

## **NATIONAL STAKEHOLDER GROUP MEETING 11: MEETING REPORT** **Document Reference NSG109**

The eleventh meeting of the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority's (NDA's) National Stakeholder Group (NSG) took place on 21-22 September 2010, at the Lowry Hotel in Manchester. More than 100 stakeholders, from all sectors, participated in the meeting.

The specific objectives of the meeting were: to discuss, at high level, the content of the NDA's Strategy consultation document; to discuss NDA and SLC targets and performance for 2010/11; to discuss developments in the NDA's internal and external environment; to conclude the review process and provide clear direction for future stakeholder engagement.

The main sessions from the event are listed below, along with a summary of the discussions that took place.

### **DAY ONE: 21 SEPTEMBER 2010**

#### **CEO Update**

The meeting began with an update from the NDA's Chief Executive, Tony Fountain, which covered the following issues:

- The NSG: the eleventh NSG nearly did not take place and it was only after some tough negotiations with Government that the NDA received approval for the event. Several changes had to be made, most notably the absence of The Environment Council (TEC) facilitation team.
- Changes at the NDA: the NDA was in the middle of a change programme, to take the organisation to around two-thirds of its current size (approx. 300 staff down to 200) and to create the right organisational structure to do the job. The new slimmer NDA would focus on strategy, planning, contracting, designing incentives structures, and holding our SLCs to account. Tony paid tribute to Richard Waite (Executive Director for Delivery) and Bob Churchill (Head of Socio-Economics and Corporate Social Responsibility) who had recently left the NDA and to Randall Bargelt (Programme Director for Dounreay) who was due to leave in the near future. He also welcomed David Batters who would be joining the NDA from BAE in the middle of October to take up the role of Chief Financial Officer and Mark Lesinski who would be joining the NDA from Magnox South as the new Executive Director for Delivery. Finally, Tony thanked Andrew Oldham and Alan Moore who had been filling these roles on an interim basis.
- Changes in Government: clearly, there has been a change of Government since the last NSG and the NDA is right in the middle of the coalition with a Liberal Democrat Secretary of State and two Conservative Ministers. NDA had been working with the Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) and the Shareholder Executive on the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) bid and Government was expected to make an announcement on future funding on, or around, 22 October.

- Other Updates:
  - At Sellafield, efficiencies needed to be achieved, to demonstrate that West Cumbria is an attractive place to invest in. At the Sellafield Mox Plant, the European campaigns were complete, and efforts were now focussed on gearing up for the Japanese campaign. Work was continuing around the legacy ponds and silos, and it was noted that it was a challenging task to develop credible plans around these facilities.
  - At Magnox – the two Site Licence Companies (SLCs) (North & South) were being combined into one. Electricity generation was going well, with an extension in place for Oldbury and work ongoing to secure an extension for Wylfa. At Chapelcross, a major programme to remove asbestos was underway, with around 57,000 bags already removed and Hinkley Point was demonstrating leadership in clearing out skips. The Magnox Operating Plan had slipped slightly, but both the NDA and Magnox were working hard to bring it back on track.
  - Vault 9 at the Low Level Waste Repository was now open and the NDA had published its Low Level Waste (LLW) Strategy.

### **Q&A Session with NDA Executive**

- Q. Is the Secretary of State supportive of the work being undertaken by NDA, and is the level of funding available through CSR going to be affected by his views?
- A. The Secretary of State was very supportive of the NDA, and has been right behind the proposals developed. He feels he is in a position of special responsibility, and that it was morally wrong for the nuclear agenda to have been neglected for some time by previous governments.
- Q. Why was the NDA formed in the first place if the responsibility is now being given back to the SLCs?
- A. Organisations grow. As a start-up organisation, the NDA was recruiting, building a structure, and growing. It is now time to take a step back and consider what the NDA does, what does it need to look like, etc. NDA is leading the industry by reviewing its organisational structure and business practices. A different model could be employed around the SLCs, but NDA believes that it is employing the right one – to employ the world's best companies to complete the technical tasks.
- Q. We understand the Business Model of contracting out the management of the sites etc., but want to be clear on who is accountable, both to the local community and to stakeholders more widely?
- A. The NDA is the owner on behalf of government, and it is up to us to give confidence that sites are being run well. The NDA was set up because this confidence and reassurance was not there and we need to ensure that we effectively manage those who deliver the work programme.
- Q. How does NDA know that the right 30% of its workforce will go?
- A. A rigorous selection process has been applied, after designing an appropriate organisational structure. The new structure will provide a smaller organisation with capable, motivated staff.

