	Community Benefits		
3d	Criterion: "Whether the Partnership is confident that accepting a GDF and committing the host area to a nuclear future for many generations to come is economically advantageous and will contribute to economic sustainability"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Satisfied that there is sufficient prospect of the development of other job-creating investments complementary to a repository that will provide sustainable employment in the long term 	<p>✓ <i>We believe the criteria has been met to our satisfaction (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p> <p>?</p> <p><i>There are outstanding points we feel need to be discussed</i></p> <p>✗ <i>We do not believe the criteria has been met (sufficiently at this stage)</i></p>

Comments:

Appendix 4 – Table of responses from assessment of criteria

	ABC	Barrow BC	CBC	CCC	CTiC	Chamber of Commerce	Eden DC	Unite/ GMB *	Cumbria Tourism	Carlisle CC	SLDC	NFU	NuLeAF **	LDNPA	Prospect *	CALC
Criterion 1a	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	Not present	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓
Criterion 1b	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	?
Criterion 3a	?	X	?	?	?	?	✓		?	?	✓	✓	?	X	✓	X
Criterion 3b	✓	✓	?	?	?	?	✓		?	✓	✓	?	?	?	✓	✓
Criterion 3c	X	?	✓	?	✓	?	✓		?	✓	✓	?	✓	?	✓	?
Criterion 3d	?	✓	✓	?	✓	?	✓		?	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	?

See Section 3 for definitions of the responses.

* Unite/GMB and Prospect Union were not in attendance at the meeting but Prospect had submitted their responses to the Programme Manager in advance.

** This is an officer response from NuLeAF.

RWMD’s generic Disposal System Safety Case, Published February 2011 Interim Comments from the Regulators’ Review

1. Introduction

NDA's Radioactive Waste Management Directorate (RWMD) published a generic Disposal System Safety Case (gDSSC) [Ref ¹] early in 2011. The Environment Agency, the Office for Nuclear Regulation and the Department for Transport¹ are reviewing the gDSSC under the voluntary arrangements we have agreed with RWMD for regulatory scrutiny of its work.

Our review provides advice and comment to RWMD on matters within our regulatory remit; it does not form the basis of any regulatory decision. We are providing the following interim comments for the West Cumbria MRWS Partnership’s information. We will finalise our review and publish our detailed comments in the autumn.

2. Interim Comments

Having reviewed the gDSSC, our overall view continues to be that it is feasible that a safety case could be generated that would meet regulatory requirements, should a suitable site be identified.

We appreciate the steps RWMD has taken in issuing the 2011 gDSSC. Production of the gDSSC has been a significant exercise for RWMD and represents a very substantial commitment of resources.

We agree with RWMD’s peer reviewers [Ref ²] that the gDSSC “*has collated and integrated a considerable body of information...*” and that “*this collation and integration of information is an important and not insubstantial achievement.*”

We consider that the gDSSC provides a valuable statement of accumulated knowledge and experience, and that it may also provide a useful rehearsal for at least some aspects of how arguments might be presented in any future site-specific safety case. Thus, it should help RWMD improve the quality (i.e. fitness for the specified purpose) of documents forming part of any regulatory submissions that RWMD might make in the future. It is less successful in signposting how it might be used in future to support the site selection process and help develop any future site-specific case.

We are content with the broad structure of the gDSSC, but we consider that some individual documents tend to be too long, poorly structured, repetitive and inconsistent in level of detail. There is also much repetition between documents, and the linkages between them are often not as good as the broad structure would suggest. We think that, if RWMD puts effort into stronger editorial control in future, this will help RWMD present its work clearly and understandably to technical audiences and also to wider audiences.

We think that RWMD could usefully have described in the gDSSC the process by which RWMD will consider new information, for example, from R&D (both its own and other R&D nationally and internationally), and how it will combine this with the existing body of knowledge relating to a safety case. We suggest that RWMD should address this aspect in its future work.

