

Day 1

Introduction – Jo Fisher

Jo outlined the purpose of the day and the objectives of the meeting. She also gave an update on recent events, areas of progress and ongoing waste treatment initiatives, noting activities at the NDA, LLWR, SLCs and non-NDA sites.

Questions:

Dave Weatherburn (NDA) – raised the issue that it is important that the LLW Strategy Group membership is given the opportunity to provide feedback on how the meetings are going.

This point was noted and feedback opportunities will be highlighted. At the current time, we are very happy to receive any informal feedback outside of the meetings as well as at the meetings themselves.

Alan Jackson (NDA) – asked whether SLCs will need to go through a BPEO process in order to use the new treatment services at LLWR?

The intention is that this will not be the case, especially if previous work will enable this by being referenced to, for example the use of the NDA national study on metal treatment. This is currently referenced in applications for transfer of metal for treatment.

Bav Thacker (Capenhurst) – noted that Capenhurst is assessing Sellafield BPEOs to undertake a gap analysis. Where possible, they will use justification as provided by the Sellafield work and then do additional work where required.

Topical Strategy Consultation Feedback – David Rossiter

David provided an outline of the responses to the Topical Strategies document, circulated after the first LLW Strategy Group, noting that there were 13 responses received, which equates to over 300 separate comments. Consequently, the summary provided would not necessarily pick up every individual comment; however, all were being taken into consideration. The responses included answers to specific questions and general comments and were from a wide range of organisations including consignors (NDA and non-NDA); Regulators; NDA; and Government and Local Authorities.

Questions:

Ollie Okeke (NII) – queried what “new facilities” were being referred to in the response to question 5 (“Do you agree with the application of the waste hierarchy?”), the point from the presentation slide being “Inappropriate to impose facilities on unwilling communities”.

The response was non-specific but was taken to mean new disposal or waste treatment facilities. Bav Thacker also noted that all new facilities should have a consideration of the waste management hierarchy in their design and implementation.

Ollie Okeke (NII) – queried what was meant by “central” in the response to question 13 (“Do you agree with the proposed approach of segregation at (or near) source or do you prefer an alternative?”), the point from the presentation slide being “Generally near-source was preferable; however some central processing might be appropriate – ‘no one-size fits all’”.

David noted that the exact intention of the comment was unclear; however it most likely referred to off-site treatment.

Bav Thacker (Capenhurst) – queried whether there is scope to improve or further comment on the topical strategies?

Yes, we are open to receiving further comments if people wish to give them.

Fred Plumb (MoD) – noted that there were several references to decisions using the ALARP principle, and that whilst important it can be used as an excuse to not do something.

There was a general awareness that this could be an issue, so it is important to strike a balance. It was noted that there is also a link to the BPEO process.

Fred Barker (NuLeAF) – asked whether there would be a digest of the comments?

Yes, something could be circulated if people want it. David asked if the rest of the attendees were happy with their comments being distributed. This was generally accepted, although reservations were noted with regard to the detail being posted to the web.

Clive Nixon (NDA) – asked whether this meeting would include an update on the developing LLW baseline?

This was ongoing work and therefore will be covered at the next LLW Strategy Group meeting.

Alan Jackson (NDA) – in reference to some of the feedback on treatment options, Alan queried why better packing fractions are at odds with treatment options? There is a need to maintain the drive for good packing efficiency.

David outlined that the comment related to current incentivisation on packing fraction. It may not be possible to achieve this when sending waste for treatment, and there is a need to understand how in practice use of the treatment options would be incentivised.

Alan noted that whilst small packages seem like a good idea, it is important to make sure that this does not add to the overall amount of waste being disposed of.

Fred Plumb (MoD) – Segregation of waste is important and needs to happen. LLWR should be driving this by providing the necessary infrastructure.

David noted that the economies of scale provided by looking at the whole inventory of LLW rather than just individual sites should drive the move to treatment forward. Bav Thacker noted that it is important that we do not second guess the strategy, whilst making efforts to move forward.

