



ISM

SUBMARINE DISMANTLING PROJECT

Other Contributory Factors (OCF)

© Crown Copyright (2011)

Issue 1.0 – October 2011

This document has been released as background information to support the Submarine Dismantling Consultation (28 Oct 2011 – 17 Feb 2012). It has been redacted to protect personal information.

For further information about the Submarine Dismantling Project, please visit:
www.mod.uk/submarinedismantling

For information about Freedom of Information requests, please visit:
www.mod.uk/defenceinternet/freedomofinformation

Document Information

Project Name: Submarine Dismantling Project	
Document Title: Other Contributory Factors (OCF)	
Issue Status: Issue 1.0	Deliverable Reference:
Produced By: ISM Ash 1b Defence Equipment & Support MOD Abbey Wood Bristol BS34 8JH	Level of Control: This Document is controlled to Level 1/2/3/4 iaw SDP PMP Document Quality Management Procedure. At each level the Document must be Approved and Authorised.

Document Authorisation

Owner: [REDACTED], SDP Project Manager	Peer Reviewer	If applicable
Author: [REDACTED], BMT	Committee Endorsement:	If applicable
Editorial Checker:	Technical Checker:	If applicable
Document Approver: [REDACTED], SDP Asst Hd Approvals	Approver's Signature:	
Document Authoriser: [REDACTED], SDP Asst Hd Approvals	Authoriser's Signature:	

Conditions of Use

The material in this document is subject to Crown copyright protection unless otherwise indicated. The Crown copyright protected material (other than the Royal Arms and departmental or agency logos) may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium provided it is reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. Where any of the Crown copyright items in this document are being republished or copied to others, the source of the material must be identified and the copyright status acknowledged.

The permission to reproduce Crown protected material does not extend to any material in this document which is identified as being the copyright of a third party. Authorisation to reproduce such material must be obtained from the copyright holders concerned.

This document has been produced by the Submarine Dismantling Project (SDP) and is subject to standard Ministry of Defence conditions of use. Control of this document is to be in accordance with SDP PMP Document Quality Management Procedure. Proposed amendments and comments should be directed to the Document Owner at the address above.

Amendment History

Issue	Date	Details of Amendment	DCCF
0.1	13 Jun 11	Initial draft for internal discussion.	
0.2	14 Jun 11	Revised draft following internal review.	
0.3	1 Jul 11	Updated reflecting the output of the OCF workshop of 22 June 2011.	
0.4	14 Jul 11	Updated following comments from project team.	
1.0	11 Oct 11	Updated following comments from project team.	

Distribution

SDP Project Board
SDP Virtual Team
OCF Workshop Delegates (see Annex C)
SDP Scrutiny Meeting Members

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Context	1
1.2. SDP Decision Making Process	1
1.3. Document Structure	2
2. ANALYSIS OF OCF	3
2.1. The Place of OCF in SDP Decision Making	3
2.2. OCF Analysis	3
3. DISCUSSION OF OCF	4
3.1. OCF profiles	4
4. CONCLUSIONS	15
4.1. Summary	15
A ANNEX A: ABBREVIATIONS	
B ANNEX B: REFERENCES	
C ANNEX C: WORKSHOP ATTENDEES	

1. Introduction

1.1. Context

- 1.1.1. The aim of the Submarine Dismantling Project (SDP) is to deliver a safe, secure, environmentally responsible, timely and cost-effective solution for the dismantling of 27 of the UK's defueled nuclear powered submarines.
- 1.1.2. At the end of its Assessment Phase, SDP must submit recommendations in its Main Gate Business Case (MGBC) on options for:
- The technical approach for removing radioactive materials from submarines (the 'initial dismantling' activity);
 - The site(s) to be used for the initial dismantling activity;
 - The type of site to be used for interim storage of Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) that is awaiting disposal in the UK's proposed Geological Disposal Facility.
- 1.1.3. Before developing its recommendations, the project is committed to public consultation on these options and its proposals to progress the project. The current assessment of these options is set out in an Operational Analysis Supporting Paper (OASP) which summarises the currently available evidence and underpins proposals for the most cost-effective approach to meeting the aims of the project.
- 1.1.4. This document, the OCF Report, seeks to identify those factors which may affect the assessment of these options but are not quantifiable in cost or effectiveness terms. At this stage, it would be premature to conduct a full assessment of OCF as this should be informed by the responses from public consultation. Consequently, this document has been restricted to defining and characterising potential OCF, rather than attempting to analyse their impact on decision making.

