

Notes and Actions of 13th Submarine Dismantling Project Advisory Group

20th-21st June 2012, Mercure Holland House, Bristol

Day 1 - 20th June

In attendance

Les Netherton (LN)	Chairman of SDP Advisory Group
Jane Tallents (JT)	Nuclear Submarine Forum
Di McDonald (DM)	Nuclear Submarine Forum
Andy Daniel (AD)	Industry representative (Babcock)
Ian Avent (IA)	CANSAR
David Whitworth (DW)	Nuclear Institute
Phil Matthews (PM)	NuLeAF
Robin Carton (RC)	Plymouth City Council
Shelly Mobbs (SMob)	Eden Nuclear and Environment
Tub Aves (TA)	Nuclear Institute
Gary McMeekan (GM)	Environment Agency
Sean Morris (SMor)	Nuclear Free Local Authorities
David Collier (DC)	MOD - SDP Project Team Customer Friend
Dr Sue Jordan (SJ)	Defence Infrastructure Organisation
Gareth Rowlands (GR)	MOD - DE&S Secretariat
John Davis (JD)	MOD - SDP Project Manager
Simon Tinling (ST)	MOD - SDP Project Asst Project Manager
Lt Cdr Chris Hall (CHal)	MOD - SDP Project Team
Mike Cushen (MC)	MOD – former SDP Project Manager
Sally May (SMa)	MOD - SDP Project Team
Chris Hargraves (CH)	MOD - SDP Project Team
Jim Cochrane (JC)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Bryony Cushen (BC)	MOD Work Experience - Observing
Christine Bruce (CB)	MOD - SDP Rosyth
Emma Webster (EW)	Green Issues Communiqué
Ben Johnson (BJ)	Green Issues Communiqué

Apologies

Steve Lewis (SL)	Office for Nuclear Regulation
Fraser Thomson (FT)	Fife Council
Roy Stewart (RS)	Fife Council
Dr Paul Dorfman (PD)	Warwick University
Nigel Parsons (NP)	MOD Devonport

1. Welcome, Apologies and Introduction

LN welcomed members of the SDP Advisory Group to Bristol. LN introduced John Davis (JD) to the Advisory Group as the replacement for Mike Cushen who left the project team in February 2012. MC was thanked for his contributions.

LN introduced two new members to the group: Phil Matthews (PM) from NuLeAF, who succeeds Fred Barker, and Robin Carton (RC) from Plymouth City Council. The group recorded its thanks to Fred Barker for his valuable contributions to the Project during his time with NuLeAF. David Collier (DC) confirmed his resignation from the membership of the group as he is now contracted to support the project team, so was attending on their behalf.

A number of members gave their apologies as listed above. LN informed the group that under the Terms of Reference the Chairman should be appointed annually. LN was re-confirmed as the Chairman of the Advisory Group for the next 12 months.

LN took members through the agenda for the two days, noting a slight change on day 2, an additional presentation to be given by Ele Carpenter.

2. Notes of the 12th SDP AG

No issues were raised

3. Actions from 12th SDP Advisory Group

Action Number	Description	Actionee	Status
12.1	EW to circulate NDA strategy published in April 2011	EW	Complete
12.2	ST to ensure that public consultation materials acknowledge the differences between UK and Scottish policy	ST	Complete
12.3	ST to consider the clarification regarding the flexibility of dismantling approach to managing future classes within the public consultation materials and share with Di McDonald (and sub group members) in advance	ST	Complete
12.4	EW to add question to Q&A re Fukushima	EW	Complete
12.5	GM to speak to MC regarding the Environment Agency paper responding to Fukushima	GM	Complete
12.6	MC to contact BG regarding Scottish policy further to the discussion regarding waste	MC	Complete
12.7	SMa to add Question and Answers to the Public Consultation Document Hierarchy diagram	SMa	Complete
12.8	MC to consider whether the Public Consultation question set can be released in advance of public consultation to the Advisory Group	MC	Complete

