

DOUNREAY STAKEHOLDER GROUP

SITE RESTORATION SUB GROUP

Minutes of the DSG Site Restoration sub group meeting held on Wednesday 26th January 2022 at 1900 hours via MS Teams.

Present:	Gillian Coghill	DSG Site Restoration sub group chair (Buldoo Residents Chair)
	Cllr Willie Mackay	Highland Council (sub group deputy chairman)
	Cllr Struan Mackie	DSG Chair
	Bob Earnshaw	DSG honorary member
	David Alexander	Thurso and Wick Trade Union Council (DSG Vice-Chair)
	Brian Mutch	SGRPID
	Roger Saxon	DSG honorary member
	Thelma Mackenzie	Thurso Community Council
	Niall Watson	Dounreay Unions
	David Craig	Caithness West Community Council
	David Broughton	DSG Co-opted Member of the Public
	Tor Justad	DSG Co-opted Member of the Public

In addition:	Dawn Clasper	DSG Minute Secretary
	June Love	Dounreay Community Relations Manager (DSG Secretariat)
	Frederic Stalin	DSRL Strategic Director
	Lt Cdr David Chisholm	MOD Vulcan
	Ian Rogers	ONR (Dounreay)
	Stewart Ballantine	SEPA
	Vik Winspear-Roberts	ONR (Vulcan)
	James Bryson	DNSR (Vulcan)
	Ian Davies	CNC

MINUTES

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Gillian Coghill welcomed everyone and thanked everyone for attending. She also welcomed Superintendent Ian Davies who had taken over from CNC Chief Superintendent Keith McCarthy.

Gillian Coghill reminded members to put their microphones on mute and use the 'hands up' button if they wished to speak.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from:

- Joanna Coghill, Association of Community Council
- Cdr Mark Cleminson, MOD Vulcan - Lt Cdr Dave Chisholm deputising
- Michelle Johnson - NHS

3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Gillian Coghill noted that the last meeting - DSG/SESG(2021)M03, held in November 2021 – had been circulated in advance to all members. These minutes had been endorsed at the DSG public meeting held in December 2021.

She invited members to raise anything from the minutes.

Tor Justad asked if there had been an update on the research that had been commissioned by Dounreay on the behaviour of radioactive particles. June Love responded that an update had been received and distributed to DSG members. She would re-issue the update to Tor Justad.

4. ACTION STATUS

Gillian Coghill noted that the status of actions has been circulated to members in advance of the meeting. Of note:

- DSG(2021)M04/A003: DSRL to provide a project update on the shaft and silo at next Site Restoration sub group meeting.

Gillian Coghill noted it has been suggested that this would be a good presentation for the main public meeting. June Love was currently progressing this and the aim was to provide this at the March public meeting.

- DSG(2021)M04/A016: : Business Meeting member to write down key principles that we would like to see any bidders meet for MOD contract

Gillian Coghill noted that this related to ensuring that the social impact considerations of the Vulcan decommissioning contract and how DSG interacted with potential bidders was articulated. This had been discussed at the business meeting and it was agreed that it would be useful to have feedback from all DSG members. Gillian Coghill noted that later in the agenda there would be a discussion about the DSG Review and how the recommendations of that will be agreed in terms of taking these forward. Hence it had been agreed by the Business Meeting that an ad hoc meeting in February for all DSG members would be organised.

- DSG(2021)M04/A019: Dave Wallace to make contact with Cllr Stephen Clackson on NDA engagement.

Gillian Coghill noted that this was in relation to discussion raised at the December meeting where there was some press speculation that the socio economic activities of the NDA would extend further than the Travel to Work area. She believed that Dave Wallace has contacted Cllr Clackson to clarify.

- DSG(2021)M04/A020: DSRL to take forward discussions on the information in terms of project progress, against schedule and cost at the next site restoration sub group meeting. **Action complete:** paper reformatted taking on board comments received – see DSG(2021)P003.

