

## Work Programme for 2009/10

17 Sep 09

Document No:	13 draft 5
Status:	Draft
Lead Author:	3KQ (with Steering Group)
Title:	Work Programme for 2009/10 (draft)
Notes:	Includes changes made at Steering Group meeting on 16 September 09

The schedule below indicates the core tasks that will be undertaken at each of the West Cumbria MRWS Partnership meetings in 2009/10. Each task is derived directly from the criteria that the Partnership will use when recommending whether to participate or not in the future siting process. The criteria, and more detail on some of the tasks, are outlined overleaf and must be read in conjunction with the schedule below.

Workstream	4 September	14 October	24 November	13 January 2010	23 February 2010
1 – Safety, Security, Environment and Planning			1a(i) Understand what regulatory bodies and processes are in place	1a(iii) Understand role of planning system	
2 – Geology		2a(i) Understand peer review process for BGS work			2a(ii) Ask DECC to instruct the BGS work if appropriate
3 – Community Benefit	3a(i) Understand DECC views on community benefit, and international experience	3b(i) Understand impacts of GDF and potential mitigation measures		3a(ii) Develop principles for community benefit (cont.)	3a(ii) Develop principles for community benefit (cont.)
4 – Design and Engineering	4a(i) Understand generic design concept		4a(ii) Understand retrieveability and reversibility		
5 – Process		5a(i) Understand the site selection process			
6 – Public and Stakeholder views	6a(i) Adopt PSE plan 6a(ii) Initiate Round 1 PSE	6a(ii) Monitor and guide Round 1 PSE	6a(ii) Monitor and guide Round 1 PSE	6a(ii) Monitor and guide Round 1 PSE	6a(iii) Reflect on and respond to output of Round 1 PSE
7 – Other Activity					

The criteria and subsequent tasks identified for 2009/10 are below.

	<b>Workstream</b>	<b>What we will look for</b>	<b>How we will do this</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Safety, Security, Environment and Planning</b>		
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"> <li>▪ Confidence that necessary regulatory bodies and processes exist or are being developed</li> <li>▪ Adequate communication links between regulators and community are present and working</li> <li>▪ Acceptability of the planning aspects of the early stages in the siting process</li> </ul>	<p>Task 1a(i)– Understand what regulatory bodies are involved, what their roles are and what regulatory processes they have in place or are developing. <i>Presentation from regulators potentially followed up by sub-group/SG meeting as needed.</i></p> <p>Task 1a(ii)– Assess the recent and current arrangements for regulatory interfaces with the community. <i>Presentation from regulators.</i> (2010/11)</p> <p>Task 1a(iii)– Understand the context and role of the planning system in the process and any uncertainties associated. <i>Single advance paper and presentation from CCC, with supporting info from DECC (on IPC) and A/CBC (on LDFs) as required. To cover stages before and after a DfP if taken.</i></p>
<b>2</b>	<b>Geology</b>		
2a	Criterion: "Whether the Partnership is confident in the integrity of the BGS screening work/report"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Acceptable peer review process</li> <li>▪ Broad stakeholder confidence in BGS study</li> </ul>	<p>Task 2a(i)– Understand peer review process and work with Government to alter process if required. <i>Discussion with DECC at a Partnership meeting; delegated to SG if needed.</i></p> <p>Task 2a(ii)– Ask DECC to instruct the start of the BGS work. <i>Partnership decision.</i></p> <p>Task 2a(iii)– Assess summary of s/h views from DECC's stakeholder review process, and Partnership's PSE Round 2. <i>Partnership discussion upon completion of BGS work and PSE Round 2.</i> (2010/11)</p> <p>Task 2b– Assess BGS report when published. <i>Presentation from BGS.</i> (2010/11)</p>
2b	Criterion: "Sufficient areas remaining in West Cumbria after initial screening to make further progress worthwhile"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Subjective judgement that the results of the screening leave enough "possibly suitable" land to make further progress worthwhile</li> </ul>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Community Benefits</b>		