12.9	SMa to consider the context/balance of the situation in the video and consultation document	SMa	Complete
12.10	SMa to circulate the 'Responding to the Public' slide	SMa	Complete
12.11	SMa to add a short paragraph regarding previous consultations into the introduction of the public consultation document	SMa	Complete
12.12	SMa to circulate to the AG the opening sections of the public consultation document in word rather than PDF	SMa	Complete
12.13	All to email comments about the public consultation document to SMa and EW	All	Complete
12.14	MC to consider whether there is the requirement for another advisory group before public consultation	SMa	Complete
12.15	MC to write to the HPA to thank them for the support and assistance of Shelly Mobbs	MC	Complete
12.16	All to email any comments regarding LN's involvement with the STAC to him if they did not raise them in the meeting	All	Complete

4. Schedule Update

JD took the AG through the key milestones for the project, the key activities that had been completed since the last meeting and gave a recap of the key decisions and when they have to be made.

JD also explained the purpose of, and preparations for, the Demonstrator. It was noted that a number of the processes that will be used for dismantling are already used for maintenance of submarines during service.

TA stressed the importance of the project continuing to be open and transparent as it progresses.

LN asked whether the Demonstrator contract would be separate to the contract for the remaining boats. JD confirmed that this would be the case.

JC asked if more information about the Demonstrator could be published, focusing on the preparatory work for the Demonstrator and the regulatory processes that will apply. ST responded that much of this information was included in the Consultation Document and that the Post Consultation Report focuses on reporting back consultee responses to the consultation.

DW noted that the presentation said 'at least one boat' and asked what process will be undertaken to select the boat(s)? ST replied that the decision may be taken for the demonstrator to be more than one boat so that differences between boats can be examined. The boat(s) would be selected based on a range of criteria, such as the ALARP principle, age of boats and the planned maintenance schedule.

SMor asked whether there will be a demonstrator at both sites if the dual site option is chosen for initial dismantling. ST explained that this is not anticipated as the learning from undertaking the demonstrator would be transferable between sites.

LN asked for updates on the Demonstrator to be provided when possible as there had historically been a lot of confusion about the Demonstrator and what it actually entailed.

5. Public Consultation responses

SMA outlined the consultation process and reviewed key points. She took the group through the statistics indicating the levels of engagement during the consultation as provided in the Post Consultation Report. SMA thanked the group for their comments on the document received during the preceding review period and explained that it was to be published imminently.

SMA presented a flow diagram that demonstrated how consultation responses were processed and introduced the tagging system. DC added that comments were broken down into individual points and then every point had a one or more individual tags, this meant that the number of tags was greater than the overall number of individual respondents.

SMA took the AG through the consultation comments, breaking them down to the different headings used in the Post Consultation Report.

She began with 'Aims and Objectives'. It was noted that there was a great deal of support for the dismantling part of the proposals, with respondents acknowledging that something needed to be done, rather than be left any longer.

When it came to the issue of future classes there was a tension between those who thought future classes should be considered within the scope of this project and those that didn't think it should be. For those who thought they should be within scope, this mainly revolved around the principles of value for money.

SMA said a number of respondents had suggested that public confidence should be added to the project's objectives. ST informed the AG that public confidence is a key user requirement, but that it isn't currently an objective, as it would be difficult to measure or set a standard.

JT said that the biggest difficulty was that public confidence isn't just reliant on this project, but there are a number of other factors that would influence it which are not within the project's control.

LN confirmed that issues of confidence have been raised in other areas of consultation and that ultimately it's how you deal with that in the public arena that will help achieve public confidence. It is a complex task for MOD, but the key is openness and transparency.

JT suggested that part of a Contractor's contract should be that they have properly trained people to explain things to the public.

The group agreed that they strongly recommend that MOD considers how future contracts can be written to ensure the inclusion of stakeholder engagement.

IA asked if it would be possible to give updates to the LLC while the Demonstrator and dismantling of the other boats is taking place and that if done correctly this would help to inspire public confidence. RC stressed that part of public confidence relates to trust in the regulators to act if something does go wrong.

The recommendation was made that contractors should make regular updates to the LLC during the Demonstrator and dismantling phases of the project.