Steve Walters (Magnox South) – noted that the Topical Strategies report and other discussions appear to focus on volume reduction. It is not clear what radiological impacts there will be on LLWR as a result.

David noted that the work on the Post Closure Safety case is ongoing and does need to be factored in as we move forward. Jo noted that to date the annual radiological capacity is at most only a quarter met. Andrew Fairhurst (Environment Agency) noted that the Environment Agency are currently reviewing the recent submission from LLWR and noted that concentration of radionuclides is as important (if not more so) for certain impact scenarios than the overall radiological capacity of the site."

Richard Evans (Cumbria County Council) – queried where the 750000m3 capacity figure that is used in discussions about LLWR is derived from and whether this be addressed at the next meeting?

Jo responded that we have provided the information before and can re-submit the information to CCC. ACTION: Joanne Fisher

NDA LLW Strategy Group Terms of Reference – Tim Hedahl

Tim summarised the comments received in response to the Terms of Reference, circulated after the first LLW Strategy Group meeting. Some of the general points raised included, modify name of group to UK LLW Strategy Group, emphasise openness and transparency, disseminating information and good

DRAFT

practices, flexibility for membership, increasing quorum minimum and acknowledgment of regulator independence in LLW Strategy Group recommendations.

There was a general discussion around the use of the word National in the name of the group and whether this should be UK-wide. The issue stemmed from a reference in the previous meeting to the UK solid LLW policy as belonging to Defra, whereas in fact the devolved administrations in addition to Defra jointly own the policy. It was agreed that the name of the group will remain "National" but there will be explicit references in the ToR and the strategy to it having UK-wide coverage.

Questions:

Bav Thacker (Capenhurst) – Requested that the acronym "LSG" no longer be used as it has other uses elsewhere.

We will remove the acronym from formal usage.

Ollie Okeke (NII) – reiterated the point with respect to regulator independence and also raised concern that the Chairperson of the Group has a final say on any decisions.

Jo outlined that the LLW Strategy Group exists to influence the strategy, but may not always represent everyone's opinions and that there is a need to pick up these other points. However, at the end of the day, the NDA own the strategy and will have to take the responsibility for making final decisions. (It is worth noting that this situation will make it easier for the regulators and other members to retain their independence). Jo also noted that the Terms of Reference will be published to the internet when completed and there remains an important job for finalising the membership, which will be undertaken between now and the next meeting.

Steve Walters (Magnar South) – Asked whether the Group will be able to facilitate some short-term wins across the industry and/or SLCs?

Carried over to the Good Practice Session on Day 2.

ACTION: Terms of Reference to be finalised 18 July 2008

LLW Management in Scotland – Jim Cochrane (SEPA)

Jim provided an overview of SEPA's remit in the management of LLW in Scotland including a focus on the regulation of LLW at nuclear licensed sites in Scotland, a look at any differences in EA/SEPA regulatory approach, application of the waste hierarchy in Scotland and some issues for non-nuclear sites.

Key points made included the following:

- SEPA comments on the Dounreay LLW facility planning application have been posted to the SEPA website.
- SEPA's Waste Sector Plan includes all aspects of waste management apart from nuclear waste and therefore presents an opportunity for the future.
- Importance of remembering other waste management activities at site, for example non-radiological hazardous wastes.
- A workshop will be led by environmental regulators on the 3 July in Edinburgh to look at the revision of the Guidance on Requirements for Authorisation for Near-Surface Disposal Facilities for radioactive wastes.
- SEPA are fully signed up to Government's policy for the management of LLW and will support the NDA in making the LLW Strategy Group work, support implementation of the policy and be proportionate in approach, whilst maintaining regulatory independence.
- Jim raised the issue of legacy LLW (waste that has already been consigned); whilst not strictly in the spirit of the policy, perhaps there is an opportunity to have another look at the issue.
- Incentivisation for applying the waste management hierarchy will be critical to making progress.

