

Comments received from PSG on draft 2

The specification was sent to the Project Steering Group(PSG) on 20 Dec 05. Sign off was given from all PSG members involved in the sign-off process (Jamie Woolley, UK Nuclear Free Local Authorities was not involved) by 22 Dec 05, some by default. As stated in an email to members sign off would be assumed where no objections were received by the deadline, in order to enable the progression of the specification. In January, follow up phonecalls were made to each member to confirm sign off. Verbal sign off was not achieved with only two members, one of whom later emailed comments which were taken to mean agreement with the content of the specification.

During the above sign off process, comments were received from a number of PSG members. These **un-attributed** comments on the record keeping specification (draft 2) are listed below.

Comments received	CIRIA response
I'm happy with the spec.	-
I have discussed this with colleague – and we are generally happy with the specification. One small point relating to the policy makers (where DEFRA is quoted) is that current policy will need to be considered in the development of our document. In this respect, I understand that DEFRA is developing a national strategy for management of information relating to radioactive waste – no details have yet been published but if we include provision in the specification for current policy to be considered it should allow the relevant aspects of the national strategy to be included in our research.	Included a note that current policy should be considered
as ever a very comprehensive document, with which I am happy. I do wonder however if the date for tenders is to close at the end of Jan with the holiday period. I might have missed this in earlier versions and consultants might have already been submitting tenders as they knew the date in advance.	Deadline required to meet overall schedule but consultants have been notified of forthcoming project
I have read through Draft 2 of the spec for the record keeping project. Without being extremely picky I think all the bases appear to be captured and this spec should suffice. I note another steering group member's comments about the potential for the report to be dominated by a list of do's and don'ts, but work on the basis that the Steering Group input will ensure it is appropriately aligned. My only interest is how will you select/invite the consultants for tendering. I have in the past received comments that SAFEGROUNDS has a very selective number of people invited to undertake work.	-
<p>1. I'm OK with this except that in the introductory section of the suggested contents section (3.4) there needs to be a flow diagram of the SAFEGROUNDS process, which should highlight those parts of the process where records are relevant. This would emphasise to the reader that records are important at the start of the Land Management Process, during the Process, as an essential part of any stewardship and after the land has been released from control.</p> <p>On CIRIA suggestion to incl. 4-page summary:</p> <p>Whilst KP 5 is right, the 4 pager is not quite there with respect to record keeping and the flow diagrams - this is mainly a history thing - ie the LMG doesn't start with Characterisation so reviewing historical records isn't there, nor capturing characterisation records.</p>	

<p>Different parts of the nuclear and defence industries have different existing procedures, regulatory requirements and organisational arrangements relevant to contaminated land and land quality record-keeping.</p> <p>The draft specification does not appear to envisage that the guidance should explore in any depth what existing systems and requirements are already in place, both within industry and elsewhere (e.g. Nirex, local authorities, public records office, NDA). My main worry about this project is that we may end up with a document dominated by generalised 'lecturing' addressed to industry about how important record-keeping is and how many problems can arise, leading to guidance on how to deal with and/or avoid problems that is too generalised for it to be obvious for specific record-holding organisations to know what they should do. That said, I recognise that this is a difficult area to address and I hope the chosen consultants will exceed my expectations.</p> <p>Some specific points:</p>	<p>Points to be borne in mind during contractor selection and management of the project</p>
<p>The 1st para of 2.4 should probably read "Furthermore, contaminated land investigation/remediation projects can tend to be managed as a series of short-duration phases spread over several years with sometimes prolonged periods of relative inactivity." (or word to that effect).</p>	<p>Sentence amended to take account of these points</p>
<p>In the 2nd para of 2.4, I think "subsequent" should read "consequent".</p>	<p>Change made</p>
<p>In the set of paragraphs beginning at the bottom of page 3 (starting with 'Site owners'), note that NDA and MOD are not the only site owners. Also probably worth adding a paragraph on "Former site owners (e.g. MOD for 'alienated sites')" and ask MOD to explain the interest (which may also affect NDA as current owner of some ex-MOD sites). My understanding is that MOD retains some contingent liability for contamination/ordnance hazards on ex MOD land that has been sold off or transferred to another public body in the past (depends to some extent on the terms of sale/transfer). Finally in relation to these paragraphs, it is appropriate to list Local Authorities, but more by virtue of the Planning Regime and the existing Part IIA. The extension of Part IIA to radioactivity is in practice likely to have little in the way of implications for record-keeping for nuclear and defence sites, as those of us who attended a recent SAGTA workshop on the radioactive Part IIA discovered.</p>	<p>Paragraphs amended or added to take account of these points</p>
<p>Under 3.5 and 9.1, I am a bit surprised at the high level of CIRIA management time and the number of people involved. Also, I think it would be helpful to tenderers to mention that there will be 'contributions in kind' from Steering Group and Working Group members and others involved in SAFEGROUNDS.</p>	<p>CIRIA input results from amount of consultation required – lowering will affect the quality of outputs</p> <p>Note added on contributions –in-kind</p>
<p>Under 3.6, the existing guidance on record-keeping for decommissioning that was produced by LMG-SITF (posted on the SAFEGROUNDS</p>	<p>Already mentioned – but</p>

