

The content of this document is not representative of the views or internal work of the Ministry. The Ministry staff member named used their Ministry email address in error at the time to carry out a conversation in their capacity as a board member of Engineering New Zealand, a non-governmental professional body. Engineering New Zealand has consented to the release of this conversation.

From: [Sue-Ellen Fenelon](#)
To: [Tania Williams](#); [Rosalind Archer](#)
Cc: [Richard Templer](#)
Subject: RE: Nuclear energy
Date: Friday, 11 February 2022 5:09:55 pm

Hi Tania

I was combining my thoughts about how EPAC needs to consider immediate risks, with some thinking about how to address Bryan's concerns in a fair and complete way.

But I agree with you, its probably not the best priority for EPAC, and certainly, we should wait until after the BlackRoom (and backcasting?) before we consider where this fits in the priority list.

I've also since considered the point Bryan made about nuclear power only being an example of how we are dealing with technical conversations – and so addressing only nuclear power wouldn't necessarily satisfy him.

I wonder whether underlying this is more of an emotional response from him, and no amount of rationalising will resolve it – but you might see it differently, and you have both been more in this conversation that I have. So happy to leave it for now.

Thanks
Sue-Ellen

From: Tania Williams <tania.williams@engineeringnz.org>
Sent: Friday, 11 February 2022 4:34 pm
To: Rosalind Archer [9\(2\)\(a\)](#); Sue-Ellen Fenelon <Sue-Ellen.Fenelon@mfe.govt.nz>
Cc: Richard Templer <richard.templer@engineeringnz.org>
Subject: RE: Nuclear energy

MFE CYBER SECURITY WARNING

This email originated from outside our organisation. Please take extra care when clicking on any links or opening any attachments.

Hi Rosalind and Sue-Ellen,

While the proposal is interesting, I wonder if it is a priority for EPAC to commit resource to nuclear energy currently? I agree that the energy sector is well aware of the problems the climate goals raise.

I wonder if this is something we should consider again after the BlackRoom when prioritizing our next steps.

I am happy to arrange a time for us to discuss this further if you wish to do it before then.

Regards, Tania

Tania Williams FEngNZ
General Manager

Engineering New Zealand
Te Ao Rangahau

P :: 9(2)(a)
M :: 9(2)(a)

From 3 December 2021, any person who enters our offices and who is eligible for vaccination will need to demonstrate they are fully vaccinated. We remain open to meeting with anyone, regardless of vaccination status. Alternatives to meeting in person include meeting online or by phone.

If you've received this email by mistake, please be aware its content is confidential, may be legally privileged and is only for the person specified in the message. Please let us know immediately and delete it from your system. We also ask that you don't share, copy or forward it or any part of it to anyone else. The views and opinions expressed by the writer don't necessarily reflect Engineering New Zealand policy

From: Rosalind Archer 9(2)(a)
Sent: Thursday, 10 February 2022 10:57 am
To: Tania Williams <tania.williams@engineeringnz.org>; Sue-Ellen Fenelon <sue-ellen.fenelon@mfe.govt.nz>
Cc: Richard Templer <richard.templer@engineeringnz.org>
Subject: Re: Nuclear energy

Hi Sue-Ellen,

Interesting proposal. An EPAC review would be internal, and not public facing initially. Do you have an "expert" in mind. We have one on the board after all Budget wise do we have \$10K available that we'd want to commit?

Regards,

Rosalind

From: Sue-Ellen Fenelon <sue-ellen.fenelon@mfe.govt.nz>
Date: 10 February 2022 at 7:16:30 AM AEST
To: Rosalind Archer 9(2)(a), Tania Williams <tania.williams@engineeringnz.org>
Subject: Nuclear energy

Hi Rosalind and Tania

Regarding Bryan's commentary about nuclear power, I wonder if there is a role (reluctantly) for EPAC here? And interested in your views.

The role of EPAC is to consider risks for the engineering profession. Bryan's contention is that the climate goals provide a risk for the engineering sector (BTW, the energy generation and transmission sectors are acutely aware of this). But the majority of the Board agree that the risk of opening the nuclear question is reputationally risky for Eng NZ.

We could consider whether EPAC has good cause to carry out a preliminary investigation into nuclear energy, but clearly this is off the top of my head, while I'm multi-tasking in the Board meeting!!

Say:

- What do we know about nuclear power as an energy source
- What are the risks associated with delivery of nuclear energy (radioactivity)
- How would it provide better capacity for NZ, in response to NZ's climate emissions responsibilities
- What is the social license
- What are the reputational issues that Eng NZ should consider
- What is the Govt policy on it, and how does this reflect the social license / Kiwi sentiment
- Recommendation on how Eng NZ should deal with this, given our strategic pillars, in particular our strong goal to build credibility with the Govt.

If we put together a 'report' for the Board, then it could be discussed at a Board meeting.

We could take a formal decision at the Board meeting which would then be minuted.

Potentially, we could give it a call up – say ask the Board to reconsider the issue in, say, 5-8 years

I'm thinking that this could be a largely desk top exercise, and perhaps in the order of a \$10k commission to an 'expert' – although likely to need input from a technical expert and from a governance/CE perspective.

What do you both think of the idea?

Clearly, the above bullet point list needs further work.

Thanks
Sue-Ellen