DRAFT

- Ensure that environmental agencies are engaged early.
- A clear framework for clearance and exemption, including specifics, a qualitative as well and quantitative approach, building on the work of the IAEA is a SEPA desire; Jim asked if other people want this as well?

Fred Plumb (MoD) – noted that finance is critical to the decisions that are made, for example in decommissioning of nuclear submarines radioactive waste is accounted for whilst asbestos and PCBs (Polychlorinated biphenyls) are not accounted for.

Jim noted that integrated waste management is the intended approach, if you want to separate management of radioactive and no-radioactive wastes then do so and clearly say why.

Jo put this in the context of the NDA's wastes management strategies. Feedback was received at the National Stakeholder Group that we should use the waste management hierarchy to structure our strategies, for example, having a strategy for waste prevention across the piece (high activity, low activity and non-radioactive wastes etc), then have a strategy for waste minimisation etc. Jo asked what the group thought of this proposal.

Ollie Okeke (NII) – said that he felt that there were pros and cons to both approaches. However, it is important to focus on the people who are going to implement the strategy. They generally are given topic responsibilities, for example LLW, ILW etc and it is critical that they are able to find the strategic direction they need. If they have to trawl multiple documents looking for the sections that relate to their work, it jeopardises the strategy.

Laurence Cook (Sellafield) – noted that the nuclear Industry Code of Practice for Clearance and Exemption is one of the most useful guidance documents available in the area at the present time. However, the policy now means that its scope is somewhat limited. As such it would be good to make the use of this group in the future for development of more guidance to fill the gap between the policy and implementation.

Jim agreed and noted that Safegrounds and SD:Spur also provide useful work, but there is a concern that it just isn't getting used. Bav Thacker queried why the regulators do not enforce the use of such guidance on sites? Jim advised that, in addition to the wish for regulators to maintain their independence, the Environment Act does not allow the environmental regulators to do so. Dave Rossiter noted that there is a need for this group to consider if and how it should provide focus and direction to the other working groups out there. There is a need to ensure that they are looking at the right issues and that they produce effective and useable guidance.

Strategy development update and Strategic Environmental Assessment – Matthew Clark and Andrew Craze (NDA)

Matthew gave a brief reminder of the overview of the strategy development process, an update on progress with developing a LLW baseline and a reminder of some of the other activities ongoing in developing the strategy.

Ollie Okeke (NII) – queried how the NDA ensures that the sites Integrated Waste Strategies (IWS) are correct. There was some discussion around this process noting that a number of reviews are undertaken during development of the IWSs. The IWSs include assumptions, exclusions and action plans and therefore the scope of them is well understood.

Andrew provided an introduction to Strategic Environmental Assessment, why it relates to the NDA strategy and the LLW strategy and an overview of our approach to delivering the requirements of the Directive. It was noted that there are a number of Strategic Environmental Assessments going on in radioactive waste policy and there is a need to ensure that we make the most of any opportunities to follow similar approaches and that we understand the reasons behind different approach where they exist.

DRAFT

Steve Walters (Magnar South) / Olli Okeke (NII) – queried how the process differed from Environment Impact Assessments for Decommissioning Regulations. Are we at risk of duplicating work? Andrew noted that they are similar, but that the SEA will be at a higher more strategic level, not at the site / project level.

Question and Answer session - All

A general discussion was undertaken to look at the alternative treatment services being developed at LLWR. Jim Cochrane asked whether the group could see what was in the Expressions of Interest and the responses. Joanne Fisher advised that this could be covered in general terms, however, because of procurement rules the detail could not be covered in anyway. Jo asked Chuck Conway (LLWR) to provide an update on progress in this area.

Chuck Conway (LLWR) – with respect to the metals treatment service, LLWR put out an Expression of Interest for a complete service including management and treatment of the waste but also including full permitting and compliance activities

Laurence Cook (Sellafield) – noted that Sellafield have a metal decontamination facility. There is in theory a possibility for using this facility for wastes from elsewhere.