1.2. SDP Decision Making Process

- 1.2.1. The decision making process leading up to recommendations for MGBC, as set out in the Concept of Analysis (CoA)¹, involves the combination of three analyses:
- **Operational Effectiveness (OE):** how effectively does each SDP option² meets the needs of the MOD set out in the User Requirements Document (URD)³.
 - **Investment Appraisal (IA):** what is the Whole Life Cost (WLC) of each SDP option.
 - **Other Contributory Factors (OCF):** what is the potential impact and significance of non-quantifiable factors on each SDP option.

¹ SDP Concept of Analysis v1.1 dated March 2011.

² SDP Integrated Options Report v1.0 dated February 2011.

³ SDP URD v4.0 dated February 2011.

1.2.2. In forming proposals for public consultation, the results of the OE and IA have been brought together to form a Combined Operational Effectiveness and Investment Appraisal (COEIA) within the OASP. At this stage, potential OCF are identified in the OASP but are not considered in the formation of proposals. Once public consultation is complete:

- The COEIA, and underpinning OE and IA, will be revised where sound technical concerns have been raised regarding the analysis, assumptions or input data. Such revision will require formal agreement from the SDP team and an audit trail to data underpinning the technical concerns.
- The COEIA will also be revised where further work is required to test underpinning assumptions or the feasibility of key opportunities.
- The OCF will be refined, clarified and analysed on the basis of the results of consultation and ongoing stakeholder engagement.

1.2.3. A revised OASP will then be submitted to D Scrutiny for formal endorsement and this will provide the underpinning for recommendations in the MGBC submission to the IAC.

1.3. Document Structure

1.3.1. The document is structured as follows:

- Section 2 provides the approach which has been adopted for defining and characterising the OCF.
- Section 3 describes the OCF.
- Section 4 summarises key findings to date.
- Annex A contains a list of abbreviations.
- Annex B contains references.
- Annex C contains a list of attendees at a workshop held to define the OCF.

2. Analysis of OCF

2.1. The Place of OCF in SDP Decision Making

2.1.1. The SDP benefits map⁴ identifies potential benefits and disadvantages accruing from the project and has been used to inform factors relevant to the OE, IA and OCF. The latter include factors:

- Which cannot practically be measured in terms of effectiveness or WLC and are therefore not included in the OE or IA; and
- Which depend on insights from Public Consultation or the political, policy and strategic positions of external stakeholders which are, in some cases, evolving or dynamic.

2.1.2. In most MOD projects the number and impact of OCF are limited, but in SDP the level of stakeholder interest and influence, including that of the public, is such that there are a larger number of relevant OCF with considerable potential bearing on the options.

2.2. OCF Analysis

2.2.1. When the MGBC is submitted to the IAC the analysis of OCF will augment the results of the COEIA by indicating if any of them:

- Represent a significant risk to delivery due to political, policy, strategic or commercial reasons. Such risks cannot be adequately represented within the OE or IA because they are either unbounded, unquantifiable or represent a combination of very low probability and very high impact; or
- Render some of the options more or less attractive.

2.2.2. At this stage, prior to public consultation, the OCF have not been assessed fully, but some potential OCF have been identified, discussed and reported to inform the consultation process and invite more detailed feedback from the public and stakeholders. The assessment of OCF to date has comprised the following:

- Review of OCF emerging from earlier consultations on SDP and ongoing stakeholder engagement;
- A workshop, held on 22 June 2011 with key project staff and MOD stakeholders to review the OCF, discuss key aspects and identify an approach to further analysis. The attendees at the workshop are listed at Annex C; and
- Identification, characterisation and a high level initial assessment of their likely impact, reported in Sections 3 and 4 of this report.

⁴ As reported in the SDP Benefits Report v1.1 dated October 2011

3. Discussion of OCF

3.1. OCF profiles

3.1.1. OCFs identified to date are listed below. Each is then described in more detail, with a summary table at the end. There is no significance in the list order.

