ONR NGO Forum - Meeting Minutes   
29 April 2025 (1000-1230) – Teams meeting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| In Attendance (ONR): | In Attendance (NGO): |
| Rachel Grant (RG) – Director of Strategy and Corporate Affairs (ONR co-chair)  Nicki Crauford (NC) – Chair  Mark Foy (MF) – Chief Executive and Chief Nuclear Inspector  Sarah Brown (SB) – Head of Policy  Louise Smith – Senior Policy Advisor  Shane Turner – Director of Regulation – Technical Directorate  Jane Loughran (JL) – Head of Communications  Madeline Bird (MB – Senior Communications Manager)  **Secretariat/organisers:**  Liz Bibby – Policy Advisor | Dave Cullen (DC) – BASIC (NGO co-chair)  Richard Outram - Nuclear Free Local Authorities  Rita Holmes - Ayrshire Radiation Monitoring Group (ARM)  Sue Aubrey - Stop Hinkley campaign.  Jill Sutcliffe (JS) – Low Level Radiation and Health Conference  Katy Attwater (KA) – Stop Hinkley  Peter Banks (PBan) – Blackwater Against New Nuclear  Prof. Andy Blowers (AB) – Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group  Peter Burt (PB) – Nuclear Awareness Group/Nuclear Education Trust  Paul Collins (PC) – Stop Sizewell C  Alison Downes (AD) – Stop Sizewell C  Allan Jeffrey (AJ) – Stop Hinkley  Tor Justad (TJ) – Highlands Against Nuclear Power  Ian Ralls (IR) – Friends of the Earth Nuclear Network  Trish Whitham (TW) – Nuclear Information Service  Chris Wilson (CW) – Together Against Sizewell C  Peter Roche (PR) – NWAA and Scotland Campaign Group  Okopi A (OA) – Research Manager Nuclear Information Service  Mike Taylor (MT) – Together Against Sizewell C (TASC)  Joan Girling (JG) – Together Against Sizewell C (TASC)  Ruth Balogh (RB) – Friends of The Earth Nuclear Network  John Busby (JB) – Stop Hinkley |

1. Welcome and introductions - Rachel Grant/Dave Cullen
   1. Rachel Grant (RG) opened the forum and welcomed all participants.
   2. RG informed the meeting of a provisional date of 1 July 2025 for the next Climate Change workshop. RG stressed that we're really keen to look for some more volunteers now to join the organising/planning committee. Any NGO members who are interested should contact Katy Attwater.
   3. Jill Sutcliffe (JS) mentioned that she will be attending the Exeter University’s Tipping Point and will report back at the next meeting.
2. 1. Dave Cullen (DC) introduced Mark Foy’s agenda item and also marked the loss of Pete Wilkinson.
3. Update from ONR Chief Executive and Chief Nuclear Inspector – Mark Foy
   1. MF requested 60 seconds silence to remember Pete in a quiet moment of contemplation.

**Welcome to new Chair – Dr Nicki Crauford (NC)**

* 1. NC introduced herself and expressed that she was looking forward to hearing and understanding the views of the NGOs. NC was on the Environmental Protection Agency in New Zealand for eight years and also chaired the electricity regulator in New Zealand for three years. She joined ONR in March and thanked the forum for the invitation to introduce herself.
  2. Siting consultation update – MF noted that an area of concern for the NGO community was around sighting consultation with EN7 being launched by DESNZ. ONR have been involved in the consultation, and we have provided two inputs. The current approach to siting was around eight designated sites that were identified for the deployment of nuclear technologies. EN7 seeks to move away from that approach, and it looks to cater for SMR and AMR technologies, the intention being to review every five years. The difference mainly is that it will be developer led, and criteria based but ONR will still be a robust, independent nuclear safety and security regulator. There will still be the requirements to comply with the nuclear site licence conditions, and we will also provide advice to the Planning Inspectorate.
  3. MF mentioned that he had received an email from JS expressing that it would turn into a free for all but MF explained that licence applicants will have to clearly demonstrate compliance with the criteria. Our perspective is that as a nuclear safety regulator, they will be required to meet the standards that exist for nuclear facilities and that will continue in the future. MF provided the link to our first input to the consultation.
  4. MF mentioned that he had received an email from JS expressing that it would turn into a free for all but MF explained that licence applicants will have to clearly demonstrate compliance with the criteria. Our perspective is that as a nuclear safety regulator, they will be required to meet the standards that exist for nuclear facilities and that will continue in the future. MF provided the link to our first input to the consultation.