Environment Agency, the Office for Nuclear Regulation and DfT, 20 July 2011

¹ The Department for Transport’s Radioactive Materials Transport Team continues to act on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport who will remain the GB Competent Authority for the transport of radioactive material until, subject to approval by Parliament, responsibility is transferred to the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change. A Parliamentary decision is expected before the end of the summer.

References

1. NDA, generic Disposal System Safety Case, December 2010.
2. Peer Review of NDA RWMD's Generic Disposal System Safety Case: Analysis of Peer Review Comment Resolution, 2010-15-1B, Version 1.1, 12 January 2011.

Appendix 6 – How Members Represent their Organisations on the Partnership

All Partnership members recognise the need to update the organisations that they represent and proactively feed their views in. This is essential to prevent Partnership members becoming 'detached' from their organisation in terms of understanding, as well as maintaining the credibility of the representative role that members commit to fulfilling. The table below sets out how each organisation undertakes to do this.

Note the gaps will be filled as reporting mechanisms are clarified.

Organisation	Nominated Representatives and preferred contact details	Mechanisms Used
Allerdale BC	<p>Alan Smith (councillor) alan.smith@alldale.gov.uk Tim Heslop (councillor) tim.heslop@alldale.gov.uk Carni McCarron-Holmes (councillor) carni.mccarron-holmes@alldale.gov.uk Michael Heaslip (councillor) michael.heaslip@alldale.gov.uk Charles Holmes charles.holmes@alldale.gov.uk Richard Griffin richard.griffin@alldale.gov.uk</p>	<p>Verbal progress report provided to the following meetings: - Corporate Management Team/ Heads of Service. - Regeneration Portfolio Holders. - Regeneration Managers Group (for further cascade). - Partnerships and Communities Directorate.</p> <p>Formal report for endorsement, or decision, would be via: - Nuclear Issues Task Group. - Executive Committee Council.</p>
Barrow BC	<p>Ken Williams (councillor) kenwilliams@barrowbc.gov.uk Phil Huck philhuck@barrowbc.gov.uk</p>	Verbal update given to Leader after each Partnership meeting.
CALC (Allerdale)	<p>Chris Shaw chris.shaw@calc.org.uk Geoff Smith (councillor) geoffandhelen@tesco.net</p>	Regular written and verbal report to CALC's Allerdale Association meetings.
CALC (Copeland)	<p>Chris Shaw chris.shaw@calc.org.uk Keith Hitchen (councillor) keith.hitchen@btinternet.com</p>	Regular written and verbal report to CALC's Copeland Association meetings.
CALC (Cumbria)	<p>Guy Richardson guy.richardson@calc.org.uk</p>	Regular written and verbal report to CALC's Executive Committee meetings.
Carlisle City Council	<p>Jason Gooding jasong@carlisle.gov.uk</p>	
Chamber of Commerce (Cumbria)	<p>Robert Johnston rob@cumbriachamber.co.uk</p>	
Churches Together in Cumbria (CTiC)	<p>Revd Dr Lindsay Gray lgray782@btinternet.com</p>	

