



ISOLUS Project

Stakeholder Workshop
Held on 15 May 2007

Summary Report

Equipment & Support Development Consultancy (ESDC)



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Document Details

Note: This report is a summary of the discussions and decisions captured on flipchart during the course of the Stakeholder Workshop. It has been produced as an aide-memoir for participants rather than a definitive record of every detail.

Transcription by: Peter Taylor and Nick Hutchinson –
ESDC facilitators

For attendees:

If you have any thoughts to add to the issues discussed in the meeting, or if you believe the transcription has any factual inaccuracies, please contact Tony Lokier from the MoD ISOLUS (Interim Storage of Laid-Up Submarines) team on 0117-9133066 or SUBIPTISOLUS2@wsa.dlo.mod.uk .

For non-attendees:

If you have any comments on the issues discussed in this report please contact Tony Lokier from the MoD ISOLUS team on 0117-9133066 or SUBIPTISOLUS2@wsa.dlo.mod.uk .

1. Aims and Objectives

The objective set for the workshop was:

To take forward the outcomes from the ISOLUS Stakeholder Workshop held on 8 February 2007, as documented in the 3KQ Transcript Report dated 20 February 2007.

With the specific aim of

- Reaching a satisfactory conclusion in determining appropriate membership of the ISOLUS Advisory Group (IAG) and to agree draft Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the group.
- Not to revisit the detail of work undertaken on 8 Feb 07.
- Agree to park contentious/unresolved issues for later resolution.

The group confirmed their consensus to this approach and with regard to the last bullet point a sheet, annotated with outstanding issues remaining from the last meeting, was set up to capture and record any new issues. A copy of this sheet is appended at Annex B to this report.

2. Agenda

The agenda was:

- Welcome and introductions
- Context and Background
- Objective / Aim for Session
- Confirmation of Core Proposal
- Review / Agree – Membership & ToRs
- Next Action & Close

3. Ground Rules

- Mobiles turned off
- All participate
- All listen
- Share Airtime equally
- No private meetings
- Keep to time

4. Context and Background

Maggie Taylor, Assistant Director ISOLUS, took the opportunity at the start of the workshop to brief attendees of recent structural changes that had occurred within the Department and the impact they were likely to have on the ISOLUS project.

In summary following the merger of the Defence Procurement Agency (DPA) and the Defence Logistics Organisation (DLO) a new joint organisation had been created on 2 April 2007 under the title of 'Defence Equipment and Support (DE&S). The HQ of the new organisation being sited at Abbey Wood.

Under new governance and management structures Director General Submarines had assumed overall responsibility for the submarine programme. Lord Drayson, Minister for Defence Equipment and Support had been briefed on the ISOLUS project and confirmed that he fully supported its aims and objectives.

5. Confirmation of 'Core Proposal' – (Annex A – Slide 4)

The Core Proposal presented and discussed at the previous workshop was as follows:

“To set up a mixed, broadly representative group to act as a sounding board for the MOD ISOLUS Steering Group and project team, including giving feedback on proposals and advising on stakeholder involvement.”

As there had been some doubt expressed whether the group had actually accepted the Core Proposal during the previous meeting and a belief that it had been 'left open and in limbo', workshop attendees were asked to re-confirm that all were now content to move forward on the basis of the proposal as stated.

Following discussion and some minor amendment to the text and context of the proposal the following amended form of words was agreed:

“To set up a group to act as a sounding board for the MOD ISOLUS Steering Group and project team, including giving early input and feedback, and advising on stakeholder involvement”

6. Terms of Reference (ToRs) – areas to agree on

The following subject areas for the terms of reference were highlighted to be discussed and agreed.

- The 'role' of the IAG
- Membership
- Conduct of business
- Resources required by the IAG

6.1 Role of the IAG – (see Annex A – Slides 7 & 8)

The Role of the IAG, as set out in slide 7, was discussed and agreed by the group subject to the following minor amendments to the proposed text:

Bullet 1 – Insert: “**proposed**” before “**initiatives and strategies**”

Bullet 2 – Insert: “**early input and**” before “**feedback**”

Bullet 3 – Insert: “**early input and**” before “**feedback**”

Bullet 4 – Insert: “**scope of**” before “**requirements.....**”

Bullet 5 – Insert: “**public and other**” before “**stakeholder**” and delete: “**future**” before “**engagement**”

A concern was raised regarding the implications of the potential Babcock take-over of DML might have on the future role and direction that the IAG would take. Tony Lokier advised that he was cautious over discussing this at this point in time whilst the take-over issue was still commercially sensitive and negotiations still on-going. It was agreed that this issue be parked for later discussion by the IAG once the take-over issue had been resolved.