[ONR’s Consultation Response: National Policy Statement for new nuclear power generation: new approach to siting beyond 2025 – 8 March 2025](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.onr.org.uk%2Fmedia%2Fri2eepa5%2Fonrs-response-to-the-governments-national-policy-statement-for-new-nuclear-power-generation-080324.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK)

* 1. MF set out the second part of the focus of our response. The 50 MW threshold in terms of the planning framework will be retained, but there's no such threshold in relation to nuclear site licencing. Under the new NPS EN-7 HSE will now determine if a site meets the semi urban population density criterion. ONR will continue to provide advice to the Planning Inspectorate (PINs) who administer the requirements of NPS EN-7.
  2. JS commented that throughout the development of nuclear power, the issue of waste has always been either ignored or put to the back and waste issues haven’t been sorted out.

**Update on early engagement**

* 1. MF explained that we set out our own guidance for early engagement and that DESNZ are open to our advice and that we are mindful of the government's new build agenda. The whole life cycle management covers all aspects of nuclear operations, shutting down the reactor, defuelling, dealing with the fuel, decommissioning and dismantling and dealing with the waste. Central to that is the geological disposal facility. We're engaged with the vendors and developers of these new technologies. We are also working with the NDA on the delivery of geological disposal facility.
  2. Mike Taylor (MT) mentioned that they took part in the review of EN6 and have since taken some advice from the Environment Agency. There are four of the nominated sites in EN6 in higher risk flood zones and those sites should have been removed.
  3. MT also mentioned that the government were talking about buying some sites, including Bradwell.
  4. MT stated that we have the International Atomic Energy Authority standards, which are siting standards.
  5. MT commented on emergency planning as we are almost committing to build a power station immediately adjacent to Sizewell B and we don't have an acceptable Emergency planning zone.
  6. MF responded to MTs comments - as the regulator, we will ensure that the design caters for all the various hazards associated with any particular site location.   
     The developer will have to provide us with a safety justification that demonstrates that our satisfaction, that it can be constructed, commissioned, and operated safely for the duration of the identified period of operation. We will look at flooding and extremes of temperature.
  7. MF, regarding the IAEA standards, we contribute to the development of IAEA standards, we understand the context of them quite intimately. The UK is committed to ensure the international standards are achieved and set out in our regulatory framework within the United Kingdom.
  8. MF, for emergency planning, we have to be satisfied of the operators ability to respond to any particular incident on the site and also in terms of the local authority and its arrangements, we oversee their ability to respond should an incident occur. If there are multiple sites adjacent to one another, we ensure that we are satisfied in their ability in those emergency situations. In terms of Sizewell A and budget cuts, we've been working with the NDA and the government to understand the implications of the various spending review settlements.
  9. MF explained that following discussions with NDA, they have sufficient funding to continue to ensure the safety of its estates for the remainder of the spending review period. Years two, three, four and five have yet to be decided upon, but once we understand the impact of those settlements, we will then take a view as to whether we require NDA or government to take any further action.
  10. Tor Justad (TJ) asked the new chair NC, when she visits Dounreay that she meets members of the Dounreay Stakeholder group.
  11. TJ asked MF about the semi urban population density criterion and if he could summarise what that means.
  12. MF replied that the criteria identify acceptable and unacceptable population densities in the vicinity of nuclear facilities. HSE make the decision but not in isolation.
  13. Andy Blowers (AB) said that in the forum we have with government there were discussions with the Minister about the siting policy.
  14. AB made several points. He thinks the new policy is poor and has been opposed. Previously there was a strategic policy in which criteria were applied, and sites were identified. The document is still promoting the EN6 sites.
  15. AB said ONR prides itself on its independence, but it's given two roles now. It's got the role of regulator and the role of facilitator or enabler. The issue of independence is important because the government has been talking about blockers.
  16. MF replied to AB and assured the NGO community that the robustness of our regulation will remain as will our independence.
  17. MF summarised that site selection criteria remains government policy. Our approach will not change and we will still require a pre-construction safety report.
  18. Peter Burt (PB) asked a question about the resource implications for the new policy and how they might affect ONR and indeed others involved.
  19. MF responded that resources and the dynamic nature of the new build sector is a challenge for us and ensuring that we have the right resources available. We've adopted a three-tiered approach around early engagement which allows us to use multiple multidisciplinary teams across various specialisms within the organisation.
  20. Ian Fells (IF) asked if breeding cycles were back on the table
  21. MF replied that this was a choice for the vendor but that we would ensure we are satisfied with the standards of safety, security and all phases of the life cycle of the nuclear facility.