Bav Thacker (Capenhurst) – queried where Capenhurst fit into the process. The site has aspirations to provide treatment services, but they are not yet in a position to respond to this kind of opportunity. Bav queried whether this process was about “finding out what is out there”?

Jo indicated that the purpose was to get things moving with the supply chain and try to deliver, where appropriate, some quick-wins. In the longer term, there is a need to develop a wider number of options. Tim Hedahl (LLWR) also noted that the process was part of working towards choices for the consignors. In the long term, there should be scope for various routes and levels of involvement for consignors and LLWR.

Richard Evans (Cumbria County Council) – queried whether the IWS documents tell us what facilities are needed?

Jo responded that this was not yet the case. They do record opportunities and where these exist there is an opportunity for the sites to flag them up and / or develop further with the consignor support organisation.

John Smith (Dounreay Sites Restoration Ltd) – queried whether there are any restrictions on Dounreay using these new services?

Jo indicated that it should not be a problem so long as the appropriate routes are available and it meets regulatory approval. There may be an opportunity to develop direct routes to treatment through LLWR.

Tim Hedahl (LLWR) – there is a need for assessment of what facilities are out there on the sites and whether there are any opportunities for use of those facilities for multi-site purposes.

Fred Plumb (MoD) – noted that work had been undertaken in 2002 looking at the availability of site assets. Jo noted that there is a significant job to be done in gathering this kind of information, but we need to ensure that we are making the best use of everyone’s time. It’s likely that we will cover such topics in more detail at the next meeting.

Ollie Okeke (NII) – noted that there is a need to understand the issues around regulation, in particular with reference to waste storage.

Tim Hedahl noted that in particular there is an emerging issue around VLLW. Ollie agreed that there was a need to progress this issue of licensing at VLLW receiving sites and provide some clarity. **ACTION - next meeting to discuss the issue in further detail.**

DRAFT

Alan Jackson (NDA) - noted that there is a need to work closely with Sellafield on these issues because they hold a large amount of the waste.

Laurence Cook (Sellafield) – noted that the Sellafield LLW strategy should be in place by the end of the year and there may be an opportunity for the LLW Strategy Group to review early drafts in detail. There was some discussion around the compatibility of the IWS with the Sellafield LLW Strategy. Whilst some opportunities are in the baseline, there is a need to understand further potential for cost savings and also the strategic fit of these options before they are carried forward.

Fred Plumb (MoD) – queried whether there is scope to use lightly-contaminated material in new build?

It is important to note that such options are there, but we also need to understand how they fit into the overall national picture and whether there is a desire to make the most of them.

Richard Evans (Cumbria County Council) – queried the length of consultation for the Strategic Environmental Assessment scoping report of five weeks.

Andrew Craze (NDA) – 5 weeks is the statutory requirement and we will consider other options.

Jim Cochrane (SEPA) – asked whether the incineration service LLWR is looking into indicates where the waste will be treated. This has significant implications for public perception.

Jo advised the group of work on public perception being undertaken as part of the non-nuclear industry strategy.

Bav Thacker (Capenhurst) – How should VLLW be sent to LLWR when the Conditions for Acceptance would indicate that it is not compliant?

VLLW to LLWR is an option, but we do need to develop the alternatives. Steve Walters (Magnox South) noted that local stakeholder were generally positive on the proximity principle for onsite disposal and also for VLLW disposal to local landfills.

Facilitated discussions - All

The afternoon comprised four facilitated workshops looking at specific issues:

- Session 1: Success Factors
- Session 2: Options & Opportunities
- Session 3: Research & Development
- Session 4: LSG Sub-committees

Feedback from the sessions was provided on Day 2 (see below).

Day 1 wash up - All

Ollie Okeke (NII) – Andrew had asked in what way we can raise issues with the NII and Regulators and Ollie offered to be a conduit for issues raised at the LLW Strategy Group and would endeavour to return to the group with preferred positions.