IA suggested that, once the Demonstrator had started, a 'virtual tour' of the process could be developed for the website. ST also confirmed that the SDP website would be updated throughout the Demonstration phase.

SMor said that the NFLA were disappointed that the MOD is spending £1bn on the process to start building new submarines.

SMA took the group through the responses relating to 'Removing the Radioactive Material'. There were wide ranging views that considered the containment provided by each of the different options. The principle of 'As Low As Reasonably Practicable' (ALARP) was raised particularly when considering Reactor Compartment storage.

Safety and risk were key areas of concern that respondents raised and some made related calls for more information on dose and discharges. It was noted that this will be forthcoming, but that it must be presented in such a way that makes it understandable to the general public.

DMc said that when the difference between the permitted limit and the proposed use of that limit is too wide, it seems that the gap is to allow for mistakes that don't have to be reported. Having a wide legal limit allows you so much room for mistakes that it undermines people's confidence.

SMob informed the group that the Environment Agency has consulted on how discharge limits are set.

GMc confirmed that there are other means within permits for example quarterly notification levels are set below a quarter of the annual figure.

The AG agreed to recommend that SDP consider the total impact MOD activities have on the local community. In particular, SDP should discuss trade-offs with other MOD activities at the dismantling site(s) and make it clear that SDP requires their co-operation. If they do not co-operate the SDP project will be at risk.

LN on behalf of the AG thanked MC for his help over last few years and wished him well. MC left the meeting.

SMA took the AG through the next theme, 'Dismantling Location' which was a particular concern for people who live near a potential dismantling site. Transporting submarines was a key issue for many people many of whom highlighted the benefits of a dual site approach. The importance of keeping communities informed was re-emphasised.

SMA reported the feedback relating to interim storage of Intermediate Level Waste (ILW). It was noted that while a number of people saw initial dismantling of submarines as akin to activities which already take place in the dockyard, many saw ILW storage as a new and unacceptable development. The difference between MOD, NDA and Commercial sites was discussed. IA said that the people of Plymouth felt that ILW storage in Plymouth was a step too far. The area has higher background levels of radon, tritium discharges from the dockyard, refit and refuelling work, six laid-up submarines and the potential for dismantling. The idea of adding ILW storage in the area would be unfair.

JT commented that members of the public often say that a site should be located away from areas of large population, but that there are also problems of fairness in this approach since these people have not benefited from the work involved in the submarine programme.

SMA took the AG through the comments received relating to Community Impacts, for example the effects on perceptions of an area that may in turn affect future business and investment in a particular area. Many people in Plymouth want to see the development of green technology for example. Meanwhile Plymouth Naval Base and dockyard is the centre of excellence for nuclear submarines and therefore has the skills and experience and the current benefits from that work. In Rosyth there has been a move away from nuclear work since the refitting and maintenance work was won by Plymouth in the 90s.

It was noted that employment opportunities was not a significant issue raised during the consultation, and that this was probably most likely due to the small number of jobs that would be created.

The issue of community benefits was raised. RC said that one of the difficult things was to understand what potential impacts for a local area would be. How can public confidence be understood or measured?

SMA introduced the Other Contributory Factors (OCF) theme. It was noted that most of the points raised focussed on risk and uncertainty, for example relating to Scottish policy and the referendum on Scottish Independence. Consultation respondents highlighted the potential policy changes that could happen and how current funding issues could exacerbate risks further.

In Devonport other issues were raised, e.g the incinerator. In Rosyth similar responses focused on the future vision for the dockyard and waterfront and the container port proposals.

SMA discussed the Approach to Analysis. Detailed points were made in the consultation responses relating to the methodology of the Options Analysis process and questions about involving wider stakeholders in the process.

Out of Scope issues were also raised in the consultation, such as defuelling which has historically taken place at Devonport. SMA said it was important that the Project set out clearly where it does and does not have direct responsibility and / or influence. Some members of the Group noted that SDP's consultation may have raised wider awareness in the community about this process.

JT commented how far the process has moved in the time she has been involved in the AG. She first got involved with ISOLUS, as it then was and in CIOP struggled to get issues such as these mentioned in a MOD document. She was very heartened when evaluating the consultation to see the difference the AG has made.