- Q. There is concern that the government, namely Francis Maude, would have cancelled the NSG event. Is this a reflection of Government's attitude towards stakeholder engagement?
- A. This is a demonstration of the rigours of the current climate. The intent is to demonstrate value for money. The need for stakeholder engagement is recognised, but it needs to be carried out in a more efficient and appropriate way.
- Q. The public perception is that the NDA seems to be encouraging private landfill companies to get involved in the disposal of waste and this is all about reducing costs, rather than what is best practice. What advice is NDA giving to government on the matter?
- A. The LLW Strategy that has recently been published proposes a balanced approach to risks and hazards. This is not about sending LLW to landfill sites, but about adopting the right approach for the different types of waste. A representative from the Environment Agency (EA) added that the EA has a statutory function in determining applications for disposal. Interest in such a contentious issue was recognised and consultation and engagement would be sought where appropriate.
- Q. I have looked at the draft Strategy and am confused when I look at the dates for the Magnox sites to enter care and maintenance. Hinkley Point A closed in 2000, but is behind other sites (e.g. Chapelcross) that closed more recently. As the Hinkley Point Site Stakeholder Group (SSG) Chair, how should I explain this to my stakeholders?
- A. A representative from Magnox offered to go into the detail behind this scheduling during the SLC breakout sessions later on the first day.
- Q. Who has responsibility for the management / disposal of old nuclear warheads; and what discussions are taking place around waste from new nuclear build?
- A. The old nuclear warheads do not sit within the NDA remit, and would therefore be an issue for the Ministry of Defence and Government. New nuclear build waste is also outside of NDA's remit, and it would therefore be inappropriate to comment. A representative from DECC added that the national policy statement on nuclear power (which would include information on new nuclear build waste and decommissioning) was due to be re-published later this year for further consultation.
- Q. The supply chain is being energised to look for solutions. If NDA is genuinely looking for solutions, it seems odd that 57,000 bags of Scottish asbestos are coming across the border to Sellafield?
- A. This was considered to be a comment rather than a question.

## **Presentation on NDA Draft Strategy**

Adrian Simper (NDA Director for Strategy and Technology) gave a presentation on the NDA Strategy which was currently out for consultation. Adrian focussed on the highlights in the document, as well as explaining the process by which stakeholders could submit their comments and the programme of stakeholder events the NDA was supporting throughout the consultation period. There was then an opportunity to ask questions:

- Q. Are you consulting with the British Geological Association?
- A. No specific engagement has been planned, but they are entitled to respond to the consultation.

- Q. Given the overall objective of the NDA is Site Restoration, is it not a bit odd that there is nothing in the document to explain how much land has been restored to date etc...?
- A. We did discuss this, but decided it was not appropriate information for a strategy document.
- Q. Chapelcross SSG was one of the first to receive your presentation and like most SSGs, we will put in a response. However, we were wondering whether we should wait until after the CSR settlement has been announced before doing so. Would you advise that this was the best thing to do?
- A. I would not advise either way. We have tried to de-couple the draft document from resource availability and would hope that the Strategy will not be affected by the CSR outcome. However, I understand why you might want to wait.

### **Future of NDA National Engagement**

Jon Phillips (NDA Director for Communications and Stakeholder Engagement) gave a presentation on the findings from The Environment Council led Review (published on 20 August) and the NDA's response (published on 14 September). Thanks were given to all those stakeholders who had participated in the Review, particularly those that had responded to the online questionnaire, agreed to be interviewed and / or participated in the stakeholder review panel. Jon then took questions:

- Q. Will the presentation given today be given to any other groups or at other engagement events?
- A. The review was launched at the NSG with a promise that we would come back at this meeting to outline the proposed way forward. However, both the TEC Report and the NDA response have been published and any stakeholder is free to ask questions or request further information. In addition, all NSG participants would be able to feedback to their constituents on today's discussion.
- Q. The NDA is asking for views at NSG after it has already published its response. How can stakeholders feed in to an already-published document?
- A. Stakeholders were engaged throughout the period of the review, and through the production of TEC's Report, so stakeholders have already influenced the process. The point is well made, but we made clear at the last NSG that the process was TEC would do the Review, make recommendations to the NDA and then the NDA would take a decision. In addition, as the NDA has accepted all the findings from the Review, there was nothing really to engage with stakeholders on, other than how we implement the next steps which is a discussion we were hoping to start today.
- Q. How can stakeholders convene a major meeting with the NDA when they have something to discuss with NDA? The new framework doesn't appear to support this?
- A. In fairness, the current framework does not allow this either. Issues can be raised to the NDA either directly or through SSGs. The NDA has always invited stakeholders to engage on matters, and the new framework allows a more flexible approach.

