

Nirex Report

October 2004

Nirex Report

Contents

Part One – Establishing the Position

Aims	p 4
Method	p 4
General comment and explanation	p 4
<i>1. Explanation of categories</i>	
<i>2. General remarks on categories</i>	
Conclusion	p 6
Attachments	
<i>1. Table of categories</i>	
<i>2. Sheet of questions, categorized and by session</i>	
<i>3. Numbers of questions by year and by category</i>	
<i>4. Graphs showing 'periodicity' of questions</i>	
<i>5. List of MPs who have put down questions, by session, with their constituencies</i>	
<i>6. List of 'nuclear sites', in parliamentary constituencies, showing MPs and their political affiliations</i>	

Part Two – Comments on the UK Nirex 2004 Media and Public Affairs Strategy

Aims	p 9
Method	p 9
General comments on the strategy	p 9
Comments on content of the strategy	p 10

Part Three – The Way Forward

Statement	p 13
The perceived image	p 13
What we have now	p 13
What must be done	p 14
What could CORWM propose	p 14
Actions to be instigated	p 16
How these actions should be instigated	p 16
The purpose and aim of these actions	p 16
Strategies for the target groups	p 16
1. <i>Parliament and government</i>	
2. <i>Public at large</i>	
3. <i>Regional communities that might be affected</i>	
4. <i>Nirex image and reputation</i>	
End	p 18

Introduction ?

- objective
- facts
- context
- etc

Nirex Report

Part One – Establishing the Position

Aims

To produce a list of MPs who have an interest in the subject of radioactive waste management. To categorise this list in such a way that a clear strategy can be developed which can be targeted specifically to the individual MPs and other target groups.

why is
subject
as well
in context

Method

1. parliamentary records were examined covering a period of 15 years (1989 - 2004)
2. 7 general categories were established which were then further subdivided into 17 more specific categories (attachment 1)
3. the information derived from the parliamentary records (attachment 2) over the past 9 years (from 1995/96 to 2003/4 (to date)) was analysed and assigned to categories (attachment 3)
4. this was then interpreted (see Nirex Report – Part Three - The Way Forward)

This intellectual but time-consuming exercise gives **a firm factual and statistical base** from which to operate, it helps to remove conjecture and affirms or rejects subjective opinions.

However, **it is not a general compilation of the views of MPs**, but a reflection of their widespread interest in matters nuclear. As such it gives a clear indication where interests and fears lie and how they might be satisfied and assuaged.

General Comment and explanation

In order to further understand this information it is necessary to give:

1. an explanation of the categories
2. general remarks on the classifications.

1. Explanation of Categories

- the general headings result from a particular reference in the question
 - the specific headings are usually because of a specific reference ?
 - categories are 'catch-all' for questions in that general area and could come from quite diverse angles e.g.
- a) Questions that could be categorised as Category 2, FOREIGN, Importing/returning radioactive waste (see * in attachment 1) could include issues such as:
- ethical issue of handling other countries waste
 - transport implications
 - security of materials
 - health and safety
 - cost
 - escorts – Ministry of Defence (MoD)
 - illegal imports (98/99 – (73)(86))
 - concern and problem of Russian waste
- b) They could also be categorised as Category 2, FOREIGN and cover issues such as:
- imports/returns
 - transport
 - Russian stocks/waste management
 - French discharges
 - References to Irish Sea discharges not included except where there is a specific reference to the Irish government.
- c) In Category 1, MILITARY AND DEFENCE (MoD) which includes all references to military use of nuclear materials including references to dockyards and submarine decommissioning.

~~d) Q1 in Category 7, GENERAL subdivision~~

2. General Remarks on Classification

Many questions contain more than one query – explicitly or implicitly – and as such, have been placed in more than one category. For example a question on ‘transport of nuclear materials’ could be concerned with:

- cost of transport
- security of transport - physically
- health (of ship’s crews)
- safety – technically/community safety/constituency concern e.g. London transits
- terrorism – hijacking
- use and cost of MoD facilities – escorts etc.
- purpose of transport – import/export/reprocessing/storage/transfer – etc.

Category 7, GENERAL could be usefully broken down further as it contains matters, which came up occasionally. Initial breakdown could be as follows:

- international agreements/conventions
- environmental impact/implications
- energy policy/strategy
- health
- safety
- research
- recycling – consumer implication – irradiation
- contamination/remediation
- public consultation etc.

Conclusion

As a result of this exercise, we can show that MPs approach the issue of nuclear waste and its implications, as with most other issues, from different standpoints.

Generally, the motivations are:

- political – one of principle
- political – one of opportunism
- constituency/regional concern
- general/national concern
- 'gut' dislike/like – could be based on personality conflicts

THORP ?

However, the 'nuclear' issue is one that evokes considerable feeling outside the general considerations above. These special are also diverse:

- anti-nuclear attitude
- history of background in CND
- anti-war, pacifist
- arms trade
- proliferation
- previous or existing preferences for other fuels, e.g. coal background
- environmental impact concerns
- general green/eco-warrior

Or having a political researcher with some of the above!

Some questions come in 'clusters' from different MPs – especially if they are topical, newsy, etc. e.g.

- disposal of waste in Australia 1998/99
- Cap la Hague emissions (June 2000 (40,41))
- Imports from Germany (1998/99 (77))

New titles come up at particular times e.g.

- CORWM, ISOLUS, ^oTHEPT, MOX

THORP ?

After the 1997 election, particularly 1998/99 – there were more questions about matters such as policy, strategy, agreements/conventions, environmental impact, etc. These have gone into category 7, GENERAL.