SMA then introduced the feedback received relating to the Next Steps for the SDP. The key message emphasised the importance of maintaining the momentum and making a commitment to future dates to demonstrate this. It was recognised that it was equally important to continue to provide information as and when it becomes available, particularly relating to dose and discharges.

Finally, SMA discussed with the group the feedback relating to the conduct of the consultation. It was noted that people responding to the consultation felt the meetings and information provided was useful and the workshops were particularly helpful.

A learning point was that a number of respondents felt that the feedback form was complex and asked too many questions. A criticism was that the publicity for some of the consultation events was too low. It was noted that the media coverage in certain areas was lower profile than may have been predicted.

A further point that came from the feedback was a scepticism from respondents as to their ability to influence decisions. Indications are that this is because people had been involved in other consultations where their views had not appeared to have influenced the outcome.

SMA said a number of people felt that they would reserve judgement on the process until the MOD told them what they had done to address their feedback. Alternative methods of stakeholder engagement were suggested. An appetite for information to be published on an ongoing basis was emphasised.

6. SEA responses

SJ took members of the AG through the responses to the SEA, explaining that this had been a particularly complex SEA and that AMEC who assisted viewed it as one of the most complicated they have assisted on.

She noted that statutory bodies were broadly supportive and that local authorities gave constructive comments to the consultation. 500 plus comments were received and a wide range of viewpoints were expressed.

It was noted that the length of the report was significant and that as much as possible was contained within the appendices. Comments were made regarding the Non Technical Summary (NTS) and the degree of detail contained within it. It was noted that the NTS was singled out for praise by a number of statutory bodies.

SJ took members through the Comments on Approach to Assessment section. It was noted that there was a large amount of information included in the appendices and that some people struggled to find all of the information.

A discussion took place regarding the meaning of the word 'significant' and the difference in legal terms and in the opinion of a local resident.

Monitoring for radioactivity in the environment was a significant issue in local communities at potential dismantling sites.

SJ noted that the potential non availability of the GDF was a big concern raised by respondents.

LN said that before the consultation there was a fear that the SEA may be seen as an afterthought, but that he feels that it was properly integrated into the consultation and that the number of responses received illustrates this.

Members of the AG stressed the importance of providing information as it becomes available.

7. Options Analysis progress update

ST took members of the AG through the A3 handout taking members through the decision process and recapped the options. He noted that there were 24 integrated options considered including the 'do minimum' comparator).

ST gave a recap on the three different options analysis methods:

- Operational Effectiveness (OE): how well does each option meet our requirements?
- Investment Appraisal: what is the whole life cost of each option through to the GDF including ship recycling. Noting that this must include risk.
- Other Contributory Factors (OCF): factors which are not quantifiable in terms of cost, but that affect deliverability and or fairness.

LN noted that OCF is something pretty novel for the MOD to consider. It was explained that it is not something that is normally addressed in such a strategic way and noted that this could be explained in the next update of the document SDP - Our Approach to Decision Making. SM confirmed that the MOD also intends to update the document SDP – Our Approach to Public and Stakeholder Engagement.

ST took the AG through the Combined Operational Effectiveness and Investment Appraisal (COEIA) plot which illustrated the assessment of cost and effectiveness of the 24 options at the time of public consultation. The degree of separation (or closeness) of the options is shown by the error bands which represent uncertainty in both the cost and effectiveness of the options.

ST explained the decision logic. The role of the independent observers from the AG was noted particularly in this area. DC commented that at each level there is a data report that contains the underpinning data.

ST provided an update on the options. He said that during the consultation period the NDA confirmed that storing an RPV in an NDA facility is a feasible option. This had previously been declared in the consultation as an opportunity.

An options workshop was held in April 2012 to refine the options set. Options which were demonstrably uneconomic were discounted from further assessment except where OCFs demanded further consideration.

