

Notes of 6th ISOLUS (Interim Storage Of Laid-Up Submarines) Advisory Group (IAG)
held on 11th September 2008 at the Ibis Hotel, Birmingham

Attendees:

Ian Avent	Community Awareness Nuclear Storage And Radiation (CANSAR)
David Collier	Independent Specialist
Andy Daniel	VT Nuclear Services
Dr Paul Dorfman	University of Warwick
David Gatehouse	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Chris Hargraves	MOD - ISOLUS Deputy Project Manager
Sandra Jack	Scottish Government
Peter Lanyon	Nuclear Submarine Forum (NSubF)
Stephen Lewis	Health & Safety Executive (HSE) - Nuclear Installations Inspectorate (NII)
Antony Lokier	MOD - ISOLUS Team (Secretary)
Jon Mallon	MOD - ISOLUS Team
Nicola MacLeod	MOD - ISOLUS Commercial Officer
Di McDonald	Nuclear Information Service
Paul Naylor	Environment Agency
Les Netherton	Environmental Health Advisory Services Ltd (Chairman)
Shelly Mobbs	Health Protection Agency
Bob Pirret	Rosyth Local Liaison Committee
Gareth Rowlands	MOD – Defence Equipment & Support (DE&S) Secretariat
Peter Stacey	MOD - Representing Naval Base Commander Devonport
Son Mon Sutcliffe	Member of Public
Jane Tallents	NSubF
Maggie Taylor	MOD - Assistant Director (AD) ISOLUS Project
Dr William Thompson	Lancaster University
David Whitworth	Institution of Nuclear Engineers (INucE)
Lt Steve Woodley	MOD - ISOLUS team

1. Welcome, Introductions & Apologies

Les Netherton (LN) welcomed all those present and asked everybody to introduce themselves as there were some new members. The following apologies had been received:

Tub Aves	British Nuclear Energy Society (BNES)
Alistair Berrill	MOD - Representing Naval Base Commander Clyde
Dr Jane Hunt	Lancaster University
Dr David Littlewood	The Centre for Professional Ethics, University of Central Lancashire
Rajnika Patel	CIRIA
Mark Toner	Scottish Environment Protection Agency

LN stated that unfortunately Tub Aves was in hospital for a major operation and wished him a speedy recovery on behalf of the group.

LN also thanked Antony Lokier (AL) for his support as secretary to the IAG over the years and wished him well in his new job on behalf of the group and welcomed Jon Mallon his replacement.

2. Complaint arising from the IAG of 18th June

LN stated that the IAG would be aware of a complaint received following a debate at the last meeting concerning the topic of identifying an independent peer reviewer. During that debate, members from all sides had expressed perceptions of named people, companies and organisations. Arising from that, a complaint was raised by Large and Associates, followed by correspondence between Large and Associates and certain IAG members.

LN made a statement as Chair that this had been a particularly difficult debate during which a number of named people and organisations had been mentioned, and views expressed about how they would be perceived by other groups within and outside the IAG. That was the context of the meeting, and LN requested that this was minuted as the purpose of the debate and that it was never intended by any of the IAG members to defame or rundown or dismiss any of the people named working for these organisations as a general concept. No objections were raised to this statement.

LN read out the following statement from Mr Large:

“STATEMENT OF JOHN H LARGE OF LARGE & ASSOCIATES RELATING TO THE ISOLUS IAG MEETING OF 18 JUNE 2008

I was concerned that during the IAG meeting of 18 June 2008 a number of individuals opined their doubts about my independence and/or personal integrity when acting in a professional capacity. Because the meeting was held in public, that the Notes and Records of the meeting would be publicly accessible and, particularly, that some other members attending the IAG might be unduly prejudiced by the comments, I asked a number of individual IAG members to either substantiate, clarify or withdraw certain of their comments. Above all, I wished to establish that these individuals were not, with their comments and opinions, presenting the authorised view of the organisations that they individually represent at the IAG.

I have established that with his comments Tub Aves did not represent the position of the British Nuclear Energy Society (BNES); David Whitworth has stated that his comments were personal and not the viewpoint formulated or expressed on behalf of the Institution of Nuclear Engineers (INuCE); and Robert Gray, a Deputy Chief Inspector of the Nuclear Installations Inspectorate, has assured me that Steve Lewis was speaking personally and not on behalf of the Nuclear Installations Inspectorate. All three individuals (Messrs Aves, Lewis and Whitbread) have individually explained in correspondence with me that it was certainly not their intention to question my professional competence and independence, and personal integrity. Separately, Andy Stevenson has provided me with a clarification of what he said at the meeting.

