

1. Do you agree that a waste substitution policy should be adopted for radioactive waste arising from overseas research reactor fuel reprocessing contracts at Dounreay?

YES

The proposals appear to be reasonable and pragmatic. They should hopefully also reduce costs, while not increasing the level of hazard or threat to people or our environment. In practice, the proposals should actually reduce these hazards and the chances of an accident with population or environmental consequences.

2. Do you agree that substituting cemented Materials Test Reactor radioactive waste for Prototype Fast Reactor radioactive waste should be an available option to finalise the overseas contracts?

YES

A sensible and pragmatic proposal.

3. Question 3. Do you agree that substituting vitrified radioactive waste from Sellafield for cemented Materials Test Reactor radioactive waste and/or Prototype Fast Reactor radioactive waste should be an available option to finalise the overseas contracts?

YES

I just hope that the overseas customers recognise the multiple benefits and (apparent) absence of drawbacks in the proposals.

4. Question 4. Do you agree with the proposals to ensure broad environmental neutrality for the United Kingdom?

YES

A logical necessity for both parties involved.

5. Question 5. Do you agree that all of the relevant implications of the proposed policy have been identified?

IN PART / NOT SURE

Costs presumably have been considered, but don't get significant mention in the consultation doc. Similarly, some work has presumably also been done to compare risks (eg, of accident) associated with the policy, in comparison with non-adoption.