With regard to the proposals highlighted in slide 8 the general consensus was that the IAG should operate as a single group but that provision should be available for sub groups to be formed to look at specific issues.

6.2 Membership – (see Annex A – Slides 9 & 10)

Initial discussion centred around the proposal that there could be three categories of membership, as set out in slide 9, eg. Core, Ad-hoc or Correspondence. Whilst recognising the advantages of different forms of membership the general consensus was that 'Core' membership should initially be offered to all candidates and that it should be left to the invitees to determine the level of membership they required.

In response to the proposal that the group 'vote' on who of the individuals, groups and organisations identified on the proposed membership list (see Annex C) should be invited to become a member of the IAG, the consensus was that there was no reason why all those listed should not be initially invited to join the group. It was agreed that the IAG needed to ensure that the diverse range of skills required were represented within the membership whilst maintaining a 'balance' in representation between Government/Regulators and other interested parties.

Additional candidates for membership to the IAG were identified as follows:

- Representative from CANSAR – Campaign Against Nuclear Storage and Radiation

-
- Representative from Cumbria Local Liaison Committee
 - Representative from Academia
 - An 'Ethicist'
 - Someone able to provide a 'Technical critique' of the project.

In response to the questions posed in slide 10 it was agreed that attendance would be by invitation from the IAG and that members should be allowed to nominate deputies to attend in their absence. An essential criteria for the deputy, however, was that they should be fully briefed and authorised to act on behalf of the member.

6.3 IAG – Conduct of Business – (see Annex A – Slides 11 & 12)

In response to the questions posed in slides 11 the following was agreed:

- **Who should 'Chair' the group?** - the candidate should sit on the MISG for continuity purposes and be able to demonstrate good, competent chairing skills. Les Netherton – Environmental Health Advisory Services Limited volunteered to act as the 'chair' for the first meeting on the basis that the formal appointment of a permanent 'chair' would be agreed at the first formal IAG meeting. On the question of rotation the view was expressed that as the IAG would only meet 2/3 times a year this was not practical and it was agreed that the position should be reviewed annually.
- **Provision for use of facilitation services** – group agreed this was sensible.
- **Frequency of meetings** – agreed that the group would meet 2/3 times a year, that ad-hoc meetings could be called as required, and that business could be conducted out of committee. The only issue noted here was that the group would need to implement a procedure to track what 'out of committee' work was being undertaken and how it was to be formally recorded.
- **Location of meetings** – it was agreed that rotating the location for IAG meetings was a good idea and that it would also present the opportunity for the IAG to visit and hold meetings at sites of interest to the group. Initial locations suggested in addition to Abbey Wood included London, Manchester and Edinburgh. John Shepherd offered Devonport as one of the sites of interest to be visited and an action was placed on attendees to notify the Secretariat if they were willing to host a future meeting.

In response to the questions posed in slide 12 the following was agreed:

- **Who provides Secretariat / arranges meetings** – MoD confirmed they were content to provide secretariat services for the IAG and to arrange future meetings. In the absence of other volunteers this offer was accepted.
- **IAG will operate on the basis of openness and transparency** – the criteria under this bullet point were agreed. On the subject of the secretariat only issuing summary notes of meetings some attendees suggested that on occasions it would be essential, to maintain an audit trail of specific discussions and approvals made by the IAG, that more formal notes would be required. This was accepted in

principal and Tony Lokier confirmed he would make arrangements for discussions to be recorded for record purposes and transcribed when required.

- **Resolution of Issues/Disagreements** – it was agreed that there should be a process for the IAG to advise the MISG of areas where there was disagreement with a specific policy or action. It was also agreed that the IAG should review the performance of the group after one year including its relationship with the MISG.