I am satisfied with these four responses and, accordingly, I consider the matter to have been congenially resolved and that it is now closed.

I have received no response whatsoever from Bob Pirrett so I assume that he might choose to voice his clarification, or whatever, directly to the forthcoming IAG meeting.

3 September 2008

***JOHN H LARGE
LARGE & ASSOCIATES
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
LONDON “***

Bob Pirret (BP) stated that he had not replied to Mr Large's letter as a matter of principle, as he did not believe that we should be debating separately on IAG issues with companies or members of the public. He believed that we should deal with it in a different way. It was not meant as disrespect to Mr Large that he had not replied to the letter, as he would not have replied to any letter from any individual as a matter of principle. As far as the letter itself about BP's personal observation at the meeting, Mr Large provided a potential interpretation that BP could not subscribe to as he would never say anything at the IAG that could be taken in that line of interpretation. Therefore BP said he would have no difficulty to the letter being included with the notes.

Steve Lewis (SL) expressed concern regarding the release of partial transcripts of the meeting. His own comment had included the word “personally” and he confirmed that there was no NII view on Mr Large and his position with ISOLUS, as it had never been debated.

David Collier (DC) stated that what counts as “independence” was at the heart of this issue. Paul Dorfman (PD) agreed that the notion of independence is tricky, and to question someone’s independence in a public arena was deeply problematic. LN proposed to append the correspondence on this subject to the notes to close the issue, Annex A. This was supported only if all the correspondence was made available, which would require permission from those parties not present.

Action 6.1: Gareth Rowlands (GR) to obtain permission from Large and Associates & BNES to attach their letters to IAG members to the meeting notes.

3. Complaint/Clarification procedure for issues arising from IAG meetings

LN presented a draft procedure, Annex B, for dealing with issues arising from IAG meetings in the future. BP agreed with the purpose, but some of the criteria in the protocol needed to be discussed further. The procedure needed to be entirely visible for the public to see and address any concerns raised but it was important to maintain a closed meeting and not provide a conduit for everybody to get involved. SL warned that written notes did not capture the whole context of a discussion, including the body language on the day, and reemphasised his concern about the partial release of transcripts in the future. GR stated that a lot of effort had been made to try and get the balance right with the extracts provided but limited resources had stopped everything being included. Jane Tallents (JT) expressed her concern that we should not exclude all comments from the public in the future. BP suggested that the IAG should continue to review any comments received from the public and decide if they should be included in the agenda. He had produced a revised procedure which it was agreed to circulate for comment and produce an update version for consideration at the next meeting. It was also agreed that the ISOLUS team would administer the procedure.

Action 6.2: Bob Pirret to forward revised complaints procedure to the ISOLUS team for distribution to the IAG.

Action 6.3: IAG members to provide comments on the revised IAG complaints procedure by 13th October 2008.

Action 6.4: ISOLUS team to collate comments on revised IAG complaints procedure and to produce composite for consideration at the next IAG meeting.

4. Action Grid

“Action 1.6: Di MacDonald to provide a point of contact for Environmental Justice.” - Action ongoing. Di MacDonald (DM) stated that this was still ongoing.

“Action 2.2: The ISOLUS team to start a short regular newsletter.” – Action Closed. Superseded by Action 5.2.

“Action 2.7: The secretary to provide an updated paper with a section on roles for comment.” – Action ongoing. The governance paper has been delayed due to other priorities.

“Action 4.3: Lt Steve Woodley (SW) to liaise with PD, DS and David Littlewood (DL) regards editing of the Risk Glossary.” – Action Closed. Superseded by Action 6.10. This was discussed under agenda item 8.

“Action 4.4: JH to give a ‘Public Risk Understanding’ presentation at the next IAG.” – Action In-hand. It was agreed to defer this to the December meeting.

“Action 4.5: SW to distribute declassified versions of recently received reports to IAG members.” – Action ongoing. This was discussed under agenda item 6.

“Action 4.11: Maggie Taylor to develop the ISOLUS Look Ahead Chart.” – Action ongoing. This was discussed under Agenda Item 9.

“Action 5.1: IAG members to provide any suggestions for the newsletter to the Secretary by 27th July 2008” – Complete. No suggestions received.

“Action 5.2: Secretary to present draft newsletter to the IAG at the next meeting.” – Ongoing. Deferred to the new convenor contract.