- Q. Experience at SSGs is that Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) are losing interest in decommissioning and are moving onto new nuclear build. Perhaps a separate meeting is required for NGOs?
- A. We would share the view that NGOs are focussing their efforts on new build, but that does not mean we should not try to engage with them. Ad hoc meetings have been held, but we must not forget this important stakeholder constituency.
- Q. At the last NSG, NDA started to discuss a new way forward on stakeholder engagement with stakeholders. At this meeting, a published report and way forward has been presented, but without an engagement agenda. How can the stakeholders move forward without a forward agenda?
- A. The forward agenda will come out of the NDA's business planning process, which already allows for significant stakeholder input. This approach will allow us to design engagement activity that best suits the issues concerned and move away from a twice-annual event which we fix in the diary before working out the agenda afterwards.
- Q. What is the 'capacity building' critical enabler in the presentation?
- A. Capacity building is about ensuring that the organisation has the capability to understand and deliver engagement commitments – i.e. do we have the right people with the right skills.
- Q. There is real value in the individual SSGs getting together to discuss their own problems and issues. How will this be taken forward under the new framework?
- A. We agree that there is value in the SSGs continuing to meet and in the SSG Chairs periodically coming together. This is included as one of the mechanisms we will continue to exploit going forward.
- Q. Regional meetings may be an option and it would be useful to have a 12 month engagement agenda to comment on.
- A. Views are welcome from stakeholders on the issues they would like to be engaged on going forward, but it would be presumptuous of NDA to put such an agenda together at this stage, particularly before our CSR settlement is known.
- Q. The 'Existing Mechanisms' list seems to contain everything apart from the NSG?
- A. The new framework does have the capacity for a national-level meeting.
- Q. Networking for stakeholders is very valuable, but there is no mention in the framework of the use of electronic mechanisms for engagement.
- A. The NDA's website and online engagement are part of the engagement toolkit, and will absolutely be used in the forward engagement process.
- Q. It seems that what you are saying is that although there will still be strategic issues to bring forward and discuss with stakeholders, there will be a shift towards engagement on delivery and performance against targets?
- A. Agreed.

A request was made for an additional breakout session to discuss the issue further. This took place early on the second day, before the main meeting re-convened.

## **NDA/SLC Targets**

John Clarke introduced the issue of NDA business planning and the setting of targets. The presentation was followed by an opportunity for participants to visit a series of "market stalls", one for each SLC, to hear about the progress at the site or sites concerned. This part of the session was entirely informal and no notes were taken.

## **DAY TWO: 22 SEPTEMBER 2010**

### **SSG Chairs' Forum Update**

Q. Has the Kings Cliffe planning application been turned down?

A. Our understanding is that it was initially approved by officials but was then rejected by the Council planning committee.

## **Breakout Sessions**

Participants were then invited to choose between three breakout choices – interim states, co-location and NDA strategy. All the comments made in these sessions have been fed into the NDA lead for the topic concerned, but are not included in this meeting note so as to keep it to a manageable length.

## **Final Plenary Session**

The NDA leads at each of the breakout sessions fed back the highlights from their discussions and Bruce McKirdy updated the meeting on the GDF project (further details at [www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/](http://www.westcumbriamrws.org.uk/)). Jon Phillips highlighted three main points in relation to future engagement:

- In designing the programme going forward the NDA needed to try to maintain face to face contact
- NDA must recognise the technical constraints with using technology as a way of engaging with stakeholders
- All needed to recognise Strategy was coming to completion and engagement going forward needed to move towards delivery

Tony Fountain then closed the meeting by thanking all the participants and committing to report back to stakeholders before the end of the current financial year on the:

- outcome of CSR
- Sellafield plan
- Dounreay competition process
- Capenhurst deal

NDA Communications  
30 September 2010