

Minutes from 10th Submarine Dismantling Project Advisory Group
27th July 2010 Royal Hotel, Cardiff

In attendance

Les Netherton (LN)	Chairman of SDP AG
Mike Cushen (MC)	SDP MOD
Fraser Thomson (FT)	Fife Council
Cllr Brian Goodall (BG)	Fife Council
Sean Morris (SM)	Nuclear Free Local Authorities
Jane Tallents (JT)	Nuclear Submarine Forum
Di McDonald (DM)	Nuclear Submarine Forum
David Collier (DC)	Golder Associates
Andy Daniel (AD)	Industry representative (VT Group)
Steve Lewis (SL)	HSE NII
Robert Pirret (RP)	Babcock Stakeholder Liaison
Dr Paul Dorfman (PD)	Warwick University
Ian Avent (IA)	CANSAR
Jon Mallon (JM)	SDP MOD
Dr Sue Jordan (SJ)	SDP MOD
Georgie Mackender (GM)	SDP MOD Graduate
Gareth Rowlands (GR)	DE&S Secretariat
Simon Tinling (ST)	SDP Asst Hd Approvals
Phil Northcott (PN)	SDP App RN
Mike Cushen (MC)	SDP MOD
Ben Johnson (BJ)	Green Issues Communications
Emma Webster (EW)	Green Issues Communications
Dave Wells (DW)	Nuvia Limited
Cllr George H Regan (GRe)	SCCORS
Martin Murray (MM)	Environment Agency
Gary McMeekan (GM)	Environment Agency
Sally May (SMa)	MOD DE&S

Invited to present:

Francis Parkinson	MOD DNSR
-------------------	----------

Members of the Public in attendance in the public gallery

Max Wallace	
Christina Hugill	SDP Customer Friend
Daniel Richards	MOD Graduate
David Pollock	MOD Graduate
Alistair Cleave	DNSR Graduate

1. Welcome, Apologies and Introduction

LN welcomed members of the SDP AG to Cardiff.

The following members of the advisory group gave their apologies for the meeting:

Apologies

Tub Aves (TA)	The Nuclear Institute
Chris Hargraves (CH)	SDP MOD
Shelly Mobbs (SMo)	Health Protection Agency
Dave Whitworth (DW)	The Nuclear Institute
Fred Barker (FB)	NuLEAF
Andrew Boddice (AB)	Scottish Government
Jim Cochrane (JC)	SEPA
Ric Lockwood (RL)	Sultan

Di McDonald asked about the attendance of Sonia Sutcliffe, LN said that this would be raised under item 4 of the agenda.

2. Notes of 9th SDP AG

Ian Avent asked for an explanation as to how the analysis of options referred to in paragraph three on page five of the 9th Advisory Group meeting had been undertaken. MC explained that this would be addressed later in the presentation.

3. Action Grid from the 9th SDP AG

Action 2.7 The Secretary to provide an updated paper with a section on roles for comment. **To be completed under terms of reference section on the agenda.**

Action 4.4 Jane Hunt/Paul Dorfman to give a 'Public Risk Understanding' presentation at the next SDP AG. **On agenda**

Action 5.5 ISOLUS team to investigate options for a shared area. **It was deemed that this is no longer required.**

Action 6.11 Steve Woodley to include Shelly Mobbs in the production of the Risk Glossary. Steve Woodley to liaise with Paul Dorfman, Steve Lewis, Shelly Mobbs and David Littlewood regarding editing of Risk Glossary. **Complete.**

Action 6:12 Chairman to suggest to MISG that they meet IAG members. **Complete.**

Action 8.7 All IAG Members to review the glossary on the website and see if there are any other terms that should be included. **Complete.**

Action 9.1 EW to confirm DNSR presentation at the next SDP AG. **On agenda**

Action 9.2 EW to attach a post-meeting note to reflect David Collier's comments regarding ethics. **Complete.**

Action 9.3 EW to attach a post-meeting note to correct the rank from Commander to Commodore. **Complete**

Action 9.4: GR to consider whether MSPs should be included on the list for pre consultation engagement. **Complete**