**Status of SZC safety reports/case**

* 1. MF provided an update on SZC. He said that a nuclear site licence was issued last year. We continue to engage with the Sizewell C team ahead of the pre-construction safety report. Sizewell C will produce its own safety report, but because it's intended to be a replication of the design at Hinkley Point C, many of the documents between Hinkley Point C and Sizewell C will be common. We will also be looking at where the design differs, where the pre-construction safety report differs from that at Hinkley Point C and then requiring supporting evidence for those differences as part of that submission.
  2. Chris Wilson (CW) asked, with regard to the site safety report and the pre-construction planning report, that until they are finalised there’s no nuclear construction that can take place?
  3. MF replied that that was correct
  4. Alison Downes (AD) asked if there was an update on the turbine hazard risk to Sizewell B that Sizewell C might cause, as this was an outstanding issue on the initial safety assessment?
  5. MF replied that we would take the question away and respond to AD direct.

**Action 1** – provide an update to AD regarding the turbine hazard risk to Sizewell B that Sizewell C might cause.

Response - We continue to engage with both licensees (EDF NGL and SZC Ltd.) on SZC’s progress in developing an adequate safety case for the turbine disintegration topic. As an enabling regulator, we are setting out our regulatory expectations, providing advice and guidance to both licensees, through a series of engagements at key stages of the safety case development process. We plan to undertake a formal review of the related SZC safety case once approved and submitted by the licensee. We are currently anticipating the submission and our assessment to take place in 2026.

* 1. AD said that EDF made a press release about replacing all of the fuel in the Flamanville reactor core. ASN stipulated EDF need to present a report to limit fluctuations in flow to the reactor core before the end of 2026. Is there a risk that the reactor needs to be redesigned? Has Hinkley's construction gone too far for that to happen? Should construction there be suspended? And what are the implications for Sizewell C?
  2. MF replied that EDF are considering the impact on HPC, but a decision has not yet been made but they will be looking at options over the coming months.
  3. MT asked if the status of the GDA has been updated on the ONR website and also requested confirmation that components for Sizewell C have been ordered in advance?
  4. MF responded that we do keep the status of assessment findings up to date on our website and we are working through the findings with EDF. Long lead components are ordered in advance so that they are available when required and this is a common approach.
  5. MT also asked whether the construction of the plant can take place because the desalination plant cannot supply the water they were relying on for the construction.
  6. MF replied that we are aware of the water supply aspect and continue to work with NNB GenCo to ensure they have sufficient supplies to the site during and beyond construction.
  7. The NGOs said there is still a big outstanding decision on the platform height at SZC. If the Government commits to FID, there might be an outstanding issue here that could add a lot of cost onto the project. They commented that they have faith in ONR to get the decision right but if the platform needs to be higher then there's a major financial risk in committing tax payers money with this major unresolved issue.
  8. CW wanted confirmation that as the platform height forms a nuclear structure, construction cannot start until the height observations are complete?
  9. MF confirmed that this is correct but that the determination has been made and has been finalised.
  10. CW asked for an update on the completed platform height observations.
  11. MF advised that we would take an action to take that point away and confirm the status.
  12. **Action 2** – provide CW with finalised platform height observations for Sizewell C.

Response – The is no outstanding decision on the platform height at SZC, this has already been confirmed as +7.3 meters ordnance datum. We do have some platform height observations which are being tracked but these will not alter the platform height.

* 1. Government’s Plutonium Policy
  2. MF discussed plutonium disposition, and outlined the government intent, which is now to put plutonium beyond reach and prevent non-proliferation and other nefarious activities. The majority is held by NDA and this will now go through an immobilisation process.
  3. Rita Holmes (RH) asked how far away we are from having a solution for storage?
  4. MF replied that we are looking at Hot Isostatic Pressing (HIP) which involves compressing the material and locking it into a matrix. This makes it beyond reach and not retrievable again.
  5. Peter Roche (PR) asked if ONR had received a paper written by Nick Scar on the possibility of problems when disposing of plutonium. MF asked if he could resend it.
  6. **Action 3** – PR to resend the paper written by Nick Scar on the possibility of problems when disposing of plutonium to MF.