“Action 5.3: Maggie Taylor agreed to issue a revised statement covering this period.” – Complete Issued. Issued 14th July 2008

“Action 5.4: All to suggest views for a discussion on learning points by 8th August 2008.” – Complete No views received prior to meeting. This was discussed under agenda item 7.

“Action 5.5: ISOLUS team to investigate options for a shared area.” – Ongoing. Deferred to the new convenor contract. This was discussed under agenda item 9.

“Action 5.6: Secretary to include page numbers on correspondence.” – Complete.

PL raised a request for document titles to have clearer titles in the future as they can be very confusing, also a relevant reference number would be useful. AL stated that the MoD had mandated a new 3 part document naming system to be used on all correspondence. The first part is based on a reverse order date, YYYYMMDD, to enable chronological sorting of documents; the second part is the title; the third part is the security classification (e.g. UC – Unclassified). The ISOLUS team agreed to use clearer file titles when distributing documentation to the IAG.

“Action 5.7: MT to issue the options paper for preview.” – Complete. Issued 18th July 2008. This was discussed under agenda item 9.

“Action 5.8: IAG to provide comment on options paper by 8th August 2008.” – Complete. No comments received. This was discussed under agenda item 9.

“Action 5.9: LN/ISOLUS team to review meeting timings.” – Complete. It was agreed for the Chairman and the ISOLUS team to select the timings for future meetings based on the agenda.

“Action 5.10: ISOLUS team to review venue facilities.” - Complete. AL stated that the Manchester hotel for the next meeting had been contacted to confirm that they do meet the current requirements of the Disability Legislation.

5. Technical Options Study

CH stated that the first workshop of the Technical Options Study had taken place and Frazer Nash (FN) had issued the Attributes report. The next workshop was planned for 9th & 10th October. PD reported on the following concerns raised by the NGO's regarding the direction of the Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) ranking system:

- There was an issue with the independence of Frazer Nash from Babcock Marine.
- The attributes look unhelpful.

- The workshop did not fill in the attribute definition.
- It was a simplified ranking process rather than developing a ranking process.
- Not enough data and information to base judgements on
- Scoring is a problem.
- Too short a time to complete the process.
- CANSAR are not happy to enter this process as it leads to a narrow approach.

PD requested that these comments be embedded in the FN document, and not presented as a separate document. As balancing statements, there had been some attempts at broadening, refining and contextualising the process in terms of ranking. There had been some discussion on the merits of Evidential Reasoning, another type of ranking system, which amounts to aggregating criteria and generating belief and plausibility functions. However, it should be noted that Evidential Reasoning is actually a subset of the MCDA process and has similar strengths and weaknesses, in this sense trying to quantify qualitative values. A core issue is whether there is little numerical difference between the options. PD's personal view was that the process is one that outs differences rather than completes them. Other issues raised were how to integrate the CIOP recommendations into the attributes process. The core issues outed were extendibility and key user requirements. PD believed that FN had produced a good report and requested the following additional information:

- Are all the assumptions on the range of costs for the options based on the current rates?
- Data requests for Inventory, levels of contamination through the submarine and workers' doses.
- Are there US analogues for Inventory reliability and confidentiality in terms of budgetary estimates?
- Core issues were raised about disposal and storage.
- Data was requested for Astute wastes.
- Clarification regards interim stores.
- What happens under fault conditions?
- Is robotics a mature technology?

DC stated that he was reserving judgement until he sees how the work develops.

CH asked PD to pass these concerns to FN to enable them to take them forward.

Action 6.5: Paul Dorfman to pass comments regarding the Technical Options Workshop to Frazer Nash.

Ian Avent (IA) requested more information regarding the Evidential Reasoning system. SL stated that it was a ranging process based on confidence. DC offered to provide a link to "wikipedia".

Action 6.6: David Collier to circulate link re Evidential Reasoning.

JT expressed concern that only the Top 5 attributes were being requested. CH stated that every attribute will be discussed and that he would seek to give clarity in the process.