Post 11/9/2001 – the concerns about terrorism and hijacking of material usually connected with transport to and from other countries (2001/02, (41,46,75,131,136)).

Nirex Report

Part Two - Comments on 2004 Media and Public Affairs Strategy

Aims

I was asked to comment on the UK Nirex 2004 Media and Public Affairs Strategy.

Method

I used results from the exercise to categorise the list of MPs gained from examining parliamentary records (see Nirex Report Part One – Establishing the Position) and my own parliamentary experience to develop a media and public affairs strategy, before checking my conclusions against those of the published strategy.

What was most interesting was that I started from a different perspective but came broadly to the same conclusions.

General comments on the strategy

The strategy is well thought out and well-founded, embracing all the nuances of the problem and obviously a great deal of hard work has gone into its framing.

Having said that, coming to the end of 2004 one could justifiably ask what has been delivered or achieved. Any strategy is only as good as its implementation and must depend on the tactics used to achieve a positive outcome.

It is vital to remember that the 'strategy' cannot be furthered until it is translated into an 'operational' mode and I suggest that this operational side is implemented along the lines I mentioned in Nirex Report Part Three - The Way Forward).

done, but
difficult to put
into work!

My difficulty was that I wasn't privy to all that the Communication Directorate has been doing during the year except for some initiatives that John (Dalton) mentioned to me:

- 21st Century Science
- Industry Supports ~~Science~~ *Education*
- At the University of Lancaster *Radil(e)*
- Parliament and Industry Trust etc.

However notwithstanding all the hard work that has been done, I think that it would be true to say that the general views and attitudes towards Nirex have not changed substantially, especially in Parliamentary terms.

change
I feel that there is now an urgency in the matter with the possible demise of Nirex as it is presently constituted.

*leaders
needs
back to
views*

It would be wilful neglect if all avenues were not pursued over the next year.

Comments on the content of the Strategy

These are made against the content of the Strategy.

Paragraph 1

Paragraph 1 states that the Energy Bill was 'the perfect hook on which to hang a resurrected key issues briefing'. The following questions need to be answered in order that the strategy can be seen to be effective:

- what was the result?
- were briefings held systematically?
- were they successful?
- was there a measurable response?

The interest in the House of Lords is well known, many have a vested interest in the industry – which is known and resented by certain Members in the House of Commons. This doesn't mean that they should be ignored; there are some very eminent scientists among them. I know that some of my

ex-colleagues and friends in the House of Lords would want to help if asked in developing our cadre of Parliamentarians.

Paragraph 2

I agree entirely with the CORWM reference.

Paragraph 3

Succinctly puts the need for a cohesive approach.

Paragraph 4

Oral briefings are absolutely essential to build up a cadre of MPs. It will be time consuming, but that is probably the only way to achieve that particular tactic.

Paragraph 5

Yes – it is so important that people are ‘singing off the same hymn sheets’ and that there is good communication within the team to ensure that everyone knows what every one else is doing.

Targets

This is exactly what is required to progress the ‘strategy’. But it does need updating and enlarging, remembering that not only the soft targets need addressing but also the uncommitted and maybe some of the hostiles.

CORWM

I was asked to ‘stay away’ from CORWM, which I have done, other than speaking to the Chairman at the All-Party Group meeting.

However, I agree with the general thrust of the strategy in wanting to maintain openness, honesty and transparency.

As far as ‘Third Party’ support is concerned, as I have expressed before, it really is essential to develop the indirect approach.

Media

Not my field so I find it difficult to comment. However my general feeling is that journalists are manageable and must be kept on-side. It is also important to recognise that we are dealing with different 'types' of journalists.

Scotland

Obviously vitally important as the pattern of Parliamentary Questions has shown. We must also be aware of Wales with its devolved powers in the environment field.

Departments

I agree with the analysis and approach, which needs to be developed further.

Other 'Third Parties'

I agree that this can be a fruitful area but it needs widening to include organisations mentioned in the Nirex Report Part Three - The Way Forward.

Nirex Report

Part Three - The Way Forward

Statement

'UK Nirex Ltd is responsible for providing safe, environmentally sound and publicly acceptable options for the long-term management of radioactive materials.'

the UK with

The perceived image

With this declared and worthwhile aim it is surprising that Nirex does not have a more positive image in both Parliament and the wider community.

Why should this be so?

Is it because Nirex is perceived as:

- an arm of the nuclear power industry and as such is perpetuating an 'undesirable' industry
- the potential bringer of bad news, the NIMBY syndrome fear
- an organisation that hasn't always been open and forthright in the past

Is it because of past mishandling of the problem:

- from a communication and public relations point of view

Or, as is most likely, is it a combination of bad perceptions and communications?

What we have now

1. An analysis of Written Parliamentary Questions over the past 9 years, year by year, arranged by subject, with data handling to give graphs and a computer framework (submitted previously)

2. A list of MPs who have shown an interest for varied reasons
3. A list of 'nuclear' sites (as given in Nirex publication), with the constituencies, MPs and their political affiliations marked against them.

What must be done

The critical time is now before the publication of the CORWM Report – which could be in about a year and a half!

It would be foolish to sit back and wait for the Report to be published and then respond.

It is therefore important and critical that groundwork is laid down to be able to respond to the possible options that CORWM might propose.

The CORWM review of options, because of its commitment to extensive public consultation, is already leaving its footprint of a climate of opinion and discussion.

What could CORWM propose?

