



West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group

Decommissioning Sub Committee

Present

Cllr Norman Clarkson, Chairman
Mr Ron Hargreaves, Vice Chairman
Mrs Claire Tandy, Meeting Secretary

Mrs Sarah Buss
Mr Joe Clark
Cllr Peter Connolly
Mr Paul Foster
Mrs Tracey Griffiths
Mr Chris Halliwell
Mr Peter Mann
Mr Russ Mellor
Mr Paul Milne
Mr Stephen Tandy
Mr Rob Waters
Mrs Fee Wilson

Apologies

Mr George Andrews
Cllr Alan Clarke
Cllr Mike Davidson
Mr Joe Murdock
Mr Colin Sharpe
Mr Ranald Stewart

Distribution

Meeting Attendees
Mr George Andrews
Cllr Mike Davidson
Mr Joe Murdock
Mr Colin Sharpe
Mr Ranald Stewart

1. Chairman's Welcome and Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed the members to the meeting and updated them that since the last meeting, both the Chairman and the Vice Chairman had met with Mr Foster to discuss Sellafeld Performance and get a better appreciation of how performance is now measured at Sellafeld. The Chairman commented that this was a very useful introduction to performance monitoring.

2. Review of Previous Minutes and Outstanding Actions

A review of the previous minutes was conducted. The Chairman and Vice Chairman had the following comments:

The production of Life Time Plan 10 (LTP10) is very important and it is important that the group do not lose sight of how LTP10 is progressing. Mr Foster updated the meeting that work on LTP10 is ongoing and Sellafield Ltd aim to complete the production of the plan by March 10. It is due to be submitted to the NDA by May 10. This will be a credible deliverable plan and will form the Sellafield contract baseline with the NDA.

The Vice Chairman noted that it is important that reports try and explain how the site is reducing hazards in more quantifiable terms and to explain if the risks are reduced because hazards have been removed. Hazard reduction and risk was a main theme which carried through the previous minutes and it was good to see that the NDA Hazard Baseline presentation was being discussed at this meeting.

Both the Chairman and Vice Chairman noted how many of the reports which were submitted to the committee contained a lot of industry jargon and there was a plea for plain English to be used in future reports and for acronyms to be explained.

3. Sellafield Site's Performance Report

Mr Foster explained to the meeting that the Performance Report is an abridged version of the Plan of the Week report which the Managing Director uses to review performance. Mr Foster added that although this is a useful report, it is still evolving and will be improved upon as time goes on. It is a tool which is used to assess and measure Site performance against the Life Time Plan.

To date, the site has achieved a Scheduled Performance Index (SPI) of 0.98 which means that the site has achieved 98% of the programme that they declared would be completed at the end of August. The Site also has a Cost Performance Index of 1.06 which is also an excellent achievement as the site has effectively delivered a 6% cost saving on the planned spend. This performance is better than in recent years.

The Site Team are also in the process of producing a Performance Dashboard report which will demonstrate performance from all elements of the business. This document will be underpinned with supporting information. Mr Foster added that he was happy for the Decommissioning Sub Committee to have sight of this report at future meetings.

Mr Foster did add that the information contained in the performance report could be shared but must be used in context.

Mr Clark commented that he did not see any real value in the distribution of this report. He felt that it should be included on the website and also that it needed to be much more succinct. Mr Foster said that the idea behind the report is that all of the milestones are identified and progress against the milestones can be easily identified i.e. the report shows what is ahead of or behind schedule. Mr Foster offered to discuss with the committee which line items they were interested in seeing and then they could be reported against at forthcoming meetings.

Mr Clark asked if reporting by exception was a possibility. The Vice Chairman stated that through reporting by exception, you lose a lot of data and don't really get a feel for how things are going especially when things are going well.

Mr Milne reported that the NDA view this report as a big step forward. The LTP is too unwieldy to report against where as other reports can be too wordy. The NDA fully supported the production of this report and note that from an NDA and a Sellafield Executive perspective, the report works very well but he acknowledged that it may not suit all audiences.

The Chairman acknowledged that this is a useful management tool, but would prefer a written status report.

Cllr Connolly commented that it is difficult to comment on the performance report as it had just been handed out at the meeting and that time would be needed to read and digest the report. He also noted that the information should not be available in the public domain as there is the possibility then that the content could be taken out of context.

