

Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM)

Triennial Review 2012

May 2012

Contents

Introduction	3
Stage 1 - Functions	8
Stage 2 - Governance	16
Conclusion	29
Annex A List of respondents to stakeholder consultation	30
Annex B Appraisal form for committee members	31

Introduction

1. This document sets out the findings of the 2012 Triennial Review of the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM). It describes the purpose of Triennial Reviews, the process adopted for this review and presents findings based on feedback from stakeholders. The report – based on the evidence - makes a recommendation on the future of CoRWM and suggests ways in which the operations and governance of the Committee could be improved.

Triennial Reviews

2. Triennial Reviews are a Cabinet Office mandated process for reviewing the function of Non-Departmental Public Bodies (NDPBs), the appropriateness of the bodies' delivery mechanisms and their governance arrangements. Reviews should take place every three years for each NDPB, unless an exemption is agreed by the Cabinet Office.
3. The Cabinet Office has identified two principal aims for Triennial Reviews:
 - to provide a robust challenge of the continuing need for individual NDPBs – both their functions and their form; and
 - where it is agreed that a particular body should remain as an NDPB, to review the control and governance arrangements in place to ensure that the public body is complying with recognised principles of good corporate governance.
4. Triennial Reviews consist of two stages, as set out in Cabinet Office guidance¹ addressing these two principal aims.
5. Stage 1 is designed to examine the key functions of NDPBs and consider whether they are still needed. It also assesses whether the functions could be better delivered by alternative delivery options. If Stage 1 concludes that the NDPB should remain as the delivery body, the review moves to Stage 2.
6. Stage 2 looks at the control and governance arrangements in place to ensure that the NDPB is operating in line with recognised principles of good corporate governance.

Triennial Review of CoRWM

What is CoRWM?

7. The Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) is an independent advisory body that provides scrutiny and advice to Government on issues related to the management of radioactive waste in the UK. It is a vehicle for delivering transparent and open scrutiny of Government and industry plans on the storage and disposal of radioactive waste.

¹ Guidance on Reviews of Non Departmental Public Bodies Cabinet Office June 2011.

<http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/sites/default/files/resources/Cabinet-Office-Guidance-on-Reviews-of-Non-Departmental-Public-Bodies.pdf>

8. CoRWM was jointly created by UK Government and the Devolved Administrations – the sponsor departments. It reports to Ministers from the UK Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC), the Scottish Government, the Welsh Government and Northern Ireland. Sponsor Ministers jointly make appointments to the Committee, agree its annual work programme and respond to its advisory reports, as appropriate. CoRWM plays a key role in advising on the Scottish Government’s radioactive waste management policy alongside the UK Government’s disposal programme.
9. The Committee was first established in 2003. It was reconstituted in 2007 to provide independent scrutiny and advice to UK Government and Devolved Administration Ministers on the long-term management of radioactive waste, including storage and disposal. CoRWM has no employees and comprises a Chair and 14 members who are paid on a per diem basis. The Chair has a time commitment of approximately one and a half days per week and members have an average time commitment of one day per week. The Committee holds plenary meetings in public at various locations around the UK. The CoRWM Secretariat, comprising two full time staff, are within DECC. In 2011/12, CoRWM had a budget of £500k.
10. In July 2006 CoRWM reported to Government recommending:
- Geological disposal is the best available long term solution;
 - Safe and secure interim storage is needed in the meantime;
 - Further research and development is needed.
11. Government accepted the recommendations and in 2008 published its Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) White Paper² setting out the way forward for England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Much of the work that the Committee scrutinises arises from the Government’s Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) programme.
12. In the White Paper the Welsh Government reserved its position on the policy of geological disposal for higher level radioactive wastes. The Welsh Government has however continued to play a full part in the MRWS programme to secure the long term safety of radioactive wastes, to ensure the implementation of a framework appropriate to the needs of Wales and to ensure that the needs of Wales are taken into account in the development of policies in this area.
13. The Scottish Government decided to opt out of the MRWS programme saying it did not support disposal of higher activity wastes in a deep geological facility. It published its Policy in January 2011 that the long-term management of higher-activity waste should be in near surface facilities. However, the Scottish Government continues to support the CoRWM recommendations for a robust programme of interim storage for higher activity wastes and an ongoing programme of research and development.

² Managing Radioactive Waste Safely A Framework for Implementing Geological Disposal June 2008
<http://mrws.decc.gov.uk/assets/decc/mrws/white-paper-final.pdf>

CoRWM and the Triennial Review process

14. The Triennial Review of CoRWM was announced in the UK Parliament by the Minister of State for Energy on 12 March 2012. The Minister also wrote to the respective Chairs of the Energy and Climate Change Select Committee and the House of Lords Science and Technology Select Committee, bringing the review to their attention.
15. Cabinet Office guidance states that reviews should be appropriate for the size and nature of the NDPB in question and should also offer value for money. Given the small scale of CoRWM, DECC adopted a 'light touch' yet still a robust and challenging approach drawing on existing evidence and the views of stakeholders. The Review team comprised officials from DECC and the Devolved Administrations and included independent representation from within DECC.
16. The Review team undertook a proportionate engagement of key stakeholders who have dealings with CoRWM by inviting them to submit responses to the three questions (reproduced in the table below) during a 'mini' consultation period of three weeks beginning on March 12. The questions were also published on the DECC website so that any individual or organisation could respond if interested. The mini consultation closed on 2 April. Nine responses were received including from operators, regulators and non-governmental organisations. A list of respondents is at annex A. As the table below indicates, the majority view of respondents is that the key functions performed by CoRWM continue to be necessary and appropriate and these functions are best delivered by a NDPB.

Stakeholder questions and summary statistics

Do the key functions performed by CoRWM continue to be necessary and appropriate for the successful management of higher activity radioactive wastes in general and the successful implementation of the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) programme in particular?

You might wish to consider issues such as: is independent scrutiny and advice, over and above that already provided by the independent safety, security and environmental regulators, necessary for the successful long-term management of higher activity radioactive wastes and the delivery of geological disposal?; is stakeholder engagement and transparency of information important?

Summary statistics

- 8 respondents agreed with this statement
- 1 respondent disagreed

If you consider that CoRWM's functions remain valid, are these functions best delivered by a Non-Departmental Public Body (NDPB)?

You might wish to consider issues such as: could delivery of the functions be taken 'in house' and performed by civil servants or the wider public service?; could the functions be delivered through more informal ad hoc arrangements?; could the functions be merged with another NDPB?

