

NATIONAL DOSE ASSESSMENT WORKING GROUP

SUB-GROUP ON COMMUNICATIONS

6th Meeting held on 11th March 2008, Aviation House London.

1. Present

Chair	Barrie Lambert	Consultant
Regulators/agencies	Stuart Conney	FSA
	Anne Nisbet	HPA
	Mike Poole	NDA
	Patrick Stephen	NII
	Mark Toner	SEPA
Specialists/NGOs	Jill Sutcliffe	Independent
Secretariat	Ray Kowe	HPA
Apologies	David Collier	Faulkland Associates
	Andrew Craze	NDA

2. Minutes of previous meeting

Members agreed on the minutes of the 5th meeting.

3. Actions from the fifth meeting

Action 4.2 Ray to email Patrick to see if the NII communications person is best to represent the NII on the communications subgroup. *Ongoing. Patrick has emailed Chris Snape on this matter and is awaiting a reply.*

Action 5.1 Anne and David Collier to finalise programme and draw up a list of 'targeted' participants for the risk communication workshop. *Completed.*

Action 5.2 Barrie to delete the term 'or Constraint' from question 4 in the leaflet and reword the footnote accordingly. *Completed.*

Action 5.3 Mike to write footnote for question 11 for Barrie to incorporate into the leaflet. *Ongoing. Mike has sent the footnote, Barrie needs to incorporate it.*

Action 5.4 Subgroup members to review the wording of question 11 and send their comments directly to Barrie by Friday 2nd November. *Completed.*

Action 5.5 Subgroup members to think of a title for the information leaflet by Friday 2nd November. *Completed.*

Action 5.6 David Collier to provide illustrations for questions 1 and 2 of the information leaflet by the end of November. *Completed.*

Action 5.7 Ray to provide an illustration for question 3 of the information leaflet by the end of November. *Completed.*

Action 5.8 David Webbe Wood to provide the FSA modelling schematic for question 4 of the information leaflet by the end of November. *Completed.*

Action 5.9 David Webbe Wood to approach CEFAS for an illustration of monitoring outside a power station for question 5 of the information leaflet by the end of November. *Completed.*

Action 5.10 David Webbe Wood to provide an illustration of the RIFE report for question 6 of the information leaflet by the end of November. *Completed.*

Action 5.11 Anne to provide an illustration of the collection of seaweed for question 7 of the information leaflet by the end of November. *Completed.*

Action 5.12 Mike to provide illustrations for questions 8 and 9 of the information leaflet by the end of November. *Ongoing.*

Action 5.13 Barrie to provide illustrations for questions 10 and 11 of the information leaflet by the end of November. *Ongoing.*

Action 5.14 David Collier to produce a table of who needs to be communicated to and what information they might need. *Ongoing.*

4. Topics for discussion

4.1 Seminar on risk communication - feedback

Anne has discharged an ACFWG action by organising the workshop.

The meeting was useful for establishing links. The communications team for the EA are in contact with the communications team for the HPA CRCE for the first time.

Neville Craddock said the meeting was useful in establishing old and new links.

The EA and FSA now have an initiative on how to take things forward. There is an action on Carol Attwood to look at the possibility of a second workshop on how to put communications into practice.

Cathy Alexander of the FSA commented that a dialogue could be reopened with the food industry on what to do with food from contaminated areas.

The workshop has given added incentive to reconvene the ACFWG.

David Collier is going to summarise key points from the DoH risk communication booklet into an NDAWG good practice note for the website and has suggested having a second workshop on food and probabilistic risk communication.

Action 6.1 Anne to write a one page summary about the workshop by June that will go on the NDAWG website

Mark Toner said the principles highlighted in the workshop was interesting but could not see how to apply them. SEPA do not face the same problems as with some of the other agencies as they do not have direct contact with the food industry. They do however have extended experience of communicating with the general public on contaminated land issues. This is facilitated by having access to their board which allows the flow of information which is well received by the public. They also engage with the public by holding meetings in public places.