Some responses had criticised the weighting attached to discharge criteria in the Multi Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA). ST explained that the low end of the scoring scale had been too ambiguous as to what was meant by 'statutory limits'. In the re-run of the MCDA post-consultation, this lower end (ie. for the poorest score) had been set at a dose to the critical group of 10 μ Sv (Micro Sieverts). This was a figure that was generally accepted to be in the 'As Low As Reasonably Achievable' region and a much better threshold of acceptability. SMob cautioned that the project should not describe a public dose of 10 μ Sv as 'unacceptable' and agreed to advise ST on the appropriate language to use.

Action 13.1: ST to speak to SMob to seek guidance regarding the language used relating to discharges.

ST provided an update regarding the Investment Appraisal. ST said that JD had visited the French Navy and they had provided useful information. Lessons have also been learned from discussions with the NDA relating to storage costs.

OCF discussions have also continued.

ST said that the MOD do not intend to name ILW sites until key decisions have been made in 2013.

ST reminded members of the scoring workshop that was taking place outside the meeting at 5pm.

LN closed the meeting until the morning.

Meeting closed: 16.30

Day 2 - 21st June 2012

In attendance

Les Netherton (LN)	Chairman of SDP AG
Jane Tallents (JT)	Nuclear Submarine Forum
Di McDonald (DM)	Nuclear Submarine Forum
David Collier (DC)	MOD project team
Andy Daniel (AD)	Industry representative (Babcock)
Ian Avent (IA)	CANSAR
Dr Sue Jordan (SJ)	Defence Infrastructure Organisation
Gareth Rowlands (GR)	DE&S Secretariat
John Davis (JD)	SDP Hd Approvals
Simon Tinling (ST)	SDP Asst Hd Approvals
Chris Hall (CHal)	SDP App RN
Emma Webster (EW)	Green Issues Communiqué
Ben Johnson (BJ)	Green Issues Communiqué
Sally May (SMa)	SDP Approvals
Shelly Mobbs (SMob)	Eden Nuclear and Environment
Tub Aves (TA)	Nuclear Institute
Dave Griffiths (DG)	Environment Agency
Chris Hargraves (CH)	SDP Approvals
David Whitworth (DW)	Nuclear Institute
Phil Matthews (PM)	NuLEAF
Robin Carton (RC)	Plymouth City Council
Christine Bruce (CB)	MOD Rosyth
Sean Morris (SMor)	NFLA
Jenny Ewer (JE)	Polaris Consulting
David Bangert (DB)	Polaris Consulting
Dr Paul Dorfman (PD)	Warwick University

Apologies

Steve Lewis (SL)	Office for Nuclear Regulation
Fraser Thomson (FT)	Fife Council
Roy Stewart (RS)	Fife Council
Jim Cochrane (JC)	SEPA
Nigel Parsons (NP)	MOD Devonport

Members of the Public

Ele Carpenter	Goldsmiths College
Bernadette Buckley	Goldsmiths College
Rod Dickinson	University of West England, Artist and Lecturer

Before the meeting officially opened DB and LE ran through a presentation showing the results of the previous evening's weighting workshops. Members asked if the weightings

from the various stakeholder types could be merged to form a combined weighting reflecting the view of the Advisory Group.

Action 13.2 :

- ***To circulate raw data along with notes once the inputs have been checked.***
- ***To circulate the output to AG members for comment before wider publication and circulate with a “health warning” explaining that the workshops were a quick process to assess ‘gut feel’ rather than detailed consideration of data.***

LN opened the second day of the meeting and re-introduced Ele Carpenter (EC) to the AG. He informed the AG that he agreed for EC to provide an update to the AG.

EC introduced Bernadette Buckley and Rod Dickinson. She then reported back to the AG further to her presentation at the last meeting regarding her applications for grant funding.

EC informed the group that she had been successful in a bid for a research grant from the Arts and Humanities Research Council. Her plan is to set up a round table discussion between interested parties and six to ten artists. In the following year she will be applying again for funding for actual projects.

AG members were invited to sign up to a mailing list to stay abreast of developments with this project and it was noted that a group of artists involved in the project may wish to visit a submarine in the future.

Members of the AG congratulated Ele Carpenter and her colleagues on the grant award.