3a	<p>Criterion: "Whether the Partnership is confident that an appropriate community benefit package can be developed"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable process in place to secure additional benefits - beyond those which derive directly from the construction and operation of the facility</li> </ul>	<p>Task 3a(i)- Understand Government's perspective on community benefit and what is stated in the White Paper, as well as international experience of other nuclear communities. <i>Presentations from DECC and NDA supported by White Paper and summary report of international experience.</i></p> <p>Task 3a(ii)- Develop with Government a formal set of cross-party principles by which community benefit would be discussed, agreed and potentially administered, including how benefits might be allocated to different communities. <i>Steering Group lead with an economic advisor, seeking sign off from Partnership at key stages.</i></p>
3b	<p>Criterion: "Whether the Partnership is confident that appropriate possibilities exist to assess and mitigate blight if it occurs"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable process is in place to assess any negative impacts and mitigate them</li> </ul>	<p>Task 3b(i)- Understand the likely broad impacts (both positive and negative) of hosting a repository, and how they might be mitigated. <i>Collate existing work with NDA and NuLeAF. Mechanism to be defined.</i></p> <p>Task 3b(ii)- Define the scope of research required to assess in more detail the likely extent of impacts. <i>Partnership discussion followed by Steering Group writing draft research scope. (2010/11)</i></p>
3c	<p>Criterion: "Whether the Partnership is confident that the possibility of a repository fits appropriately with the overall direction of the relevant community/ies"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for the possibility of a repository in relation to other documented long term priorities</li> </ul>	<p>Task 3c- Understand the vision for the future of West Cumbria and to what extent a repository may or may not fit into it. <i>Presentation from Local Authorities. Fergus to offer re-worded version of this task. (2010/11)</i></p>
<b>4 Design and Engineering</b>			
4a	<p>Criterion: "Satisfied that the design concepts being developed are appropriate"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable design concept and flexibility thereof</li> <li>Reassurance that reversibility/retrieveability is an option, and flexibility to confirm this later</li> </ul>	<p>Task 4a(i)- Examine the generic design concept, and how this translates into a specific design depending on any location ultimately chosen. <i>Presentation from NDA, with supporting paper.</i></p> <p>Task 4a(ii)- Develop a common understanding of the meanings of reversibility/retrieveability/recoverability and the implications associated with them, as well as how flexible the generic design concept is. <i>Presentation from NDA and regulators and potentially NGOs</i></p>

		<p>or <i>environmental consultants as well.</i></p> <p>Task 4b– Develop understanding of the inventory, the process for altering it and how the community might influence it. <i>Presentation from NDA. (2010/11)</i></p>	
4b	<p>Criterion: "Satisfied with the proposed inventory to be managed in a facility"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of what the inventory is, and acceptable process for how the inventory would be changed, including how the community can influence this</li> </ul>	
<b>5</b>	<b>Process</b>		
5a	<p>Criterion: "Whether the Partnership is confident that the siting process is sufficiently robust and flexible to meet their needs"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable process of moving from 'possibly suitable areas' to specific potential host sites</li> <li>Provision for 'pause points' to allow more work to be undertaken at a potential Community Siting Partnership's request (if DTP taken)</li> <li>Acceptable nature of (and limitations to) the Right of Withdrawal</li> <li>Acceptable Community Siting Partnership process can be defined</li> <li>Acceptable degree of Government commitment to sustain the process</li> </ul>	<p>Task 5a(i)- Understand the site selection process, including how community can influence it. <i>Read White Paper, presentation from DECC/NDA followed by Steering Group liaison as needed.</i></p> <p>Task 5a(ii)- Understand, and seek reassurance on, how 'pause points' might be introduced and managed. <i>Steering Group seek clarification and discussion as required from DECC and NDA. (2010/11)</i></p> <p>Task 5a(iii)- Understand what a Decision to Participate implies and how the Right of Withdrawal works, what would need to underpin it, and when it ceases to exist. <i>Read White Paper, presentation from DECC, Steering Group discuss with DECC if required. (2010/11)</i></p> <p>Task 5a(iv) Define Terms of Reference for potential Community Siting Partnership (2010/11)</p> <p>Task 5a(v) Seek reassurance and evidence from Government on their commitment to the process. (2010/11)</p>
<b>6</b>	<b>Public and stakeholder views</b>		
6a	<p>Criterion: "Whether the Partnership's recommendations are credible given public and stakeholder views" (<i>note: the word 'credibility' here is used to reference the criterion in the White Paper, para 6.22</i>)</p>	<p>This is a subjective judgement but any recommendation might require at least the following to indicate credibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broad support from the stakeholder organisations in the area, including those that are likely to form a Community Siting Partnership if a DTP was taken (<i>again, words taken from WP para 6.22</i>)</li> </ul>	<p>All of the PSE related tasks would be: <i>developed by PSESG, adopted off by Steering Group: updates would be provided to Partnership unless otherwise stated.</i></p> <p>Task 6a(i)– Design and adopt a PSE Plan.</p> <p>Task 6a(ii)- Initiate, monitor and guide Round 1 PSE, including consulting on the PSE Plan.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ An increasing level of confidence in the Partnership held over time by stakeholders engaged and a surveyed sample of the general public</li> <li>▪ Evidence that concerns raised have been, or will be, addressed where appropriate, including explanations as to why not where relevant</li> </ul>	<p>Task 6a(iii)- Reflect on output of Round 1 PSE, incorporate output and provide feedback to participants. <i>Full Partnership to consider output report of Round 1.</i></p> <p>Task 6a(iv)- Adopt a redesigned Round 2 PSE as required (2010/11)</p>
<b>7</b>	<b>Other Supporting Activity</b>		
	Task 7a- Build the capacity of Decision Making Bodies and other Partnership members. <i>Individual members to take individual responsibility.</i>		
	Task 7b- Manage risks in the process. <i>Steering Group to consider at alternate meetings.</i>		