Summary statistics

- 6 respondents agreed with this statement
- 1 respondent disagreed
- 2 respondents gave an answer which neither agreed or disagreed with the statement

If you consider that an advisory NDPB is the right delivery mechanism for the functions of CoRWM, what improvements could be made to support the effective and efficient delivery of CoRWM's remit?

You might wish to consider issues such as: does CoRWM do a good job – does it offer value for money?; is CoRWM politically impartial?; do you trust CoRWM as a source of independent advice and authoritative information?; has CoRWM the necessary skills and experience to fulfil its remit?

Most stakeholders felt that CoRWM provided a value for money service but some suggested improvements including:

- Keeping the remit and membership of CoRWM under review to ensure it always meets the needs of Government and the MRWS programme;

- CoRWM to consider different ways of reporting its activities and advice.

The remit and membership of CoRWM is already kept under review. Sponsors will work with CoRWM to consider whether different ways of reporting the activities of, and advice from, CoRWM would improve the effectiveness of the Committee.

Geological Disposal and the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) Programme

17. The UK has accumulated a substantial legacy of radioactive waste from a variety of different nuclear programmes, both civil and defence-related. Some of this waste is already in storage, but most will only become classified as waste over several decades as existing nuclear facilities are decommissioned.
18. The MRWS programme is concerned with identifying and implementing the long-term management of the UK's higher activity radioactive waste. In line with CoRWM's advice, the policy of the UK Government is for the long-term, safe and secure management of higher activity radioactive waste by placing it in a geological disposal facility (GDF), supported by interim storage.
19. Geological disposal involves isolating radioactive waste deep inside a suitable rock formation to ensure that no harmful quantities of radioactivity ever reach the surface environment. To achieve this, waste will be placed in an engineered underground containment facility – a GDF. The GDF will be designed so that natural barriers (geology) and man-made barriers (eg the waste container) work together to minimise the escape of radioactivity over the long timescales required to allow the radioactivity to decay.
20. The UK Government is responsible for the policy and will take all the final decisions to ensure that the objectives of the MRWS programme are met. As Government's implementing body, the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) is responsible for planning and delivering geological disposal and will provide the nuclear safety, geological and engineering input. Independent regulators such as the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) will ensure robust, independent regulation in relation to statutory responsibilities for ensuring that national and international safety, security and environmental standards and legislation are met.
21. The UK Government and the Devolved Administrations for Wales and Northern Ireland are committed to strong independent scrutiny of the proposals, plans and programmes needed to deliver geological disposal. It is CoRWM primarily that fulfils this role. Its independence is maintained by the fact that it is set apart from Government, the implementation machinery and the statutory roles of the NDA and the independent regulators.

Review Stage 1 - Functions

Objectives and functions

22. This section considers the key objectives and functions of CoRWM and whether they are still required. It then considers whether CoRWM's status as an advisory NDPB is the best model for the delivery of its functions.
23. CoRWM scrutinises the work of the UK Government and the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) on the long term management of higher activity radioactive waste. This includes UK Government and NDA work on the implementation of geological disposal and the work of the Scottish Government on developing and implementing its policy for the management of higher activity waste (HAW). It also includes NDA work on treatment, storage and transport of HAW and on waste management aspects of the management of spent fuels and nuclear materials. Its primary task is to provide independent scrutiny on the Government's and NDA's proposals, plans and programmes to deliver geological disposal, together with robust interim storage, as the long-term management option for the UK's higher activity wastes.
24. Whilst the focus of CoRWM's work is on HAW, its work also includes spent nuclear fuels, plutonium and uranic materials that are not considered to be wastes at present but may be in the future. In addition to scrutinising the work of the NDA, the Committee also monitors the progress and plans for HAW management of other organisations that own or produce these wastes.

Are the functions still required?

25. The Review team considered whether the functions provided by CoRWM as described above are still required by the UK Government and the Devolved Administrations.
26. Every attempt to find and implement a solution for the disposal of higher activity waste over the last 50 years has failed due to a combination of factors including technical immaturity, lack of transparency, poor public engagement and resulting public anxiety. There is a low level of public trust in the nuclear industry most recently seen in the public reaction to last year's nuclear incident in Fukushima, Japan.
27. A key part of the MRWS implementation process therefore is the need for a visible, independent, trusted voice to provide scrutiny and advice to Government on the implementation programme. This assertion is supported by eight out of the nine stakeholders who responded to the mini consultation. They stressed the importance of retaining the functions of CoRWM citing its independent role and its influence in building and maintaining public and stakeholder confidence in the programme for managing radioactive waste. Only one respondent maintained that the independent scrutiny provided by CoRWM was no longer necessary and that stakeholder engagement is best provided by the Government and the NDA.
28. There is good evidence that CoRWM's role of providing independent and authoritative advice adds value to the work of others. One respondent, for example, welcomed the support of CoRWM in assessing the recent generic Disposal System Safety Case

(gDSSC) produced by the NDA. They said that the ‘useful scientific perspective it provides will be very helpful in informing our approach to the production of future safety case related material’. Other examples of where the input of CoRWM has been useful include the advice it provided to Government on the acceleration of the MRWS programme; a paper for DECC’s Chief Scientific Advisor on the strategic co-ordination of UK R&D; and its input to NDA’s work on methodologies for site identification and assessment. The role of CoRWM in stakeholder engagement is also valued by stakeholders. One respondent said that ‘the Committee has also provided useful input on stakeholder engagement and communications around radioactive waste management on a number of occasions’. One operator said: ‘we believe that the current formal constitution of CoRWM serves to provide a good blueprint for transparency in terms of putting information into the public domain’.

