

Notes of 1st ISOLUS (Interim Storage Of Laid-Up Submarines) Advisory Group (IAG)

Held on 4th July 2007 at Manchester Town Hall

Attendees:

Les Netherton	Environmental Health Advisory Services Ltd (Chairman)
Maggie Taylor	MOD - Assistant Director (AD) ISOLUS
David Collier	Faulkland Associates
Sonia Sutcliffe	Member of Public
Chris Hargraves	MOD - ISOLUS Deputy Project Manager
Dr William Thompson	Lancaster University
David Griffiths	Environment Agency (EA)
Dr David Warner	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA)
David Senior	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate (NII)
John Shepherd	MOD - Representing Naval Base Commander Devonport
Dr Louise Brown	Scottish Environment Protection Agency
Peter Lanyon	Nuclear Submarine Forum
Di McDonald	Nuclear Information Service
Tub Aves	British Nuclear Energy Society (BNES)
David Whitworth	Institution of Nuclear Engineers
Ian Avent	CANSAR
Andy Daniel	British Nuclear Group Project Services Limited
Andy Stevenson	MOD - Representing Naval Base Commander Clyde
Stewart Kemp	Nuclear Free Local Authorities (NFLA)
Andrea Lindezey	Manchester City Council
Antony Lokier	MOD - ISOLUS Team (Secretary)

Apologies:

Cllr George Regan	Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (CoSLA)
Jane Tallents	Nuclear Submarine Forum
Dr Jane Hunt	Lancaster University

Post Meeting apology from Dr Paul Dorfman, Warwick University.

1. Welcome by Chairman

Les Netherton welcomed all those present.

2. Introductions

All those present introduced themselves and gave short descriptions of their background relevant to the IAG.

3. IAG Terms of Reference

Draft Terms of Reference based on the output from the previous workshops attached at Annex A were put forward for discussion.

Following wide-ranging discussions LN suggested the following additional roles for the group:

- Monitor implementation of the recommendations from the Consultation on ISOLUS Outline Proposals (CIOP) & the Front End Consultation (FEC).
- Consideration of ethical issues that arise.
- Act as the ISOLUS Process Guardian.

The meeting expressed concern about how the IAG could provide retrospective input and feedback on proposals. Also that there was an urgent need for the IAG to preview current proposals and to give adequate time for their consideration.

LN acknowledged that the IAG members had varied interests and depth of knowledge and that during its future discussions the group may not always be able to reach a full agreement. Where significant differences occur, these will be recorded and presented to the MoD ISOLUS Steering Group (MISG).

Whether "Process" or "Project" Guardian is appropriate would be discussed at the next meeting.

4. Membership of IAG

The membership table at Annex B was presented to the IAG for discussion. This table was based on output from the IAG workshop, updated with the responses from invited parties received to date.

The following actions were taken to progress the membership:

Action 1.1: Bill Thompson to provide a point of contact for an ethicist.

Action 1.2: John Shepherd to liaise with the Devonport Local Liaison Committee to determine if they wish to be represented on the IAG.

Action 1.3: Peter Lanyon to provide a point of contact for the Peace and Justice group in Plymouth.

Action 1.4: David Collier to provide a point of contact for the Department for Transport, Health Protection Agency, an ethicist and the Cumbria local liaison committee.

Action 1.5: Andrew Stevenson to provide a contact for the Rosyth Local Liaison Committee.

Action 1.6: Di MacDonald to provide a point of contact for Environmental Justice.

Action 1.7: Secretary to provide updated membership table to next meeting.

PL cautioned that there may be potential difficulties in offering membership to Local Community Liaison Committees.

5. Chairmanship of IAG

LN proposed that the chairmanship should be for one year and the group agreed. LN offered to undertake this role for the first year and the group accepted his offer.

6. Review of Issues "Parked" at Workshops

It was proposed that the process of "parking" issues that could not be discussed in full be continued for future meetings. This was accepted by the group.