Jo added that we had an action to meet to discuss regulatory issues around the disposal of VLLW. Bav Thacker noted that we need a regulatory framework that enables innovative strategy to be developed. Clive Nixon (NDA) advised that there is to be a meeting on 14th July to look at these kinds of issues. Andrew Craze noted that there are a number of groups for this kind of discussion and there may be a need to rationalise them to make them more effective. Jo questioned whether this issue had wider application and whether there is a need to develop a network of people that need to be influenced to make LLW strategy work? Paul Meddings

DRAFT

(British Energy) advised that this network is already in place at British Energy. **ACTION – members to provide a network map and also some indication of timescales for influencing.**

Laurence Cook (Sellafield) – reminded the group that strategy becomes an academic exercise if there is no funding to implement it. Could the group cover incentivisation and processes for identifying savings at the next meeting? Current situation is that any savings made are diverted away to high hazard rather than reinvested in making further savings against waste management.

Jo advised that spend to save activities will need to be justified in a business case.

ACTION: Identify ideas for incentivisation or “ring-fencing” funding from LLW innovation savings

Shaun Gorman (Cumbria County Council) – felt that there is a policy vacuum with respect to how LLW strategy fits with planning guidance, in particular the timeliness of the strategy to inform planning policy frameworks.

Jo replied that it was necessary to make sure that planning framework consultations were in our communications strategy, in many cases sites already speak to their local authorities. There is a need to establish exactly what support is needed. Richard Evans expressed the view that Regional bodies are not kept informed of developments and that there is a need to involve the Department of Communities and Local Government who are responsible for planning. It was noted that there is a need to ensure that this area is effectively engaged so that there is clear guidance to planning authorities in the future.

Day 2

LLW Strategy Group Update: Magnox South – Steve Walters

Steve provided the group with an overview of Magnox South’s operations with respect to waste management and described some key projects such as, on-site disposal of LLW at Hinkley Point, VLLW disposal opportunities, metal melt trials and FED dissolution projects.

Dave Weatherburn (NDA) - asked if the LTP for Hinkley Point had provision for coastal defences?

No, and the on-site disposal is not covered either. At the present time, it is an option and work to date is part of a “path finder “ project.

Dave Weatherburn (NDA) – queried whether there were expectations of community benefit associated to the project?

Steve advised that there was and without it there is probably a 50/50 chance that the project would be accepted. Jo reiterated the point that the community benefit package for LLWR is an exceptional case given the national role of the facility. The NDA is in no position to negotiate for community benefit packages for other developments (except the Geological Disposal Facility), and in particular for site specific projects.

Other issues were raised around disposal of asbestos, sparking a discussion about the use of alternative thermal destruction techniques. At the present time, such approaches are considered by sites to be too expensive and also not necessary for LLW. However, there may be a need to have a look from a national point of view.

Steve gave further information on the metal melting trials. To date 78 Te of metal from Hinkley has been recycled into shield blocks, which are used in Japan. The waste has tended to be higher-end LLW and some ILW. Steve noted that there are many more opportunities, for example boiler from sites. However, they tend not have high enough SED scores to be made an early priority. Bav Thacker queried how

DRAFT

sustainable the market would be? Steve advised that it should be until 2012, but there are certain constraints around material quality.

Martin Robb (NDA) – advised the group of developments at Springfields where they are investigating on site disposal due to pressure on Clifton Marsh to close. They have based their approach on a site in the USA and have flown over the stakeholder group from there to meet with the Springfields site stakeholder group. This had had benefits in sharing the experience of on-site disposal and providing a level of comfort to local stakeholders.

Feedback on facilitated discussions – Matthew Clark, David Rossiter, Nic Solente and Chuck Conway

Matthew summarised the outputs of the breakout session on success factors for the LLW strategy the previous day. The outputs were grouped by the number of sessions at which they had arisen. The most popular outputs are shown below, although this does not include all of the issues raised:

Resounding agreement (4 groups)

- Stakeholder buy-in (incl. socio economic impacts)
- Overall reduction in cost of LLW management
- Positive impacts on other activities and programmes

Nearly resounding agreement (3 groups)

- Implementable and flexible

Ollie Okeke (NII) – reminded Matthew of one of the success factors that all parties involved in the management of LLW should gain some benefit, but this was not captured in the slides. It may be beneficial to capture these in plain English to help communicate to the wider public.