29. A number of respondents mentioned the fact that as CoRWM’s role goes beyond that of the independent regulators, the Committee offers a usefully broader as well as an independent perspective. One operator stated: ‘CoRWM are an independent body that provides public confidence over and above that provided by the regulators. The functions of CoRWM are a valuable activity’.
30. This support for and validation of CoRWM’s role was also reflected in the findings of the Cabinet Office Public Bodies Review in 2010 which concluded that CoRWM should be retained as an advisory NDPB because of its important role in providing independent scrutiny and advice to Government on the long-term management of higher activity radioactive wastes. The Review team also considered the findings of the House of Lords Select Committee on Science and Technology’s inquiry into CoRWM³, which assessed how the Committee had performed in the two years since 2008. That inquiry also considered whether CoRWM’s remit was appropriate and assessed its impact on the implementation of the Government’s MRWS programme. One of the findings of the inquiry was that the existence of an independent and effective scrutiny body played an important role in maintaining public trust and confidence in the Government’s strategy for radioactive waste disposal. The report stated that: ‘CoRWM’s scrutiny role is important, both in holding the Government to account and in maintaining public trust and confidence’.
31. The Government believes – and is supported by the House of Lords Select Committee on Science and Technology in the above report - that it is essential to the success of the MRWS programme that a trusted, independent voice is seen to be a key part of the implementation process. Communities that have voluntarily come forward to enter discussions with Government about a disposal facility siting process clearly value CoRWM’s independent role and seek the Committee’s advice in responding to technical, ethical and public engagement challenges relating to their ongoing participation. A representative of one of the communities said: ‘a body to independently scrutinise the MRWS process is vital, particularly to the success of the MRWS programme’. They go on to say that: ‘We have always found that the advice [CoRWM has] given has been helpful, timely and useful and we would hope that this would continue in the future’.

³ House of Lords Science and Technology Committee. Radioactive Waste Management: a further update. March 2010
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200910/ldselect/ldsctech/95/95.pdf>

32. Any perceived weakening of the MRWS programme to address the challenge of radioactive waste disposal might also impact on the UK Government's policy on new nuclear power. As set out in the National Policy Statement (NPS) for Nuclear Power Generation⁴, the Government is satisfied that effective arrangements will exist for the management and disposal of waste from new nuclear power stations. Challenges to the credibility of UK waste disposal policy or withdrawal of currently involved local authorities from the siting process could require the Government to review its policy on new nuclear power.
33. The Review team concluded that the success of the MRWS programme is dependant to a great extent on the functions provided by CoRWM. Removing the independent scrutineer advising on the programme of radioactive waste management, may stall the programme to site a disposal facility through withdrawal of volunteer local communities. This will have serious knock-on effects on the NDA's multi-billion nuclear site decommissioning programme – they are dependent on a route to dispose of the waste created by decommissioning. It might also cause the Government's policy on new nuclear power stations to be challenged as this requires the Government to be satisfied that effective arrangements will exist for the management and disposal of waste created by the new nuclear operators.

⁴ National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6). Two volumes. July 2011

http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/meeting_energy/consents_planning/nps_en_infra/nps_en_infra.aspx

Delivery Models

34. This section of the report provides a comparative analysis of the potential delivery structures for the functions provided by CoRWM. In considering the full range of organisational structures suggested by the Cabinet Office guidance, it was possible to rapidly dismiss several concepts due to immediate and obvious drawbacks. Each option is considered in turn below.

Abolish the functions provided by CoRWM

35. This delivery model would see the functions of CoRWM abolished. For the reasons set out in the previous section, abolition of the functions performed by CoRWM is not a credible option.

Bring the functions 'in house'

36. This delivery model means the functions currently performed by CoRWM would be brought into DECC and be subsumed within one of the Department's own teams.

37. The functions of CoRWM have to be delivered at arm's length from Ministers in order to ensure the functions are delivered independently. Bringing the functions 'in house' would undermine this independence. One stakeholder said: 'Functions cannot be taken 'in house' and performed by civil servants as this would undermine the scrutiny role'. Even if the issue of independence were to be set aside there are practical difficulties associated with bringing the function 'in house'. For example, the members of CoRWM are highly skilled and experienced in a wide range of areas such as geology, environmental law and underground engineering – all necessary for the robust scrutiny and assessment of the MRWS programme. DECC does not have the required skills or expertise at the high level needed to perform the function 'in house'.

38. One option would be for DECC to directly employ the CoRWM members. However, Members have agreed to work in an independent capacity and will not be likely to agree to work directly within DECC either as consultants or employees. They, or their replacements, would then have to be brought into DECC through some form of recruitment process for external experts, at additional cost, and would not then be providing the function required as an independent voice. For the reasons cited above, removing a key independent source of advice and challenge to the Government's MRWS programme is likely to be severely criticised - and rightly so – on the grounds of reducing transparency.

Move the functions out of Central Government

39. The Review team considered whether the functions of CoRWM could be delivered by others such as local government, the voluntary sector or the private sector. The team also considered whether the functions could be provided by engaging directly with users, stakeholders, interested sectors and local communities.

40. The majority of stakeholders who responded to the consultation were firmly of the view that the function could not be delivered by other sectors as there would always be a question mark over the independence and transparency of the advice. For example, if the private sector were to be paid to provide the advice there could be a concern amongst stakeholders and the wider public as to whether the advice was truly independent, given the ethos of the private sector is to make a profit. If the third sector

were to take on the role there would need to be reassurance that the Committee would be sufficiently resourced and funded and that activities such as fund raising would not distract from the core work of the Committee.

41. One stakeholder pointed out that it would be hard for other sectors such as the wider public service to match the depth of technical expertise and influence offered by CoRWM. Furthermore, as the MRWS programme is national in scope it is more appropriately scrutinised by a national body rather than by the local authority sector, for example.
42. One stakeholder felt that some people do not consider CoRWM to be truly independent as members are appointed by Government and are therefore perceived to be ultimately answerable to Government. There will always be an issue over how truly independent any organisation can be but as constituted as an advisory NDPB there are safeguards in place in respect of a public appointments process which serves to ensure the good conduct of CoRWM members and the independence of the advice they offer.
43. All the actors associated with managing radioactive waste, Government, the NDA and regulators do engage directly with their stakeholders but in many cases stakeholders only receive a single (partisan) perspective depending on who is addressing them. CoRWM plays a key role in acting as a single source of authoritative and independent advice as well as playing a key role in filtering and making sense of the myriad views of other organisations.
44. The Review team concluded there was no strong evidence to suggest there would be a clear benefit in moving the functions of CoRWM out of central Government.