Although it is not possible to give the precise outcome, it is possible to make a broad guess at the proposals, which might include:

- a) a positive option for deep geological disposal
- b) a negative option towards deep geological disposal and in favour of another method of disposal
- c) a prevarication with the suggestion of no action, or one or more proposals for disposal.

No matter what options are proposed there would be a need to respond

If the proposal is:

a) there will be a need to push government into action – a positive CORWM report does not mean that the government will act. Although armed with the CORWM report they will still be facing the same problems and lobby groups that they face today – NIMBY, anti-Nirex, community worry, 'green and environmental' groups etc.

b) there will be a need to argue especially if the Report equivocates

c) there will be a need to push for a more positive position.

In any event there must be in place a **process** of preparation for the target groups:

1. Government
2. Parliament – 'such leaders'
3. General public and communities
4. NIMBY areas.

This process must be put in place **NOW**. It can't be high profile but must consist of a number of elements implemented in a sensitive and appropriate way.

careful!

[We have to be sure that 'opinion leaders are carefully recruited and groomed'.

After a careful identification of the people we want to deal with, the key is to:

- evaluate their views and influence potential
- to recruit them to specially designed relationship activities and then
- provide them with a programme of appropriate communications messages and platforms.

↳ must provide tools to allow people to do this

Actions to be instigated

1. Promote scientific and technical arguments
2. Promote political arguments in Parliament and government.
3. Promote confidence-building in communities that may be affected and with the general public begin a broad general programme of 'education' by way of engagement, dialogue and debate
4. Embark on NIREX image change

— Small, clear + easily understandable.

↳ LGA 516

How these actions should be instigated

1. We must first establish what are the best lines of action to be followed particularly whether 'direct' or 'indirect' methods would be better.
2. They must be sensitive and appropriate - any mistakes might be costly and irretrievable.
3. We must decide what resources and contributors are to be put into these actions.

The purpose and aim of these actions

The purpose and aim is to enable our target groups to realise that:

- the problem exists,
- it must be resolved, and
- that 'our' way is the best way forward, otherwise there can be no future development of the nuclear industry.

Strategies for the target groups

The strategy must be directly relevant and appropriate for each of the target audiences:

1. Parliament and government
2. Public at large
3. Regional Communities that might be affected (including NIMBYs)
4. Nirex image and reputation

1. Parliament and government

Design strategy to:

- bolster (and, if possible, enlist) those MPs who support our policy
- convince those MPs who are indifferent or soft against
- isolate or convince those MPs who are against

This can be done by:

- enlisting a cadre of MPs who are ready and well-briefed to respond 'spontaneously' to the CORWM report
- relating radioactive-waste/production areas to constituencies – then constituencies to MPs
- using scientific and technical arguments
- using security of energy supply arguments
- referring to terrorism and security of stockpiles
- identifying other means of action

→ nuclear issues

2. Public at large

Embark on a general programme of 'education' - encouraging dialogue and debate.

Investigate ways of using other organisations e.g.

- BGS
- Geological Society
- ESEF(England and Wales)
- universities
- and others

Each Science Education Forum

3. Regional communities that might be affected

After establishing what might be the likely areas/regions – not to be disclosed, focus on these areas/regions:

] difficult
in
disclosure

- use local and regional media to progress arguments, not necessarily by Nirex.
- explain and debate the geology and technical aspects
- make them partners in the exercise (empower them by including them in the decision making process)

4. Nirex image and reputation

Embark on programme to change the image of Nirex so it will be considered a concerned, caring, soundly based and scientifically founded organisation:

- correct public perception, so Nirex is not seen as the producer of the problem
- change public address, so Nirex is not associated with Harwell and radioactive waste production
- change funding basis, so Nirex is not seen as being funded by the radioactive waste producing industries
- change name!

End

October 2004

Nirex Report

Table 1
Categories

7 MAIN CATEGORIES (GENERAL)		17 SUB-CATEGORIES (MORE SPECIFIC)
1	MILITARY & DEFENCE	General
		Dockyards and submarines
2	FOREIGN	General
		Importing/returning radioactive waste *
3	OFF-SHORE	Disposal/dumping
		Discharging
4	ON-SHORE	Disposal/dumping
		Discharging
		Storage
		Stocks
		Transportation
5	WASTE	General
		Nirex
		Cumbria/Nirex
		Scotland/Nirex
6	RE-PROCESSING	Domestic
		Imports/exports
7	GENERAL	Including – policy, environmental impact, health, safety, strategy, research, recycling

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT WHO HAVE PUT DOWN QUESTIONS IN RECENT YEARS – with their constituencies.

1995/1996

Beckett. Margaret	Derby South
Congdon. David	-----
Cousins. Jim	Newcastle Central
Cunningham. Roseanna	-----
Dalyell. Tam	Linlithgow
Durant. Anthony	Reading East
Foulkes. George	Carrick, C&D
Ingram. Adam	E.Kilbride
Luff. Peter	Mid-Worcs
Macdonald. Callum	Western Isles
Meacher. Michael	Oldham W
Morgan. Rhodri	Cardiff W
Purchase. Ken	Wolver.NE
Smith. Lew	Blaenau Gwent
Spink. Robert	Castle Point