- Public confidence (OCF-01)
- Socio-economic impacts (OCF-02)
- Political and policy frameworks (OCF-03)
- Implications of / on other local projects (OCF-04)
- Impact of / on other UK radioactive waste management initiatives (OCF-05)
- Commercial considerations (OCF-06)

3.1.2. The OCF workshop of 22 June 2011 presented the OCF listed above and two others which were subsequently eliminated from consideration through discussion:

- Confidence in SDP Programme Schedule; removed because confidence in the programme schedule was agreed to be part of normal programme planning and management.
- Implications of/on other MOD Programme; removed because it was agreed that these implications are included in the OE and IA.

3.1.3. This section contains profiles for each of the OCF:

- **Description.** A description of each OCF.
- **Implications for SDP?** A discussion of the likelihood and impact that the OCF presents as a risk to the SDP progress or SDP options. This is an initial view which, in many cases, cannot be substantiated until after Public Consultation.
- **Potential Differentiator between Options?** A discussion of whether the OCF represents a differentiator between options.
- **Significance:** The view of workshop delegates on the potential significance of each OCF to SDP: very high, high, medium or low;
- **Findings:** the results of discussion on the OCF at the workshop.

Description	
Title	Public Confidence
Reference	OCF-01
Description	<p>Different SDP options may engender different levels of public confidence. This OCF covers the potential impact of public confidence on SDP, and encompasses the following possible issues (both positive and negative):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on cultural heritage arising from dismantling and ILW storage. • An opportunity to enhance public understanding about the submarine enterprise and nuclear safety. • Visible demonstration of commitment to dismantling through the public seeing action being taken to remove an indefinite liability. • The opportunity to preserve naval heritage. • The public perception of the perceived radiation dose risk. • The public perception of the perceived dismantling risk. • The perception of an unbounded and indefinite liability and its impact on intergenerational equity. • The public perception that the storage site and/or dismantling facilities will lead to the local area becoming stigmatised. <p>This list of public concerns or opportunities is unlikely to be complete, and many of the issues above are potentially complex to unravel.</p> <p>Public confidence is noted as being a very significant OCF. The process of public consultation will capture the views of participants on the issues listed above and other issues. This will provide important insights into the range of issues arising and of the probable extent of any concerns.</p> <p>The views of all participating members of the public on different options will be captured through public consultation and recorded, and then summarised and put forward to the IAC as an OCF. Public consultation may also lead to changes to the OE and IA analyses where valid material and/or evidence based changes are identified and agreed.</p>
Implications for SDP?	A lack of public confidence could affect some options adversely and could potentially lead to judicial review or public inquiry which would have a significant impact on project timescales.
Potential differentiator between options?	Yes; how local communities respond in individual locations is likely to differ and this could affect options differently. Although public perception may not be seen as a valid reason for choosing between options, strong perceptions might influence selecting between closely grouped options, or flag significant risks to obtaining planning permission (or other approvals) which may impact the SDP approach.
Significance	Delegates at the workshop considered that this is likely to be of high significance but that this can only be assessed adequately through public consultation.
Summary	
Findings from the Workshop	The workshop concluded that there is a difference between public confidence and public acceptance. Public confidence can be managed through delivering an open, transparent and robust process whereas a lack of public acceptance may be unavoidable where all options are

	<p>perceived as undesirable.</p> <p>It was suggested that public confidence had to cover both the process and the technical approach to SDP, and that the key to success was successful engagement with the public. It was also noted that the difference between the Do Minimum option and the Do Something Options, especially in terms of their different end states, needed to be made clear to the public.</p> <p>The discussion also agreed that public confidence might be addressed through positive engagement with Non Government Organisations (NGOs) and Community Based Organisations (CBOs) as well as the wider public, and that there would be a need to understand the underlying reasons for views expressed by all parties.</p> <p>The conclusion of the workshop was that public confidence might differentiate between options but this could not be assessed until after public consultation.</p>
--	---

