Respondent Details	
Name:	Richard Herbert

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
X	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):

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	I do not agree. The abandonment of fast breeder technology at the point at which it was becoming mature was regrettable and irresponsible from an environmental point of view. Liquid metal technology offers the possibility of a passively safe reactor that can have its nuclear characteristics adjusted to burn or produce fuel. In the 1980's when the LMFBR programme was abandoned, the various collaborative programmes had:- --solved the problems of sodium to water heat exchange that dogged the PFR --proved that the fuel design was intrinsically safe --demonstrated that thr PFR design was practical and safe & stable to operate. The liquid metal cooled reactor can be designed to breed or burn, or be neutral. The use of such technology raises the prospect of extracting 40% or more of the energy in uranium ore rather than the very small proportion that a once-through process uses.
Q2	Do you agree that the Government has got to the point where a strategic sift of the options can be taken?
Response	Conditionally yes, but the option of resuming work on liquid metal cooled reactors should be revived before the work done in the 1970's to early 1980's is lost for ever.
Q3	Are the conditions that a preferred option must in due course meet, the right ones?

Response	No, because they assume storage of exhausted nuclear fuel instead of reprocessing.
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	It is right to do this, but the policy should foreclose as few options as possible. It would be wrong to squander an energy resource for fear of nuclear proliferation. There are already (unfortunately) enough easier ways in the world for proliferation that we can afford to look after our assest, which we are well capable of doing, without significantly affecting the proliferation risk. In any case, the older the plutonium gets, the less good it is for weapons. The MoD needs fresh 239 Pu for its purposes and has to replace material from time to time because it decays.
Q5	Is there any other evidence government should consider in coming to a preliminary view?
Response	I believe it is government's duty to govern. The current policy of leaving nuclear power research to market forces and to other nations is irresponsible and an abdication of duty. Government ignored the CFR in the 1980s, I am convinced for political rather than technical reasons. The programme should be revived whilst there are still a few around who can remember what it was.
Q6	Has the Government selected the right preliminary view?
Response	The MOX solution is not unacceptable provided the spent MOX is kept available for reprocessing. We, or our descendants, will need it one day.
Q7	Are there any other high level options that the Government should consider for long-term management of plutonium?
Response	I am not aware of any