Copeland BC	<p>Elaine Woodburn (councillor) ewoodburn@copelandbc.gov.uk Allan Holliday (councillor) allan.holliday@copeland.gov.uk John Kane (councillor) john.kane@copeland.gov.uk Yvonne Clarkson (councillor) yvonne.clarkson@copeland.gov.uk Paul Walker paul.walker@copeland.gov.uk Steve Smith steve.smith@copeland.gov.uk Ian Curwen ian.curwen@copeland.gov.uk</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leader's update to full Council. - Update to Nuclear Working Group. - Update to Executive at key milestones. - Update to MRWS Task Group when needed.
Cumbria County Council	<p>Tim Knowles (councillor) timothy.knowles@cumbriacc.gov.uk Tony Markley (councillor) anthony.markley@cumbriacc.gov.uk David Southward (councillor) david.southward@virgin.net Gerald Humes (councillor) gerald.humes@cumbriacc.gov.uk Paul Feehily paul.feehily@cumbriacc.gov.uk Stewart Kemp stewart.kemp@cumbriacc.gov.uk</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 6-weekly written report to Nuclear Issues Working Group (NIWG). - Quarterly report to Cabinet. - Monthly report to Nuclear Issues Programme Board. - Possible insert in weekly briefing to all staff. - Link to Partnership website. - Attending Allerdale and Copeland Local Area Committees on request.
Cumbria Tourism	<p>Richard Greenwood rgreenwood@cumbriatourism.org</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep the rest of the organisation and the wider membership of CT informed. - Updates to Senior Management Team (as and when relevant). - Reports to the Executive Board and, where necessary, formal endorsement of CT's position on any decisions which need to be taken. - Email and Viewpoint (quarterly magazine to all members). - Presentation from the Partnership at a Commercial Members Meeting.
Eden District Council	<p>Mike Tonkin (councillor) mike.tonkin@eden.gov.uk</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to members on 'Outside Bodies' website. - Presentation to members as Environment Portfolio Holder.
GMB/Unite Unions	<p>Peter Kane peter.kane@sellafieldsites.com</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updates given to Shop Stewards Committee. - Forward on newsletters to members.
Lake District National Park Authority	<p>Robert Allison robert.allison@lakedistrict.gov.uk Judith Cooke judith.cooke@lakedistrict.gov.uk</p>	
National Farmers Union	<p>Robert Morris-Eyton rmorriseyt@aol.com</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Link to Partnership website and Robert's contact details placed on NFU website. - 2 principal officers that cover West Cumbria updated that the process is happening and to forward any queries to Robert.

NuLeAF	Fred Barker fred.barker@nuleaf.org.uk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Written report to each NuLeAF Steering Group. - Referenced in e-bulletin. - Website has a GDF section which signposts Partnership meeting reports.
Prospect Union	Marcus Swift mjs17@sellafieldsites.com	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make the Partnership an agenda item at Sellafield Site Representatives Meetings, and either the General Purposes Committee or Branch Executive Council. - Send all appropriate papers to Prospect members in the Sellafield Limited Branch. - Collate questions, comments, points and general feedback. - Provide reports to Prospect's national SET Committee.
South Lakeland District Council	Simon Rowley s.rowley@southlakeland.gov.uk Clare Feeney-Johnson c.feeneyjohnson@southlakeland.gov.uk	Forward minutes and newsletters to Senior Management Team and Portfolio Holder.
Observing Members:		
CoRWM	Brian Clark briandclark@btinternet.com Mark Dutton lizmark@lizmark1.co.uk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Verbal update to all plenary meetings. - Circulate key papers to Committee. - Insert in e-bulletin as appropriate.
DECC	Bruce Cairns bruce.cairns@decc.gsi.gov.uk John Dalton john.dalton@decc.gsi.gov.uk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to various meetings and colleagues with an interest in the process. - Advise Ministers who take Government decisions in this area.
Environment Agency	Gavin Thomson gavin.thomson@environment-agency.gov.uk	Report key points arising to various colleagues in nuclear regulation and NW region.
Isle of Man Government	Paul McKenna paul.mckenna@gov.im	Presentation on geological disposal given to Council of Ministers in 2009. Regular updates/scientific advice to Isle of Man Government.
Nuclear Decommissioning Authority	Alun Ellis alun.ellis@nda.gov.uk Jay Redgrove jay.redgrove@nda.gov.uk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monthly reporting to RWMD and central communications staff. - Dissemination of Partnership minutes and Meeting Reports to staff.
Office for Nuclear Regulation	Mick Bacon mick.bacon@hse.gsi.gov.uk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contact reports distributed after each contact (meeting or otherwise). - Regular report to related project groups. - Briefings taken before each meeting depending on agenda.
West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group	David Moore dmoore@copelandbc.gov.uk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quarterly verbal updates to SSG. - Paragraph in quarterly newsletter. - Link on website to Partnership site.