The issues "parked" at the previous workshops were reviewed as follows:

1. "Local/National stakeholder involvement" – This had effectively been addressed in the ToRs by the continuous opportunity to evolve the group as the project develops and sites are identified.
2. "Are members of the group going to be representing a constituency/bringing their expertise etc?"
- The members will be reflecting a wide variety of views depending on their level of involvement in their organisations.
3. "Who is the process guardian?" This would be included in the Terms of Reference.
4. "A timeline of future decisions for the project" – Ongoing, this would be covered under Agenda Item 9.
5. "Network?" – The Terms of Reference and membership are flexible and provide a wide communications network.
6. "More detail on different stages of indicative programme" – Ongoing, this will also be covered under Agenda Item 9.
7. "Does the group have to reach agreement?"- No, all views will be recorded and presented to the MISG.
8. "Should the group meet in public? Why shouldn't it?" - It was felt that the group should meet in public, but some thought would have to be given as to how to manage the practical arrangements, such as access, timing and seating. It was suggested that those with models of previous examples of public access forward them to the ISOLUS project in order for them to make a proposal for discussion at the next IAG.

Action 1.8: Those with models to forward them to the ISOLUS team by 24th August.

Action 1.9: ISOLUS team to present a proposal at the 2nd IAG meeting.

9. "Babcock-Devonport Management Ltd issue" – Ongoing, this remains commercially sensitive and is subject to review by the Office of Fair Trading.
10. "Need for ongoing review of membership as IAG develops" - See Item 4. Membership would a standing item on the agenda.
11. "IAG to give consideration to skills required by members" - This will be covered under the membership item on the agenda.
12. "Decision on IAG 'Chair' for the future" - Completed - covered under Agenda Item 5.

13. "Location of future meetings - rotate" - The group was happy to rotate the meeting around the following locations: Manchester, Edinburgh, London, Cumbria, Lancaster University and Bristol. It was also agreed to take up the offer of holding the next meeting at Plymouth to take advantage of the opportunity to tour the submarine exhibit COURAGEOUS.
14. "Funding 'non-contract' costs" – These would effectively be covered by the attendance fee. This may need to be reviewed in the future if large amounts of time are needed to review documents in advance of a meeting. The importance of good summary documents issued as far in advance as possible was raised as a way to reduce this burden.

7. MoD ISOLUS Steering Group (MISG) Feedback

Maggie Taylor stated that the last MISG was held on 16th May, the day following the 2nd IAG workshop. The MISG were pleased that progress had been made in setting up the IAG and the draft Terms of Reference were noted. It was noted that a feedback mechanism between the IAG and MISG was needed and it was suggested that visibility of the draft MISG minutes would be useful.

8. Stakeholder Engagement and Communications Strategy

The draft ISOLUS Stakeholder Engagement and Communications Strategy attached at Annex C was presented to the group for comment. There was some comment that it was inappropriate for MoD to lead on this as the IAG was going to advise on stakeholder engagement. The Secretary said that this paper was a first draft, which was intended to initiate the discussion.

It was suggested that a decision process map was needed in order to determine what decisions are required and when. This in turn would help determine the appropriate level of stakeholder engagement and communications on each activity.

The 'Why' section needed to include reference to feedback so that it was not envisaged as being a one-way communication.

A discussion took place regarding the status of the ISOLUS public consultation recommendations, as there had been a number of changes and developments in the nuclear field. It was noted that whilst the original decisions need to be preserved, time has moved on. IAG members who had visibility of developments in other parts of the nuclear industry would be able to inform the IAG and MISG of any changes which may affect the project. This was discussed further under Agenda Item 10.

It was agreed to submit any further comments on the strategy to the ISOLUS Project Team so that the draft could be updated for discussion at the next IAG.

Action 1.10: All to provide any comments to MoD on the strategy by the 24th August.

9. Outline Plan for ISOLUS Technical Studies Briefing

Chris Hargraves (CH) formally took the action to produce a programme for the next meeting, so that everybody was aware of the timescales that the project is currently working to.

Action 1.11: CH agreed to produce a programme for the next meeting.