1996/1997 — 1997/1998

Baker, Norman	Lewes
Bennett, Andrew	Denton & Reddish
Brinton, Helen	-----
Cable, Vincent	Twickenham
Campbell-Savours, Dale	-----
Chaytor, David	Bury N
Clapham, Michael	Barnsley W
Clarke, Tony	Northampton S
Coaker, Vernon	Gedling
Cohen, Harry	Leyton & Wanstead
Corbyn, Jeremy	Islington N
Cunningham, Jack	Copeland
Cunningham, Roseanna	-----
Dafis, Cynog	Ceredigion
Dalyell, Tam	Linlithgow
Davies, Geraint	Croydon Central
Fearn, Ronnie	-----
Flynn, Paul	Newport W
Gardiner, Barry	Brent N
Godman, Norman	-----
Gorrie, Donald	-----
Hancock, Mike	Portsmouth S
Home-Robertson, John	-----
Jones, Ieuan Wyn	Ynys Mon
Jones, Martyn	Clwyd S
Keen, Alan	Feltham & Heston
Lawrence, Jackie	Preseli Pembs
Lidington, David	Aylesbury
Llwyd, Elfyn	Merionydd N.C.
MacLennan, Robert	-----
McGrady, Eddie	South Down
McWilliam, John	Blaydon
Meacher, Michael	Oldham W
Mitchell, Austin	Great Grimsby
Moonie, Lewis	Kirkcaldy
Morgan, Alasdair	-----
Morgan, Julie	Cardiff N
Redwood, John	Wokingham
Ruane, Chris	Vale of Clwyd
Shaw, Jonathan	Chatham & Aylesford

Shephard. Gillian	SW Norfolk
Simpson. Alan	Nottingham S
Smith. Llew	Blaenau Gwent
Smith. Robert	West Aberdeen & Kincardine
Taylor. Matthew	Truro & St Austell
Todd. Mark	S. Derbyshire
Walley. Joan	Stoke on Trent
Williams. Alan W.	Carns. W
Wray. Jimmy	Glasgow, Baillieston

1998/1999

Alexander, Douglas
 Chaytor, David
 Clarke, Eric
 Cohen, Harry
 Collins, Tim
 Corbyn, Jeremy
 Cunningham, Jim
 Cunningham, Roseanna
 Dafis, Cynog
 Dalyell, Tam
 Drew, David
 Edwards, Huw
 Gillan, Cheryl
 Grieve, Dominic
 Hancock, Mike
 Key, Robert
 Lawrence, Jackie
 Livsey, Richard
 McDonald, John
 McGrady, Eddie
 McNamara, Kevin
 Morgan, Alasdair
 Salter, Martin
 Simpson, Alan
 Smith, Lew
 Stewart, David
 Stunell, Andrew
 Taylor, Matthew
 Turner, Desmond
 Walley, Joan

Paisley S
 Bury N

 Leyton & Wanstead
 Westmoreland & Lonsdale
 Islington N
 Coventry S

 Ceredigion
 Linlithgow
 Stroud
 Monmouth
 Chesham & Amersham
 Beaconsfield
 Portsmouth S
 Salisbury
 Preseli Pembro
 Brecon & Radnor

 South Down
 Hull N

 Nottingham S
 Blaenau Gwent
 Inverness E, Nairn & Lochaber
 Hazel Grove
 Truro & St Austell
 Brighton Kempdown
 Stoke on Trent N

1999/2000

Baker. Norman	Lewes
Brake. Tom	Carshalton & Wallington
Burton. Colin	Elmet
Chaytor. David	Bury N
Cousins. Jim	Newcastle Central
Cox. Tom	Tooting
Gibb. Nick	Bognor Regis & Littlehampton
Hancock. Mike	Portsmouth S
Jenkin. Bernard	N Essex
Key. Robert	Salisbury
Lawrence. Jackie	Preseli Pembro
Leslie. Christopher	Shipley
Livsey. Richard	-----
MacLennan. Robert	-----
McCabe. Stephen	Birm Hall Green
McNamara. Kevin	Hull N
Moore. Michael	Tweeddale, Etrick & Lauderdale
Rendel. David	Newbury
Robertson. Laurence	Tewkesbury
Savidge. Malcolm	Aberdeen N
Smith. Lew	Blaenau Gwent
Stunell. Andrew	Hazel Grove
Taylor. Teddy	Rochford & Southend
Thomas. Simon	Ceredigion
Tonge. Jenny	Richmond Park
Turner. Neil	Wigan

2000/2001

Chaytor. David
 Cohen. Harry
 Cotter. Brian
 Cousins. Jim
 Cox. Tom
 Dalyell. Tam
 Fearn. Ronnie
 Gale. Roger
 Gibb. Nick
 Jack. Michael
 Jenkin. Bernard
 MacLennan. Robert
 Pickles. Eric
 Smith. Lew
 Stunell. Andrew

Bury N
 Leyton & Wanstead
 Weston super Mare
 Newcastle Central
 Tooting
 Linlithgow