Gillian Coghill noted that the Dounreay paper has started to draw some of this information out with a look ahead to the three year plan. June Love had been speaking with Mark Rouse to request a presentation at the March meeting on the 3 year plan that the site is currently working to until the Life Time Plan was complete and had gone through due diligence and governance processes. This presentation and the one on the shaft/silo would be the topics for the March public meeting.

- DSG(2021)M02/A007: Following on from the recent announcement on the NDA Review, can NDA/DSRL provide DSG with a one page diagram of what the current NDA plethora of Boards is to allow DSG to understand the oversight/sanctioning process.

Gillian Coghill noted that this was expected to be received around March/April 2022.

She invited members to raise anything from the actions. No issues were raised.

5. SEPA CONSULTATION: PERMIT VARIATION FOR DOUNREAY LOW LEVEL WASTE FACILITY

Gillian Coghill noted that after discussions at the meeting held on 3 November a note for the record (DSG(2021)C052) had recorded all initial questions/topics raised. DSRL had then issued a response to the pertinent questions raised. Gillian Coghill noted that the consultation had been due to open at the end of January and asked Stewart Ballantine for a date when this consultation would commence.

Stewart Ballantine responded that it had been hoped to go live at the end of January, but this had been delayed. He noted that he would email the DSG secretariat with the link when it was available on their website.

Gillian Coghill asked members, in the light of the response from DSRL to the topics addressed, whether they were content with the responses received.

David Craig noted that he was not happy with the responses from Dounreay as they had ignored one of the main points raised regarding the longer lived nuclides. The design of the facility was less than 10,000 years and there was still going to be several tons of uranium in the (existing) pits. He noted that he represents the Caithness West Community Council and felt that consideration of the permit should also take on board the safeguarding for future generations from this material especially if the pits were to remain in-situ. He believed there had been no thought towards looking at future generations and no explanation of technology and the ability to segregate the uranium existing on site. He asked why there was no consideration of segregating uranium from the rest of the waste before it goes into the new facility to ensure a far shorter half-life.

Frederic Stalin responded that care was required to ensure the two topics (the permit variation for the New LLW Facility and the options for the existing site pits) did not get confused. The baseline for the existing pits was to retrieve the waste and dispose of in the New LLW Facility but the Interim End state team were looking at the various options. No decision for the existing pits had been made and retrieval, at this time, remained the baseline intent. If a decision was made to leave the pits in-situ a safety and environmental case would be required to allow the regulators to take a view.

The variation of the permit was linked directly to the New LLW Facility. DSRL had provided SEPA with all the information they require and SEPA would determine this application through consultation and with their internal experts. It was important to note that the existing pits were not factored into the variation of permit but if the decision to retrieve waste from the pits for disposal in the LLW Vaults would need to satisfy the requirements of the permit for the LLW vaults.. At this point, however, the existing pits did not have any bearing on the permit consultation.

Gillian Coghill noted she had attended a workshop looking at all the potential options for the existing pits noting that no final decisions had been made and this would be a subject that she would expect to come back to DSG once the optioneering was complete. Frederic Stalin re-iterated that at present the baseline was to recover the waste in the existing pits and further work was being undertaken to consider alternative options.

Roger Saxon noted that if the site decided to leave the pits in-situ then why was the argument made around coastal erosion to site the New LLW Facility where it is. He did not believe it made any sense to have in situ as an option unless it was a 'do nothing' option to allow optioneering of the long list of potential options. He also noted that if this was the case why was the site also spending a

fortune in ensuring the silo was fenced off. Frederic Stalin responded that these were two different historical waste facilities (the existing LLW pits and Shaft/Silo). He intimated that further information would be made available at the March DSG meeting with a presentation on shaft/silo.

Frederic Stalin added that during the optioneering for the Shaft & Silo the option for retrieving the waste was made and the site continued to believe this was the correct approach to ensure that the waste was recovered, segregated and treated and stored appropriately. The retrieval of the waste in these facilities were a given. In terms of the existing LLW pits, while the baseline was to retrieve the waste the team were currently considering all the options to explore whether there were smarter ways of dealing with this waste. Hence why the options for the LLW pits were being reconsidered. The impact of coastal erosion or detail of the inventory would come into the thinking as the options were teased out in more detail. Whatever option was considered the most appropriate would go through the rigors of regulatory discussion and cases to be made on both safety and environmental grounds.