6.4 IAG – Resources – (see Annex A – Slide 13)

The arrangements for the payment of attendance fees, travel and subsistence costs, secretariat and facilitation costs, and the provision of funding for the group to commission work, as set out in slide 13, were agreed. The first line of the third bullet point was amended to read:

“MoD will fund independent peer reviews / research where the”

Peter Lanyon – Nuclear Submarine Forum asked if there would be scope for the MoD to fund some of the activities of this group. Tony Lokier responded that the MoD would only be in a position to fund specific pieces of work that were fully sponsored/approved by the IAG and/or MISG.

7. Next Actions

The next actions were agreed as follows:

- a) **Brief MISG** – The MISG was scheduled to meet the following day on the 16 May 07. AD ISOLUS, Maggie Taylor advised that a draft ToR document had been worked up during the course of the workshop and with the permission of the group she would like to present the draft ToRs at the MISG as part of an update on progress towards setting up the IAG. An assurance was given that the MISG would be advised that the ToRs were only draft and remained subject to formal ratification at the first IAG meeting.
- b) **Issue summary notes of meeting** – Tony Lokier, ISOLUS2 confirmed that summary notes of the workshop would be issued for comment and approval in due course.
- c) **Arrange first formal meeting – early July?** – It was agreed that in order for the IAG to maintain momentum and move forward the first formal meeting needed to be held sooner rather than later. Early July was suggested and members would be advised of potential dates by the ISOLUS Team in due course.

Attendees at meeting

| Name | Surname | Organisation |
|-------------|----------------|--|
| Dr Louise | Brown | Scottish Environmental Protection Agency |
| David | Collier | Faulkland Associates |
| Andy | Daniel | British Nuclear Group Project Services |
| Kate | Ingram | DE&S Policy Secretariat Submarines |
| Dr Jane | Hunt | Lancaster University |
| Peter | Lanyon | Nuclear Submarine Forum |
| Tony | Lokier | DE&S ISOLUS2 |
| Dr Paul | Naylor | Environment Agency |
| Amanda | Nelson | DE&S Policy Secretariat Submarines |
| Les | Netherton | Environmental Health Advisory Services Limited |
| John | Shepherd | Representing Naval Base Commander Devonport |
| Andrew | Stevenson | Representing Naval Base Commander Clyde |
| Dr Jill | Sutcliffe | Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum |
| Ian | Robinson | Health and Safety Executive, NII |
| Maggie | Taylor | DE&S Assistant Director ISOLUS |
| Dr William | Thompson | Lancaster University |
| Dr David | Whitworth | Institution of Nuclear Engineers |

ISOLUS Project



Stakeholder Workshop – 15 May 2007

Equipment & Support Development Consultancy (ESDC):
Peter Taylor and Nick Hutchinson



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

SLIDE 1

Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- Context and Background – Maggie Taylor / ISOLUS Team
- Objective / Aims for Session
- Confirmation of 'Core Proposal'
- Review / Agree – Membership & ToRs
- Next Actions & Close



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE



SLIDE 2

Context and Background

- Defence Equipment & Support (DE&S) organisation created 2 April 2007.
- Result of merger of DPA and DLO. HQ at Abbey Wood.
- Director General Submarines has overall responsibility for the submarine programme.
- Minister (DE&S) has given his full support to Project ISOLUS.



SLIDE 3

Workshop Objective

- To take forward the outcomes from the ISOLUS Stakeholder Workshop held on 8 Feb 2007, as documented in the 3KQ Transcript Report dated 20 Feb 2007.

Aim:

- to reach a satisfactory conclusion in determining appropriate membership of the ISOLUS Advisory Group (IAG) and to agree draft Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the Group.
- Not to revisit the detail of work undertaken on 8 Feb 07.
- Agree to park contentious/unresolved issues for later resolution.



SLIDE 4

Core Proposal

“ To set up a mixed, broadly representative group to act as a sounding board for the MoD ISOLUS Steering Group and project team, including giving feedback on proposals and advising on stakeholder involvement.”

Q – Do we have a consensus from the Group that everyone is content to move forward on the basis of this proposal?



SLIDE 5

ToRs – areas to agree on

- The 'role' of the IAG
- Membership
- Conduct of Business
- What resources will/does the IAG require/need



SLIDE 6

Role of IAG

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 MoD ISOLUS Steering Group (MISG) aimed at facilitating the ISOLUS programme.

The group will undertake the following roles:

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



SLIDE 7

Role of IAG, cont ..