North Thanet
 Bognor Regis & Littlehampton
 Fylde
 N. Essex

Brentwood & Ongar
 Blaenau Gwent
 Hazel Grove

2001/2002

Ainsworth. Peter	E Surrey
Baker. Norman	Lewes
Barker. Gregory	Bexhill Park
Bruce. Malcolm	Gordon
Burton. Colin	Elmet
Carmichael. Alistair	Orkney & Shetland
Chaytor. David	Bury N
Cotter. Brian	Weston super Mare
Cousins. Jim	Newcastle Central
Curtis-Thomas. Claire	Crosby
Doughty. Sue	Guildford
Drown. Julia	S Swindon
George. Andrew	St Ives
Gibb. Nick	Bognor Regis & Littlehampton
Grayling. Chris	Epsom & Ewell
Hancock. Mike	Portsmouth S
Lawrence. Jackie	Preseli Pembs
Lloyd. Tony	Manchester Central
Llwyd. Elfyn	Merionydd
Mackinley. Andrew	Thurrock
Mailaber. Judy	Amber Valley
Marsden. Paul	Shrewsbury
McGrady. Eddie	South Down
Merron. Gillian	Lincoln
Perham. Linda	Iford N
Robertson. Angus	Moray
Ruane. Chris	Vale of Clwyd
Sayed. Jonathan	Mid Beds
Shiple. Debra	Stourbridge
Simpson. Alan	Nottingham S
Smith. Llew	Blaenau Gwent
Stunell. Andrew	Hazel Grove
Taylor. Matthew	Truro & St Austell
Thomas. Simon	Ceredigion
Weir. Michael	Angus
Wishart. Pete	N.Tayside
Wray. Jimmy	Glasgow Baillieston
Key. Robert	Salisbury
Steen. Anthony	Totnes
Davey. Valerie	Bristol W
Chidgey. David	Eastleigh
Clifton-Brown. Geoffrey	Cotswold
Flynn. Paul	Newport E

Grayling. Chris
Watson. Tom

Epsom & Ewell
West Brom

2002/2003

Baker, Norman	Lewes
Barker, Gregory	Bexhill & Battle
Baron, John	Billericay
Blunt, Crispin	Reigate
Cable, Vincent	Twickenham
Carmichael, Alistair	Orkney & Shetland
Chaytor, David	Bury N
Cunningham, Jack	Copeland
Curtis-Thomas, Claire	Crosby
David, Wayne	Caerphilly
Drews, David	Stroud
Godsiff, Roger	Birm Sparkbrook
Hayes, John	South Holland & The Deepings
Hughes, Simon	N Southwark & Bermondsey
Mann, John	Bassetlaw
McGrady, Eddie	South Down
Meacher, Michael	Oldham W
Reid, Alan	Argyll & Bute
Ruane, Chris	Vale of Clwyd
Shaw, Jonathan	Chatham & Aylesford
Smith, Llew	Blaenau Gwent
Squire, Rachel	Dunfermline W
Stewart, David	Inverness E---
Stunnel, Andrew	Hazel Grove
Thomas, Simon	Ceredigion
Watson, Tom	West Brom E
Wiggin, Bill	Leominster
Wray, Jimmy	Glasgow Baillieston
Wyatt, Derek	Sittingbourne & Sheppey

2003/2004

Ainsworth. Peter
 Baker. Norman
 Bellingham. Henry
 Chaytor. David
 Cunningham. Jack
 Hancock. Mike
 Hoyle. Lindsay
 Jenkin. Bernard
 Jones. Kevan
 MacDonald. John
 Mallaber. Judy
 Mercer. Patrick
 O'Brien. Stephen
 Reid. Aian
 Robertson. John
 Robertson. Laurence
 Simon. Sion
 Smith. Llew
 Tami. Mark
 Watson. Tom
 Wright. David

E Surrey
 Lewes
 NW Norfolk
 Bury N
 Copeland
 Portsmouth S
 Chorley
 N Essex
 N Durham

 Amber Valley
 Newark
 Eddisbury
 Argyll & Bute
 Glasgow Anniesland
 Tewkesbury
 Birm Eddington
 Blaenau Gwent
 Alyn & Deeside
 West Brom E
 Telford

NUCLEAR SITES / CONSTITUENCIES / MPs / PARTY

<u>Nuclear Sites</u>	<u>Constituencies</u>	<u>MP</u>	<u>Party</u>
Vulcan/Dounray	Caithness & Sutherland	John Thurso	LD
Rosyth	Dunfermline W	Rachel Squire	L
	"" E	Gordon Brown	L
Clyde	Clydebank&Milngarvie	?	
	Dumbarton	?	
Torness	East Lothian	Anne Pickering	L
Hunterston	Cunningham N	Brian Wilson	L
Chapelcross	Dumfries	Russell Brown	L
Drigg	Copeland	Jack Cunningham	L
Windscale			
Sellafield			
Eskmeads			
Heysham	Morecambe&Lunesdale	Geraldine Smith	L
Hartlepool	Hartlepool		L
Springfields	Fylde	Michael Jack	C
	Ribble South	Nigel Evans	C
Capenhurst	Ellesmere Port	Andrew Miller	L
Wylfa	Ynys Mon	Albert Owen	L
Trawsfynydd	Merionydd	Elfyn Llwyd	PC
Cardiff	Cardiff N	Julie Morgan	L
Stafford	Stafford	David Kidney	L
Donnington	Shrewsbury&Atcham	Paul Marsden	LD
	The Wrekin	Peter Bradley	L
Sizewell	Suffolk Coastal	John Gummer	C
Bradwell	Maldon&Chelmsford E	John Whittingdale	C
Amersham	Chesham & Amersham	Cheryl Gillan	C

Harwell	Wantage	Robert Jackson	C
Culham			C
Aldermaston	Newbury	David Rendel	LD
Berkeley	Stroud	David Drew	L
Oldbury	Northavon	Steve Webb	LD
Fort Halstead	Sevenoaks	Michael Fallon	C
	Orpington	John Horam	C
Dungeness	Folkestone&Hythe	Michael Howard	C
Portsmouth	Portsmouth	Mike Hancock	LD
Winfrith	Dorset S	Jim Knight	L
Devonport	Devonport	David Jamieson	L
Hinkley Point	Bridgewater	Ian Liddell Grainger	C

2004 Media & Public Affairs Strategy

▪ 2004 –Key Policy Drivers

- Resolution of Nirex independence
- Ongoing work of CoRWM
- Progress of the Energy Bill
- ISOLUS debate – particularly in Scotland
- New build debate
- European Nuclear Waste Directive

▪ Parliament

With the announcement of the Energy Bill (incorporating the draft NDA Bill) in the Queen's Speech, we have the perfect hook on which to hang a resurrected key issues briefing. Interest in both Houses, but especially the Upper, on nuclear energy generally and the waste issue specifically has already meant that we have been able to step up our proactive contact with parliamentarians. Equally it also means that we have a job to do in ensuring that the long-term perspective is not lost in the ongoing debate.