Description	
Title	Socio-Economic Impacts
Reference	OCF-02
Description	<p>Different options will have different impacts on local communities, both economically and socially. The WLC model being used in the IA does not include the financial benefit or disbenefit to the local communities. This OCF covers the potential socio-economic impact of different SDP options on local communities. It includes the potential benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved fit with the local vision for the area. • Definite but unquantifiable positive socio-economic impact e.g. through indirect employment or the construction of infrastructure. • Definite but unquantifiable negative socio-economic impact e.g. the SDP facilities may rule out some other land use. • Potential socio-economic impacts where (sometimes contradictory) assertions have been made about impacts but where consultation and additional work will be needed to provide evidence of direction and extent e.g. impact on tourism, house prices. • Increased direct employment associated with submarine dismantling and storage. <p>This OCF builds on the results of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and includes both economic impacts and also less tangible social effects such as links between the local community and the MOD, which may be positive or negative.</p> <p>Broad financial estimates and structured discussion may be used to ascertain if there are significant differences between options in terms of socio-economic impact, and to broadly graduate them as positive or negative when measured against the current situation (recognising that the Do Minimum option also represents a change to the current situation as larger numbers of submarines are stored afloat).</p>
Implications for SDP?	As no significant socio-economic impacts are anticipated, the risk to the progress of SDP options is considered to be low. However, failure to mitigate significant socio-economic impacts (if any were to be identified) could lead to a failed planning application.
Potential differentiator between options	Yes; different options will deliver different impacts on different communities and may have an impact on closely grouped options.
Significance	Delegates at the workshop considered that this OCF is likely to be of low significance but noted that public consultation is required to properly inform this assessment.
Summary	
Findings (from the Workshop & SEA)	<p>The workshop noted that some potential socio-economic impacts (eg. effect on house prices) will be very difficult to assess as perceptions and reality are inextricably linked. It was also noted that such perceptions are often tied into other projects proceeding in the local area from which it will be difficult to separate the SDP component.</p> <p>It was also concluded that it was erroneous to depict SDP as increasing jobs; rather that it could preserve them at a time when the MOD and related industrial activity is reducing in size. Further, it is important to consider that the socio-economic impact of the Do Minimum option will be different in the future.</p>

	<p>Estimates for the likely number of jobs per annum to be generated or sustained by the different technical approaches are considered in the SEA as: RC separation and storage would generate 85-135 jobs, RPV removal and storage 60-105 jobs and Packaged Waste storage 60-105 jobs. In each case, however, the profile of jobs over time would vary.</p> <p>The SEA also found that there is a slightly higher potential for disruption at Devonport due to the proximity of the Dockyard to a population centre, compared to Rosyth. However, as dismantling work will be conducted at the Dockyard(s), and ILW storage at existing nuclear site(s), there is unlikely to be any significant impact beyond that already experienced from Dockyard or nuclear site operations.</p> <p>In summary, the workshop considered that this OCF could, in principle, be used to differentiate between the options but that the socio-economic impact of SDP was not likely to be significant for dismantling site locations. Moreover, it was considered likely that this OCF could at a later stage be translated to risk adjusted costs (associated with Section 1.06 benefits and timescales for planning permission) within the IA.</p>
--	---

Description	
Title	Political and Policy Frameworks
Reference	OCF-03
Description	<p>Potential political impacts are not considered in the OE or IA although the alignment of SDP options with specific policies on decommissioning and radioactive waste management is considered within the OE. Political factors (and their interactions with policy) may, however, have a significant bearing on SDP where they might impact on the project either at national level (directly or through constraints in, or changes to, the policy or regulatory frameworks) or at local level (e.g. through the planning consent process and wider societal 'licence to operate' considerations). These might be categorised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UK Government and Devolved Administrations could have a significant impact on SDP options through differing policies – or even legislation. The Scottish Government has devolved powers on waste management and is now in the process of implementing its policy on Higher Activity Waste (HAW). This policy, whilst not directly applicable to waste arising from decommissioning of submarines, takes a different approach to geological disposal of Intermediate Level Waste which is the policy in England and Wales. Moreover, greater devolution of powers to the Scottish Government could occur during the lifetime of the project and SDP could be affected by differences in policy and regulation. • Local political opinion, in the form of opposition or support for dismantling and ILW storage facilities, could affect planning consent and, therefore, the timescales and costs. Although the IA takes account of the potential for delays, there may be broad and very significant issues arising from specific options which need to be highlighted in narrative terms. The Localism Bill currently passing through Parliament could have a significant affect on the influence exerted by local government and the communities they represent.
Implications for SDP?	Delegates at the workshop concluded that political decisions and considerations might prevent or delay certain options from being realised.
Potential differentiator between options	Yes; the risk associated with some options may make them less attractive.
Significance	Delegates at the workshop considered that this OCF is likely to be of very high but noted that Public Consultation and ongoing engagement with other Government Departments and Devolved Administrations may help to moderate this assessment.
Summary	
Findings (from the Workshop)	<p>The workshop recognised the significance of this OCF, but it was agreed that it was not possible or appropriate to anticipate political outcomes and that instead the appropriate policies and responsibilities had to be set out in the analysis and subsequent Business Case.</p> <p>Local political opinion will be stimulated and clarified by the Public</p>