**New CNI/CE Handover from Mark to Mike**

* 1. MF announced that Mike Finnerty would join ONR on 1 July 2025 and MF will stay on for a short period. It is hoped that Mike will take on the CNI/CE role by the end of July.
  2. DC asked about the move of Aldermaston into routine attention and what criteria ONR have had to satisfy justifying the change. He also asked for an update on the death of the worker on July 2023.
  3. MF responded that AWE was placed into enhanced attention because of concern in a number of areas on the site. In terms of the culture on the site, that was leading to similar types of events occurring, but we have seen significant improvement as well as significant leadership improvements on the site. Safety submissions are much improved in terms of quality and the standard. In terms of what they're doing in the facilities that they have, it is satisfying our requirements in that regard. We've looked at all of those areas now, we have seen improvements, and we are satisfied with the return to routine attention. Regarding the death of the worker, it's no longer with the police and ONR are now leading on it. No further information is available as it is an ongoing investigation.
  4. Peter Burt (PB) asked if the new Mensa facility is operating yet? Also has the Secretary of State for Defence exempted U.S. military bases from repair and the ionising radiation regulations? What does this mean in terms of off-site protection for the local public? Is there an emergency plan that covers them and if so, what does it entail and who is responsible for it?
  5. MF confirmed that Mensa’s capabilities are gradually ramping up but is not fully operational although the building’s infrastructure is complete and there is a gradual transfer to the facility. MF also stated that he is unaware that the SoS for Defence was looking to exempt US bases from either IRRs or REPPIR.
  6. JS stated that the US Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) project got rid of a lot of US atomic workers, and then they were asked back because they were needed and many refused to go, she is unsure if this is true.
  7. JS thanked MF for his understanding and tolerance of the NGOs.
  8. MF said this affects the Department of Energy more than other departments.
  9. PR asked what will happen as three of the four SMRs in the competition for GBN are only going up to stage two in the GDA process. Presumably if they're going to pick two reactor types, they will continue to go on to phase three.
  10. MF replied that it is up to the requesting parties to decide. Westinghouse have withdrawn so there are only three left in the competition. Whoever finishes first effectively will be the one that receives the most support.
  11. RH raised query if any developer led projects have been deployed in the US?
  12. MF replied that there are a number of projects in the US where they have started to dig into the ground. Some of it is for the test facilities but give an indication of them being further ahead of where we are in the UK. The earliest technology will be after 2030 but that is ambitious. There are many different technologies, and it may be that the vendor and developer of a particular technology wants to deploy it in the UK first. We would be developing the first of a kind, but we will have the right regulatory footprint over any first of a kind technology to make sure that it's done safely and securely.