Clive Nixon (NDA) – informed the group of some work that had been undertaken on public perception using virtual stakeholder groups (e.g. assessing what a real group of stakeholders would think of an issue before engaging with them). Clive also made the point that it would be important to understand how you would know if you had met the success factors, ensuring that they were ‘smart’.

Dave Weatherburn (NDA) – proposed that the success factors should be captured at the front of the strategy.

Richard Evans (Cumbria County Council) – Queried whether the intention was to prioritise the success factors?

Matthew suggested that this was not really necessary and also cannot be achieved particularly effectively, because different people would prioritise them in different ways.

Steve Walters (Magnar South) – Suggested it would be useful to map out an action plan to meet the success factors and separate them out into those that are achieved in implementation of a good strategy development process and actual outputs.

Jim Cochrane (SEPA) – Agreed that these should be captured and used as a benchmark to take forward.

Amanda MacMillan (NIA) – Advised that each year the NIA carry out MORI polls on public perception of nuclear issues. Often waste is seen as a separate issue from the rest of the industry. Amanda offered that there is an opportunity to use this work in the future to inform work on LLW strategy. The information is published as a synopsis including graphs and demographics. **ACTION: Amanda to discuss opportunities further with Richard Flynn (NDA ~ Communications).**

DRAFT

David summarised the outputs of the session on Options and Opportunities studies from the previous day. The output was grouped into the following categories:

- Process – what should the process look like
- Outcomes – what it should deliver
- Regulatory aspects/issues to take into account
- Engagement requirements of the process
- Funding the outcome and demonstrating value
- Market and supply chain
- Priority issues/topics
- Actual options to consider

And then indicated what would happen with the outputs, as follows:

- Digest the comments more thoroughly
- Develop the optioneering methodology/process further
- Consider the linkages with other LLW work streams
- Develop the scope and prioritisation of studies further
- Develop programme and engagement aspects further
- Start solving your problems

Chuck Conway (LLWR) – Asked whether there had been a discussion on what order the detail should be undertaken in – for example VLLW first?

It was indicated that this had not happened to any level of detail, although Dave Weatherburn indicated that it was important to ensure that the big issues that would make significant impacts in the short term be tackled first.

Jo Fisher (NDA) – queried whether there had been any discussion on the depth and breadth of work that had been undertaken to date.

There was some discussion around the usefulness of a register of BPEOs and option studies that led to the following actions:

ACTION: template for register to be distributed with the membership

ACTION: members to respond with a rough first attempt at completing the template with key documents within 2 weeks. (Later this expanded to include examples of good practice and picked up earlier discussions around treatment, storage, and disposal assets).

Martin Robb (NDA) – described the NDA Asset Transfer Scheme and indicated the levels of savings already being made (on the order of £1m off the LTP). The database is to be expanded to include operational facilities and operational windows, and there may be an opportunity to expand it to include information like that being discussed. The scheme is also looking to extend to British Energy and MoD.

Nic presented the outputs of the sessions on Research and Development from the previous day. There was a strong focus on ensuring that R&D work should identify and share available technologies & good practices, involve supply chain and identify gaps & barriers preventing or limiting application. Some areas of research need were identified and these will be carried forward into the evolving R&D programme. There was some discussion around there already being lots of information and knowledge out there.

Chuck Conway (LLWR) – described the outputs of the previous day's sessions on subgroups and existing work groups. Some of the ideas put forward for subgroups include the following:

- Inventory, Waste Tracking, Forecast

DRAFT

- CFA – linkage to PCSC
- Strategic Review
- Incentivisation
- Event Log
- Stakeholder Relations
- Linkage to Commercial Waste Industry

A large number of existing groups were also identified. A general discussion took place on the availability of information that is already out there. One key point was that there is a need to ensure good internal communication at the NDA because the Site Programme Managers and Strategy and Engineering Managers hold so much information on good practice and it would be useful to feed this into the subgroups. In particular the monthly dashboards would be very useful.