The briefing needs to be pitched in such a way as to put across the key messages but not be seen to undermine the ongoing work of CoRWM. Broad brush and fairly basic in scope and content, it should include some or all of the following:

- *Introductory messages* – The waste exists, it is an ethical issue, it must be dealt with whether or not, Nirex has changed
- *Where does Nirex fit* – place in the fuel cycle, long-term perspective (with advent of NDA etc.), recent announcements (independence, CoRWM etc.)
- *Why now* – why it is right, proper, and feasible to act now (doable, opportunity, future generations etc.)
- *Why deep* – the one that comes closest to CoRWM's remit but essential if we are to bring third party pressure to bear on the Committee. International precedent, safety, environmental containment, fairness to future generations etc.

In addition the opportunities to continue orally briefing key figures should also be established, enabling us to engage in a more candid dialogue about CoRWM and our preferred long-term management solution. Also, specifically with regards to the Bill there is a need to consider both whether we are to seek to make any specific amendments and whether we are to approach any sympathetic MPs over membership of the Standing Committee (which would entail them speaking at Second Reading).

Alongside this specific briefing, consideration should also be given to writing a 'corporate script' – designed for internal use only – which is a long hand version of the core presentation. With focus on Nirex and its activities only likely to increase and widen over the coming year, such a message management tool would serve to ensure that the same key points are communicated across the company to a range of different audiences

Suggested targets for the Parliamentary briefing would include:

Select Committee Chairmen

- Rt Hon Michael Jack – Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
- Peter Ainsworth – Environmental Audit
- Dr Ian Gibson – Science and Technology

Backbench Labour MPs

- Russell Brown - Dumfries Constituency (Chapelcross)
- David Drew - Stroud Constituency (Berkeley & EFRA Select Committee)
- Hon Lindsay Hoyle - Trade & Industry Select Committee
- Dr Ashok Kumar - Trade & Industry Select Committee, Deputy Chair Energy Studies APG, Board Member POST
- John McFall – Dumbarton Constituency (Clyde Base & Chair Treasury Select Committee)
- Geraldine Smith – Morecombe and Lunesdale Constituency (Heysham, Science & Technology Select Committee)
- David Wright – Telford Constituency (Donnington & Environmental Audit Select Committee)
- Parmjit Dhanda – Gloucester Constituency (British Energy), Science & Technology Select Committee
- Paddy Tipping - EFRA Select Committee, Chair Energy Studies APG

Conservative Spokespeople & MPs

- Theresa May – Shadow Secretary of State for Environment & Transport
- Caroline Spelman – Shadow Secretary of State for Environment
- Stephen O'Brien – Shadow Secretary of State for Industry
- Gregory Barker - Environmental Audit Select Committee
- Mark Francois - Environmental Audit Select Committee

Liberal Democrat Spokespeople & MPs

- Norman Baker – Chief Spokesman, Environment
- Sue Doughty – Spokesman, Environment
- Malcolm Bruce – Chief Spokesman, Industry
- Norman Baker - Vice Chair, All Party Environment Group, Shadow Spokesman for Environment
- John Thurso - Caithness, Sutherland & Easter Ross Constituency (Dounreay)

Labour Backbench Peers

- Lord Evans of Parkside – Nuclear Industry Interest
- Lord Corbett of Castle Vale – Nuclear Industry Interest
- Lord Hardy of Wath – Nuclear Industry Interest
- Lord Lofthouse of Pontefract – Nuclear Industry Interest
- Baroness Nicol – Nuclear Industry Interest
- Lord Taylor of Blackburn – Nuclear Industry Interest

Conservative Peers

- Earl Atlee – Energy Spokesman
- Lord Dixon-Smith – Environment Spokesman
- Duke of Montrose – Environment Spokesman
- Lord Rotherwick – Environment Spokesman
- Baroness Miller of Hendon - Trade and Industry Spokesman
- Lord Hodgson of Astley Abbots - Trade and Industry Spokesman
- Earl of Lindsay – Nuclear Industry Interest
- Lord Jenkin of Roding – Nuclear Industry Interest
- Lord Skeimersdale – Nuclear Industry Interest
- Lord Geddes – Nuclear Industry Interest
- Lord Howell of Guildford – Nuclear Industry Interest
- Lord Naseby – Nuclear Industry Interest

Liberal Democrat Peers

- Lord Ezra – Energy Spokesman
- Baroness Miller of Chilthorne Domer - Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Spokesman
- Lord Livesy of Talgarth - Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Spokesman
- Lord Razzell - Trade and Industry Spokesman
- Lord Sharman - Trade and Industry Spokesman

▪ **CoRWM**

When considering how to communicate with the new Committee the central point to be emphasised is that it should not involve any major reinvention of wheels – the strengths and practices (openness, honesty, transparency) that have carried us this far (i.e. with our post '97 rehabilitation or our independence) should form the basis of our work with CoRWM. There may be a new emphasis to the strategy and in the way in which we communicate, but the essential underpinning should remain the same.