Merge with another Body

45. This option involves looking at other areas of Government that deliver a similar or complimentary function. The Review team looked at the landscape in order to ascertain the potential for merging the functions of CoRWM with another body. In addition to CoRWM there are four NDPBs in the 'nuclear landscape':
 46. **Nuclear Liabilities Financing Assurance Board (NLFAB)** : an advisory NDPB. NLFAB provides impartial scrutiny and advice on the suitability of the Funded Decommissioning Programme (FDP), submitted by operators of new nuclear power stations. The Board advises the DECC Secretary of State on the financial arrangements that operators submit for approval and on the regular review and ongoing scrutiny of funding.
 47. **Nuclear Liabilities Fund**: a Public Corporation. The Nuclear Liabilities Fund was created to provide arrangements for funding certain long-term costs of decommissioning some nuclear power stations.
 48. The Review team considered there would be no benefit in merging the functions of CoRWM with either NLFAB or the Nuclear Liabilities Fund. The remits are different and would therefore require members with a different range of skills.
 49. **Civil Nuclear Police Authority (CNPA)**: an Executive Non-Departmental Public Body. Established in April 2005, the CNPA's remit is to ensure the effectiveness of the Civil

Nuclear Constabulary (CNC), taking account of the strategic priorities set by DECC. The CNC is responsible for defending and protecting those civil nuclear sites to which it is deployed with a view to denying unauthorised access to nuclear material and, if necessary, recovering control of any nuclear material which may have been lost to unauthorised persons; and to ensure the safe and secure movement of nuclear materials within the UK and internationally. The Review team quickly discounted a merger with the CNPA on the grounds that the remits of the bodies are very different.

50. **Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA):** an Executive Non-Departmental Public Body. Established in April 2005, the NDA's mission is to deliver safe, sustainable and publicly acceptable solutions to the challenge of nuclear clean-up and waste management. It would not be appropriate to merge CoRWM with the NDA as CoRWM scrutinises and challenges NDA's work.
51. In addition, the Review team considered whether the functions of CoRWM could be merged with those of the independent regulators such as the Office for Nuclear Regulation. Such a merger would not be compatible however with the independence that is essential to the role of CoRWM. As indicated earlier, CoRWM's independent role is maintained by the fact that it is set apart from Government, the implementation machinery and the statutory roles of the NDA and the independent regulators.
52. Stakeholders who commented on the possibility of merging CoRWM with another body were opposed to such a move on the grounds that CoRWM needs to stand apart from others in the landscape if it is to fulfil its core function of providing independent scrutiny and advice on radioactive waste management. One stakeholder held the view that merging CoRWM with another body would dilute its impact.

Delivery by a new Executive Agency

53. This is not a credible option. The functions of CoRWM are not executive in nature, they are advisory. Unlike an Executive Agency, CoRWM delivers no service except scrutiny and advice. There is already an executive body charged with implementing radioactive waste disposal – the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority.

Continued delivery by a NDPB

54. This option would see CoRWM continuing to perform its scrutiny and advice functions. It is a tried and tested model which has the support of stakeholders, Government and the House of Lords Select Committee on Science and Technology. As a Non-Departmental Public Body, CoRWM offers a range of expertise and scrutiny independent of Government, the nuclear industry and regulators. It is this independence and transparency which makes CoRWM such an influential body trusted by stakeholders and the wider public alike.
55. The continued existence of CoRWM as an advisory NDPB ensures the continuity of the scrutiny and advice function. Any disruption to the MRWS programme – for example by attempting to implement a new delivery model - would cause delay to the programme to deliver geological disposal and would usher in a period of uncertainty where Government policy and the activities of the NDA and the regulators would go unchallenged.

The Three Tests

56. One of the requirements of the Triennial Review process is an assessment of the role of CoRWM in line with the Government's "Three Tests":

- Is this a technical function (which needs external expertise to deliver)?
- Is this a function which needs to be, and be seen to be, delivered with absolute impartiality (such as certain regulatory or funding regulations)?
- Is this a function which needs to be delivered independently of Ministers to establish facts and/or figures with integrity?

Is the body needed to perform a technical function?

57. Yes. Although independent technical advice can be provided by both the Committee and the statutory regulators, only CoRWM provide a wider range of advice, for example, on public engagement and ethics concerning the very long-term management of radioactive waste, and an unbiased, non-political view of UK and overseas progress to allow learning from experience. Past attempts to deal with the problem of radioactive waste have failed as a result of a lack of attention to these issues.

Does the existing body need to be politically impartial?

58. Yes. CoRWM's credibility and authority in large part is derived from the fact that it is independent and impartial and is perceived to be so. Such credibility would be critically undermined if CoRWM was seen to have political leanings of whatever persuasion.

59. Furthermore, given geological disposal is a long term programme (2-3 decades until estimated first waste emplacement, followed by over 100 years of facility operation), a concern from many stakeholders is how to guard against policy change as a result of future changes in political administration. In order to have any chance of succeeding in addressing this long-term problem there is a need for a fair and transparent process that can maintain sufficient continuity across political changes in local and national Government. CoRWM performs a useful independent role in ensuring all parties are fully informed of the strong arguments for geological disposal and can remain an enduring, independent source of advice across local and national changes in administrations.

Does the existing body need to act independently to establish facts?

60. Yes. This is CoRWM's principal reason for existence. Technical advice can always be sourced from industry or regulators but this is not sufficient to meet the clear public need to have a source of advice on all aspects of radioactive waste management that is visibly independent from Government and can provide a trusted voice of challenge and unbiased advice. CoRWM's core role is to provide independent scrutiny and advice on the programme to implement geological disposal, alongside the other radioactive waste management issues of interim storage and research and development. In implementing geological disposal, Government has to achieve the difficult balance of combining a technical and scientific approach that achieves long-term protection of people and the environment with an approach that is open and transparent and that inspires public confidence. CoRWM's independent scrutiny is crucial to the public confidence element of this, which has been absent from all the previous (failed) attempts to deal with radioactive waste.

Conclusion

61. In evaluating the delivery models and assessing the functions of CoRWM against the three tests, it was the conclusion of the Triennial Review that CoRWM should continue as an advisory Non-Departmental Public Body.

Review Stage 2 - Governance

62. The last section established a requirement for the functions of CoRWM and concluded that CoRWM should continue as an advisory NDPB. This section considers the governance of CoRWM. That is, what arrangements are currently in place to ensure that CoRWM delivers its functions effectively and that DECC and other sponsors have sufficient oversight.
63. The standard approach to assessing Corporate Governance in the UK is the use of “Comply or Explain” questions. Cabinet Office guidance on the principles of good corporate governance is arranged as questions and structured around six key areas covering: accountability; the role of the lead sponsor Department; role of the chair; role of members; communications; and conduct and behaviour.
64. These questions were then considered by CoRWM and sponsors resulting in the evaluation below of how well CoRWM and DECC comply with the principles.
65. The three key documents used by the Review team to appraise the governance arrangements were:
- Cabinet Office Guidance on Making and Managing Public Appointments:
http://civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/public_appt_guide-pdf_tcm6-3392.pdf
 - CoRWM's Terms of Reference:
http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/en/crwm/cms/about_us/terms_of_refer/terms_of_refer.aspx
 - CoRWM's Code of Practice:
<http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/assets/corwm/post-nov%2007%20doc%20store/documents/other/2012/corwm-code-of-practice.pdf>
66. In addition, CoRWM were asked to provide supporting documentation to confirm their compliance where applicable. In order to highlight areas where scope for improvement was identified, bold text is used.