	<p>Consultation and so its implications at this point cannot be defined.</p> <p>At the time of the workshop, MOD was preparing to publish its Nuclear Liabilities Management Strategy⁵ which should further clarify the applicability of the Scottish Government's policy on long term management of HAW to defence liabilities in Scotland, including the defuelled submarines at Rosyth and any waste arising from them.</p> <p>The workshop set out a series of actions to help further define this OCF, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Determine the position regarding when a defence asset becomes waste.2. Determine the potential impact of localism on SDP.3. Engage with the Scottish Government to clarify the implications of its policy on Higher Activity Waste. <p>The workshop concluded it may be appropriate, once more information is available from the above actions and from public consultation, to divide this OCF into national and local sub-categories.</p> <p>Delegates at the workshop took the view that this OCF could have the greatest significance for SDP.</p>
--	---

⁵ MOD's Nuclear Liabilities Management Strategy has now been published, dated September 2011.

Description	
Title	Impacts on/of other local projects
Reference	OCF-04
Description	<p>This OCF has been included as a prompt to consider the possible implications for SDP (and visa versa) of any other planned or proposed non-MOD developments in the vicinity of the shortlisted dismantling sites.</p> <p>An example of such a project would be the Energy from Waste incinerator proposed for development at Devonport. This OCF would consider whether it introduced any new constraints, whether any SDP impacts needed reassessing if they were in addition to those from an incinerator, whether there were any public confidence issues, and so on.</p>
Implications for SDP?	Delegates at the workshop considered that it was unlikely that any option would be excluded due to conflicts with other local projects, but that the combined effects of SDP and other local projects would be reviewed in the light of Public Consultation responses.
Potential differentiator between options	Yes; the implications of / on other local projects may make certain options more or less attractive.
Significance	Delegates at the workshop considered that this OCF is likely to be of low significance but noted that Public Consultation is required to properly inform this assessment.
Summary	
Findings (from the Workshop & SEA)	<p>The workshop discussed a number of projects close to Devonport and Rosyth. The SEA, however, lists the following projects at Devonport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devonport Landing Craft Co-location Project; • Devonport Area Action Plan 2006-2021 Adopted 2007; • Energy from Waste Combined Heat and Power Facility North Yard, Devonport. <p>At Rosyth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rosyth Renewable Energy Plant; • Rosyth International Container Terminal; • Ferry Terminal Expansion; • Forth Crossing. <p>The scope of this OCF, as discussed at the workshop, was confined to projects that are outside of MOD, but it was noted that both Project Roundel and the potential sale of parts of HMNB Devonport could create similar OCF as well as affecting OE or IA assessments.</p> <p>In general, it was agreed that whilst SDP could affect or be affected by these projects the impact was less due to the fact that dismantling would be conducted on existing nuclear licensed sites which are largely self-contained.</p>