1. Feedback from NGO Strategy Workshop in January 2025 – Sarah Brown
   1. Sarah Brown (SB) explained that at the workshop we shared our draught strategic objectives and our draught mission and vision with the NGOs. We had substantive discussions and carried out a Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis in groups and fed back. We have captured the key reflections from all of the comments and we have an understanding on the value of our independent regulator role highlighting the importance of continuing to improve and promote transparency. With the announcement of the Prime Minister's Nuclear Regulatory Task Force, we are into a transition period now and we will pick up our strategy development work later in the year.
2. Break
3. Transparency – General Discussion – Jane Loughran/Louise Smith
   1. Jane Loughran (JL) introduced the session on transparency and linked it to the next five-year communications and engagement strategy which will support the new organisational strategy. JL expressed how NGO expertise is hugely appreciated and noted that NGOs reach, and footprint is much wider than them as individuals. JL requested that individuals answer five questions on the feedback form following the meeting. JL also asked if there's anything else that we can do as an organisation to really help and support NGOs in that sharing of information. JL also provided details of international meetings including the NEA Characteristics of a trusted regulator.
   2. PR asked if we would be submitting this to the regulatory taskforce as a concept?
   3. RG replied that we would be submitting this to the taskforce as it is something that we are incredibly proud of. We want to use the model that we have here to demonstrate our openness and transparency, and the benefit gained from taking the time to engage in an open, honest and transparent way.
   4. JL gave details of a recent presentation given to the Belgian regulator by Madeline Bird on our engagement and transparency.
   5. AD asked if ONR would be asking similar questions to other stakeholders including industry representatives?
   6. JL said that we will but unsure what or when exactly as this is the first group that has been approached.
   7. RG replied that we would be submitting this to the taskforce as it is something that we are incredibly proud of. We want to use the model that we have here to demonstrate our openness and transparency, and the benefit gained from taking the time to engage in an open, honest and transparent way.
   8. AB thanked ONR for their efforts and communications over the years and asked that the relationship does not get complacent.
   9. Louise Smith (LS) appreciated the work we do with NGO forum but would like to understand options to widen our audience and possibly include the general public. LS opened a Microsoft poll but not everyone could access so she suggested a future conversation about the technologies that people use. Individuals commented on different aspects including, a wider audience which may include the general public, the range of individuals that we might expect, could NGOs invite guests and other topics that could be covered. Site stakeholder groups were discussed as an option but they are not ONR owned but we could look to see how we can use these groups to help us expand our audience.
   10. Several NGO members were all unsure of the definition of the general public and what involvement they could have in these meetings.
   11. PB pointed out that there are several forums for nuclear discussions and that perhaps the local liaison committees and the site stakeholder groups would be more appropriate to involve members of the public.
   12. AD pointed out the process for inviting new members to the group, as in other groups that has been unsuccessful.
   13. RG confirmed that the ONR NGO forum membership will remain as it stands.
   14. LS echoed her thanks to everyone for taking part in the discussion and their comments.
4. Update on climate change work
   1. Shane Turner (ST) provided an update on climate change work. A significant amount of work has been carried out during the past 18 - 24 months and has been comprehensive in getting a good understanding of the industry in respect to how they’re protecting from the hazards of climate change. The industry has taken account of the recent climate change projections and can demonstrate active inventories will remain safe now and into the future. To achieve this, we sent a comprehensive questionnaire out to industry that included licensees, prospective licensees and requesting parties to gather intelligence. We are now at a point to gather this information together in a report which we aim to publish by the end of June 2025 and will be used for discussion at the July workshop. The high level findings in the report are that the industry is making progress in terms of ensuring the climate change effects are understood and mitigated against. We did not identify any significant shortfalls but there is still work to do by the industry to ensure that they remain resilient against climate change in the future.
   2. As part of this work, we also engaged with the Environment Agency and we've recently published a report, which is our response, to the fourth round of climate adaption reporting.  This is the first time we've been invited to provide a response and hopefully we will be invited more routinely in the future. We have also been engaging internationally with regulators who face similar challenges and we appear to be ahead in most areas in terms of our focus. We will be attending an IAEA conference later this year, focusing on climate change, to share and learn from a worldwide position on how other regulators are dealing with this challenge.
   3. PB stated that is really important that the report acknowledges the long term uncertainties and risks associated with climate change and the nuclear sector and does not give the impression that everything is ok.
   4. ST replied that the report will be balanced and based on evidence noting the uncertainties and there is more for industry to do and once the report is issued the CNI will write to industry to set out our expectations.
   5. KA mentioned her disappointment that NGOs weren’t consulted on the questions in the report or how companies and organisations would be approached. KA would like HPC and SZC to be included in the future as they will be most exposed to climate change.
   6. ST explained that the sample used was informed by many factors including our current knowledge on sites and where we had less knowledge and where the questionnaires identified more challenges. Our engagement on climate change will continue across all sites we regulate.
   7. KA expressed her thanks that ONR are continuing with climate change workshops.
   8. MF added that it’s not clear from our website and in our guidance what our expectations are on climate change, so we are considering what we can make publicly available and how we can provide clarity for both industry and NGOs.
5. Taskforce – Sarah Brown
   1. SB led the session explaining the Prime minister’s announcement regarding a nuclear regulatory taskforce covers a review of the whole regulatory system, not just ONR. SB asked NGOs for their thoughts as we engage with the taskforce and what a successful outcome, for ONR would be?
   2. AB said that this is an assault on the principle of independent regulation. ONR is supposedly independent and therefore above interference. The government seems to be saying that regulation is far too strict and time consuming but ONR needs stand up to this.
   3. PB added that this is being led by astute political operators who are against regulation and that ONR need to be assertive.
   4. MT said that the regulator's code should be reviewed and that we must set out the role of the independent regulator.
   5. SB thanked everyone for their comments and understands how we need to be clear around the key role of our independence throughout the process.
6. AOB, Summary and close – David Cullen and Rachel Grant

MF reminded everyone that the consultation is on the Gov website and that contributions can be made individually or collectively.