Accountability

Principle

The Minister is ultimately accountable to Parliament and the public for the overall performance, and continued existence, of the public body.

1. Do the Minister and sponsoring department(s) exercise appropriate scrutiny and oversight of CoRWM, including oversight of any public monies spent by, or on behalf of, CoRWM?

Yes. Sponsors hold regular meetings with CoRWM every 6-8 weeks. CoRWM's work programme is agreed with sponsors each year. Progress reports are produced prior to each plenary meeting and these can be used to check that work is being carried out to the agreed schedule. The work programme and progress reports are published on the CoRWM website: <http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/>. CoRWM sends sponsors (and then publishes on its website) quarterly budget reports for information. There are also routine discussions/interactions with DECC about CoRWM finances/budgetary issues.

2. Are appointments to CoRWM made in line with any statutory requirements and, where appropriate, with the Code of Practice issued by the Commissioner for Public Appointments?

There are no statutory requirements in relation to appointments to CoRWM. However appointments are made in line with the Code of Practice issued by the Commissioner for Public Appointments as stated in CoRWM's Terms of Reference (ToR) at paragraph 9. http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/en/crwm/cms/about_us/terms_of_refer/terms_of_refer.aspx.

The Review Team also looked at the documents concerning a recent appointment to the Committee and these clearly showed that the process followed was compliant with the Code of Practice issued by the Commissioner for Public Appointments.

3. Does the Minister normally appoint the Chair and all members of CoRWM and is he able to remove individuals whose performance or conduct is unsatisfactory?

DECC and Devolved Administration Ministers are jointly responsible for appointing the Chair and all members of CoRWM as stated in CoRWM's Terms of Reference at paragraphs 1 & 9. http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/en/crwm/cms/about_us/terms_of_refer/terms_of_refer.aspx

The CoRWM Code of Practice states at paragraph 8 that members can be removed from office by Ministers should their performance or conduct be deemed unsatisfactory. <http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/assets/corwm/post-nov%2007%20doc%20store/documents/other/2012/corwm-code-of-practice.pdf>

4. Does the Minister meet the Chair on a regular basis?

The CoRWM Terms of Reference at paragraph 21 state that 'The Chair will meet Ministers on appointment, and then at least annually along with other members as appropriate'.

http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/en/crwm/cms/about_us/terms_of_refer/terms_of_refer.aspx

The Chair meets a DECC Minister once each financial year and also meets Scottish, Welsh and Northern Ireland Ministers as required.

5. Is there a requirement to inform Parliament and the public of the work of CoRWM through publication of an annual report (or equivalent publication)?

Paragraph 14 of the Committee's Terms of Reference state that: 'The Chair will submit a report to Ministers by 30 June each year on the delivery of the agreed work programme. This will be made available in the UK and Scottish Parliament, the National Assembly for Wales and the Northern Ireland Assembly'.

http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/en/crwm/cms/about_us/terms_of_refer/terms_of_refer.aspx

CoRWM publishes an Annual Report in June each year. It is published on the CoRWM website and highlighted in an e-bulletin to stakeholders. It is also sent to sponsor Ministers. The seventh annual report (June 2011) can be found here:

<http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/assets/corwm/post-nov%2007%20doc%20store/documents/reports%20to%20government/2011/2922-corwm-201011-annual-report.pdf>

6. Is CoRWM compliant with Data Protection legislation?

CoRWM's Secretariat is run by DECC and data are held in DECC's data and information management systems. CoRWM is compliant therefore with the Data Protection legislation in the same way that DECC is, as its lead sponsoring Department.

7. Is CoRWM subject to the Public Records Acts 1958 and 1967?

As above, CoRWM is subject to the Public Records Acts 1958 and 1967, the same as its lead sponsor Department, DECC.

Role of DECC as lead sponsor Department

Principles

The departmental board ensures that there are appropriate governance arrangements in place with the public body.

There is a sponsor team within the department that provides appropriate oversight and scrutiny of, and support and assistance to, the public body.

8. Does the Departmental Board's regular agenda include scrutiny of the performance of CoRWM?

No. CoRWM is a small advisory NDPB with an annual budget of no more than £500k. The DECC Board can of course scrutinise the performance of CoRWM if they feel it is necessary or appropriate but it is never likely to be regular agenda item. Scrutiny of CoRWM's performance is managed by the DECC sponsor team.

9. Is there a document which sets out clearly the Terms of Reference (ToR) of CoRWM and are the ToR accessible and understood by DECC and by all board members?

Yes – the Committee's Terms of Reference are published and can be found here: http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/en/crwm/cms/about_us/terms_of_refer/terms_of_refer.aspx. The ToR are understood by Members and they regularly refer to them in the course of business.

10. Are the ToR regularly reviewed and updated?

Yes. The Terms of Reference are reviewed prior to each appointment process and when business needs and/or departmental responsibilities change. They were last reviewed in June 2011.

11. Is there a dedicated sponsor team within DECC with a clearly defined role?

DECC is the lead sponsor for CoRWM and members of the MRWS Programme team within DECC act as lead sponsor officials. The MRWS team liaises with designated sponsor officials within each of the Devolved Administrations to co-ordinate sponsorship at official and ministerial level. The responsibilities of all DECC sponsor teams are clearly set out on the NDPB pages of the DECC intranet and responsibilities are also reflected in the objectives of staff fulfilling the sponsor function.

12. Is there regular and ongoing dialogue between DECC and CoRWM?

Yes. The Secretariat is made up of core DECC civil servants who liaise frequently – both formally and informally - with the DECC sponsor team with whom they share offices. There are regular progress meetings between CoRWM and sponsors every 6-8

weeks and CoRWM Task Group meetings with sponsors on specific topics, including drafts of documents.

13. Is there an annual evaluation of the performance of CoRWM and of the Chair?

Yes. The Committee's Terms of Reference at paragraph 22 states that all CoRWM members will be subject to an annual appraisal of their performance. It is the CoRWM Chair who carries out these appraisals and the Chair submits members' appraisal reports to DECC. This requirement is also set out in paragraph 17 of the Committee's Code of Practice.