CH presented a summary table, attached at Annex D, of the proposed ISOLUS studies that cover some of the major issues in the short and medium term and the proposed IAG involvement.

PL commented that there was little information about how the project had progressed in the 2 years since the formation of the MISG.

With regard to the proposed Technical Options Study, CH emphasised that no decisions or changes had been made to the ISOLUS project baseline assumption of Reactor Compartment storage, but that a review was needed to confirm if that baseline assumption was still valid.

With regard to the environmental impact studies, it was recommended that the regulators should be engaged at the earliest opportunity.

Di McDonald emphasised that the group must be given the information and be able to make input before project decisions are made.

10. Public Consultation recommendations

MT proposed a process to create an audit trail of the FEC and CIOP recommendations based on the example attached at Annex E, which is a table with the original recommendation, the original MoD response and the action being taken to progress that recommendation. The progress statement on each recommendation would be drafted by the ISOLUS team and presented to the IAG for comment and then presented to the MISG before being placed on the website. It was recommended that a plain English approach be used for these progress statements. It was requested that the draft statements were provided in advance of the meeting to allow time for consideration.

11. Any Other Business

An observation was made that the project title no longer appeared to reflect the aim of the project and now would be a good time to review it. It was proposed that this should be raised at the MISG.

Action 1.12: MT to raise the possible update of project title at the MISG.

LN noted that a number of comments had been made during the meeting regarding the website and suggested that it would be useful for the group to provide any ideas for improvement to the MoD.

Action 1.13: All to provide any comments to MoD on the website by the 24th August.

12. Date and Venue of Next Meeting

- Date of next meeting in Plymouth was to be confirmed outside of the meeting.

Annex A - ISOLUS Advisory Group ToRs

Core Proposal

To set up a group to act as a sounding board for the MoD ISOLUS Steering Group (MISG) and project team, including giving input & feedback on content proposals and advising on stakeholder involvement processes.

Purpose of the Group:

The ISOLUS Advisory Group (IAG) will provide a vehicle for conducting independent assessment of initiatives and outcomes, and to furnish a conduit for providing scrutiny, advice and counsel to the MISG aimed at facilitating the ISOLUS programme.

The roles of the group include:

- Act as a sounding board for proposed initiatives and strategies.
- Provide early input and feedback on the content of proposed scopes of work.
- Provide early input and feedback on strategies and the outcomes of reports.
- Input into the scope of requirements for Independent Peer Review/Research.
- Advise on public and other stakeholder involvement in engagement activities.

Membership:

Membership of the IAG is through personal invitation. Membership will be a standing item on the IAG agenda, as the composition will evolve to reflect the focus and priorities of the Project as it develops. Deputies are allowed if fully informed and able to contribute to the meeting.

The Chair will be a member of the MISG.

The proposed Core and Correspondence members are shown at Annex A.

Conduct of Business:

The IAG shall normally meet up to 4 times a year, prior to and following MISG meetings. Additional meetings may be held as required. In general:

- The Secretary will issue notes of meetings and discussions will also be recorded for record purposes. After ratification by members, notes of meetings will be published on the ISOLUS website.
- Business will be transacted and reported in an open and transparent manner. The rationale will be explained behind any decisions to withhold information such as security classification or commercial issues.
- Business may be conducted by correspondence where appropriate.
- Sub groups may be formed to look at specific issues.

Resources:

The MoD will fund attendees the following when not covered by parent organisation:

- Attendance fees.
- Reasonable travel & subsistence at cost.

The MoD will fund the secretariat and facilitation of the IAG meetings

The MoD will fund Independent peer reviews/research where the scope of requirements have been identified and agreed as reasonable by the IAG and the ISOLUS Project Team.

Review:

These ToRs will be reviewed annually or earlier if necessary.