Description	
Title	Impact of / on other UK radioactive waste management initiatives
Reference	OCF-05
Description	<p>This OCF covers the interactions between SDP and other radioactive waste management initiatives across government and the nuclear industry. The extent of the impact and significance to the decision will potentially be very different for the different initiatives, so each will be assessed separately.</p> <p>The current practise in the civil nuclear sector is that ILW is stored at the site of origin pending disposal in the proposed GDF. However, building on the findings reported within the 2009 UK Radioactive Higher Activity Waste Storage Review, NDA is exploring opportunities to share current and planned storage assets to improve value for money and reduce the environmental impact of new store build.</p> <p>The development of such a strategy could significantly affect the context in which SDP options are considered, including options to use NDA facilities for storage of ILW. The potential implications for SDP are complex and extend into OCF because consideration of an NDA storage option for SDP needs to account not only for OE and IA but also the obligations that NDA has towards its various stakeholders.</p> <p>New LLW / VLLW disposal routes are opening up, and opportunities for managing or disposing of ILW that is near the LLW class boundary are being explored at a strategy level. The potential impact of these developments will be addressed by inclusion as an OCF, unless these impacts can be fully assessed with the IA or OE analyses.</p>
Implications for SDP?	Delegates at the workshop considered that these suggested changes to policy would be unlikely to exclude any options from consideration.
Potential differentiator between options	Yes; new waste technologies and approaches may have a differential impact on options.
Significance	Delegates at the workshop considered that this OCF is likely to be of moderate significance but noted that public consultation is required to properly inform this assessment.
Summary	
Findings (from the Workshop)	<p>The workshop agreed that the focus of this OCF should be ILW, as that posed the most significant risk to SDP. It was noted that Option 8 (Packaged Waste with storage at a NDA site) could be affected by developments in NDA strategy, particularly on waste storage consolidation.</p> <p>Another concern raised related to the dependency of the project on the proposed GDF and the potential for SDP to influence or affect that programme.</p> <p>There workshop digressed onto the handling of opportunities and it was agreed to discuss these as part of the OE analysis where they could not, at this stage, be represented adequately within the IA.</p> <p>The conclusion of the workshop was that this OCF could differentiate between the options by posing risks to specific options. If and when</p>



	these risks become quantifiable, this OCF could be migrated into the IA analysis.
--	---



Description	
Title	Commercial Considerations
Reference	OCF-06
Description	<p>Some SDP options explicitly require a commercial solution. Dismantling requires negotiation as it can only happen at two commercial sites both owned by the same contractor. The ILW storage options which include storage at the point of generation or commercial storage would also require negotiation with site owners.</p> <p>Some options, therefore, are at risk because a commercial company has a right to refuse an option and whilst this cannot and should not be discussed with any other commercial organisation at this stage, it has to be accepted that some options will face greater risks, and these can be identified.</p>
Implications for SDP?	Delegates at the workshop considered that a refusal to consider an option by a commercial provider would rule it out of contention, although constructive engagement with potential providers would help to mitigate this risk.
Potential differentiator between options	Yes; commercial risks attached to certain options may make them more risky.
Significance	Delegates at the workshop considered that this OCF is likely to be of moderate to high significance but noted that Public Consultation is required to properly inform this assessment.
Summary	
Findings (from the Workshop)	<p>The workshop agreed that the selection of dismantling site is dependent upon negotiation with the site owner, and that they have their own commercial priorities and preferences. In addition the same arguments will apply to commercial storage sites (for point of waste generation and commercial options). It was noted that this is not purely a matter of commercial incentives and negotiation since the owner or supplier's position may be influenced by the perceptions of external stakeholders or the public.</p> <p>It was noted that another area of potential commercial consideration is the willingness of commercial ship recycling facilities to take on submarines.</p> <p>It was concluded that this OCF is relevant and various options will have different degrees of risk associated with them due to exposure to commercial realities.</p>

4. Conclusions

4.1. Summary

4.1.1. Eight proposed OCFs were put to the OCF workshop and six emerged as summarised in the table below. It should be emphasised that this initial study to identify and assess the potential impact of OCFs is tentative and indicative. It will need to take account of further engagement with stakeholders and the findings of public consultation before it can be used to inform recommendations for the project's MGBC.