Sponsors carry out performance appraisals of the CoRWM's Chair and this takes account of 360 feedback from sponsors, members of CoRWM and others. However, to date such reviews have been less frequent than annually.

CoRWM also reviews its own effectiveness during the year and publishes a report. The latest report is here: <http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/assets/corwm/post-nov%2007%20doc%20store/documents/other/2011/2916-reviewing-corwm-effectiveness-201011.pdf>

Recommendation: the Review team recommends that the sponsors ensure that the frequency of the appraisal of the CoRWM Chair is increased to annually.

Role of the Chair

Principle

The Chair is responsible for leadership of the board and for ensuring its overall effectiveness.

14. Is CoRWM led by a non executive Chair?

Yes - CoRWM is an advisory body only and has no executive functions.

15. Is there a formal, rigorous and transparent process for the appointment of the Chair which is compliant with the Code of Practice issued by the Commissioner for Public Appointments?

The appointment process for the CoRWM Chair has been designed to be compliant with the Office of the Commissioner for Public Appointments (OCPA) and has taken account of the detailed guidance on the appointment process in the Commissioner's Code of Practice. An Independent Public Appointments Assessor was allocated from an early stage and was involved in the whole process to ensure and validate OCPA compliance.

<http://publicappointmentscommissioner.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/New-Code-of-Practice-for-Ministerial-Appointments-to-Public-Bodies-August-2009.pdf>

From 1 April 2012 a new streamlined regulatory regime for ministerial appointments to public bodies entered into force and guidance has been published. This new guidance, '*Code of Practice for Ministerial Appointments to Public Bodies*' will be followed in future appointment exercises.

<http://publicappointmentscommissioner.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/Code-of-Practice-20121.pdf>

16. Does the Chair have a clearly defined role in the appointment of CoRWM members?

Where possible the Chair (or Chair-designate if a new Chair is about to be appointed) is a member of the Selection Panel for CoRWM members. This role is defined in the current Chair's contract thus: 'Partake in the appointment process of Committee members. This will include attending application sift panel meetings and candidate interviews'.

17. Does the Chair annually evaluate the performance of individual committee members?

Yes, as set out in the answer to question 13. Since 2010/11 the Chair has used appraisal forms based on Cabinet Office templates . A copy of a blank appraisal form is attached at annex B.

18. Are the duties, role and responsibilities, terms of office and remuneration of the Chair set out clearly and formally defined in writing?

Duties, roles, responsibilities, and terms of office of the Chair are set out in CoRWM's Terms of Reference and Code of Practice.⁵

Total fees for the financial year for all members are recorded in the CoRWM Annual Report. Individual remuneration rates have not been recorded previously although they will be from 2011/12

■ ⁵ The responsibilities of the Chair will normally include:

- representing CoRWM in discussions with Ministers;
- advising the sponsoring Department and Ministers about appointments and the performance of individual members;
- ensuring that members have a proper knowledge and understanding of their role and responsibilities. The Chair should ensure that new members undergo a proper induction process and is normally responsible for undertaking an annual assessment of members' performance;
- ensuring that CoRWM, in reaching decisions, takes proper account of guidance provided by the sponsoring department or Ministers;
- ensuring that CoRWM carries out its business efficiently and effectively; and
- representing the views of CoRWM to the general public.

Individual remuneration rates have been disclosed on request and they are set out in information packs for candidates when appointments are advertised. Remuneration rates of the Chair and members are also included in the DECC News Releases announcing CoRWM appointments and reappointments.

19. Are the terms and conditions in line with Cabinet Office guidance and with any statutory requirements?

The terms and conditions are in line with the Cabinet Office guidance on Making and Managing Public Appointments. See paragraph 21 of the CoRWM ToR:
http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/en/crwm/cms/about_us/terms_of_refer/terms_of_refer.aspx

Role of CoRWM Members

Principle

Board members should provide independent, expert advice.

20. Is there a formal, rigorous and transparent process for the appointment of CoRWM members which is compliant with the Code of Practice issued by the Commissioner for Public Appointments?

Yes – see the answer to question 15.

21. Are members properly independent of the Department and of any vested interest (unless serving in an ex-officio or representative capacity)?

Yes. Paragraphs 18 and 19 of the CoRWM Code of Practice set out the provisions relating to any conflicts of interest. Candidates for appointment to the Committee are invited to record any potential conflicts of interest that could impinge on the independence of the candidate and these are explored as required should the candidate reach the interview stage of the appointment process.

22. Are members drawn from a wide range of diverse backgrounds?

In line with the OCPA Code the appointment process for CoRWM members seeks to draw applicants from a wide range of diverse backgrounds. The scrutiny of the Independent Public Appointment Assessors ensures that the role specification, selection criteria and advertising do not include barriers to deter groups of applicants. Monitoring data for the process is collected and provided to OCPA when requested.

See members biographies on CoRWM website.

http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/en/crwm/cms/about_us/who_we_are/who_we_are.aspx

23. Does CoRWM as a whole have an appropriate balance of skills, experience, independence and knowledge?

The skills and expertise of CoRWM were considered by the Lords Science and Technology Select Committee in its March 2010 report: Radioactive Waste Management: a further update:

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200910/ldselect/ldsctech/95/95.pdf> . The Committee concluded that CoRWM would benefit from more members with experience of business and practical on-site operations and engineering. In its response⁶, the Government considered that the current skills set of the Committee was appropriate for the stage reached in the MRWS Programme. The Government acknowledged that as the process moves forward into later more technical stages then members with the skills suggested by the Committee may be needed.

The skills set of CoRWM is kept under review. Before each appointment exercise sponsors consider and review the skills and experience they wish to bring into CoRWM to ensure it can continue to deliver authoritative advice and provide robust scrutiny of the MRWS programme.

24. Are the duties, role and responsibilities, terms of office and remuneration of members set out clearly and formally defined in writing?

Duties, roles, responsibilities, and terms of office are set in CoRWM's Terms of Reference and Code of Practice.

Members' total fees for the financial year are recorded in the Annual Report but individual remuneration rates have not been recorded previously although they will be from 2011/12

Individual remuneration rates have been disclosed on request and they are set out in information packs for candidates when appointments are advertised. Remuneration rates are also included in the DECC News Releases announcing CoRWM appointments and reappointments.