There was a discussion about the scope of Project ISOLUS and the position with disposal of Astute and future submarine classes. JT said this had been raised at the workshop but it was a more appropriate subject for the IAG. CH stated that ISOLUS covers 27 submarines (past and current classes), but there is an aspiration that any facilities built would be capable of taking future classes of submarines. ISOLUS requires interim storage for Intermediate Level Waste (ILW), but stores themselves were assumed to go after the waste had been transferred to the proposed national repository. DM stated that the Front End Consultation (FEC) referred to 27 submarines and it was assumed that the Astute class were not part of the process. However, the Pre-Qualification Questionnaire issued to industry in June 2003 stated that any solution must have the capability to allow for the disposal of additional hulls such as Astute Class. In January 2005 the ISOLUS MoD

Coastal sites evaluation report stated that the storage site would hold a maximum of 37 defuelled Reactor Compartments, 27 existing plus an assumed number of 10 Astute Class. CH stated that this was a bounding figure that Defence Estates used to ensure a potential site had enough space. The current assumption is that the ILW from Astute class would go straight to the national repository. DM stated that the website only mentions 27 submarines. JT said the document used to establish the IAG in January 2007 only references the 27 submarines, and in addition to Astute there would also now be replacement submarines for the Vanguard Class. PL said a statement was needed clarifying the position of Astute and future submarine classes, and DC added that this should be included in the FN report. DM was concerned about the link to the repository as this looked less likely and it was very long term. She believed that recent problems with Revenge highlighted the need to do more and get started now. Whilst she appreciated that there were political and money issues to be considered, the technical solution for the existing 27 submarines could be sorted out now. MT agreed that a clear statement was needed on the website and in documents to clarify these points. MT clarified the funding position, saying that ISOLUS funding was for the existing 27 submarines, and that disposal of future submarine classes would be funded by other parts of MoD. In terms of interim storage and disposal of ILW, MoD intended to follow the national solution, so if there was a repository we would use it, if not we would continue with interim storage. David Gatehouse confirmed that the NDA was working to the same assumptions for the NDA sites.

LN summarised the discussion, noting that there were historical issues about documents which did not match up, the issue of future generations of submarines, and the issue of whether the repository being considered by the National Managing Radioactive Waste Safely programme would be available. LN asked MT to clarify the situation and present a draft statement to the IAG at the next meeting. DM requested that this statement should recognise that the public appear to have been misled about the position on future classes, which may not have been a problem if they had been correctly informed at the time. David Whitworth suggested that the baseline for the future generation submarines should be treated as a separate option. PL stated that 8 years had passed since the Nuclear Submarine Forum (NSuF) became involved. If the Astute class was to be included, the NSF's position would have to be reviewed, with the risk that they may have to withdraw, hence clarifying the position was important. PD supported the view that the inclusion of Astute was de facto supporting new build, and emphasised that a clarification statement was important for the FN report. JT was concerned that there would be an impact for the next generation if the future classes were added on. DM suggested that new build submarines should be considered separately if they did not require interim storage as they would not fit under the ISOLUS umbrella and could be excluded from the ISOLUS contract. There could be consultation at a future date to reflect the situation at the time. SL warned that as a Regulator he would find it difficult to exclude future classes, especially as the MoD had a new obligation to produce a future deterrent which would have to be disposed of. MT stated that MoD has a remit to develop a solution to get best value for money for the taxpayer and would have to consider the whole situation. BP suggested that if Astute was excluded from ISOLUS it would be helpful to state how it would be covered. SL added that whilst the project may be limited to 27 submarines, the interim storage site chosen would have to consider and deal with future expectations. This would be very important for any potential communities considering hosting ISOLUS. Paul Naylor (PN) added that transparency was the key issue and if there had been a misunderstanding in the past then an apology was required. In summary, LN said that firstly, a statement from MoD was required to clarify previous statements which had been made and any possible misunderstandings arising from these. Secondly, there was a need to clarify the position of ASTUTE and future submarine classes in relation to project ISOLUS. This way ahead was supported by the Group and MoD agreed to circulate a draft statement to the IAG by the end of October so that a outline statement could be presented to the MOD ISOLUS Steering Group (MISG) in November.

Action 6.7: AD ISOLUS to produce a draft statement clarifying the position of ASTUTE and future submarine classes in relation to project ISOLUS.

PD stated that a statement would also be needed for the FN report. It was agreed to circulate the draft statement to the Technical Options Study group at the same time as the IAG.