Jill said she thought the meeting worked well, particularly the combination of academic and case studies. Jill thanked David and Anne for their organisation of the workshop. She said it was essential the subgroup keeps in touch what other bodies are doing on communication, and asked if members were aware of that Defra had drawn up some guidance notes to accompany their White paper due in May on the issue of radioactive waste management. Barrie informed members that Defra had approached John Cooper for advice concerning the public communication of the risk associated with LLW waste disposal from the non-nuclear sector.

Barrie was disappointed with the workshop as he felt it needed a bigger diversity of speakers and didn't address the issue of how to approach the public.

4.2 Draft briefing leaflet – feedback from trials.

Barrie did not expect people to comments on the contents of the leaflet as he had specifically stated in this noted to triallists. The leaflet is expected to accompany FSA presentations in which, for example, the Sv is explained.

Patrick's comments

Action 6.2 Patrick to rewrite last sentence of question 2 and send it to Barrie.

In footnote 1 the NDA is the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority not Agency

Action 6.3 Patrick to amend text for footnote 3.

In question 3 replace '1 mSv' with '1 milliSievert (1 mSv).

In question 4 line 3 remove 'or' after dose

In footnote 4 replace 'should not be exceeded' with 'is not expected to be exceeded'.

In footnote 5 add 'its views are expressed as the result of its expert members and not as a view of any of their parent bodies'. Barrie will leave footnote 5 as it is.

Action 6.4 Patrick to reword question 6 line 4

Question 7 after 'generic' add ',or average,'

Action 6.5 Stuart to reword last sentence of question 7 containing 'extreme habits

Question 8 replace 'in an instant' with 'in a short period of time'. Barrie will leave text as it is.

In question 8 you quote a figure of 6% per Sv but appear to have used 5% per Sv in the calculation in question 9. Barrie will amend text for consistency.

Question 9 Is there any point in including the pie chart if it is not legible?. Barrie has responded to this.

Question 10 add 'are' after 'diet but'.

Stuart's comments

Stuart commented that the Food Standards Agency is a statutory consultee of the Environment Agencies and has statutory responsibility for food safety through the UK and is independent of regulators and the nuclear industry.

Action 6.6 Stuart to add a sentence before the last line of question 2 to the effect of 'where issues of food are concerned the regulators take advice from the FSA and HPA'

CORE comments

Question 4 Mark clarified that the dose constraints are 0.3 mSv for operations and 1 mSv for historic discharges.

Action 6.7 Stuart to add an explanation into question 4 of how historic discharges are accounted for and a footnote explaining the 0.3 mSv and 1 mSv limits.

Question 5 members agreed that this comment was not relevant for the leaflet.

Question 7 members agreed that it was up to the EA to address this comment

Question 9 members agreed that this comment was not relevant for the leaflet.

Tim Williams White Horse local government (Harwell stakeholder group) comments

Question 1 – members felt that they had covered Tim's comment in the current text.

Question 2 – members agreed the bullet point format to highlight the roles of the NII and EA

Alan Neal UKAEA (Harwell stakeholder group) comments

Question 2 comment on the IRR's will be covered by Patrick's additions to the text.

Question 3 comment on comparison of public dose limit with natural background – this is covered by the pie chart.

Question 7 – members agreed to change the word 'product' with 'multiplied by'

Jo Hoskins STFC TU (Harwell stakeholder group) comments

Barrie does not want to include the comparison between discharge from sites with flying.

Sean Stewart Rutherford Appleton Laboratory (Harwell stakeholder group) comments

Comment on use of mSv and μ Sv - the leaflet is expected to accompany FSA presentations in which, for example, the Sv is explained.

Action 6.8 Barrie to add hyperlinks to the ONS and OPCS in question 11

Question 11 use of word 'minimal' -members agreed that this comment was not relevant for the leaflet.

Susan Adams UKAEA (Harwell stakeholder group) comments

Comment on title - members agreed that the current title of the leaflet is ok.