25. Are the terms and conditions in line with Cabinet Office guidance⁷ and with any statutory requirements?

The terms and conditions are in line with the Cabinet Office guidance on Making and Managing Public Appointments. See CoRWM ToR paragraphs 22-23.

http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/en/crwm/cms/about_us/terms_of_refer/terms_of_refer.aspx

⁶ Government Response to the House of Lords Science and Technology Committee Report: Radioactive Waste Management: a further update. November 2010. <http://www.parliament.uk/documents/lords-committees/science-technology/ScienceGovandPolicy/RespRWM.pdf>

⁷ "Making and Managing Public Appointments", Cabinet Office, 2006
<https://update.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/content/public-bodies-and-appointments>

26. Do members allocate sufficient time to CoRWM to discharge their responsibilities effectively?

Yes. Sponsors are content that all objectives and deliverables in CoRWM's annual work programmes to date have been met and delivered. Some work has been deferred with sponsor agreement when considering priorities throughout the year.

27. Is there a proper induction process for new members which is led by the Chair?

With the Chair's input new members are sent copies of CoRWM's main documents and guidance notes for incoming members. The current Committee received a copy of the original Committee's document archive including a report on lessons learned. The induction for this Committee took place during the first plenary meeting and was a combined effort from the Chair and Secretariat.

The Chair and Secretariat have carried out induction process for members joining in the period 2008-2012. The Secretariat has confirmed that an induction process for new Chair and members joining in November 2012 is being planned.

28. Are there regular reviews by the Chair of individual members' training and development needs?

No. The Review team found no evidence of regular reviews. Members review their own training and development needs on a continuous basis. Learning takes place in the course of members' work for the Committee, for example during visits to nuclear sites.

Recommendation: The Review team recommends that the Chair as part of the appraisal process for CoRWM members undertakes a review of individual members' training and development needs – at least annually.

29. Do all members ensure that high standards of corporate governance are observed at all times - including ensuring that CoRWM operates in an open, accountable and responsive way?⁸

CoRWM's Terms of Reference and Code of Practice set out how members should conduct themselves. In addition, CoRWM has published a set of key guiding principles that set out how the Committee conducts itself and how it engages with the public and stakeholders. [http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/assets/corwm/post-nov%2007%20doc%20store/plenary%20papers/2008/15-16%20january/2248%20-%20guiding%20principles%20\(revised\)2.pdf](http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/assets/corwm/post-nov%2007%20doc%20store/plenary%20papers/2008/15-16%20january/2248%20-%20guiding%20principles%20(revised)2.pdf)

Furthermore, it has published a suite of documents setting out guidance on a number of issues including a quality control process for its documents (doc. 2771); Payment of Fees (doc. 2219); Hospitality (doc. 2221); liability and performance appraisal (doc. 2231); Travel and subsistence (doc. 2220); and registering declarations of interest (doc. 2222). All are available on the CoRWM website <http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/>

⁸ ["Code of Conduct for Board Members of Public Bodies", Cabinet Office, 2011
http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/code-of-conduct_tcm6-38901.pdf

The Committee reviews its own effectiveness each year and identifies areas for improvement. <http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/assets/corwm/post-nov%2007%20doc%20store/documents/other/2011/2916-reviewing-corwm-effectiveness-201011.pdf>

In addition, it discusses its ways of working from time to time, usually at open plenary meetings.

Communications

Principle

The Public Body should be open, transparent, accountable and responsive.

30. Does CoRWM operate in line with the statutory requirements and spirit of the Freedom of Information Act 2000?

CoRWM's information is held in DECC Information Management systems and CoRWM abides by the Freedom of Information (FOI) Act 2000 in the same way that DECC does.

CoRWM has a Publication Scheme and Transparency Policy that is fully consistent with the spirit of the FOI Act 2000 and it operates with a presumption that its documents will be published.

[http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/assets/corwm/post-nov%2007%20doc%20store/plenary%20papers/2008/15-16%20january/2249%20-%20publication%20scheme%20\(revised\)2.pdf](http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/assets/corwm/post-nov%2007%20doc%20store/plenary%20papers/2008/15-16%20january/2249%20-%20publication%20scheme%20(revised)2.pdf)

31. Does CoRWM make an explicit commitment to openness in all its activities?

Yes. Paragraph 5 of CoRWM's Terms of Reference explicitly states that CoRWM shall undertake its work in an open and consultative manner. The Publication Scheme and Transparency Policy referred to above restates CoRWM's policy of openness and transparency in respect of all the information it holds.

All substantive decisions are made in public. Only early drafts of documents (not fit for public viewing) and confidential/restricted issues are discussed in closed meetings.

32. Where appropriate, has it established clear and effective channels of communication with key stakeholders?

Yes. CoRWM's website and e-bulletins are used to keep stakeholders and the public informed of progress on the work programme. It meets key stakeholders such as the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and nuclear regulators several times each year, on various topics within the Committee's remit. CoRWM aims to meet with non-governmental organisations once a year and also holds meetings with local people when on nuclear site visits.

33. Does it engage and consult with the public on issues of real public interest or concern, including for example, holding open meetings or annual public meetings?

Yes. CoRWM holds open plenary meetings several times each year. Each year, via its website and e-bulletin, it also consults stakeholders, including the public, on its proposed work programme. The Committee also consults widely with stakeholders on its reports to Government, particularly on its recommendations.

To date, CoRWM has published three reports to Government and these can be viewed here: http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/en/crwm/cms/our_current_wo/our_current_wo.aspx

Stakeholders were consulted on the content of these reports and their comments can be viewed in the comments log here:

<http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/en/crwm/cms/consultations/consultations.aspx>

34. Are the results of reviews or inquiries published?

Yes. CoRWM publishes its reports to Government, Position Papers, and discussion and information papers. All can be viewed at the CoRWM Document Store here:

<http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/documentstore/advancedsearch.aspx>

35. Does CoRWM proactively publish agendas and minutes of its meetings?

Yes. CoRWM publishes its plenary meeting agendas on the CoRWM website and also has copies available at meetings. Minutes of all meetings are published on the website unless they are confidential or restricted.

36. Are there robust and effective systems in place to ensure that CoRWM is not, and is not perceived to be, engaging in political lobbying?

Yes. During pre-election periods, and in common with all DECC NDPBs, CoRWM is issued with Cabinet Office guidance on how to avoid political impact in its operations and is expected to comply. Similarly, CoRWM receives and is expected to adhere to Cabinet Office guidance regarding attendance at Party Conferences (see response to question 37 below).