PL raised a concern about the short time proposed for consideration of the Data Report. He referred to a recent article in the New Scientist about the Secondary Photoelectron Effect which was being looked at by the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP), which could impact on the whole basis of the Data Report. SM responded that she had not had time to study the article in detail but was aware of the issue, and awaited the outcome of further work on it at HPA. She commented that this effect was well known, but explained that this was not the only way that gamma rays or natural background radiation react with atoms, there was also the Compton Effect. Her initial response on looking at the physics and the information in the article was that the effect would make much less than 1% difference to the estimated risks from radiation. The effect was to be considered by the head of Committee 2 of the International Commission on Radiation Protection, and SM expected that it was unlikely to have a significant impact on the estimated risks from radiation. This was to be considered by the head of the International Commission on Radiation Units (ICRU), but was unlikely to have an effect on a bigger scale. PD said it was an interesting theory which would be looked at and considered in terms of whether the risk factors were coherent or not. This was a long standing debate, and he and SM were currently doing work for Safeguards on this, which may or not be helpful for ISOLUS. PL believed that the Compton Effect had been resolved, but that the low energy gamma was of more concern than the high, hence attention should be drawn to this in the Data Report. LN summarised that the Data Report may have some gaps and the attributes would have to be considered against current legal guidelines. It was useful to make the group aware of these issues, although the actual impact on the process at this stage would be minimal, and detailed discussions on the potential issues lay outside of ISOLUS.

DC asked if any study information had been put on the website. CH replied, not yet, but it was intended to.

6. Technical Summary Reports Update

SW stated that the summaries were currently going through the Plain English Society and should be available for the next meeting. Two asbestos surveys had been completed and these and other reports were to be processed in line with the Freedom of Information Act.

Concern was expressed about the timing of the release of information and lack of warning about forthcoming Parliamentary debates. SW stated that with regard to Revenge, we had made a dedicated presentation at the April Workshop giving the full details. GR stated that normally only 48 hours notice was given for Parliamentary Questions and the first opportunity to see the actual statements made was when Hansard was published the following day. With regards to the Adjournment debate, 3-4 days notice was given and we were only provided with a general statement of the issue to be discussed. It was agreed that the ISOLUS project would endeavour to give as much notice as possible to the IAG of forthcoming Parliamentary business of interest.

7. Learning points from FEC/CIOP process

LN stated that he intended to make this item a regular Agenda item in order to capture lessons learnt.

PD expressed his view that the CIOP recommendations had probably not been taken on board as much as they could.

PL raised a concern that following his challenge to the MOD after the last meeting there had been a lot of voiced opinions to him but nobody else had contributed. He also referred to the recent Ministerial statement that the IAG provides independent scrutiny and questioned where this role had come from. MT stated that the scrutiny role was included in the IAG Terms of Reference. PL expressed his concern that there was not near enough information for the Group to be independent scrutineers. MT stated that dictionary definition of scrutiny was to cast a "critical gaze", and the IAG's role was to provide advice. The Minister's statement was consistent with that position and raised

nothing new. DC stated that the Nuclear Site Stakeholder Groups were backing away from the term of “scrutineer” due to the perception that it means line by line regulation rather than an overall view. LN stated that the IAG asked for more information where necessary to fulfil its role.

PL asked what progress had been made on the MISG action regarding Preview and Review. LN said action was in hand and JH had helped with clarifying Preview and Review. PL said scrutiny must include deciding whether Preview and/or Review was appropriate. LN responded that the IAG would have the opportunity to look at the forthcoming ISOLUS look-ahead chart and consider where Preview/Review was appropriate.

DM raised a concern regarding the public perception of IAG independence due to MoD’s involvement, suggesting that it may be necessary to hold a pre-meeting without MoD. LN stated that he wrote the meeting Agenda, not the MoD, and DM requested he put that in writing to reassure the public. LN agreed to take an action to produce a document detailing how the IAG works, including where responsibilities lie.

Action 6.8: Chairman to produce document detailing how the IAG works including where responsibilities lie.

DC asked if it was possible to say things “off the record”. GR said that as the meeting was recorded we would have to release the recordings under the Freedom of information Act if they were requested. AL suggested the option of turning the recording off and asking any members of the public to leave, but this would conflict with being open and transparent. LN commented that it was for this reason that CoRWM meetings are never “off the record”.

PL said he had produced some comments, post the FOI releases, on lessons learnt. LN agreed to issue them to the whole IAG to stimulate discussion at the next meeting. AL agreed to create a grid of items raised to assist future reference.

Action 6.9: Peter Lanyon to provide “Analysis of FOI docs” document for issue to the IAG.

8. Development of a Glossary update

SW stated that work was ongoing on the glossary update. SM stated she would like to be involved in the production of the glossary. SW took an action to involve her in the production.

Action 6.10: Steve Woodley to include Shelly Mobbs in the production of the Risk Glossary. Steve Woodley to liaise with Paul Dorfman, Steve Lewis, Shelley Mobbs and David Littlewood regards editing of the Risk Glossary

9. IAG Work plan for the Year and ISOLUS update

MT said MoD was currently reviewing the programme and aimed to present the new plan to the MISG in November and to the IAG in December. David Whitworth asked if the plan would cover the whole assessment phase as the complete picture would be needed to assess the logic. MT confirmed that the plan would cover the period up to the main investment decision.