Annex B - Membership of ISOLUS Advisory Group

	Core Member (Y / N)	Ad-hoc Member (Y/N)	Corres- pondence Member Y/N)
British Nuclear Engineering Society (BNES)	Y		
Campaign Against, Nuclear Storage And Radiation (CANSAR)	Y		
Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM)			
Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA)			
Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (CoSLA)			
Devonport Local Liaison Committee			
Department for Transport (DfT)			
Environment Agency (EA)	Y		
Friends of the Earth			
Greenpeace			
Health and Safety Executive (HSE)			
Health Protection Agency (HPA)			
Institution of Marine Engineers			
Institution of Nuclear Engineers	Y		
Lancaster University	Y		
Member of the Public - Ms Sonia Sutcliffe	Y		
MoD ISOLUS Team	Y		
Naval Base Commander - Clyde	Y		
Naval Base Commander - Devonport	Y		
Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA)	Y		
Nuclear Free Local Authorities	Y		
Nuclear Information Service	Y		
Nuclear Installations Inspectorate (NII)	Y		
Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum (NuLeAF)			Y
Nuclear Submarine Forum	Y		
Rosyth Local Liaison Committee			
Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA)			
Scottish Executive Environmental and Rural Affairs			
University of Warwick	Y		
Other Membership Recommendations			
Generalist			
Independent Consultation Skills			
Industry Specialists			
University Student			
Membership Recommendations added at 15 May meeting			
Member from Academia			
Ethicist			
Member able to provide a Technical critique			
Cumbria Local Liaison Committee			

Annex C - Stakeholder Engagement and Communications Strategy

Aim

The aim of this document is to define the stakeholder engagement and communications strategy for project ISOLUS.

Why?

The Ministry of Defence (MoD) is committed to a policy of openness and transparency for project ISOLUS. Our aim is to carry out work in as transparent a way as possible, so that it will be clear how and why decisions have been made. We believe this is key to building public confidence in the project.

Who with?

The MoD wants to engage with anyone who has an interest in, or will be affected by, the project, in a manner that enables stakeholders to participate in a constructive and positive way.

The table in Appendix A shows the stakeholders that we will engage with during the course of the project and type of involvement for each activity. This will be reviewed and updated as the project progresses.

[Draft Appendix A attached for discussion and population by the IAG]

On what?

Some of the key activities that will be covered:

- Technical options
- Siting criteria
- Strategic Environmental Assessment
- Public Consultations

The table in Appendix A also includes a list of activities currently being undertaken.

Where

This strategy will initially be focused at a national level, and will move progressively to local levels of engagement as siting options become clearer.

When?

We will make information available in a timely manner for each activity, so as to allow reasonable opportunity for comments or questions.

How?

We will use a variety of communication mechanisms, including meetings, written reports, workshops, e-mails, newsletters and website, selecting the most appropriate methods for each activity. Information will be made available with varying degrees of technical content to enable stakeholders to engage at a level they feel comfortable with.

All the information will be available on the ISOLUS website -

www.isolus.org.uk

In addition, output from the following stakeholder groups is available on the website: -
MoD ISOLUS Steering Group

ISOLUS Advisory Group

What will be withheld?

The operating principle for the ISOLUS project is that information will only be withheld by exception. We will explain the rationale behind any decision to withhold information such as security classification or commercial issues.

Review

This strategy will be reviewed annually and developed to meet future changes as the project evolves.

DRAFT

Stakeholder Organisations	Technical Options	Siting Criteria	Environmental Impact Assessments	Public Consultations	Future Statutory Consultations
British Nuclear Engineering Society (BNES)					As Applicable
Campaign Against Nuclear Storage And Radiation (CANSAR)					
Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM)					
Construction Industry Research Association (CIRIA)					
Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (CoSLA)					
Cumbria Local Liaison Committee					
Department for Transport (DfT)					
Devonport Local Liaison Committee					
Environment Agency (EA)					
Friends of the Earth					
Greenpeace					
Health & Safety Executive					
Health & Safety Executive - Nuclear Directorate					
Health Protection Agency (HPA)					
Institution of Marine Engineers					
Institution of Nuclear Engineers					
Naval Base Commander - Clyde					
Naval Base Commander - Devonport					
Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA)					
Nuclear Free Local Authorities					
Nuclear Information Service					
Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum (NuLeAF)					
Nuclear Submarine Forum					
Rosyth Local Liaison Committee					
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)					
Scottish Executive Environment and Rural Affairs Department					

