

## CoRWM E-BULLETIN, No 11, October 2006

Welcome to the eleventh issue of CoRWM's e-bulletin, which reports on the topics discussed at CoRWM's plenary meeting held on September 25th 2006, held in London.

The main business covered:

- Reports on activity August to September
- Forward work programme to mid-November
- Implementation programme
- Quality Assurance
- PSE
- Next actions

The Chair and members gave a vote of thanks to Fred Barker for all his invaluable work for CoRWM and wished him well in his Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum position.

The QA working group had been voluntarily disbanded as its work had come to an end.

The Council for Science and Technology (DTI/OSI) had expressed enthusiasm for CoRWM's work and had requested a 'lessons learned' paper from CoRWM. On the 13th October, members had been invited to meet sponsors of CoRWM to discuss the programme and to learn of government plans.

Sam Usher, CoRWM's programme manager, outlined key work streams to mid November in paper [1867](#). This amounted to: responding to enquiries about the report, ensuring correct attribution, developing thinking on future work and maintaining contact with the public and stakeholders. The budget for the period of August to mid-November was £175,000.

Andy Blowers introduced the Implementation of CoRWM's Recommendations, and outlined the work of the Implementation working group and invited members to read Mark Dutton's paper on partnership, paper number [1870](#). The issue of state aid was discussed as potentially being of importance to the concept of community packages and enhancing the well-being of potential host communities. There were no substantive changes to be made to the Implementation report. The overseas experience paper would be completed and added as an annex to the report. It was agreed that the logical step forward was to complete short papers which examined how the future work areas identified by the Implementation report could be taken forward and this process was in hand. Mark Dutton's paper threw up more questions on the nature of the partnership, the role of the ratifying body and the structure of the partnership itself. There were differing views about how detailed we should make the forward work

programme but eventually it was agreed that a reasonable level of detail should be incorporated.

QA group's work was over although it had identified forward work in respect of ensuring a road map was included on the website to allow a detailed audit trail for documents pertinent to key decision areas of CoRWM's work, especially with reference to Steve Mansfield's 'key documents' note. The status of the final report itself was discussed in the light of the change made to the HPA reference and Lynda Warren's objection to this as it occurred after member sign off. It was agreed that this was a case of force majeure and that future changes would be restricted to clarifications (i.e. more direct wording through the change of a word or two), the addition of diagrams and illustrations and an erratum slip to accompany any changes. Any such small changes to the text would be proposed by Steve Mansfield, and the Chair, Deputy Chair and Lynda Warren would adjudicate on them.

It was agreed that CoRWM needs to continue talking to its key stakeholders and that this programme needs co-ordination. The meeting was referred to Sam Usher's paper [1869](#) which proposed a mixture of methods through which to continue contact. Informal bilaterals are already being proposed and arranged (e.g. Highland Council, NuLeAF etc. It was agreed that further public and stakeholder engagement should be kept as a responsive programme rather than as a proactive one. Gordon MacKerron would write to all stakeholders thanking them for their participation, and explaining that CoRWM is available for meetings if required.

The issue of CoRWM's relationship with the Low Level Radiation Campaign (LLRC) dominated any other business and it was agreed that some changes to document 1633 could be accommodated but that changes to the report itself could not be accepted. A period of joint fact finding would be a prerequisite to including the issues requested by LLRC. It was also agreed that Government would need to sponsor further work on the issue of radiological impact but this was catered for in the CoRWM recommendation for a robust research and development programme.

### **OBTAINING CORWM DOCUMENTS**

The documents cited in this bulletin are all available for download from the CoRWM website, or by clicking on the links in this document.

### **CONTACTING CORWM**

CoRWM can be contacted at the CoRWM Office, 3/H26 Ashdown House 123 Victoria Street, London SW1E 6DE, and [contact@corwm.org.uk](mailto:contact@corwm.org.uk)