With this in mind the following issues and themes need to be borne in mind:

- **Strong messages** – the announcement on our independence means something of a step-change in the way we communicate our key messages. Our approach will have to be more assertive and front-foot (as with Tc-99), with less emphasis on the pre-'97 negatives (while still stressing the lessons learnt) and more on the post-'97 positives. Nowhere will this be more important than with CoRWM. Our arguments will be examined, tested and contested in the strongest, most sustained manner since the planning inquiry and we will need to be confident not only in their inherent strengths and robustness, but also in our ability to communicate them.
- **Comparison** – in a similar vein, with the main focus of the Committee being an examination of the options, we cannot fight shy of pushing the Nirex Concept, and in doing so the key will lie with comparisons. The zero-sum nature of the problem must be emphasised, as must the need to look to the option that builds in the most defences against uncertainty.

The Concept will be attacked from all angles, both in its generality and its minutiae, but it must be continually stressed that no single option can, or should be viewed in isolation, and that when all the variants, factors, and parameters are considered phased deep geological disposal constitutes the best practicable all round management option.

- **Shape and structure** – there is, quite rightly and understandably, a lot of information currently being prepared for submission to CoRWM, all of which will need some overall shape and structure. This can be provided by the standard presentation, which, as the central communication tool of the company, supplies the narrative necessary (i.e. project viability, strengths of the Nirex Concept etc.) to ensure coherence and focus in the messages being fed into CoRWM.
- **Transparency** – it is crucial that Nirex does not (and is not seen to) beg any special favours in terms of access to the Committee or demand that, simply because we have been around the longest, we should be able to dictate the pace and programme of work. We will be dealing with an open market of information (with, hopefully, a few exceptions such as the inventory) and need to position ourselves as a very helpful and very well informed stakeholder, winning them over with strength of argument rather than mere dominance.

By the same token though, we must ensure that all the Committee's dealings are carried out in such an open and transparent manner and that all information sought and received, from all quarters, is made public. Our own lessons learnt (especially process and behaviour) should be carried over to the work of CoRWM to preclude later questioning of the legitimacy of the consultation process.

- **Independence** – just as we have sought independence from the industry and the NDA on the grounds of legitimacy, so we need to ensure our separation from the new Committee to avoid it becoming portrayed as 'Nirex Mark II' and to protect the integrity of the process. Similarly, from our own perspective we need the independence to stop us becoming a kind of second secretariat for the Committee and to allow us to, legitimately, criticise CoRWM, should we feel it necessary, on process and/or outcome.
- **Third party support** – if, as stated, there is to be an open market in information, then we need to ensure that we are not the only ones proactively putting forward the arguments (ethical, scientific, environmental etc.) in favour of phased deep geological disposal. Sympathetic supporters in all fields – academic, political, scientific, international, environmental – should be encouraged to play a full and active part in the consultative process, both through feeding their views into CoRWM and helping Nirex sharpen up its own contribution.

- **Media**

The 2004 political agenda, which includes, amongst other topics, the Energy Bill and the ongoing work of CoRWM, represents a gear change in relevant policy development. The main consideration for us on the media front is whether 2004

should also represent a gear change in how we engage with the media – both in terms of 'level of volume' and breadth of contacts.

Level of Volume

We have been extremely effective in working with the media and have built relationships with key commentators, based on trust and dialogue, which, in part, may explain opponents' concerns to exert control over us and our management.

At the same time we are rarely quoted or referenced on the record – other than in a historically negative context. To date there has been a deliberate strategy not to raise the profile on the record, mostly in response to advice and concern from Government that this would be unhelpful. This legitimate concern remains and should continue to be a significant consideration in informing strategy.

That said, it is also worth considering that the level of volume and 'name-check' references, is too low and could be counterproductive to Nirex's efforts to communicate effectively with wider stakeholders and the public. We should consider going more on the record with positive messages, which would raise the visibility of Nirex to wider audiences, and publicly reflect the ownership of issues, which privately we are already recognised for.

The risk of not doing so is that we lose the required level of visibility within a stakeholder (and potentially public) debate that has an increasing number of players, from CoRWM to the NDA, and the industry.

But if not handled properly and without the tacit or implicit support of Government (or elements of its), the risk would be loss of key political support. Therefore the task is to find a middle-way which has political support. This is a finely balanced argument which requires further consideration before deciding on a course of action – or non-action.

Widening the contact base

We have developed very good contacts with some elements of the media, particularly national political, business and science correspondents; and some local journalists who continue to display a very keen interest in the issues.

Given the level of activity in this policy area in 2004 there is sure to be an increased level of interest and coverage in the specialist press. There is a good case for us widening our base of active contacts to cover more of the trade and specialist press (such as *Utility Week*, *New Scientist*, *Economist*) and to increase levels of activity with both the national science correspondents and key regional journalists (see also the 'Scotland' section).

For example a feature piece by either Chris Murray or Sir Ken, or a key Nirex scientist on the international experience of managing radioactive waste placed in one of the journals above could give us the required visibility and contribute in a positive way to the overall debate and Government objectives.

The Media Contact list can be reviewed, updated and expanded in the New Year, while a list of Government (and other third party) quotes and references should be prepared to support the Nirex position. Previous visits to Finland, Sweden and the US have been very effective and should also continue to be utilised.

▪ Scotland

Various scares (the Greenpeace 'site' list, local community compensation) and more recently the whole nuclear submarines debate has revealed a dangerous combination of great interest and lack of up to date knowledge on radioactive waste management in Scotland. The view of us is very much of it as the same organisation that was seeking a repository in Dounreay in the 1980's/1990s and the view of the current state of Government policy is similarly outdated.