David Broughton commented that many years ago there had been a study of pits 1-6 and this had concluded if the total inventory fell into the sea it would be dispersed and would not breach regulations nor impact to the general public and that the dispersal would happen very quickly. In the early 2000's the site had considered the best option for the pits and comment on coastal erosion had been included. Frederic Stalin responded that this would only be one data point in a suite of options and best practicable means (BPM) would be considered across all the options. The question about inventory of the pits was important and at this time the option of recovery continued to be the current intent.

David Craig, while understanding the arguments being made here, thought it was unlikely that the pits be left in place. If the decision was to leave it in-situ then, in relation to coastal erosion, that means the half-lives would be in the hundreds of thousands / hundreds of millions years that would end up in the sea.

June Love asked SEPA to clarify that at present the existing pits were not forming part of the consultation on the variation of the permit as this discussion was to ensure all views on the permit variation was being considered and felt this was getting mixed up with a discussion on the existing pits. Stewart Ballantine confirmed that the variation was looking at the permit for the New LLW Facility. Regardless of the option for the existing pits that was still to be determined, if the option was to retrieve the waste from the existing pits that would fall under the new permit (should SEPA grant the variation). June Love noted that had held a number of different workshops looking at the interim end state of the site (unconstrained) and that DSG members had been involved. These would continue and DSG would have an involvement as these continue to evolve.

Gillian Coghill agreed that the two issues – existing pits and permit for variation – were two different topics and focus, at this time, should be on the forthcoming consultation for the permit. She added that when responding to the SEPA consultation it would be essential that, while clarity was given by DSRL regarding the boundary, that DSG ensures that representation is made to the consultation that the boundary should not be changed.

Tor Justad noted there have been a few questions raised during this meeting and it might be helpful to have a short Teams meeting to go through the consultation (when available) in more detail to agree a DSG response. This was agreed.

ACTION - DSG/SRSG(2022)M004/A001: June Love to arrange a Teams meeting to discuss the Permit Variation for Dounreay Low Level Waste Facility once SEPA open up the consultation.

Gillian Coghill thanked everyone for their input.

6. DOUNREAY UPDATE

Gillian Coghill noted a number of written papers had been distributed to members in advance of the meeting including:

- DSG(2022)P003: Dounreay Report
- DSG(2022)P007: SEPA Report
- DSG(2022)P001: ONR Report

Dounreay: (DSG(2022)P003 refers)

Frederic Stalin, Strategic Programme Director, Dounreay stated he would take the paper as read and noted the following:

- Work was progressing on the joining of DSRL and Magnox and was due to complete by April 2023. Progress to date has been relatively smooth.
- On the decommissioning milestones, a number of these were missed with revised targets set. The delays were due to a mixture of Covid and supply challenges. The targets identified are internal targets, and as an example, the DCP target showed a missed target for the 'in-year' milestone but when looking at this from the wider plan the final date to complete was still on track.
- While the site was not very good at celebrating success there was a number of activities that continued to progress well including decommissioning of some plants within the Fuel Cycle Area.
- Further development of the life time plan continued with a focus on ensuring this is suitable for the site's mission.
- Some work had been undertaken at the New LLW Facilities and the details were outlined in the written report.
- The supply chain would be an important and integral part of supporting the site's mission and re-engagement of the supply chain has commenced, recognising the need to ensure that the bigger companies can identify and work with the local SMEs.

Roger Saxon noted that the written paper stated the breeder fuel removal target date of March 2022 was not achievable. He understood the issues with the restrictions of Covid but noted there was currently no revised target date to meet this milestone. He had asked before if the effects of COVID would have an adverse effects on the decommissioning programme. Frederic Stalin responded that in terms of a revised target there is a revised timeline and would take an action to provide an update on this.

ACTION - DSG/SRSG(2022) M004/A002: Frederic Stalin to provide an update on the Breeder Fuel removal.