Action 13.3: GIC to circulate information relating to the art projects received from Ele Carpenter.

8. AG Evaluation and Lessons Learned from the Consultation

LN introduced the subject of review of the Advisory Group and the consultations throughout the project's history. He encouraged members to share their thoughts on what had worked well and what could be done better with a focus on particular learning points for the future, starting with the Consultation on ISOLUS Outline Proposals (CIOP).

CIOP

It was LN's view that the process was a 'function of its time' as its approach was to go out to industry to seek a way forward. Bids and proposals came forward with very little technical data to supplement or inform them. The lack of information provided by MOD in this process resulted in the consultation being combative because industry could not answer people's questions. The lesson that has been learned is not to approach consultation without being able to provide answers to reasonable questions.

JT felt that MOD didn't define the parameters of solutions or options for comment – which created tension.

AD suggested that the scope of the briefing to industry was too “loose” and therefore did not encourage industry to spend a lot of time or money responding to it in a sufficiently detailed way. He felt that the industry could only respond in-depth in response to a clearly defined requirement.

JT felt that the CIOP proposals encouraged a “NIMBYist” response and were perceived by communities as a test of their resistance. She felt that there had been a change in attitude and that SDP had done a better job of presenting the issue as a “national problem”

One or two members expressed a feeling that the Environment Agency was also vilified by the public because it was seen as being part of Government. This could arise again if the public don't feel that they can rely upon the EA and ONR. They must maintain independence.

SMor felt that MOD had come to understand that it needs to “bring the public along with it” and that this was a good thing.

Advisory Group

LN felt that, while it was appropriate for the meetings to be held in public, this had been a constraint on the information that the MOD could present at the meeting.

TA said he felt that AG membership had suffered without local involvement from the councils and local action groups. DM felt that the MOD should consider inviting someone from a philosophical/ethics background to join as this had been useful in the past.

JT felt that it was very difficult to involve new members in the AG because of the wealth of history and material that is required reading to be able to contribute with confidence. However, it was also pointed out that long-term membership meant that some members ran the risk of being perceived by wider communities as becoming too close to the project and losing objectivity.

SMob commented that there were very few young people involved in the group and this would cause problems with continuity later in the project. PD said he would be happy to ask students he knew if the group wished.

It was SMob's view that the AG had contributed to making the consultation process much better and felt that MOD would have gone about it in a different way without the AG. She felt that a positive engagement process contributed towards public confidence.

DC raised the issue that it was very difficult to know how successful the AG had been in inspiring public confidence without conducting in-depth social research.

IA said he had gained confidence in the project from being involved with the AG and that the MOD project team had evolved its approach well over the last few years. However, he said that the perception of his local community group [CANSAR] was that he had “gone native” and that there is still no level of trust from his ‘constituents’ . He said that a lot of confidence in SDP had been lost when the site selection had been narrowed down to two sites – with little explanation as to why this had been done and no AG involvement in the process.

ST felt that the lesson learned from this was that there should have been an interim AG meeting to explain the thought process before announcing the site selection options.

There was general agreement among AG members that the SDP was doing a better job at sharing information with the public and that it needed to provide enough information to people to enable them to make their own informed critical judgements.

AG Sub groups

SJ felt the input from the SEA sub group had been very useful for reviewing material, particularly in the early stages, and ensuring the SEA stayed focused as it developed.

SMor found the group “extremely useful” and developed a level of understanding that he would not have got at the AG. However, he said that the non-disclosure agreement had made communication with the rest of the members difficult at times and also made him feel unable to write the formal consultation response on behalf of his organisation.

DC felt sub groups were very “honest and open” and that members worked well together to deliver consultation process.

SMob felt that she had a real influence as a sub group member.

PD said he felt able to criticise the process if necessary, but that the relationship between the sub-groups and AG may need to be reviewed because the sub-group members did not feel able to report back to the AG with concerns due to the non-disclosure agreement.

SMa recorded the Project Team’s thanks to the members of the sub-groups for their participation.