* 1. DC and RG thanked everyone for their attendance and giving up their time. DG also expressed his heartfelt thanks and farewell to MF for his time and willingness to engage with the NGOs in these forums.
  2. MF thanked everyone for their kind words and appreciated the communications over the years.

1. Summary and Close
   1. Meeting closed at 12.30.
2. **Questions received post meeting deadline**
   1. There were also questions emailed into ONR by Richard Otteram (RO) but they were too late to be included in the discussion. As an addition they have been added below along with ONR’s response.
   2. RO - Has ONR told Last Energy that they cannot move any of the spent reactor units off site until year 49? (i.e. seven reactor units each running for 6 years, followed by a 7-year cooling off period).
   3. ONR response - ONR has not made decisions regarding Last Energy’s design and operating approach (including future decommissioning plans) – these are expected once a licence application is made (expected 2026-27), and associated submissions including decommissioning plans are received for assessment. In this context, it is important to note Licence Condition (LC) 35 which requires (future) licensees to make an implement adequate arrangements for decommissioning of any plan or process which may affect safety. LC32 (5) is relevant in regard to how ONR regulates stages of decommissioning.
   4. Our regulatory expectations are documented in the Safety Assessment Principles (SAPs.) For example, the SAPs DC series and associated paragraphs.
   5. Para 830 states that the overall strategy should be consistent with Government policies and strategies and identify and explain any differences.
   6. SAP DC.3 sets out our expectations for the timing of decommissioning, which should be taking all relevant factors into account.
   7. Paragraph 841 sets out our expectation that decommissioning should be carried out as soon as reasonably practicable and sets out the factors that often affect this.
   8. SAP DC.4 and associated paragraphs set out expectations for decommissioning plans to be developed for assessment.
   9. It is important to note that judgements on decommissioning plans are dependent on UK government policy– for example, the UK Government's base case strategic assumption, as stated in the Funded Decommissioning Programme Guidance for New Nuclear Power Stations (2011), is that the spent fuel from a new NPP will be kept in long-term storage on-site until disposal at a GDF, and that the packaging of spent fuel will also be carried out on-site.
   10. RO – Last Energy are emphasising that their reactor units are constructed so that they are classified as “intermediate nuclear waste storage”. There’s an implication that the reactors, and their fuel, will only be classified as intermediate nuclear waste. What is the ONR view on this?
   11. ONR response – ONR requires licensees to produce and implement a strategy for the management of radioactive waste, which includes ensuring that the radioactive waste of any type or form is well understood, and the generation of any waste incompatible with currently available storage or disposal technology is prevented or minimised.
   12. During early engagement and pre-application advice phases we will be seeking the prospective licensee’s understanding of the types and forms of wastes produced, and we will be making regulatory decisions in that regard.
   13. As per previous response, ONR has not made decisions regarding Last Energy’s design and operating approach (including future decommissioning plans). These are expected once the prospective licensee makes a formal licence application (expected 2026-27), and the associated submissions (including technical underpinning for the expected types and forms or radioactive waste) are received for assessment.
   14. RO - The ONR has moved Hartlepool Nuclear Power Station operated by EDF into enhanced regulatory attention for safety. Please can you provide a summary of the reasons why enhanced regulation has been imposed, what improvements EDF will have to implement to come out of enhanced regulations, and how long EDF has to introduce these improvements?

Response - [Nuclear site moved into enhanced regulatory attention | Office for Nuclear Regulation](https://gbr01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.onr.org.uk%2Fnews%2Fall-news%2F2025%2F04%2Fnuclear-site-moved-into-enhanced-regulatory-attention%2F&data=05%7C02%7CLiz.Bibby%40onr.gov.uk%7C067b559ff9ac4252baee08dda2ba2aff%7C742775df807748d681d01e82a1f52cb8%7C0%7C0%7C638845642674821688%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=g%2FNuyMLzFn4OtGjamCaf9KHEMgRxBA%2BbmQ6e0NHllvE%3D&reserved=0)

**Summary of Actions – April 2025**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Action 1** | Provide an update to AD regarding the turbine hazard risk to Sizewell B that Sizewell C might cause | Complete |
| **Action 2** | Provide CW with finalised platform height observations for Sizewell C. | Complete |
| **Action 3** | PR to resend the paper written by Nick Scar on the possibility of problems when disposing of plutonium to MF. | Ongoing |