37. Are there restrictions on members attending Party Conferences in a professional capacity?

Yes. As an NDPB, CoRWM must and does abide by Cabinet Office rules on attendance at Party Conferences.⁹ As the rules make clear, it should be exceptional for board members or staff of NDPBs to attend Party Conferences in an official capacity. Any requests to attend must be approved by both the sponsoring Department and the Cabinet Office. If members attend in a private capacity then they should comply with

⁹ *Rules on Lobbying for Non Departmental Public Bodies*

<http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/sites/default/files/resources/ndpbs-lobbying.pdf>

what is set out in their Codes of Conduct on political activity which should comply with paragraphs 3.11- 3.14 of Cabinet Office's Code of Conduct.

Conduct and Behaviour

Principle

Board members should work to the highest personal and professional standards. They should promote the values of the public body and of good governance through their conduct and behaviour.

38. Is there a Code of Conduct setting out the standards of personal and professional behaviour expected of all members and which follows the Cabinet Office Code?¹⁰

Yes. CoRWM's Code of Practice is based on the Cabinet Office guidance for non-departmental public bodies, but also includes other provisions relevant to the remit and work of CoRWM.

39. Are all members aware of the Code and is the Code part of the terms and conditions of appointment?

The CoRWM Secretariat has confirmed that all members are aware of the Code of Practice.

All applicants for CoRWM are asked at interview if they are willing to sign up to CoRWM's Terms of Reference, Code of Practice and the 'Seven Principles of Public Life' produced by the Committee on Standards in Public Life. http://www.public-standards.gov.uk/About/The_7_Principles.html

Any subsequent offer of appointment explicitly states that acceptance requires members to sign up to the Terms of Reference, Code of Practice and the Seven Principles of Public Life.

40. Are there clear rules and procedures in place for managing conflicts of interest?

Yes. Paragraphs 18 and 19 of the CoRWM Code of Practice set out the provisions relating to any conflicts of interest. Any conflicts of interest are recorded in plenary meeting minutes and are published.

¹⁰ "Code of Conduct for Board Members of Public Bodies", Cabinet Office, 2011
http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/code-of-conduct_tcm6-38901.pdf

41. Is there a publicly available Register of Interests for CoRWM members which is regularly updated?

Yes. The latest version of the Register of Interests from April 2012 is available at: <http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/assets/corwm/post-nov%2007%20doc%20store/documents/other/2012/3030-register-of-member-interests-april-2012.pdf>

42. Are there clear and published rules in place governing the claiming of expenses?

Yes. CoRWM follows the same rules and guidance used by DECC staff.

43. Are effective systems in place to ensure compliance with these rules?

Yes. All claims for expenses are submitted to the Secretariat which carefully checks each claim to ensure it is correct before signing it off. The claim form is then sent to DECC's Shared Services Directorate where further checks are made before the claim is paid.

44. Are there clear rules and guidelines in place on political activity for members?

During pre-election periods, as a DECC NDPB, CoRWM is issued with Cabinet Office guidance on how to avoid political impact in its operations and with which it is expected to comply. Similarly, CoRWM receives and is expected to adhere to Cabinet Office guidance in respect of attendance at Party Conferences .

45. Are there effective systems in place to ensure compliance with any restrictions?

Yes. Regular Cabinet Office guidance to arm's length bodies is circulated to CoRWM members by the Secretariat on receipt of the material from DECC sponsors or the Cabinet Office.

46. Are there rules in place for members and senior staff on the acceptance of appointments or employment after resignation or retirement?

Cabinet Office Guidance says there should be rules for NDPB staff accepting business appointments after resignation or retirement in relation to the functions of the NDPB concerned and any potential for conflict of interest which may give rise to public concern. There are no tailored rules in place for CoRWM. CoRWM members follow the rules about the acceptance of outside appointments for Civil Servants which are set out in Annexes A and B of section 4.3 of the Civil Service Management Code: <http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/about/resources/civil-service-management-code>

Conclusion

1. It was the conclusion of this Triennial Review that CoRWM should continue as an advisory Non-Departmental Public Body providing scrutiny of and advice to Government on issues relating to the management of radioactive waste in the UK. It was the assessment of the Review team that CoRWM offers a range of expertise and scrutiny independent of Government, the nuclear industry and regulators. It is an independent body that is trusted by stakeholders and the wider public alike.
2. The Review team also found that the governance arrangements in place for CoRWM were for the most part fit for purpose. They made two suggestions for improvement:
 - the Review team recommends that the Chair as part of the appraisal process for CoRWM members undertakes a review of individual members' training and development needs – at least annually.
 - the Review team recommends that the sponsors ensure that the frequency of the appraisal of the CoRWM Chair is increased to annually.

Annex A – List of organisations that responded to the consultation

AWE – Atomic Weapons Establishment

Copeland Borough Council

EDF Energy

Horizon Nuclear Power

Nuclear Decommissioning Authority

NuGen

NuLeAF

Waste Recycling Group

Westinghouse UK

Annex B – Appraisal form for committee members

**ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE/COMMITTEE CONTRIBUTION
FOR
THE COMMITTEE ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT**

Name of Committee Member	
Date Appointment Started	
Date Appointment Ends	

PLEASE DISCUSS THIS ASSESSMENT WITH COMMITTEE MEMBER

(Please give examples in space provided)

Attendance and Commitment: Committee Meetings

Low	Adequate	Good	Very Good

(Please tick as appropriate)

Team working to deliver CoRWM's work programme to agreed timescales			
Low	Adequate	Good	Very Good

Ability to constructively challenge within the Committee and contribute to decision making			

Low	Adequate	Good	Very Good

Contribution to provision of advice to Government/NDA that is focussed on relevant issues, constructive, evidence-based and factually correct

Low	Adequate	Good	Very Good

Contribution to strategic direction of CoRWM's scrutiny and advice			
Low	Adequate	Good	Very Good

Ability to represent the Committee when required			

Low	Adequate	Good	Very Good

Assessment of any other specific areas of responsibility/contribution (e.g. Task group leadership, representing as an observer, liaising with Secretariat on budget management/website management)			
Low	Adequate	Good	Very Good

Overall Assessment			
Low	Adequate	Good	Very Good

At this stage the form should be signed by:

- The Chair;
- Member concerned (who is also invited to make comments).

Signature of Committee Member	
-------------------------------	--

Date	
Comments (if desired)	

Signature of Chair	
Date	

© Crown copyright 2012
Department of Energy & Climate Change
3 Whitehall Place
London SW1A 2AW
www.decc.gov.uk

URN 12D/223