Capturing Good Practices – Tim Hedahl / Jo Fisher

This session was a general discussion on the capturing and dissemination of good practices.

Ollie Okeke (NII) – pointed out there needs to be some consideration of what merits “good Practice” as things that work at one site will not necessarily be appropriate for other sites. Maybe there is a need for a subgroup to look at this issue?

Jason Dean (LLWR (Nexia Solutions)) – Queried whether there are commercial issues around the sharing of good practice, in particular for the sites.

Paul Meddings (British Energy) – suggested that an alternative approach would be to capture all experience and then let other sites decide whether or not it is useful to them. Later John Smith (Dounreay) proposed that an alternative approach would be for a forum on which sites could post their issues and challenges and then other sites who have addressed them already can offer advice.

Nic Solente (LLWR) – in response to a brief discussion around the difference between “good practice” and “best practice” being demonstrated by how much practices were picked up by other sites, not determined by a committee.

A number of other issues were briefly covered including the EARWG database (<http://www.rwbestpractice.co.uk/>).

Bav Thacker (Capenhurst) - Whether this was about sharing information or was intending to go further and develop industry standards?

Joanne replied that certainly at the present time it was about sharing of information that is already out there, which was, in general, supported. There was also support for doing something through the LLW Strategy Group meetings, noting that there needs to be a focus on the “what” the LLW Strategy Group is about. It was also suggested that site visits could be a useful forum for disseminating this kind of information.

Next Steps – Tim Hedahl / Jo Fisher

The meeting closed with feedback on the meeting. In general it was felt that the meetings were moving in the right direction, with the introduction of the workshop sessions, although more time to discuss details was requested. Some attendees would have preferred more information in advance while others were pleased to not have advance information. Dave Weatherburn also suggested that more visibility of the “projectisation” of LLW strategy development would be of use. Timing and locations of future meetings were also discussed and a request for a more detailed programme was also requested.

DRAFT

Tim also ran through the actions from the meeting:

- Confirm Agreement on LSG Terms of Reference by 18th July
- LSG members map site LLW contacts for implementation
- Identify ideas for incentivisation or “ring-fencing” funding from LLW innovation savings
- Request for information to develop national registers
 - Waste processing assets
 - Option / BPEO studies / R&D studies
 - Good practices

The LLWR website (www.llwrsite.com) will be updated with presentations from this meeting within one-week.

DRAFT

LLW Strategy Group Action List

Date	Task	Who?	When?	Completed?
17 April 08	Review Topical Strategies and provide comments.	All	16 May 2008	Complete
17 April 08	Provide feedback on LSG ToR.	All	16 May 2008	Complete
17 April 08	Provide response to plan for LLW Strategic Review.	All	30 May 2008	Complete
17 April 08	Provide any other feedback on overall NDA LLW Programme.	All	30 May 2008	Complete
20 June 08	Provision of information to Cumbria County Council with respect to the 750000m ³ capacity figure for LLWR.	JF	Timescale not agreed	Open
20 June 08	Terms of Reference to be finalised.	TH	18 July 2008	Complete
20 June 08	LLW Strategy Group members map site LLW contacts for LLW strategy implementation.	All	Timescale not agreed	Open
20 June 08	Identify ideas for incentivisation or “ring-fencing” funding from LLW innovation savings – propose that this is carried forward to next LLW Strategy Group meeting and we include session on the topic?	All	Timescale not agreed	Open
20 June 08	Template for information register to be distributed to the membership.	TH / MC	27 June 2008	Complete
20 June 08	Members to respond with a rough first attempt at completing the template with key documents within 2 weeks. (Later this expanded to include examples of good practice and picked up earlier discussions around treatment, storage, and disposal assets).	Waste consignors and LLWR	4 July 08	Open – partially completed

DRAFT