DM noted that she was initially reluctant to get involved in the sub-group’s because of the non-disclosure agreement but that she did not consider the meetings to be “secret” because the outcomes of those meetings were made public in due course.

It was felt that the scope and remit of the non-disclosure agreements should be made more explicit in future, particularly in respect of when the restrictions ‘expire’, so that those signing them would not feel as constrained.

MOD Website

There was a general feeling among AG members that navigation of the website was difficult.

SMa explained that the SDP’s site had been merged to the MOD website as part of a government-wide rationalisation exercise, which meant the material had to fit within a standard template.

However, it was noted that the underlying documentation available on the website, and the depth of information, was exemplary. It was noted however that one needed the time and inclination to find it and that anyone new to the project would struggle.

RC felt that the historical documentation was worthwhile because it gave anyone new to the project a complete overview. EC seconded this view.

It was felt that, as SDP moves into Demonstrator phase, the website should be updated and kept updated with info throughout. It was recognised that it would pose challenging to work out how this would continue to work once the project moves into a contractual phase.

Consultation documentation

DG felt that the consultation documentation was “overkill” and presented too much information for most people – although he felt that the information was there for people who needed it and was “spot on”.

There was general agreement that the documentation was very good, was aimed at the right level and not too technical.

There was a general view that there were too many consultation questions and that they were quite complex – particularly in conjunction with the SEA. SMob suggested that the organisation of the documents could be considered “best practice” but that more thought needed to be given in future to the number and complexity of the questions asked.

DC questioned the role of the factsheets. He felt that the project should think again about the information that goes in them and how they are used. JT however thought that the factsheets were very good and particularly liked that they were separate from the main document to enable people to find out more about a particular subject.

RC asked how the success of the consultation would be measured – although DC responded that it was incredibly difficult to do this and that it would probably come down to a measure of how many changes to the proposals came about as a result of consultation.

DM felt that the writing of the final report that will accompany the MOD’s decisions is important - it shouldn’t just capture and weigh-up the contributions but somehow acknowledge the value of people’s contributions by showing how the comment has influenced the process.

It was noted that SDP needed to publicly manage wider expectations for timescales for the project into the future so that people don’t feel disengaged or that things have “stalled”.

LN asked about how the Post-Consultation Report would be promoted. SMa confirmed that they would write to all stakeholders including all respondents to the consultation. The website would also be updated and an alert sent to those who had subscribed to them.

SJ said that, as a personal learning exercise, she intended to write to the statutory bodies to elicit feedback about the conduct of the SEA. DG fed back the high praise his colleagues at the Environment Agency had given the SDP SEA.

Consultation events

RC commented that he had attended the Torpoint event and commended the facilitation of the workshops.

It was acknowledged among the group that there had been issues with some of the venues and that some had been better located and promoted than others. The experience of the

team was that a day in the right place was sometimes more worthwhile than 5 days in the wrong place and this was borne out by the attendance figures.

LN commented that it was important for the future to look at local issues at the location of the event beyond the project to have a better level of understanding and better engage with local people (e.g Dalgety Bay in Scotland, the incinerator in Plymouth).

It was noted that interest in the events fell away very sharply with distance from the Dockyards, although Linlithgow was an exception to this.

It was noted that the quality of media coverage had a direct influence on attendance and interest at the events.

It was felt that there were too many days of events, but that this could only be discerned with hindsight.

It was felt that, in future, events should be staggered between a weekday and weekend and that events nearer to the dockyard would be helpful. It was also felt that attendees could be issued with a short questionnaire on leaving, to establish why people attended events and how they found out about them, which would help to inform future planning.

There was a general feeling that the local workshops were very worthwhile and well facilitated – with facilitators who were enthusiastic and knew their brief well. However DM warned that facilitators needed to be careful in future when summarising comments to make sure that they were not just summarising into a pre-conceived idea or something that suited the purposes of the project.

It was noted that there was a lot of interest in the model and that future consultations pertaining to the selected sites should also feature models. It was noted that a lot of people didn't watch the video, despite what was considered to be its good quality. DM felt that, despite her advice to the Project Team, it still had too much MOD "propaganda" in it.