Action 9.5: JM to circulate articles to the SDP AG. **Complete**

Action 9.6: MC to update SDP AG on the decision taken by the end of November (noting if there is no finalised decision for this to be reported back to the SDP AG). **Complete**

Action 9.7: EW to circulate the additional slides. **Complete**

Action 9.8: MC to discuss internally in MOD revealing the strategy for announcing sites and to support this by identifying the work that had been done by down selection. **Complete – MC referred to the second stage of SEA consultation that has been introduced.**

Action 9.9: JW to set out the regulatory processes. **Complete.**

Action 9.10: MC to state when PESTLE would be visible to the SDP AG. **This will be prior to public consultation on a review basis. Complete**

Action 9.11: All members to send to EW comments regarding Independent Peer Review. EW to circulate comments to the SDP AG. **Complete.**

Action 9.12: CH to establish a timetable for review, which would be carried out by email. The programme would be published by end November. Closed. **Overtaken by Events.**

Action 9.13: MC to provide details of regulations that support dismantling. **Complete**

Action 9.14: DC to outline what is meant by a corresponding member and what role JH would fulfil. **Closed, Overtaken by Events.**

Action 9.15: LN to write to Peter Lanyon on behalf of the group to thank him for his contributions. **Complete.**

Action 9.16: MC proposed that the next meeting would look at Nuclear Decommissioning Authority stakeholder groups and their local liaison groups which SDP AG might devolve into. **Closed, OBE, this was considered when it was thought that the public consultation would be early 2010.**

Action 9.17: EW to amend the terms of reference and re-circulate to the SDP AG. **Complete.**

Action 9.18: JT and DM to consider whether the NFLA could provide representation on the SDP CsG and to feed back their thoughts to EW. **Complete.**

Action 9.19: SM to find out whether NFLA would be able to provide representation on the SDP CsG and to feed back his thoughts to EW. **Complete.**

Action 9.20: SMO to circulate a link to the HSE report to all members of the SDP AG. **Complete.**

4. Membership of the Advisory Group

JM introduced this item and informed members of the SDP AG that Sonia Sutcliffe (Member of the Public) had tendered her resignation to the MOD in June and this had been accepted. JT asked if the role was to be replaced, it was felt that this was not necessary at this stage, but could be discussed further under Item 9 of the agenda.

LN informed members of the advisory group that JM was moving to a different project within the MOD. Members of the group wished him all the best for the future.

5. SDP Update

a. Project timeframe

MC ran through the baseline programme and updated members of the group on the progress that has been made since the group last met.

He informed members of the group that the elected representatives engagement had taken place in respect of MOD and defence-related Commercially Owned sites that were potential candidates for SDP activities between October 2009 and March 2010.

MC informed members of the Advisory Group that the first phase of the SEA Statutory Consultation started on the 17th June and concluded on the 23rd July. He confirmed that SJ would give further details later on in the meeting.

MC confirmed that the SEA and Consultation sub groups had helped shape the progress of the public consultation and SEA work. Engagement has also taken place with DECC (Department for Energy and Climate Change) and Scottish Government who have shared their experiences from recent public consultation processes.

MC confirmed that whilst there may be a new timetable the fundamental logic stays the same. It is looking currently as though public consultation will take place towards the end of 2011, with recommendations to Government in 2012. This would keep the project on schedule to deliver dismantling capabilities by 2020.

MC informed members that an OGC (Office of Government Commerce) review had taken place in the third week of November 2009 and that a number of recommendations came forward from that review. One particular comment that would be of interest to the SDP AG was that the OGC felt that this meeting was a useful tool when engaging with the public.

b. Elected representatives briefing

MC confirmed that the elected representatives briefing presentation was on the website www.submarinedismantling.co.uk in the background information, elected representatives section. The information presented to the elected representatives was correct at the time it was presented. It was confirmed that engagement with NDA sites had not yet taken place. BG raised a concern that in some locations he was aware that elected representatives that were briefed were only Council Leaders and that in some locations ward members may have been more appropriate.