A discussion took place regarding the options for setting up a shared area to enable IAG members to access data. AL said it was not possible to set up a shared area on the MoD computer system, but that a members’ area on the ISOLUS website was a possible option. Concerns were raised about how this would be viewed from a public perspective in terms of openness and transparency. LN stated that the CoRWM website had an admin. link from the main website and the rules for this area were clearly articulated. DC stated it would be useful to use the area as an archive for earlier drafts of documents, which would act as an audit trail. LN summarised that if such an arrangement were

adopted, it would need to be minuted and explained to the public. No decision was reached, but AL stated that the requirement would be included in the scope for the new convenor contract so as to leave this option open for a future decision.

MT stated that the Options Paper had been issued for preview and whilst no comments had been received in response to Action 5.8, any future feedback would be gratefully received. She also stated that no further development had taken place to date on the paper.

10. IAG Remit

This item was covered in the discussion under Agenda Item 8.

11. Keeping IAG informed

This item was covered in the discussion under Agenda Item 6.

12. MISG (MoD ISOLUS Steering Group) feedback

LN stated that the next MISG was due to take place on 13th November 2008. His feedback report, Annex C, had attempted to capture the key issues of interest to the IAG arising from the last MISG meeting on 7 May. PD queried the Accelerated Programme. MT stated that there had been changes in this area since the last MISG and it was intended to present the revised programme to the MISG in November. PL commented that there seemed to be a new sense of urgency. MT stated that MoD now had a greater understanding of nuclear decommissioning and the current Director General Submarines, Admiral Mathews, was keen to progress the project. Ian Avent (IA) asked why now, and MT stated that the creation of the NDA and greater impetus from Government had filtered through to MoD and was focussing effort on nuclear decommissioning. Peter Stacey added that legacy items need care and maintenance, so there was a cost benefit in decommissioning as early as possible. PD asked if the money for decommissioning was ring fenced or discounted. CH stated that it was neither as the MoD identifies costs for a particular year and the Treasury notes it.

PD asked what was SECA (Submarine Enterprise Collaboration Agreement). LN stated that MOD was considering entering into SECA to improve the way in which it procures, maintains and disposes of submarines and had included it in his brief as it referred to decommissioning in its Annex. Andy Daniel stated that the industry players had been involved in a consultation regarding this potential collaboration. GR stated consultation was a statutory part of the process to exempt companies from competition rules before being put before parliament.

DC considered that the role of the MISG needed clarification. LN stated that the MISG was supposed to strategically influence the project, whilst the IAG advise and scrutinise. To date not much had happened at the MISG but the IAG was now presenting things to the MISG for decision.

LN stated that the MISG Chair had asked IAG to advise on nominated substitutes for IAG representatives on MISG. PD confirmed that he still wished to be considered as a substitute and this was supported by the group.

PL stated that he would find it useful to know more about the Civil Service Code. MT agreed to provide a link to a copy (PMN: <http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/iam/codes/cscodex/index.asp>). SL stated that if Government makes a decision, civil servants implement it. On the issue of new build, MT stated that Parliament had agreed that a future deterrent was required, and MoD had to implement that decision. In previous ISOLUS consultations, MOD had acknowledged that there was a view that no new nuclear submarines should be built, but had not accepted this recommendation. PL stated that

with democracy there is a need to take on board and listen to dissenters, so the consultation recommendations should be adhered to. He wished to stay and be listened to but the ongoing new build put him in a difficult position. LN stated that under the Code of Practice civil servants are not allowed to publicly disagree with Government policy, and therefore the argument is with Government, not MOD, and he should lobby his MP. Jane Tallents stated that she was not expecting ISOLUS to change Government policy, but was trying to de-risk the programme. These issues were of public concern and it was important to keep them on the table. AL said that the issue of new build had been noted at the MISG meeting on 7th May 2008, and the meeting notes stated that the Director In-Service Submarines had informed the new Defence Minister, Baroness Taylor, directly of the public concerns at a recent briefing.

13. Notes of 5th IAG

LN proposed to include PL's comments on the notes and actions of the 5th IAG meeting as an Annex, which was accepted.