Mr Clark noted that the report was a weekly report but the meeting met every six months and therefore could only be viewed as a snapshot at the time of the committee meeting. If the committee wished to effectively track progress then they would need sight of these reports much more frequently which Mr Clark does not believe is the intent of the committee. The Vice Chairman said that the report provides a good snapshot of the period in time. He added that the committee have been asking for quantitative data and it is useful to have this available for the committee. The Vice Chairman said that there was a lot of detail in the report which could be misused were it not considered responsibly and in context, however he commented that he would be sorry if he did not receive this report for future meetings.

Mr Foster commented that the report is a monthly status report. He has tried to provide the full version of the report as this is report is used elsewhere and it avoided making additional work, however, he said that if the report didn't meet requirements then something different could be provided.

The Chairman suggested that he and the Vice Chairman meet with Paul Foster before the next meeting to agree what form the performance report should take.

M4 Action 1 – Claire Tandy to arrange a meeting with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Paul Foster to discuss the performance report for the next sub committee meeting.

Mr Milne commented that the written section of the NDA report which accompanies the plan of the week report may provide the information required for this forum.

Mr Foster then updated the meeting on the positive performance of some of the main facilities at Sellafield as follows:

- High Level Waste Plants
- Thorp
- Magnox

Mr Foster advised the meeting that operations in the Magnox facility have had to cease due to antimony discharges and five weeks has been taken out of the schedule. The discharge limits were not breached but the Sellafield Team are working with the regulators on this issue. Mr Tandy confirmed that Sellafield Ltd and the Environment Agency (EA)

have been in discussions about the antimony discharges and noted that the best environmental outcome is to continue to process fuel which in turn will lead to increased discharge levels and ultimately a breach of the limit. The EA needs to progress changes to antimony discharge limit through the European Commission under Article 37 and they are currently progressing this.

Post meeting note: A briefing note is available at :

<http://www.wcssg.co.uk/UserFiles/File/reports/ea/eabriefingnote-sb125toair.pdf>

Mr Foster continued to update the meeting as follows:

- There has been a less than expected level of fuel coming from the British Energy and Magnox plants.
- The Sellafield MOX Plant has achieved 8 fuel assemblies ahead of schedule. It is the first time that operational targets have been met.
- The Site is currently awaiting news of the Government review on the future of the Sellafield MOX Plant (SMP).
- The main projects at Sellafield are progressing well. The Sellafield Plutonium Residue Store (SPRS) is approaching completion. Evaporator D has progressed through sanctioning and the Encapsulated Product Store 3 (EPS3) is progressing well.
- There have been some issues with the laundry but these are currently being resolved.
- The Life Time Plan build programme will be concluded by May; however, the Site is aiming to have it completed by March. This will coincide with the new Integrated Change Programme. The first draft of the plan will be completed by the end of October. The Site is aiming to deliver 6 years worth of work for 5 years worth of costs and time (6 for 5). This delivery will be based on acceleration and cost saving and will focus on high hazard reduction.

The Chairman asked what had gone wrong with the laundries and Mr Foster said that the asset is ageing and is in an awkward space. There have been issues with the equipment and sumps however, a facility at Lillyhall has been used to do some of the laundry and the management team are looking at other options.

Mr Clark commented on the 6 for 5 aspiration and noted that last year, the site was working to an over pressurised budget and any savings that the Sites made had to go back to the NDA to be spent where appropriate. Mr Milne confirmed that the NDA try to control spend on accelerated items to ensure that priorities are addressed. Accelerated work should only be carried out because it is the right thing to do across the NDA portfolio. This year, Sellafield Ltd's plan indicates a spend of £230 million which is not yet funded, however, the government has confirmed that this spend can go ahead as long as it is on high hazard reduction. Any accelerated work must fit in with this priority. Mr Foster added that the site can't continue to work to an over pressurised plan. A plan needs to be developed and then change proposals submitted if the plans change. Mr Milne noted that most of the £230 million required will be funded through the Magnox revenue streams. He concurred that it is important that a deliverable plan is constructed. Mr Clark noted that on a similar theme, it could be demotivating to a workforce if they save money from the site that they are then not permitted to

spend on acceleration activities. Mr Foster said that the Sellafield Management Team and the NDA Team are working hard to ensure appropriate processes are in place to facilitate acceleration.