BG also asked whether the newly elected MPs would receive the briefing? MC confirmed that the intention was to do another round of elected representatives briefings after endorsement to do a second round of SEA consultation had been approved. GRe offered the assistance of SCCORs in this process. MC agreed to discuss this outside the meeting.

c. SEA/ Statutory Consultation

ST introduced the site assessment process that is currently being undertaken. The process has four stages. Stage one considers a number of high level options: Greenfield/ brownfield/existing licensed/authorised sites. Stage two considers the detailed threshold criteria. This gives rise to a list of credible sites. The MOD would then be in a position

through stage 3 to identify a proposed site or sites to take into public consultation. Stage 4 would follow public consultation leading to a recommended site or sites. By defining the criteria it will be possible to show how the screening of other options has taken place. It was confirmed that the MOD's scrutineers would also need to see the information and be satisfied as to its robustness. DM questioned why the Greenfield option was still being considered and whether this was necessary or just created confusion. ST confirmed it was being carried through, although this might ultimately be for comparative purposes..

BP commented that one of the biggest failings of the previous consultation was the lack of technical evidence to back up the comments being put forward. It was confirmed that this process would provide the evidence base that would be required in the lead up to and during public consultation.

ST then focused specifically on stage two of the process. This stage involved the understanding of key local stakeholders including: Local Authorities, SSGs/LLCs and local NGOs/CBOs (subject to MOD approvals). PD asked the NGO representatives what they thought of CBO/local NGO representation. JT said that it would be of assistance as a number of LLC's are quite difficult for NGOs to get involved in.

ST confirmed that the current intention was to have two events, one in the North and one in the South. LN asked if the AG would be happy if the MOD were to work up a list of potential attendees.

SJ then spoke about the SEA Stage A process. It was confirmed that the environmental report will be an element of the public consultation. SJ outlined the two-stage process that is taking place in Stage A. It was confirmed that the first part of Stage A has been undertaken and that the three documents that were sent out for comment from the statutory bodies were: non-technical summary (intended for a lay audience), the scoping report, annexes including baseline environmental conditions.

In addition to the statutory bodies a number of other government departments were invited to opt into the consultation. The first part of the statutory consultation concluded on the 23rd July and responses received as of the 22nd July included: DEFRA, Health Protection Agency, Northern Ireland Environment Agency, Environment Agency, English Heritage, Department for Transport, English Nature, Welsh Assembly Government and the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority.

MM enquired whether the full responses will be made available on the website.

Action 10.1: SJ to confirm whether statutory bodies' responses to SEA Scoping A Part 1 can be put on the SDP website.

DM asked whether the potential abandoning of the Geological Disposal Facility came under SJ's remit. ST confirmed that the acceptance of materials into the GDF was outside the scope of this project, but that materials would be stored on an interim basis before being transferred to the GDF.

MC confirmed the project assumption for the GDF coming online was 2040, but that the provision of the GDF itself was outside of the scope of the project and was the responsibility of DECC (Department for Energy and Climate Change). SDP have identified this issue as a risk if the GDF is not built or is delayed. SDP is looking at how to mitigate the risk so that interim storage can be used for longer than currently planned. It was noted that the CoRWM recommendations were for stores to be designed to last for 100 years.

GRe informed members that he will ask the two Scottish bodies for their response.

d. Public Consultation

EW introduced the public consultation sections of the presentation, outlining the key questions that the public will be asked to consider. It was noted that the need for robust evidence that can be challenged should be provided at the time of the exhibition, or in advance of the exhibition so that the members of the public attending can make considered opinions and be able to have any questions they might have answered.

EW outlined future proposals for support from the Advisory Group including: FEC/CIOP responses (Consultation sub group to conduct a preview, AG to conduct a review). The Consultation Plan is currently under development (Consultation sub group to conduct a preview, AG to conduct a review). Questions and answers (Consultation sub group to conduct a preview, AG to conduct a review).

EW reminded members of the AG that the website www.submarinedismantling.co.uk is updated on a continual basis and that recent additions include: SEA documentation and the elected representatives briefing.

Action 10: 2: MC to confirm when the consultation plan and other documents will be circulated.

Action 10.3: EW to circulate the consultation plan.

LN updated the group regarding the progress of the two sub groups. The consultation sub group has developed the information hierarchy and evaluated information gaps, including questions and answers. They have provided input into the newsletter and have assisted with the development of the initial preview and review schedule.

