Respondent Details	
Name:	Peter Manning

Please select the category below which best describes who you are responding on behalf of.

☐	Business representative organisation/trade body
☐	Central Government
☐	Charity or social enterprise
☐	**Individual**
☐	Large business (over 250 staff)
☐	Legal representative
☐	Local Government
☐	Medium business (50 to 250 staff)
☐	Micro business (up to 9 staff)
☐	Small business (10 to 49 staff)
☐	Trade union or staff association
☐	**Other (please describe): I am a former member of the Government/HSE's advisory group on nuclear matters, NuSAC.**

The consultation document sets out the Government's proposed approach to the longer term management of the UK's plutonium stocks for public scrutiny and consultation. Comments on any aspect of this issue are welcome, but the key questions posed in this consultation are:

No	Question
Q1	Do you agree that it is not realistic for the Government to wait until fast breeder reactor technology is commercially available before taking a decision on how to manage plutonium stocks?
Response	No, I disagree. You can wait, as long as you set out to make progress to resolve the current issues. That does not stop you from following a MOX option as an interim.
Q2	Do you agree that the Government has got to the point where a strategic sift of the options can be taken?
Response	Yes.
Q3	Are the conditions that a preferred option must in due course meet, the right ones?
Response	Yes. You should not automatically assume that MOX will be disposed after use in reactor. You may wish to recover the plutonium at that time
Q4	Is the Government doing the right thing by taking a preliminary policy view and setting out a strategic direction in this area now?
Response	Yes, as long as you don't starve the fast reactor of resources.
Q5	Is there any other evidence government should consider in coming to a preliminary view?
Response	The comment that "Fast reactors are always 30 years away" is due to the absence of any will to do the necessary research. They were proved in the UK at Dounreay, although availability was blighted by the use of cheap ancillary plant. We really need to understand the current status of work, particularly in France and Japan. Then we need to sort out what would be needed to bring fast reactors to fruition, probably with an international collaboration. This includes a look at the condition of our Pu, and how much clean-up is needed

	before use.
Q6	Has the Government selected the right preliminary view?
Response	No. I agree that we should not be disposing, and MoX may be appropriate for the return of Pu owned by other countries. However, the cost of electricity is bound to rise substantially as coal, gas and oil supplies diminish- yet demand increases with the growth of new economies and the advent of electric vehicles, etc. Just to look at current prices is very short-sighted. Britain will have few resources of its own, and our stock of Pu could become invaluable. It would be folly to use it up cheaply at an early moment.
Q7	Are there any other high level options that the Government should consider for long-term management of plutonium?
Response	A proper project to move fast reactors forward is overdue. We need to look to the future disposition of resources and need, worldwide. This would involve an assessment of how much plutonium is necessary to operate a fast reactor economy in the UK, and how we might assemble such a stock.