David Broughton commented on the programme and the relationship between DSRL and the NDA which worried him. He noted that the NDA had recently issued for consultation the draft business plan and it was clear that the dates for the Dounreay site did not compare and were not achievable as it looked like the dates within the draft business plan were based on the old Life Time Plan. He

was concerned that NDA's dates did not align and felt that the business plan did not reflect current status of the actual plan for the site. Frederic Stalin responded that the dates would align once the Life Time Plan was finalised and approved. The three year plan (that the site was currently working with) was agreed by the NDA to allow Dounreay to do the work in the short term (until the LTP was finalised). Key dates would be agreed by the NDA once the new LTP was available.

David Broughton thought this was incompetent of the NDA issuing a business plan that did not bear any relation to the new Life Time Plan. It was clear that the dates (as in the business plan) were unrealistic and made a mockery of asking for stakeholder input. Frederic Stalin responded that he would take this feedback back to NDA.

June Love responded that the comments on the NDA draft business plan would be included in DSG's response.

Tor Justad asked that an appendix to the written report was provided to explain the list of acronyms used within the report.

ACTION - DSG/SRSG(2022) M004/A003: June Love to include a list of glossary of the acronyms used in future reports.

Tor Justad noted that Cavendish Nuclear have been awarded a £20M contract while a much smaller contract was awarded to a local SME (for an emergency staircase). He also noted that there had been two procurement events held recently – Dunblane and Warrington – and asked what efforts there were in ensuring local companies attended these events.

June Love noted that both events had been advertised via the local networks to ensure local SMEs were aware stating that these were organised by external organisations. She also added that she was involved with the decommissioning framework contracts and meetings were held with all the consortia to discuss their socio economic plans and delivery. She acknowledged that a number of the bigger companies had partnered up with local SMEs to support these contracts and a report on the impacts of this would be made at the end of the financial year. June also noted that the site worked closely with CNSRP and the Caithness Chamber of Commerce to ensure discussions with the framework consortia were pertinent and there were some good examples of the bigger companies supporting some of the regeneration activities.

Niall Watson noted, from a DSRL TU perspective, they were keen that DSRL made use of the local supply chain (albeit that the main focus of the Dounreay unions would always be around the DSRL employees). The DSRL unions were conscious that, when looking to the future, there was a need to ensure a strong local supply chain which in turn would provide the Dounreay workforce with other opportunities once Dounreay decommissioning was complete.

June Love noted that there was an event being organised, via the Chamber of Commerce, for the local SMEs to meet with the new Executive Team. This event had been rescheduled from January 2022 (due to continued Covid restrictions) but was now being organised for early March.

Frederic Stalin noted that supply chain was key to supporting site delivery. He reiterated June's point that these events were hosted by external companies and therefore it was quite difficult to know how many of the local SMEs attended. He added that a lot of the local contracts would come through the framework suppliers. He had been impressed by how much capability existed in the local supply chain.

There being no further questions, Gillian thanked Frederic Stalin for his update.

SEPA: (DSG(2022)P007 refers) Stewart Ballantine, SEPA provided the following report:

- Chief Executive has changed: Jo Green was acting Chief Executive pending the recruitment process. She was a chief officer and has acted in this role in the past.
- The LLW variation application for the LLW facility and the cross over the onsite pits. He emphasised that SEPA's consultation was for the LLW facility variation. It was a standalone EASR permit. SEPA would consider the variation for this facility only and this would not be influenced by anything else on site.
- The existing LLW pits (on site) have been of significant regulatory interest to SEPA for a number of years. SEPA would consider the evidence DSRL was preparing when available and whatever option came forward the case would be made on its merits and implications. It would be for DSRL to provide the underpinning arguments for the preferred option going forward. One of the key requirements of the GRR was a site wide environmental safety case which would include all the various factors including the on-site disposals of the existing pits should that option be taken forward. SEPA would also factor in the influence from the Vulcan site, dependent on whether it continued to be stand-alone or become part of DSRL.
- The variation granted since the last meeting was in relation to the fuel in flasks coming from Sellafield which was a technical breach of the permit but outside the control of the Dounreay site. The variation had also amended the permit to allow the bringing back on site any items of contamination as part of the offsite environmental monitoring programme.