SJ noted that the involvement of Project Team members who were local to the areas in question gave more credence and was generally a good thing.

National stakeholder events

RC commented that there was a disparity in local authority representation between the Birmingham and Glasgow events – there being much greater representation at Birmingham. It would be difficult for people from Plymouth to travel to the Birmingham event, although local authorities in the South West were interested.

RC also felt that the events were a "missed opportunity" and could have been planned more intelligently to help obtain more detailed information from specialist stakeholders.

DG felt that the Birmingham event was very different from Glasgow and was characterised by having a larger industry presence many of whom were keen to find out more about the project but not necessarily contribute. The feeling among the AG members was that this changed the dynamic.

It was noted that because of the proximity of the National stakeholder events to the closing dates a number of organisations had already formulated their responses before attending due to the amount of time it takes to get documents approved internally.

AG Observers role

LN, DC and PD observed various events on behalf of the AG including MCDA workshops, local and national stakeholder events. Members of the AG said that they were reassured that the process was being followed. SMOB welcomed the report. AG observers felt that they had been able to challenge and that their comments had been taken on board by the MOD. Some suggested ways in which the independent observers from the AG's communication with the wider group could be improved even further.

DC noted that Fred Barker had written a very useful evaluation paper on the CIOP while he was at NuLeAF.

Action 13.4: DC to circulate Fred Barker's evaluation paper to the AG.

9. Future role of the Advisory Group

LN took members of the AG through the paper considering the future role of the AG. He opened a discussion about the role of the AG leading up to decisions being taken and asked if there needed to be another AG meeting before/after the main gate decision.

DM commented that it would be helpful for AG members to be able to see the recommendations and the report before it is published so that they can comment before a decision is taken. SMOB felt that this was important and part of the process of peer review. ST cautioned that the recommendations developed by the project following public consultation would be very sensitive whilst being deliberated by approving authorities and it was unlikely that they could be shared with the AG prior to publication / announcement.

LN proposed that the AG therefore remains and a sub group is set up to preview the decision making and contribute to the process under a non-disclosure agreement. There was a feeling that the AG needed to remain alongside the work of the sub-groups to enable them to report back and share any concerns.

Action 13.5: SDP Project Team to define what skill-base and experience they need on any future sub-group and circulate in approximately two weeks to AG members for a response the following fortnight.

Action 13.6: Current members of the sub group to confirm if they are happy to remain on the sub group within two weeks from the AG meeting.

It was felt that the AG should remain following the main gate decision to help with the site selection process etc and perform a continued monitoring role – but that the membership may change.

There was a general discussion about how consultation would continue once a contract had been let.

Members local to Plymouth expressed a concern about the effectiveness of the Local Liaison Committee at present. It was suggested that those involved in the LLC perhaps attend some examples of effective LLCs to identify best practice that could be applied.

The question of impartial observers was also raised and this matter is for future consideration by the group.

10. AOB

Under AOB IA asked a detailed question seeking assurances about ship breaking, particularly relating to the security of the process and conditions under which this work would be undertaken. ST and DG gave assurances regarding the legislative framework that governs such activity.

Meeting closed: 14.42

Action Number	Description	Actionee	Due date
13.1	<i>ST to speak to SMOB to seek guidance regarding the language used relating to discharges</i>	ST	Completed (during break)
13.2	<i>DB to create a combined weighting profile and circulate with raw charts along with notes once the inputs have all been double-checked.</i> <i>To circulate this to AG members for comment before wider publication and circulate with a “health warning” explaining that the workshops were a quick process and did not factor in OCF data.</i>	DB	Complete
13.3	<i>GIC to circulate information relating to the art projects received from Ele Carpenter</i>	EW	Ongoing
13.4	<i>DC to circulate Fred Barker’s evaluation paper to the AG</i>	DC	Complete
13.5	<i>SDP to define what skill-base and experience they need on any future sub-group and circulate to AG members for a response the following fortnight.</i>	SM	Complete
13.6	<i>Current members of the sub group to confirm if they are happy to remain on the sub group within a fortnight of MOD discharging action 13.6.</i>	All	01/11/12