<p>website) should be mentioned.</p> <p>The title of section 4 does not seem to relate to the paragraph that follows.</p> <p>I hope this is helpful. Sorry I could not make time to be involved in the Working Group.</p>	<p>strengthened by including hyperlink</p> <p>Title amended</p>
<p>I'm happy to see both of these signed off.</p>	
<p>I'm happy to sign this off.</p>	
<p>I hope you have included my sign off. I reviewed the draft spec prior to our meeting.</p>	
<p>Telephone comments provided by member – 11/01/06</p> <p>Everything ok - some minor points:</p> <p>Page 7: 2nd bullet - 'practices' should probably be 'practice'</p> <p>Page 6: General concern - description of record keeping systems - 5th bullet - what should be kept and over what timescales - This should go in there, but the consultant may need some help with that - If they say that everything needs to be kept it might not be used that widely.</p>	
<p>I am fine about signing off this document.</p>	
<p>I am able to confirm that I am reasonably content with the definition of work described by SPEC PROP2333. This latest version still retains some of the points of concern that I brought to the attention of CIRIA at the Birmingham meeting on 13th December. I would like to see these removed before I can "sign off" the document. but I can accept that these points could be cleared up during the contract work if the contractors do not feel too limited by the actual words in the specification and if CIRIA can manage the contract in these terms.</p> <p>The points that continue to worry me are:</p> <p>that the fundamental legal duties of site operators and nuclear site licensees are not brought to the fore in the needs of "Contractors and agents for the site owners" (last paragraph of page 3). It should be borne in mind that it is the site licensee and occupier (not the site owner) that has the principal legal duties under Nuclear Installations Act and Health and Safety at Work Act for example.</p> <p>that the out put of the work asked for looks to be too detailed. The HSW and NIA licence conditions are duty setting not prescriptive. The caveat of all guidance (including that generated by Safegrounds) is that it may be good advice but that at the end of the day it is for the duty holder to satisfy himself, and the regulator, that what he does is appropriate. So, too prescriptive guidance could be misleading.</p> <p>that on page 6 (third bullet point from the bottom) the end state of the site should NOT impact on the quality of records or of their preservation. These are fundamental obligations.</p> <p>there are a few more detailed points:</p> <p>(a) the phrase (first paragraph page 4) "Regulators need site licence holders to meet certain legal obligations" (my emphasis) is not quite right. It is the legal duty holder that needs to ensure that he satisfies the</p>	

<p>law.</p> <p>(b) the first paragraph of page 5 uses the descriptor "spatial". I fully support this would like to see the three dimensional nature of contamination in the ground on many sites to be made clear in the output of this work.</p> <p>(c) on page 6 the durability of records is referred to very appropriately. However, this appears under the "accessibility" heading. It must not be overlooked that durability of records is also a storage medium issue.</p> <p>Generally, however, I believe the specification is well written and I fully support the desirability of Safegrounds guidance being made available as emphasising this important task (throughout the life of the site) can only be helpful.</p>	
<p>I have been unwell and still not up to speed (i.e. haven't read the current record keeping document) but I was happy with the outcome of discussions and provided that they are captured by the document as it stands I accept it. sorry to be so feeble</p>	