Single Group or Split between Content and Process?

- Consensus that there should not be a split. – Y / N
- Sub groups to be formed to look at specific issues – when required – Y / N

Issues for IAG

- Need to look at how/whether funding and support for experts to build capacity will be available
- Ensure we don't set up unnecessary infrastructure/s



SLIDE 8

Membership - proposed

Potential candidates for Membership listed on separate sheet.

- 3 categories of membership proposed :
 - Core – permanent member
 - Ad-hoc – attends for special interest subjects
 - Correspondence - content to receive and comment on issues/documents produced by/for IAG.

Group invited to:

- annotate sheet with suggestions (post-it notes) – (3 picks ea.)
- then discuss – suggest optimum number for core membership 12-14 people.



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE



SLIDE 9

Membership, cont..

- Are Deputies allowed – yes / no?
- Is Attendance by Invitation – yes / no? If 'yes' who issues invites?
- Membership needs to remain flexible with scope for new members to be called up as required as the project develops.



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE



SLIDE 10

IAG – Conduct of Business

- Who should 'Chair' the group –
 - Independent or MoD?
 - Should 'Chair' also sit on MISG – Y / N?
 - Should 'Chair' rotate? – Y / N? If Y(es) – frequency?
- Provision to be made for use of facilitation services if required for specific issues? – Y / N?
- Frequency & Location of Meetings:
 - IAG to meet 2 or 3 times a year prior to/in between MISG meetings.
 - Ad-hoc meetings to be called as and when required.
 - Group agree business can be conducted outside/between formal meetings when necessary.
 - Location – preference to rotate location – where? volunteers to host?



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE



SLIDE 11

IAG – Conduct of Business, cont..

- Who provides secretariat / arranges meetings?
 - MoD – yes / no?
 - Any other volunteers?
- IAG will operate on the basis of openness and transparency
 - Members to have input into Agenda prior to issue
 - Aim is to circulate papers/documents well in advance of meetings to allow members sufficient preparation time.
 - Rationale will be explained behind any decisions to withhold information such as security classification or commercial issues.
 - Secretariat to issue summary notes of meetings.
 - IAG outputs and comments to be published on ISOLUS website.
- Resolution of Issues/Disagreements:–
 - Refer/escalate disagreements to MISG
 - Group to evaluate/review performance of IAG after 1 year.



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE



SLIDE 12

IAG - Resources

- MoD will fund attendees costs for the following when not covered by parent organisation:-
 - Attendance fees
 - Reasonable Travel and subsistence at cost.
- MoD will also fund the secretariat and facilitation of the IAG meetings.
- MoD will fund Independent peer reviews where the requirements have been identified and agreed as reasonable by the IAG and the ISOLUS Project Team.



SLIDE 13

Next Actions

- Brief MISG – 16 May 2007
- Issue summary notes of meeting
- Arrange first formal meeting – early July?



SLIDE 14

Membership of ISOLUS Advisory Group

| | Core Member (Y / N) | Ad-hoc Member (Y/N) | Correspondence Member Y/N) |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| British Nuclear Engineering Society (BNES) | | | |
| 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) | | | |
| Friends of the Earth | | | |
| Greenpeace | | | |
| Health and Safety Executive (HSE) | | | |
| Health Protection Agency (HPA) | | | |
| Institution of Marine Engineers | | | |
| Institution of Nuclear Engineers | | | |
| MoD ISOLUS Team | | | |
| Naval Base Commander - Clyde | | | |
| Naval Base Commander - Devonport | | | |
| Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) | | | |
| Nuclear Installations Inspectorate (NII) | | | |
| Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum (NuLeAF) | | | |
| Nuclear Submarine Forum | | | |
| Rosyth Local Liaison Committee | | | |
| Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) | | | |
| Scottish Executive Environmental and Rural Affairs | | | |
| | | | |
| Other Membership Recommendations | | | |
| Generalist | | | |
| Independent Consultation Skills | | | |
| Industry Specialists | | | |
| Member of the Public | | | |
| University Student | | | |
| Membership Recommendations added at 15 May meeting | | | |
| CANSAR | | | |
| Member from Academia | | | |
| Ethicist | | | |
| Member able to provide a Technical critique | | | |
| Cumbria Local Liaison Committee | | | |