The SEA sub group has also been very active and has assisted the MOD with the development of the SEA Scoping Non Technical summary.

e. MPOS (MOD Preferred Options Study)

ST outlined the three credible technical options:

- RC storage (commonly known as “Cut Out”). In this option you take out the whole RC and store in controlled conditions before the GDF becomes available.
- RPV storage. In this option you remove the RPV and store intact until the GDF becomes available.
- Packaged waste storage (commonly known as “Cut Up”). In this option the RC is immediately cut up and stored in interim approved storage until the GDF becomes available.

It was explained that whilst the GDF is the common end point for all options, a key difference between the options is the time sequencing of the various options.

ST updated members of the group about the Frazer Nash technical options study. He informed members that the review has recently been completed by those who participated in the study. There is an intention to publish the document on the website.

Action 10.4: EW to put Frazer Nash technical options study paper onto the SDP website.

ST explained that the MPOS work was continuing with the aim to get to a MOD Preferred Option to be presented during public consultation. The work of the MPOS is ongoing and the findings will be made public at an appropriate stage.

MOD and subject matter experts have been used in the process including independent peer review by Professor Malcolm Joyce.

There was a two phased process: Firstly there was a one day workshop based on a multi criteria decision analysis method (MCDA). This and a separate cost appraisal of the options were then combined and presented to senior members of the MOD including assurors and scrutineers.

IA enquired whether the cost modelling was based on discounted cash flows. It was confirmed that in line with Treasury requirements estimated costs had been discounted.

DC then gave feedback to the group as he was one of the three Advisory Group members present (Les Netherton and Paul Dorfman were the other members). Two workshops were observed, the first was for desk officers, the second for senior officers (this was more of a 'select committee' format).

DC confirmed that the process was fairly objectively done and that they were made to feel welcome. It was a genuinely interesting process backed up by the required information. Pretty robust discussions took place and overall it needs to be seen in context of a bigger options analysis process.

LN continued by noting that certain themes keep occurring and he asked the advisory group whether it would be of assistance to understand what goes on in a submarine during a refit etc. Members of the group agreed that this would be helpful.

Action: 10.5: MC to discuss internally about the possibility of arranging a presentation about what currently takes place during a refit etc. and how this is managed.

LN also asked whether members would find a presentation on release of dose risk assessment and dose control would be of value.

Action 10.6: MC to discuss internally the possibility of arranging a presentation about dose risk assessment and dose control at the next meeting.

Action 10.7: MC to discuss internally the possibility of having a presentation about recycling at the next meeting.

Questions from Members of the Public

Max Wallace – What sources are to be used in public consultation? Concerned that FEC and CIOP recommendations are only being considered now. Should ethical premises and principles be included?

It was confirmed that a variety of information will be used to source in public consultation all of which would be evidence based. The FEC and CIOP recommendations have been considered from the outset of this phase of public consultation. Best practice regarding public consultation will be followed throughout phase 2 of the project.

Meeting broke for Lunch (12.45pm)

6. DNSR Presentation

Francis Parkinson (DNSR Principal Inspector) presented to the Advisory Group the DNSR regulation of the Submarine Dismantling Project. During his presentation he outlined four particular areas: Why do we need regulation? Role of DNSR (Defence Nuclear Safety Regulator), Who regulates where and RAM Transport.

After the conclusion of the DNSR presentation, PN introduced a brief slide included within the information pack, titled 'How we apply regulation to SDP'

Action 10.8: EW to put the slide How we apply regulation to SDP onto the website with appropriate explanation of abbreviations.

7. Paul Dorfman presentation on risk

PD completed a presentation on public risk understanding (further to an action that arose after the second advisory group meeting). It was noted that people broadly fall into one of two categories, those who trust the system and those who don't.

The area of making democratic decisions was considered against the backdrop of balancing expert knowledge with everyday knowledge.

PD stressed the importance of participatory democracy, which provides legitimacy, accountability and transparency, builds trust, public acceptability and better long-term decision making.

8. Public Art Project

DM introduced the idea of a public art project relating to SDP. It was acknowledged that a big area of art is involved in portraying themes including: defence, science, technology, and its interface with human experience.