14. Review of Parked Issues

DM requested that Peer Review by John Large as an independent reviewer be raised as a parked issue. Her view was that he needed to be involved as he is a technical expert that NGO's wish to use. It was agreed that it would be necessary to undertake reviews in the future, but the scope of this work would need to be defined and agreed by the IAG. Nicola MacLeod stated that MoD Acquisition Policy was to undertake open and transparent competition when appropriate and that ISOLUS future work packages would reflect this policy unless robust justification was evident. Notwithstanding that mandate, distinct work packages for ISOLUS would be assessed on an individual basis and if competition was deemed viable any parties with the required skills would be considered.

PL expressed his concern that Data Reports have to be reviewed for the forthcoming Technical Options Workshop and feared that there may be gaps. CH said a number of experts would be available who would be able to provide further details as requested. LN stated that it was important to identify the need first, so if there are concerns regarding interpretation then they can be raised on the day. PL said they had involved a technical expert in a Sizewell A paper and as a consequence he was able to engage more constructively. LN said this was too complex to resolve now and he would review the need at the next meeting. PL concluded that he would agree to disagree.

15. AOB

No AOB was raised.

16. Future Meetings:

The next meeting will be held in the Thistle Hotel, Manchester on 3rd December 2008.

London and Cardiff were proposed as possible future venues.

It was proposed that it would be useful to have another workshop to share Technical Information. It was agreed to review the need for a workshop after the next meeting.

DM suggested it would be useful for the IAG members to meet the MISG members. LN agreed to raise this request at the forthcoming MISG.

Action 6.11: Chairman to suggest to MISG that they meet the IAG members.

Annex A –Complaint Correspondence

Correspondence will be attached here prior to placement on website when Action 6.1 Has been completed

Annex B - Draft Procedure

Annex C - Feedback from MISG meeting 7th May 2008

- Attached is Maggie Taylors report to MISG for detailed information
- Accelerated programme: consideration is being given to an option to accelerate the programme by two years (see MISG report). This could impact on the timing of consultations being discussed by IAG.
- Les and Maggie are producing a short paper on how preview will work and interface at MISG and IAG level.
- Submarine Enterprise Collaboration Agreement: the MOD is considering entering into the above with industry to improve the way in which it procures, maintains and disposes of submarines. Due to competition laws consultation has taken place on the potential impact. www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/AboutDefence/CorporatePublications/ConsultationsandCommunications/PublicConsultations/
- The above document mentions Devonport as a potential site. SECA is still being considered and the ISOLUS project will continue, however the potential impact in the future will need to be monitored. MISG accepted that due process would need to be followed before any decision on options or sites are progressed.
- MISG Chair asked IAG to advise on nominated substitutes for IAG representatives on MISG. (raised at last IAG meeting)
- Dismantling sites: MOD is conducting a generic assessment of sites as to greenfield, brownfield and existing licensed sites. This is for business case decisions. IAG will be involved.
- A Memorandum of Understanding has been signed between the MOD and Nuclear Decommissioning Authority. This is a high level document. It is not yet public.

Members may be aware that there has been debate at the Commons recently about ISOLUS, including a potential offer from Russia to decommission submarines.

L. Netherton. IAG Chair.

AD(ISOLUS) REPORT TO MISG 7 MAY 2008

General

Project ISOLUS activity is gaining momentum for a number of reasons:

- there is increasing recognition within MOD of the importance of nuclear decommissioning activity and willingness to do it
- the link between decommissioning/disposal of submarines and the future submarine programme is recognised
- pressure on berthing capacity at Devonport will increase as more submarines come out of service over the next few years.

The ISOLUS Programme Board, chaired by Alasdair Stirling, Director In-Service Submarines and Project Director, has been set up to progress the overall programme. The key elements of the ISOLUS programme are:

- stakeholder engagement and public consultation
- technical solution
- submarine dismantling site
- interim storage site for the resultant Intermediate Level Waste
- Procurement Strategy

All these elements are interdependent and inter-connected, and it is necessary to develop all of these elements in parallel. In conducting this work, we will draw on the recommendations from the previous public consultations. Progress is shown below.

Stakeholder engagement and public consultation

Two key stakeholder groups have been created to progress the project and to provide vehicles for ongoing stakeholder engagement:

- MOD ISOLUS Steering Group (MISG): this is the 6th MISG meeting.
- The ISOLUS Advisory Group (IAG): has held 4 meetings, plus 2 workshops on specific topics.