Gillian Coghill thanked Stewart Ballantine for his input and invited questions from members.

- Tor Justad asked if the total dose noted in the Radioactivity in Food & the Environment (RIFE) total was for the year 2021. Stuart Ballantine responded that this information was taken directly from the report, and this covered 2020.
- Tor Justad asked if SEPA were back to working 'as normal and whether Covid was continuing to have restrictions on their presence on site. Stewart Ballantine noted in terms of compliance inspections SEPA were back to the "new normal" and going forward his expectation was they would have a more blended approach between onsite inspection and remote inspections. SEPA's experience was doing some of the pre-work via MS Teams allowed them to be more effective with their time on site. When SEPA were on site they would continue to conduct their inspections.
- Tor Justad asked whether SEPA were back up and running fully following their Cyber-attack asking if SEPA's systems were now back to normal. Stewart Ballantine responded that there was regular updates on the website. They were recovering and now in a position where SEPA site inspectors can work effectively.

There were no further questions for SEPA.

ONR: (DSG(2022)P001 refers) Ian Rogers, ONR provided the following report:

- The ONR report covered the period 1 Oct to 31 Dec 21. In that period ONR safety inspectors made four visits to site covering a broad range of topics. Some of those areas inspected formed

part of ONR's schedule of compliance inspections whereas others were follow-up activities in those areas where ONR has identified opportunities for improvement.

- Of particular note, a team of specialist ONR inspectors attended site to conduct a formal review of the safety and security culture across the site. This involved representation from all operational areas and all levels of staff across the site. This had resulted in a significant amount of data which is currently undergoing analysis with a formal report and feedback to DSRL expected towards the end of this quarter.
- In addition, ONR continues to undertake activities in support of our oversight and permissioning strategies for the Shaft & Silo Project, the LLW Pits Programme and the programme of work to transfer and process the legacy HEU liquors as part of the ongoing Remnants programme.
- Apart from that, no matters of significance were reported to ONR, and ONR has not issued any Licence Instruments, Enforcement Notices or Enforcement Letters.
- ONR has introduced a new template for SSG Reports which does not include a summary of the 'News from ONR'. Instead it provides a link to the appropriate section of the ONR Website.

Vik Winspear provided an update on ONR News. Of note:

- Siemens Healthcare Limited complied with an Improvement Notice served after the loss of a package of radiopharmaceuticals. The package was retrieved and there was no harm to the public or the environment.
- Sellafield Limited have complied with an Improvement Notice following electrical safety incidents across the site.
- Hunterston B moves into the defueling stage after 46 years of generating electricity, when R4 shutdown on the 7 January.
- Chief Nuclear Inspector themed inspection into ageing facilities nears completion. Five nuclear sites have been subject to a 'themed' inspection during the last 12 months focusing on the management of ageing facilities.
- ONR continue to review COVID -19 arrangements: the majority of staff are working from home and they will continue to adjusting arrangement as necessary.
- There is a summary of the numbers of inspections, permissions, and enforcement over 2021 which can be found on our website.

Gillian Coghill thanked Ian Rogers and Vik Winspear Roberts for their input and invited questions from members.

- Tor Justad commented that he was happy to hear about the closure of Hunterston B. He asked if Torness was the last nuclear operating site in Scotland and what the timescales were for closure. He also noted that there had been significant changes to ONR, as the Chief Executive had changed asking if all positions had now been filled. Vik Winspear Roberts responded that all the posts had now been filled and it was business as usual. There was a transition period however there had been lots of communications issued to explain how this would go forward.