Art of this nature tends to be challenging and contemporary. It would not be an art project to give the MOD a message or as a form of protest. The medium it could be done in could vary from: photography, monument, exhibition or an event.

DM has been offered a meeting on 5th August with an artist who is interested. Funding would have to be considered. DM offered to produce a report for the Advisory Group after the meeting. LN asked whether this would be designed to assist public consultation or to do with nuclear submarines more widely. DM confirmed it was to do with showing how nuclear waste has to be dealt with, but that it was not aimed at colouring peoples' views before, during or after consultation.

BG commented on the proposal, noting that he was also the Councillor responsible for arts and culture in Fife and that they were in the middle of their year of arts and culture. He was concerned that it could be seen as being a distraction to the detriment of the work of the group and of the artist. It was noted that some regimes have tried to use art in the past to promote their own agenda.

BG raised a note of caution as to whether this group would want to use its resources in this way.

DC asked whether this might be part of the implementation phase rather than now, when there was a link to a specific site. DM confirmed that she saw it as a long term legacy to go on long after the project had completed.

ST suggested that this might be an area for future community engagement. He also noted that although no project funding was available there might well be wider stakeholders interested in preserving the naval heritage associated with the submarines.

9. Future role and structure of the Advisory Group

LN introduced the item outlining that membership of the group had changed quite significantly since its inception. It was noted that as we head towards public consultation members of the group will need to be able to confirm their commitment to the advisory group.

Potential national stakeholder groups may involve members of the advisory groups holding different roles. Members will have to determine whether it is still possible/appropriate for them to be involved in different ways.

It was acknowledged that the need for the involvement of the sub groups will get more detailed and pressurised as we head towards public consultation. As we move into the operational phase and potentially members of the advisory group may be contractors to the project. It was noted that there was a need for people to either declare an interest or declare the difference in their roles.

A key question to be considered is when will the advisory group have done all of its work and be in a position to be disbanded? LN commented that based on the current timeframe it was looking as though this would be sometime in 2012-2013.

DC thought it would be interesting to hear the views of the advisory group to understand what members believe it is there for. It was noted that the sub groups undertake a lot of work and are in reality the operational arm of the advisory group. JT suggested it would be helpful for there to be a greater degree of interaction between the main advisory group and the sub groups, particularly the consultation sub group. SM enquired why it was only Fife Council that were represented at the advisory group.

Action 10.9: LN to discuss the future role and structure of the advisory group with the SDP team.

10. AOB

EW recapped the actions that had been taken during the meeting. No further actions were raised.

MC asked for his thanks to Jon Mallon for the work that he had done on the project to be recorded as this was Jon's final meeting.

11. Date of next meeting

Next meeting to be held either in Liverpool or Reading, date to be confirmed. SL is investigating whether it would be possible to use the NII offices in Bootle for a meeting.

Meeting closed at 15.55pm

Action Number	Description	Actionee	Status	Due Date
10.1	SJ to confirm whether statutory bodies' responses to SEA Scoping A Part 1 can be put on SDP website	Sue Jordan	Ongoing	Next meeting
10.2	MC to confirm when the	Mike Cushen	Ongoing	In advance of the next

	consultation plan and other documents will be circulated to the Advisory Group			meeting
10.3	EW to circulate the consultation plan	Emma Webster	Ongoing	In advance of the next meeting, n.b reliant on action 10.2
10.4	EW to put Frazer Nash technical options paper onto the SDP website	Emma Webster	Ongoing	By end September
10.5	MC to discuss internally about the possibility of arranging a presentation about what currently takes place during a refit etc. and how this is managed	Mike Cushen	Ongoing	By next meeting
10.6	MC to discuss internally the possibility of arranging a presentation about dose risk assessment and dose control at the next meeting	Mike Cushen	Ongoing	By next meeting
10.7	MC to discuss internally about the possibility of having a presentation about recycling at the next meeting	Mike Cushen	Ongoing	By next meeting
10.8	EW to put the slide "How we apply regulation to the SDP" onto the website	Emma Webster	Ongoing	By end September

	with appropriate explanation of abbreviations			
10.9	LN to discuss the future role and structure of the advisory group with the SDP team	Les Netherton	Ongoing	By next meeting