4.1.2. The list below summarises the OCFs.

No	OCF	Potential Discriminator?	Workshop view of significance	Commentary
OCF-01	Public Confidence	Yes	High	Will require Public Consultation to properly understand this OCF and its implications for the different options.
OCF-02	Socio-economic Impact	Yes	Low	On the basis of current evidence it is not possible to use socio-economic impact to differentiate between the options, because the impact is not likely to be significant and more detailed information, which may support a decision, is not currently available.
OCF-03	Political and Policy Frameworks	Yes	Very High	The differences between UK and Scottish Government policy and legislation have potential to increase complexity and project risk for option variants that involve initial dismantling at Rosyth.
OCF-04	Impact of / on other local projects	Yes	Low	The impact of SDP of/on other local projects at Devonport and Rosyth was not considered to be very significant or a differentiator. However, options that involve larger footprints (in particular RC separation and storage) would be more likely to create spatial conflicts with other local projects.
OCF-05	Impact of/on other Radwaste Management Initiatives	Yes	Moderate	The progress of DECC's proposed GDF programme and the development of the NDA's strategy theme on waste store consolidation are dependent on public and stakeholder engagement. SDP options have the potential to impact and be impacted by the perception of these initiatives.
OCF-06	Commercial Considerations	Yes	Moderate to High	Public and stakeholder perceptions may create an additional influence on the willingness of site owners and suppliers to tender on some or all SDP options.

A Annex A: Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Meaning
BC	Business Case
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CoA	Concept of Analysis
COEIA	Combined Operational Effectiveness and Investment Appraisal
DE&S	Defence Equipment and Support
D Scrutiny	Directorate Scrutiny
GDF	Geological Disposal Facility
IA	Investment Appraisal
IAC	Investment Approvals Committee
ILW	Intermediate Level Waste
ISM	In Service Submarines
LLW	Low Level Waste
MCP	Maritime Change Programme
MG	Main Gate
MGBC	Main Gate Business Case
MOD	Ministry of Defence
NDA	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
OASP	Operational Analysis Supporting Paper
OCF	Other Contributory Factors
OE	Operational Effectiveness
SDP	Submarine Dismantling Project
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
URD	User Requirement Document
VLLW	Very Low Level Waste
WIF	Wet Inlet Facility
WLC	Whole Life Cost

B Annex B: References

Title	Originator	Reference/ Version	Date
SDP Benefits Report	ISM	Issue 1.0	October 11
SDP Concept of Analysis (CoA)	ISM	Issue 1.1	March 2011
SDP Investment Appraisal (IA)	ISM	Issue 1	October 11
SDP Operational Effectiveness (OE) Report	ISM	Issue 1.0	October 11
SDP Project Management Plan (PMP)	ISM	Issue 9.0	August 11
SDP User Requirements Document	ISM	Issue 5.0	October 11

C Annex C: Workshop Attendees

This Annex forms a record of the attendees at the SDP OCF Workshop held 22 June 11 at DE&S Foxhill.

Name	Affiliation	Role
[REDACTED]	MOD, ISM-SDP	Delegate
[REDACTED]	BMT, SDP Customer Friend	Recorder
[REDACTED]	Polaris, SDP Customer Friend	Facilitator
[REDACTED]	MOD, ISM-SDP	Delegate
[REDACTED]	Deloitte, SDP Customer Friend	Delegate
[REDACTED]	BMT, SDP Customer Friend	Delegate
[REDACTED]	MOD, ISM-SDP	Delegate
[REDACTED]	MOD, ISM-SUSM	Delegate
[REDACTED]	MOD, DIO	Delegate
[REDACTED]	MOD, MCP	Delegate
[REDACTED]	AMEC	Delegate
[REDACTED]	MOD, HMNB Clyde	Delegate
[REDACTED]	MOD, DIO	Delegate
[REDACTED]	Independent, SDP Advisory Group	Observer
[REDACTED]	MOD, CAP DUW	Delegate
[REDACTED]	MOD, DES, Pol-Sec	Delegate
[REDACTED]	Green Issues, SDP Convener	Delegate
[REDACTED]	MOD, ISM-SDP	Delegate
[REDACTED]	Green Issues, SDP Convener	Delegate
[REDACTED]	College Hill	Delegate
[REDACTED]	MOD, Submarine Safety Team	Delegate
[REDACTED]	Warwick University, SDP Advisory Group	Observer
[REDACTED]	MOD, D Scrutiny	Delegate