4. Decommissioning Directorate Report

Mr Halliwell presented the Decommissioning Directorate Report to the meeting. He highlighted the safety statistics and stated that the low figures represent excellent safety performance which compare favourably with other sites in the NDA estate.

The Scheduled Performance and Cost Performance Index statistics are again both good and the directorate is trying to make cost savings and efficiencies where appropriate which will hopefully allow the teams to accelerate work.

All of the Performance Based Incentives which have been set for the year are looking positive and the ones which should have been delivered to date have been delivered on or ahead of schedule.

Mr Halliwell continued to update the members that Windscale is now part of the Decommissioning Directorate. This was a seamless transfer and all of the changes were done in accordance with the management of change process.

Mr Mellor informed the meeting that a number of organisational structure changes are currently taking place in the Decommissioning Directorate and the new structure will tie in with the Life Time Plan work programmes. Of the 24 programmes of work at Sellafield (in the LTP), 8 reside in the Decommissioning Directorate and therefore the new structure reflects the LTP. People are being organised to deliver the programmes of work in a projectised structure. A handout of the new structure was given to meeting members. The new structure is a mix of existing Sellafield Ltd staff and reach back to the companies of the parent body organisation. This has provided expertise from out with the organisation. All changes are in line with the management of change process.

Mr Halliwell continued to update the meeting on the content of the report noting that two reviews have taken place recently to ensure that the Directorate is focussing on appropriate priorities and that risk reduction maintains the highest priority.

The Vice Chairman asked when there would be some tangible quantifiable numbers in relation to risk reduction. Mr Foster noted that a Safety, Security and Environmental Review is currently being undertaken and this will identify where work is being done and the reduction of risk as a result of the work. This report will also underpin the prioritisation.

M4 Action 2 – Mrs Tandy to invite Mr Bob Jones or Phil Hallington to the next meeting of the Decommissioning Sub Committee to present the Safety, Security and Environmental Review.

The discussion continued with Mr Mellor stating that the high level organisation structure in the Decommissioning Directorate will be fully projectised and will be similar to Windscale's current structure. The changes will start to take place over the next few months.

The meeting members were asked if they had any questions on the report and Mr Clark noted that the figures in the report do not really provide sufficient information. A benchmark is required to see if the stated performance is good or bad. Mr Halliwell confirmed that the figures which are stated in the report could be viewed as world class. The numbers are difficult to interpret as one event would have a major impact on the statistics. Mr Mellor confirmed that a key focus would remain on safety and behaviour.

Mr Tandy asked for confirmation of the PAIS team recommendations which impacted on the Decommissioning Directorate. Mr Halliwell noted that they focussed on hazard reduction and how the site team uses License Condition 35 to help progress decommissioning. The other two recommendations relate to how the directorate is structured and how performance can be improved to deliver more with the existing resource.

The Chairman noted that in the Windscale section of the report, there was mention that stakeholders had been invited to watch the trials of the Burst Slug Scanning Gear Shear trials. The Chairman asked which stakeholders had been invited to attend. Mr Mann could not confirm this at the meeting but noted that the Decommissioning Sub Committee Stakeholders were welcome to visit the facility.

The Vice Chairman also asked for clarification on the Windscale section of the report which discussed the fact that the volume of waste consigned to the Low Level Waste Repository (LLWR) would be significantly reduced as a result of using pre-grouted blocks within ISO containers. Mr Mann said that previously the WAGR boxes were not efficiently packaged. They are now being packaged better which is reducing the amount of waste being sent to the LLWR.

Mr Tandy noted that the report entry on the Land Quality PBI could have been expanded upon by Sellafield Ltd and could have referred to the risk assessment model which will be developed from the conceptual model as it is the risk assessment which will inform future decision making for the land quality programme.

Mr Halliwell also advised the meeting that his department had held the Annual Review of Safety earlier in the week with the NII which had been a positive meeting.

Mr Clark commented that he was a representative of the workforce on the committee and raised a number of general issues as follows:

- There were issues on the site with communication and a use of jargon, i.e. 6 for 5, four blocker, Team4Action, grey beard and skunkworks. The use of jargon is a blocker to effective communication and engagement within the industry where people have some understanding so the terms would have less meaning to the general public.
- The PAIS review – Mr Clark commented that he struggled to understand the outcome and the value of the PAIS review.
- Mr Clark commented on the Decommissioning Directorate report which stated that some projects are being slowed or deferred. He commented that originally he believed that it was small numbers of people who were affected by this but this would appear to be increasing.