- Tor Justad noted that the ONR forum for stakeholders would be held shortly adding that he found these were useful events.
- David Broughton stated he was pleased to see 46 years of safe nuclear generation from Hunterston and had been very impressed with the operations at Hunterston when he visited in his capacity as member of CoRWM. He asked that prior to shutdown had they submitted a decommissioning plan. Vik Winspear Roberts responded that Hunterston was not at the stage of decommissioning yet as they had now entered the defueling phase, therefore the first step was removing the fuel and this would require a safety case associated with this work.
- David Craig stated he had seen somewhere that Torness would shutdown in 2028. He added that personally he would like to see nuclear stations repowering up, in order to provide a good mix of reliable renewable energy for the country, and utilising existing infrastructure and workforce/resources, as was being rolled out to replace the older windfarms.

There being no further questions, Gillian Coghill thanked Ian Rogers and Vik Winspear Roberts for their input.

7. VULCAN UPDATE

Gillian Coghill noted the following written updates had been provided:

- DSG(2022)P005: Vulcan update
- DSG(2022)P006: Rolls Royce update
- DSG(2022)P007: SEPA
- DSG(2022)P004: DNSR

MOD Vulcan: (DSG(2022)P005refers) Lt Cdr Dave Chisholm highlighted the following:

Before opening up to Lt Cdr Chisholm, Gillian Coghill noted that Cdr Mark Cleminson would be moving on to pastures new and wished to place on record DSG's thanks to Cdr Cleminson for his input and commitment to DSG over the years. She asked that DSG's thanks to Cdr Cleminson was passed on with best wishes to him for the future. Lt Cdr Chisholm noted he would pass these comments on. Lt Cdr Chisholm then provided an update. Of note:

- The site continued to comply with UK, Scottish Government and MOD COVID-19 guidance. Employees are requested to complete daily lateral flow tests before coming to site and issuing home test kits as required.
- There have been no challenges to Approval of Arrangements (AOA) limits during this period.
- Defueling of the Shore Test Facility had commenced and the site had also begun the process of removing fuel from the pond in DSMP. The bulk of the spent fuel would be removed from site by the end of this year leaving a small quantity of fuel that would remain on site to allow the extended operations until 2025.
- The site conducted its annual nuclear emergency response demonstration and security exercise in November. Both exercises had gone well.
- SEPA's annual review had also taken place.
- On the future decommissioning contract for the Vulcan site, Lt Cdr Dave Chisholm stated the following:

- Since the last sub group meeting there had been a lot of engagement with the NDA especially since the PBO contract model had been terminated and the DSRL had become part of the NDA Group. This had allowed further discussion on new opportunities for both Government bodies (MOD and BEIS).
- The issuing of the PIN (Prior Information Notice) for the decommissioning contract for Vulcan would be put on hold until other options were explored in full. It was expected that there would be some progress that could be reported at the DSG public meeting in March. It was emphasised that further discussions did not change the date and it was still envisaged that operations would cease in 2025 which would allow the site to move into the decommissioning programme.
- As noted previously, Cdr Mark Cleminson would be leaving Vulcan and Cdr Ian Walker would take over this role on 4 March 2022.

Gillian Coghill thanked Lt Cdr Dave Chisholm for his update. Before inviting questions from members, she asked:

- What the status was of the employees (one in September and one in October) who had attended Caithness General Hospital with chest pains. Lt Cdr Dave Chisholm responded that they are recovering well.
- Gillian Coghill also noted that in terms of the decommissioning contract it was good to hear that MOD were now engaging with NDA and felt that by exploring all the options it should provide good value for the taxpayer.
- Tor Justad and asked why the Royal Navy continued to have a presence at Vulcan as decommissioning could be done as a civilian activity similar to Dounreay. Lt Cdr Dave Chisholm responded that decommissioning was indeed not Royal Navy core business and was more suited to the MOD civil service within the Submarine Delivery Authority. However, due to the difficulties in recruiting and retaining suitably qualified and experienced civil servants and with the skillset of RN personnel being well understood by both the site and regulators, they remained on site providing mainly a safety assurance function.
- Cllr Struan Mackie thanked Lt Cdr Dave Chisholm for his update and noted that he was conscious that the PIN for decommissioning had gone round the houses. He believed that a cautious optimism should be taken that the dialogue with NDA was ongoing as it was something that DSG had pushed hard to ensure these discussions were taking place. Although DSG did not have a collective view it had been felt that the lack of a PBO model could potentially be of benefit to MOD as aside from the value to the taxpayer it would also allow an opportunity to maximise the benefit for the local community if both sites go hand in hand for decommissioning. Although he was disappointed about the lack of progress and that there had been no updates to DSG since the December meeting it was something that might bear significantly more fruit in the future.