Annex D - PROPOSED ISOLUS STUDIES

TOPIC	COMMENT
Technical Options Study	What Why When Proposed IAG involvement Review project baseline assumption of Reactor Compartment Storage Review relative merits of options, to inform project planning and consultation Autumn/Winter 2007 Comment on proposed process and criteria Comment on appropriate consultation process Comment on draft study report
Environment Impact	What Why When Proposed IAG involvement Need to outline significant environmental impacts of technical options To inform optioneering Autumn 2007 Comment on proposed process Comment on draft report
Quantify Radioactive Material Inventory	What Why When Proposed IAG involvement Quantify radioactive waste estimates To inform processing and disposal requirements, dose estimates and consultation Ongoing Brief IAG on past studies Inform IAG of proposed future studies IAG to comment on summaries to be placed on ISOLUS website
Quantify Hazardous Material Inventory	What Why When Proposed IAG involvement Quantify hazardous materials inventory To inform processing and disposal requirements, and consultation Ongoing Brief IAG on past studies Inform IAG of proposed future studies IAG to comment on summaries to be placed on ISOLUS website
Dismantling Processes	What Why When Proposed IAG involvement Consider appropriate processes Inform costings, waste estimates and consultation Ongoing Brief IAG on past studies Inform IAG of proposed future studies IAG to comment on summaries to be placed on ISOLUS website

Annex E - DRAFT EXAMPLE FOR DISCUSSION

No.	Recommendation	MOD Response	Progress
CIOP 1	<p>The MoD should demonstrably liaise closely with the Scottish Executive, other government departments, including DTI (Department for Trade and Industry) and DEFRA (Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs), and with CoRWM (Committee on Radioactive Waste Management) and the LMU (Liabilities Management Unit)/NDA (Nuclear Decommissioning Authority), especially with regard to potential sites and to ensuring that ISOLUS decisions remain consistent with developing national strategy. The proposed timing of ISOLUS decisions and implementation should be reviewed against the timetables for the NDA and CoRWM, and decisions points identified to ensure that ISOLUS does not preempt or contradict other government strategy, but is integrated with developing strategy, and is able to demonstrate this.</p>	<p>Future consideration of potential interim storage sites by the MOD will be closely aligned with CoRWM deliberations on options for a long-term radioactive waste management solution for the UK, which is expected to be available to Government in 2006. Therefore, no further work will be carried out by the MOD on the potential interim storage sites already named, or to identify other potential sites, until CoRWM has made its recommendations to Government</p> <p>The ISOLUS Project routinely liaises with Other Government Departments (OGDs) and the Devolved Administrations, including DTI, DEFRA, and the Scottish Executive (SE). The project is also attending joint meetings with CoRWM and the DTI/NDA.</p> <p>The relationship with the NDA will be developed as they further staff up in 2005 (See CIOP Recommendation Response 46)</p>	<p>MoD continues to engage with OGDs and DAs on all matters associated with Project ISOLUS, building on established relationships which were further strengthened during the CoRWM process. MoD has established the MOD ISOLUS Steering Group, whose members include, among others, representatives from DTI, DEFRA, SE and NDA. Notes of MISG meetings are available on the ISOLUS website. In addition, MoD and DTI have established a formal agreement that provides a framework for interaction between MoD and the NDA regarding their strategies and subsequent implementation. This allows for the civil and military disposal programmes to be complementary and coherent, preparing the way for common solutions wherever possible. MoD is a member of the Engagement Liaison Group which has been reconvened by the NDA to enable better co-ordination between national stakeholder engagement processes in the UK nuclear sector. The record of meetings is published publicly and is available on the ISOLUS website.</p> <p>These arrangements are intended to ensure that, in developing a way forward for processing and interim storage of radioactive material, the MoD is integrated as far as possible with the developing wider Government strategy. Future work on developing criteria for evaluating potential sites will be conducted within this framework.</p> <p>Reviewed: (date)</p>