The Chairman commented that although these issues were important, the committee needed to concentrate on issues which would affect the general public. The issues relating to the workforce could not be dealt with in the Decommissioning Sub Committee but should be taken up with the Site Management Team.

Mr Mann asked if he may draw the Committees attention to Windscale's key issue in the formal report. He explained that in the Active Handling Facility at Windscale (which is an operational facility rather than decommissioning but it deals with legacy materials) during a bi-annual stock take, two items containing irradiated fuel which were identified on the inventory could not be found in the facility. On identifying this issue, movements within the facility were embargoed. The regulators were informed and imports and exports were stopped. An investigation was initiated and it was found that the two items had been sent in error to an Intermediate Level Waste Store. They had met the conditions for acceptance at this store. One of the containers has been retrieved and due to the location, the other container remains in the store. A programme of improvements has commenced in the Active Handling Facility in relation to record keeping, training and housekeeping. The improvement programme is identifying a number of other small anomalies but by undertaking improvements in the facility, a reoccurrence should be prevented. Mr Mann commented that effect on the National Nuclear Laboratory's business had been significant but commended the team saying that they had all worked well together.

The Chairman asked to be kept updated on the Active Handling Facility progress at future meetings.

M4 Action 3 – Peter Mann to provide an update of the Active Handling Facility progress at the next Decommissioning Sub Committee meeting.

5. Nuclear Decommissioning Authority Report

Mr Milne opened by noting that it was difficult to know what information to include in the NDA report and the Chairman commented that more information could have been included.

Mr Milne updated the meeting that the NDA have been able to sanction projects to a cost of up to £50million. Anything above that amount had to be approved through Treasury which could be quite a long process. The approval limit has just been increased to £100million. Sanctioning for the new Evaporator D project was submitted in accordance with new procedures and was approved in 5 weeks. The majority of major projects are within Russ Mellor's directorate and one sanctioning process covered 9 new projects. This went extremely well. Communications on sanctioning are flowing extremely well between Sellafield Ltd and the NDA.

Mr Milne said that a Remediation Forum has been initiated. The first meeting of the forum was chaired by Lord Hunt when he visited West Cumbria in July. Bill Poulson, Managing Director of Sellafield attends this forum as well as regulators. This is an informative committee which keeps government informed of high hazard reduction work.

Mr Milne then advised the meeting on the NDA's strategic objectives and the programmes of work which need to be carried out across the estate to achieve the objectives.

The NDA are also due to go through the Office for Government and Commerce (OGC) gateway 4 review. This review will be independent and part of the process will focus on the Sellafield competition process. As part of this independent review, Sellafield Ltd Executive team member will be interviewed as well as members of the wider stakeholder community, including David Moore and Ron Hargreaves. The review is important as it provides an independent assurance that public funding is being spent appropriately.

Mr Milne advised the meeting that the NDA have set 40 Departmental Service Objectives (DSOs) with Sellafield this financial year and these DSOs have been translated to Performance Based Incentives (PBIs). As at the end of Period 4, some of the PBIs appear to be challenging but achievable.

Mr Milne also highlighted the importance of the development of LTP10. It will be a significant programme of work and will be the programme that NMP is measured against. Mr Milne emphasised the LTP has to be credible and have a realistic baseline. LTP09 was an inherited programme for NMP and the programme was not well underpinned and therefore it was not a solid baseline on which acceleration can be judged. LTP10 will inform the funding requirements and levels for the Site.

The Public Value Programme (PVP) part of the next comprehensive spending review will have a large impact on the public sector and the NDA needs to ensure that the programmes of work can be delivered for the requested funding levels. This is why it is important that LTP10 is correct and that the focus remains on high hazard.

Mr Milne asked if any other information should be included in future reports and the Vice Chairman said that it would be useful to see from an NDA perspective how the Sellafield Site is performing.

6. Environment Agency Report

Mr Tandy updated the meeting that the Environment Agency Board had visited Sellafield Ltd in May to consider principally the Legacy Ponds and Silos and future challenges that we face. The EA praised the work that NMP and Sellafield Ltd are doing in relation to High Hazard Reduction. However, the visit reinforced the serious nature of the hazards and that clean up and risk reduction remain absolute priorities with realistic plans to address the uncertainties in delivering them.

