

**Extracts from Attachment: 2010-11-05 CCRA sector reports comments log
(DECC).xlsx**

1. Is the report fit for purpose to inform policy makers of the risks posed by the key climate impacts identified? If not, please outline why not and where can improvements be made, highlighting any particular areas of particular weakness in the draft report.

The report is not fit for purpose. It only mentions potential locations for new nuclear power stations and the need to have robust defences against flooding to protect them. The existing extensive nuclear facilities are not acknowledged. These are as much part of the UK's energy infrastructure as proposed new nuclear stations.

2. Are the potential risks associated with the key impacts clearly identified? If not, how can the presentation be modified to provide a clearer message on the potential risks?

As described above the potential risks associated with nuclear decommissioning and radioactive waste management have not been adequately covered. An additional piece of work is needed to properly scope these. There is no message about this subject included in the sector reports, nor have the 'complex linkages between sectors' been identified or acknowledged.

7. Please provide, if appropriate, a summary of your views and any further comments not covered by questions above, including additional comments on text or specific sections of the report.

Tables 8.1, 8.2, and 8.9-8.12 are not clear, there also needs to be an explanation of high, medium and low and p10 -p90 in these tables. There is a mismatch between the results and nomenclature in table 8.9 and the description in the text.

8. What other metrics or variations on existing metrics would you consider important and requiring further or additional analysis? Please indicate why.

A clearer understanding is needed of the likely effects on the nuclear decommissioning programme and the generation of electricity from nuclear and indeed non-nuclear sources. Metrics in this area might include the percentage of the NDA estate likely to be affected by key climate change impacts and the likely timescales and the percentage of nuclear energy generating sites affected. The decommissioning timescale for the existing operating sites must be a factor in this analysis.

9. It would be helpful if you could, at this stage, highlight components of the outputs from the reports which are of most policy relevance to your Department. This will help to inform further cross sectoral analysis planned over the coming months.

Given the situation described above no outputs from the reports, as they exist at present, are considered relevant to the nuclear part of DECC's work.

10. Please provide comments about any limitations to the report which you would recommend to be prioritised in future cycles of the CCRA.

As described above the potential risks associated with nuclear decommissioning and radioactive waste management have not been adequately covered. An additional piece of work is needed to properly scope these.

11. Other Comments

The contractors need to carry out additional work to adequately reflect the likely impacts of climate change on the nuclear and radioactive waste management sectors, as these play a critical role in maintaining the UK's energy supplies. Concerned that our existing nuclear infrastructure is considered as well as potential new build. The UK has some significant facilities presenting, in some cases, high potential hazards if not managed correctly, including existing operational and decommissioning nuclear reactor sites, nuclear waste and spent fuel storage facilities, spent fuel reprocessing facilities,

fuel production facilities and radioactive waste disposal facilities. Most of these are in public ownership via the DECC-sponsored NDPB, the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA).