

## Response by Brian Gerrard

No.

1

### Question

Do you agree or disagree that the draft Guidance sets out what an approvable Funded Decommissioning Programme should contain to ensure that operators of new nuclear power stations (bankrupt) estimate the potential costs of decommissioning, waste management and waste disposal (i.e. the designated technical matters) and (ii) make prudent provision for meeting their liabilities? What are your reasons?

Response

**I think clarification is needed regarding the Uranium fuel. I went around a Uranium enrichment factory, and was told the depleted Uranium belongs to the power station. This would mean costs of managing the depleted Uranium would need to be added to the FDP.**

**Clarification is needed about the interim stores, after the station has closed. My understanding is that the interim stores will hold the last fuel up to 60 years after the station closed. But the cost of the interim stores comes from running costs.**

2

Does the draft Guidance contain sufficient information to enable operators of new nuclear power stations to understand the matters that their Funded Decommissioning Programmes should contain?

Response .

**I think it does.**

**I welcome the Fund :--**

**(1) Being safe, if the station goes bankrupt.**

**(2) Not being able to buy shares in the power station.**

**I think the fund should be split up between several Financial institutes, to prevent a catastrophe if another Iceland Bank happened.**

**The vast sums of money the Fund will have, should have limits on how much investment it can make in one company. For instance if they sold 10 million ICI shares in one day, it could cause ICI shares to plummet.**