The EA noted that in fully developing the LTP10 and underpinning the assumptions, the dates for some decommissioning projects are being pushed out and there is the potential for increased environmental impact and an increase in discharges. However, it is understood that through efficiency and innovation, some of these dates can be brought back in.

The EA noted the recent good work that has been done in relation to risk mitigation and noted their continued support.

The EA were also supportive of the decommissioning development work currently being undertaken at Sellafield.

With regards to the Life Time Plan Assurance Review, work is ongoing to consider the future impact from decommissioning on waste production and the resources required to carry out the decommissioning operations. Mr Tandy reported that the EA are very supportive of this process, however, there are still large uncertainties over data which supports it and this needs to be reviewed and optimised.

Mr Tandy said that the EA report to the Decommissioning Sub Committee is currently at quite a high strategic level but added that more information could be included in the report if the Chairman and Vice Chairman felt that this would be appropriate. The Chairman and Vice Chairman asked if more detail could be included in future reports.

The Chairman commented that from reviewing the meeting reports, it is evident that there is a cohesive approach to resolving issues from the Site, NDA and Regulators perspective. Mr Foster thanked the Chairman for his comments and added that the LTP10 has been built in the open with information being shared. There has been constructive input from the NDA and the regulators. The Chairman said that it is important that we do all work together to support the industry.

Mr Clark questioned the timescales reported in the EA report relating to the NDA strategy publication and asked how the strategy would relate to LTP10. Mr Foster commented that the NDA did indicate high level strategies to the site to help with LTP10 production and much of the strategy is built on technical strategy. The timeline for the publication of the NDA report does not have a significant impact on LTP development.

7. Nuclear Installations Inspectorate Report

Mr Waters informed the meeting members that the NII report focussed on the NII specifications. The specifications were used to get the site license company to address certain high hazard issues. Sellafield has advised the NII that some of the specifications cannot be met as better defined information has highlighted the complexity of the challenges. The NII are considering the situation and will review their response to Sellafield in relation to the "Enforcement Management Model". The NII acknowledge that the Legacy Ponds and Silos now have high importance where as previously there was less focus. The NII are considering if specifications are the correct way to regulate, however, Mr Waters assured the committee that there would be no relaxation in regulation. Sellafield is dealing with high hazard and risk facilities which do require close attention from the NII.

The Vice Chairman thanked Mr Waters for the clear statement from the NII. Mr Waters confirmed that he would keep the committee informed about the use of specifications.

Mr Waters then added that the NII have reviewed the LTP10 Safety, Security and Environmental Impact Assessments and commented that the NII believe that the risk of a major event caused by further degradation of legacy plant increases over time and the NII are keen to ensure that Sellafield focus on reducing risks and remediating as soon as possible. There should be no relaxation in cleanup attempts.

Mr Waters said that an improvement notice relating to the redundant plutonium line has now been cleared. A worker received a puncture wound whilst working in the facility. Mr Waters

said that everything possible should be done to reduce or minimise the risk to workers and commented that Sellafield Ltd did a lot of good work to evaluate the risk in this instance. The NII were very satisfied with Sellafield Ltd's response to the improvement notice and so cleared it. It is important that the Site License Company continue to challenge how plutonium is dealt with and Sellafield Ltd is doing this. Mr Halliwell added that much of the work is carried out by people wearing air fed suits but personal protective equipment is the last line of defence and the teams continue to look at new ways of approaching decommissioning. The decommissioning teams need to continue to challenge and evaluate options and apply them across other workfaces.

Mr Waters commented on the future decommissioning meetings and said that the NII are also supportive of looking at how future decommissioning operations will be carried out.

As Mr Halliwell had commented earlier, the Annual Review of Safety (AROS) had taken place in the general decommissioning area of the Decommissioning Directorate and it had been a positive meeting. Past performance was reviewed and improvements identified. Mr Waters commented that the Site License Company employees are very open in their discussions and are carrying out work in the right way in relation to Human Performance and Conduct of Operations.

Mr Waters concluded by commenting that he had not included a section on Windscale but added that it was now part of the Decommissioning Directorate and this offered a good opportunity to for learning.

8. Decommissioning Directorate BPEO Presentation

A presentation was given to the meeting by Mrs Griffiths and Mrs Buss from the Decommissioning Directorate. They explained that a Best Practicable Environmental Options study is being carried out for the Decommissioning Directorate and part of the process requires stakeholder consultation. The environmental team sought involvement from the Sub Committee Members and asked if they would be prepared to be involved in a stakeholder workshop to assess the best options relating to different strategies.

Once the BPEO is produced, a forward plan will be established for ongoing maintenance of the study.

Mr Clark asked if the BPEO process was likely to remain a strategic process at Sellafield as he had seen other types of study of this nature during his time in America. Mr Foster confirmed that the BPEO process is the British regulatory process and will be utilised.

Mr Clark also asked if a Best Practicable Means (BPM) study would support the BPEO process. Mrs Buss confirmed that this was being delivered through the safety cases for high level projects. The BPEO strategy is of a higher level than the BPM.

Mrs Wilson asked if there would be the opportunity for people to volunteer to be included in the BPEO stakeholder consultation and this was confirmed. Mrs Griffiths added that any of the meeting members who were willing to participate in the stakeholder consultation should let the meeting secretary know, who will collate responses.

9. NDA Hazard Baseline Presentation

Mr Milne gave a presentation to the meeting members on the NDA Hazard Baseline Process.

Mr Milne advised that a hazard baseline is an assessment of the hazards which are posed by waste in facilities within the NDA estate. A Hazard Baseline is required:

- To quantify the hazard posed by wastes located on NDA sites
- To demonstrate progressive reductions to hazards
- To forecast reductions-through-time
- To identify opportunities for innovation and acceleration

A prioritisation process ensures that the highest hazard activities are given the highest priority. The Life Time Plan is the programme which ensures that all of the high hazard activities are identified and are being addressed appropriately. Each site will have a LTP which will identify the hazards and detail the programme of work which will be undertaken to reduce the hazards.

Mr Milne commented that Sellafield Ltd dominated the categories within the hazard baseline. It is an important document to have as it allows the NDA to prioritise funding if necessary to the highest hazard facilities.

The Chairman asked if the regulators are involved in this process. Mr Milne noted that the regulators are aware of the baseline and many discussions have taken place on the prioritisation process.

10. Any Other Business

Mr Clarkson thanked the meeting members for their input.

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday 9th March 2010. The location is to be confirmed.

Chairman:

Cllr Norman Clarkson

Secretary:

Claire Tandy

Tel:019467 75757

Action Reference	Action	Action Status
(M1)01	Claire Tandy to write to Bob Churchill/Ian Roxburgh of the NDA on behalf of the Decommissioning Sub Committee and ask for the name of the NDA representative who will attend future meetings. Also confirm the name of a nominated deputy.	Complete
(M1)02	Claire Tandy to include "Hazard Reduction Index" as an agenda item at the next Decommissioning Sub Committee meeting.	Complete
(M1)03	Chris Halliwell to arrange a visit to Sellafield Decommissioning Projects for members of the Decommissioning Sub Committee.	Complete
(M1)04	Chris Halliwell and Peter Mann to discuss reporting for the Sub Committee prior to the next meeting.	Complete
(M1)05	Claire Tandy to add agenda items to the next meetings agenda as appropriate.	Complete
(M2)01	Report to the WCSSG that it was disappointing that the NDA were unable to send a representative to the meeting to discuss the NDA Hazard Baseline agenda item and carry this agenda item on to the next meeting agenda.	Complete

(M3)01	Mrs Tandy to include the Hazard Baseline as an agenda item for the next Decommissioning Sub Committee Meeting.	Complete
(M3)02	Mr Halliwell to make the DVD on the Sellafeld Decommissioning Projects available to the Sub Committee Members.	Ongoing Restrictions remain in place for the DVD and it is not currently available for distribution. When it can be distributed, it will be made available.
(M4)01	M4 Action 1 – Claire Tandy to arrange a meeting with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Paul Foster to discuss the performance report for the next sub committee meeting.	New Action
(M4)02	M4 Action 2 – Mrs Tandy to invite Mr Bob Jones or Mr Phil Hallington to the next meeting of the Decommissioning Sub Committee to present the Safety, Security and Environmental Review.	New Action
(M4)03	M4 Action 3 – Peter Mann to provide an update of the Active Handling Facility progress at the next Decommissioning Sub Committee meeting.	New Action