Technical solution

a. Technical Options Study

Following the ISOLUS Concept Phase, Ministerial approval was given in 2002 to the further investigation of three options for the interim land storage of Intermediate Level Waste from submarines prior to final disposal. The options are interim land storage of:

- the intact Reactor Compartment
- the Reactor Pressure Vessel, and other large items, or
- size-reduced Packaged Waste

A Technical Options Study will review these options, drawing on the available technical data gathered from previous studies and proposing additional data gathering as appropriate. The study will not address site specific or social issues, and will be subject to independent peer review. The process for conducting the study was developed in conjunction with the IAG, whose advice will be sought at key stages of the study. MOD is currently going through the process of contractor selection. The target completion date is 16 weeks from contract placement. The output from the study will inform future decision making and public consultation.

b. Presentation of technical information on the ISOLUS website.

Following review by the IAG, a format for presenting technical reports on the website has been agreed. A summary of technical reports completed to date has been prepared and is currently being reviewed to gain a Plain English crystal mark prior to being placed on the website. Where information cannot be released due to commercial or security considerations, an explanation is provided. This process will be followed for future reports.

c. Future technical and environmental studies

The programme of work for 2008/9 is currently under consideration and will include a Feasibility Study which will address the programme of work required to develop a concept design for a submarine dismantling facility. The IAG will have the opportunity to preview this and other proposed work.

Dismantling site

MOD is conducting a generic assessment of types of sites (Greenfield, Brownfield and existing licensed sites) which would be suitable for dismantling submarines and processing wastes. The IAG will be engaged during the course of this work.

Storage site

A Memorandum of Understanding has been signed between MOD and the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority. This provides a framework for dialogue on issues associated with interim storage of Intermediate Level Waste.

Procurement Strategy

The procurement strategy is being developed, building on the position from the previous contractor proposals.

Financial approval has been gained and sufficient funding obtained for the project for the next 3 years, until the main investment decision is taken

Way forward

An update on this work will be presented to MOD Centre in the Autumn.

Comments from Peter Lanyon IAG No 5 Notes and Actions:

Page 1 Attendees: Peter Entwistle, I think, not Edwards.

Page 2 Para 6: I thought mention was made of FEC Recommendation 22 and CIOP Recommendation 23, both of which show that the public are strongly against free release.

Page 3 Action 4.12 and 4.13: Both refer to the same thing, but it is not the case that the bigger NGOs “did not want to be involved”; rather that they prefer that I kept them in contact via the NSubF.

Pages 3 and 4 Item 3 Technical Summary Reports Update: This seems not at all clear. Have the two technical studies mentioned been submitted for preview by us? And are they studies of the RCs of all the laid-up submarines, or only of Revenge's? Are the surveys that are to be obtained something we ought to have previewed?

Page 4 para 3: I said that I had been arguing for a long time for there to be public statements to bridge the gaps in the history of the Project and to clear up anomalies. I regretted the evasion and blurring of these issues by the MOD, and in particular MT's proposed statement sent to us on the eve of this meeting, which failed to cover either the relevant periods or the existing anomalies. I did not hear of or agree to any Action 5.3 that MT should issue a revised statement. It is perfectly obvious from the next two paragraphs of the draft notes that there is a generally expressed need within the IAG for a scrutiny of the development of the Project's problems, and that at present a revised statement from the MOD (Action 5.3) would not answer the case. I also mentioned in this connection that the Minister had stressed in the HOC on 20 May this year that the IAG is “to provide independent scrutiny of the project”. None of this is adequately represented in the draft notes.

{My subsequent constructive challenge on behalf of the IAG, and the issue of some lengthy documents under the FOI Act, make Action 5.4 inappropriate. [Copies of the notes on the (so-called “stand alone”) MOD workshop long-promised to us have still not yet been released].

I suggest that the only appropriate action here now is for the whole matter - including what the Minister meant, what gaps need to be filled, whether FOI processes are the way to do that, how far the released documents fill the gaps, and how the public should be informed of all this - to be discussed as an agenda item at the next IAG meeting. It is evident that the MOD itself needs advice on this, and this is what we are for}.

Page 6 Item 12 AOB: I can find no “covering explanation”, as promised, that has been issued explaining the “options information” and the “overarching strategy paper” with enough clarity for them to form the basis of an adequate preview by the IAG. I cannot believe that such obscure papers, sent out at the start of the holiday period and buried by the ongoing technical options review, can amount to what we need in order to conduct effective preview of such wide-ranging proposals. I suggest we devote more time and clarity to examining whatever it is that the MOD want us to consider in this matter.

Additionally: At some point I reminded the meeting that the IAG is the process or project guardian. The transcript of the meeting will show where this was, and it seems germane to include it in the notes.