The subs debate has had the advantage of bringing to the fore both those that may play a part in a larger debate on long-term waste management and of the views/fears that will prevail. This will allow us to step up our contact north of the border in more structured way. Much of what we have done in terms of communications has been reactive 'fire fighting' rather than positive engagement and this clearly needs to change over the coming year. This will not be a high profile campaign (which would only trigger fears of 'Return of Nirex') but instead an attempt to ensure informed and up to date debate as the issue gains in profile with the ongoing work of ISOLUS and CoRWM.

Specific activity should include:

- Targeted mailing of MSPs – move away from *ad hoc* nature of contact to structured dialogue with selected group of parliamentarians, with a view to taking a small group over to Finland or Sweden
- Maintain links with Scottish Executive – build on meetings with people like Ross Finnie and Peter Hastie and extend contact both on a formal (Alan Wilson, Deputy Environmental Minister, the Enterprise Ministry) and informal (other Special Advisers, Scottish Labour Party Conference) basis
- Scottish media – proactive contact with a targeted list of journalists (environment, energy correspondents, selected columnists) to raise awareness of the issue outside the usual suspects
- Local government – much of the real anger and mistrust has emanated from the local councils, particularly in the north of Scotland. The May 2003 elections saw change in personal and, although approaching them without causing suspicion will be difficult, contact needs to be renewed and updated

Possible contacts include:

- Jamie Stone MSP (Lib Dem, Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross)
- Maureen Macmillan MSP (Lab, Highlands and Islands)
- John Farquhar Munro MSP (Lib Dem, Ross, Skye and Inverness West)
- David Mundell MSP (Con, South of Scotland)
- Bruce Crawford MSP (SNP, Mid Scotland and Fife)
- Ross Finnie - Minister for the Environment and Rural Development (LD)
- Allan Wilson - Deputy Minister for the Environment and Rural Development (Lab)
- Derek Munn - Special Adviser to Labour ministers

- Cllr Anne McGovern, Leader of Fife Council
- Cllr Alison McGee, Leader of Highland Council
- Cllr Roger Saxon, member for Thurso West
- Linda Summerhayes, Press & Journal
- Bill Jacobs, Evening News
- Alastair Daiton, Scotsman (transport, science etc)
- Sandy Bremner, BBC (based in Aberdeen)
- James Reynolds - Scotsman environment correspondent

▪ **Departments / No. 10**

It is with the Departments that we have experienced the greatest amount of frustration. The independence announcement has been stymied and somewhat fudged, with, it seems, the civil servants viewing Nirex as a 'problem' and seeking to keep us wrapped up through uncertainty. This apparent breakdown between political decisions and civil service action indicates the need for a dual communications strategy. We should continue to do everything we have been doing – responding to consultations, feeding in views formally and informally etc. – but at the same time heavy political pressure needs to be brought to bear to ensure that both the spirit and the letter of Government announcements are put into practice.

It may also be useful to attempt another trip to Finland or Sweden. This would demonstrate first hand both the fact that a solution is feasible and publicly acceptable and that the solution of choice is deep disposal. By including both enthusiastic and reluctant officials and special advisers the aim would be to win over those who have concerns about the political or environmental acceptability/practicality of a solution. Possible invitees, in addition to those we already deal with, could include Paul Kissack, the Energy Policy official in the Treasury and Stephen Crisp, the new Special Adviser to the Energy Minister Elliot Morley.

- **Other 3rd Parties** – Outside of these political and media audiences there is a need to continue with efforts to widen the debate. Various surveys have shown that the issue of radioactive waste is very near the bottom of people's list of worries, in the main because of lack of knowledge or awareness, but once alerted to it, it moves to very near the top of the list. If we are to overcome this, and have the informed, mature and balanced debate that is needed, then the issue has to become one that is as familiar and widely debated as, say, nuclear versus renewables or GM crops.

If this is to take place then Nirex needs to establish and/or maintain contact with a range of groups who, while they may not have a direct or obvious interest in radioactive waste, do have an influence or involvement in the wider policy world. Such groups would include:


- Women's Institute – influential at both a national and, particularly, a local level. It is one of the few such organisations to employ full time policy

officers. Their annual conference would seem to be the best opportunity to establish contact.


- CBI – successful *ad hoc* contact has already been made at a regional level (south east) and thought needs to be given to both formalising the regional relationship and moving on to a national level.
- Think tanks – in addition to the seminar already being planned with the FPC, other think tanks could be used to ensure that both the key issue itself and side issues in which we have a close interest (local community engagement, long-term thinking etc.) appear regularly on the public policy radar.
- Regional Development Agencies/Regional Assemblies – although they may not hold a great deal of actual power or influence, they do act as something of a focus/nexus for prominent regional players. Contact has already been made with the Director of Policy at the North West Regional Assembly and the focus obviously should be on affected areas, such as the North West and the north of Scotland.

In addition, with the increased focus on clean-up and the future of nuclear energy generally, Nirex's place in the fuel cycle and the wider sector is likely to become an even more important part of our narrative. Therefore consideration should be given to the usefulness of briefing City analysts who cover the energy sector.

Analysis of PQs asked - General




Analysis of PQs asked - Re-processing




— Re-processing

Analysis of PQs asked - Off-shore




— Off-shore


Analysis of PQs asked - Waste




Analysis of PQs asked - Foreign



Analysis of PQs asked - On shore



Analysis of PQs asked '95-'04



Analysis of PQs asked - MoD