Lt Cdr Dave Chisholm responded that he agreed that it made sense noting that the clue was in the NDA's name. At the time that MOD had started looking at the decommissioning this option had been unavailable to them and therefore they were now exploring this as an option going forward.

Gillian Coghill thanked Lt Cdr Dave Chisholm and noted she looks forward to hearing some clarity at the March meeting on the future plans for decommissioning the Vulcan site.

Rolls Royce Update: (DSG(2022)P006 refers)

Gillian Coghill noted that there was no Rolls Royce attendance at this meeting. If members wished to raise any questions that could not be responded to these would be actioned through the minutes.

- Tor Justad asked if there was an update on the recruitment process and 20 key positions they reported last time apart from the apprentices. Lt Cdr Dave Chisholm responded that most of these posts would be sub-contractors that would be brought in-house. These posts were separate from the apprentice posts.

SEPA: (DSG(2022)P007 refers)

- Stewart Ballantine, SEPA noted there had been a SEPA annual review meeting to discuss the past 12 months and the future 12 months. No questions were raised.

DNSR: (DSG(2022)P004refers) Janes Bryson, DNSR provided the following:

- James Bryson placed on record his thanks to Cdr Mark Cleminson for his hard work during his tenure at Vulcan.
- DNSR had undertaken five (physical) routine visits and continues to also undertake remote inspections which were part of the COVID hybrid scenario.
- James Bryson thanked Vik Winspear Roberts for supporting him during the Lonestar 21 exercise which was an adequate demonstration of the controls in place and management by NSV and the team on site.
- DNSR had commissioned the DSMP1 to carry out the legacy fuel removal operations. This had gone very well in tandem with the defuel operations at STF and were conducted in a safe and controlled manner. DNSR did not have any undue concerns of the safety management that is being conducted on the site today.
- Finally, it was noted that DNSR was looking forward to working with Cdr Ian Walker when he takes up the post.

Gillian Coghill thanked James Bryson for his input, adding that it provided her with some confidence that DNSR had been impressed with the Lonestar 21 exercise. Emergency exercises such as these with a positive assessment by the regulators provided confidence to the community.

Gillian Coghill invited questions from members. No questions were raised.

8. CORRESPONDENCE

Gillian Coghill noted the correspondence since the last meeting had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting. Of note:

- As previously discussed, the NDA had issued its draft business plan for consultation and some members had provided comments that had been collated into one document. The consultation would close on the 31 January and therefore she urged members who wished to make comments to provide these to June Love as quickly as possible.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Before opening up to other members, Gillian Coghill noted the following:

- The DSG Business Meeting had met with Ray Kemp last week and he provided a high level update on the DSG review. The report was still awaited and as noted earlier, DSG members would be invited to a meeting in February (date to be arranged) to discuss the recommendations and agree how to take these forward. This meeting would also cover the key principles on engagement with potential Vulcan bidders.
- The next meeting would be held on 23 March and this meeting would start earlier with the AGM. It was also noted that the forward diary had been circulated to all members to allow input into calendars. It was hoped that the March meeting would take place 'in person' at the Pentland Hotel.

10. CLOSE

There being no further business, Gillian Coghill thank you everyone for their input and formally closed the meeting.

Gillian Coghill
DSG Site Restoration sub group chair
3rd February 2022

ACTIONS ARISING FROM THIS MEETING

DSG/SRSG(2022)M004/A001: June Love to arrange a Teams meeting to discuss the Permit Variation for Dounreay Low Level Waste Facility once SEPA open up the consultation.

DSG/SRSG(2022) M004/A002: Frederic Stalin to provide an update on the Breeder Fuel removal.

DSG/SRSG(2022) M004/A003: June Love to include a list of glossary of the acronyms used in future reports.