Members agreed with the comment about stating what NDAWG's role is, this could go on the cover of the leaflet rather than in the text.

Comment on site licence holders – it is included in the text.

Comment on references – it was felt that the references are more useful embedded in the text rather than at the end of the document.

Action 6.8 Barrie to amend text 'established by surveys' in question 4 to 'established by individual habits'

Barrie commented that it is not possible to compare risks from radioactive discharges with risks from day to day activities.

Geoffrey Nutt (Harwell stakeholder group) comments

Comment on table of different dose values – this is covered by the pie chart.

Question 7 – members agreed natural background should not be included in the doses.

Comment on order of questions and talking about risk first. Members agreed that the order of the questions were correct and that dose should be addressed first.

Action 6.9 Ray to send Mike Clark of the HPA a more final version of the information leaflet for comment

Barrie commented that he will include comments sent to-date and will incorporate those from the other triallists when he receives them. The aim is to finalise the leaflet by the next subgroup meeting.

Action 6.10 Barrie to collate comments from the triallists and say why they have/haven't been addressed and to thank them for their contributions.

Action 6.11 Barrie to ask for comments on the information leaflet from Ian Fairlie and Stuart Hudson at the 13th NDAWG meeting.

4.3 Communication of uncertainty

David Collier has suggested organising a seminar on food and probabilistic risk communication. Members agreed it should just be on the communication of uncertainty. Stuart said this would be useful to the FSA as they haven't trialled presenting results of their probabilistic models. Members considered possible speakers: David Collier, FSA, EA, one of the authors of the Utrecht report, a journalist with experience of communicating uncertainty in other areas e.g. the weather, someone from the Science Media Centre who have produced the leaflet 'communicating uncertainty in a soundbite'.

Action 6.12 Barrie to approach the NDAWG steering group and John Cooper about support for a seminar on the communication of uncertainty.

4.4 Guidance notes

The subgroup will produce a short guidance note based on the DoH risk communication booklet. Mike suggests that the subgroup needs to consider how to present uncertainty first.

Action 6.13 Subgroup members to think about issues for the guidance note

5 AOB

Jane Simmonds is producing a guidance note on the assessment of collective doses. This should tie in with Barrie's note on collective dose.

Jill issued members with a leaflet on the forthcoming 20th Low Level Radiation and Health Conference taking place in Cumbria in June 2008.

6 Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be late August/early September.

7 Summary of Actions

Action 5.12 Mike to provide illustrations for questions 8 and 9 of the information leaflet by the end of November.

Action 5.13 Barrie to provide illustrations for questions 10 and 11 of the information leaflet by the end of November.

Action 5.14 David Collier to produce a table of who needs to be communicated to and what information they might need.

Action 6.1 Anne to write a one page summary about the workshop by June that will go on the NDAWG website

Action 6.2 Patrick to rewrite last sentence of question 2 and send it to Barrie.

Action 6.3 Patrick to amend text for footnote 3.

Action 6.4 Patrick to reword question 6 line 4

Action 6.5 Stuart to reword last sentence of question 7 containing 'extreme habits

Action 6.6 Stuart to add a sentence before the last line of question 2 to the effect of 'where issues of food are concerned the regulators take advice from the FSA and HPA'

Action 6.7 Stuart to add an explanation into question 4 of how historic discharges are accounted for and a footnote explaining the 0.3 mSv and 1 mSv limits.

Action 6.8 Barrie to add hyperlinks to the ONS and OPCS in question 11

Action 6.9 Ray to send Mike Clark of the HPA a more final version of the information leaflet for comment

Action 6.10 Barrie to collate comments from the triallists and say why they have/haven't been addressed and to thank them for their contributions.

Action 6.11 Barrie to ask for comments on the information leaflet from Ian Fairlie and Stuart Hudson at the 13th NDAWG meeting.

Action 6.12 Barrie to approach the NDAWG steering group and John Cooper about support for a seminar on the communication of uncertainty.

Action 6.13 Subgroup members to think about issues for the guidance note

Ray Kowe 13 March 2008