

**Minutes from 9th Submarine Dismantling Project Advisory Group 22nd October
2009
Apex International, Edinburgh**

In attendance

Les Netherton (LN)	Chairman of SDP AG
Mike Cushen (MC)	SDP MOD
Fraser Thomson (FT)	Fife Council
Cllr Brian Goodall (BG)	Fife Council
Sean Morris (SM)	Nuclear Free Local Authorities
Tub Aves (TA)	The Nuclear Institute
Jane Tallents (JT)	Nuclear Submarine Forum
Di McDonald (DM)	Nuclear Submarine Forum
David Griffiths (DG)	Environment Agency
Paul Naylor (PN)	Environment Agency
Shelly Mobbs (SM)	Health Protection Agency
Sonia Sutcliffe (SS)	Member of the Public
David Collier (DC)	Golder Associates
Andy Daniel (AD)	Industry representative (VT Group)
Steve Lewis (SL)	HSE NII
Robert Pirret (RP)	Babcock Stakeholder Liaison
Dr Paul Dorfman (PD)	Warwick University
Ian Avent (IA)	CANSAR
Richard McLeod (RMc)	SEPA
Jon Mallon (JM)	SDP MOD
Dr Sue Jordan (SJ)	SDP MOD
Dr Janice Waters (JW)	SDP MOD
Fred Plumb (FP)	SDP Safety
Guy Earle (GE)	SDP MOD Graduate
Thomas Mills (TM)	SDP MOD Graduate
Chris Hargraves (CH)	SDP MOD
Peter Stacey (PS)	SDP MOD (on behalf of NBC (D))
Gareth Rowlands (GR)	DE&S Secretariat
Simon Tinling (ST)	SDP Asst Hd Approvals
Phil Northcott (PN)	SDP App RN
Neil Smith (NS)	Head of Naval Communications Delivery
Mike Cushen (MC)	SDP MOD
Harry Hudson (HH)	Green Issues Communications
Emma Webster (EW)	Green Issues Communications

Four members of the public were in attendance in the public gallery.

1. Welcome, Apologies and Introduction

LN welcomed members of the SDP AG to Edinburgh. He asked the group if it would be possible to change the order of the meeting (moving agenda item 6, SDP Update: MOD to item 4 and item 4 to item 6 in light of media coverage in two local papers over the past few days).

Unfortunately Doug Black from DNSR was not able to attend the meeting so the presentation in agenda item 5 on regulation would be from Steve Lewis.

DM enquired whether the DNSR presentation could be given at the next meeting.

Action 9.1: EW to confirm DNSR presentation at the next SDP AG.

Apologies received from: David Gatehouse (NDA), Sandra Jack (Scottish Government) David Whitworth (The Nuclear Institute) and Doug Black (DNSR).

2. Notes of 8th SDP AG

DC informed the group that he did not have competence in ethics as reported in the last note.

Action 9.2: EW to attach a post-meeting note to reflect this comment.

Page 9 Action 8.4 to read Commodore rather than Commander.

Action 9.3: EW to attach a post-meeting note to reflect this in the notes.

3. Action Grid from the 8th SDP AG

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

Action 4.4 *Jane Hunt/Paul Dorfman to give a 'Public Risk Understanding' presentation at the next SDP AG. Originally to be completed on the 22nd October, now re-scheduled to the next SDP AG meeting, to be completed by Dr Paul Dorfman.*

Action 5.2 *Secretary to present draft newsletter to the IAG at the next meeting. Draft of layout presented at the last meeting; newsletters would be discussed on the main agenda.*

Action 5.5 *ISOLUS team to investigate options for a shared area. This action was still being considered but clarification was needed on the nature of a shared area and is subject to a decision being made on whether the SDP website should be hosted by MOD or separately.*

Action 6.10 *Chairman to produce document detailing how the IAG works including where responsibilities lie. To be discussed at the meeting under terms of reference of groups.*

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

It was pointed out that a glossary does appear on the website. However, this action has been overtaken by events as Steve Woodley and David Littlewood are no longer involved with SDP. The action has been altered to EW to understand the purpose of the production of the risk glossary and to liaise with Paul Dorfman, Steve Lewis and Shelly Mobbs in moving this forward.

Action 6:12 *Chairman to suggest to MISG that they meet IAG members. The next SDP SG meeting is on 5th November and this will be mentioned at the meeting.*

Action 7.2 Paul Dorfman to provide a point of contact for Environmental Justice. **This is to be discussed on the main agenda.**

Action 7.8 Chairman to review TORs with IAG members and New Convenor. **Complete.**

Action 8.1 EW to produce written report re proposed membership of SDP AG. **Complete.**

Action 8.2 Members to forward any concerns regarding GIC website to EW within two weeks (by 21 July). **None received.**

Action 8.3 MC to consider informing the group what site selection criteria would be used. **This is to be discussed on the main agenda.**

Action 8.4 MC to contact Commodore re DNSR presentation. **To be completed at the next meeting.**

Action 8.5 MOD to report back to SDP AG on proposals for involving the group. **This is to be discussed on the main agenda.**

Action 8.6 MC to investigate how an earlier draft of the Frazer Nash report had been circulated and report back. **Completed.**

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

4. SDP Update: MOD

MC outlined the structure and composition of the virtual team explaining that it was now fully established and resourced and that he had the team that was needed to deliver the project.

a. Project timeframe

MC then ran through the baseline programme. Phase 1 was completed in March 2009 and they were currently in Phase 2 of the project. However, Phase 2 could not now be delivered by April 2010 as they were to engage with elected representatives first, which would take around eight weeks. An options analysis was in hand but they were looking at six months delay. He would report to the SDP Programme Board on 11 November and he would report back on their decision. The members of the group asked a number of questions regarding the SEA statutory consultation process. IA enquired how many local authorities were being written to as part of this process. MC confirmed that this would be addressed later in his presentation.

In response to a question regarding what would happen if the General Election were called, GR explained that public consultation could not be started once parliament had risen for an election until the election had concluded. This is known as the purdah period.

BG asked whether letters would go to the devolved administrations and also to the constituency and list MSPs. GR said that they had written to the devolved administrations.

Action 9.4: GR to consider whether MSPs should be included on the list.

JT asked for clarification as to what would happen if MOD were mid way through a public consultation when an election was called.

GR explained that it was complex but the most likely situation would be that the consultation would be scaled down but it would very much depend upon the circumstance and how much consultation had already taken place. MOD had a duty not to waste public money but would probably have to scale down activities. However, while it would be possible to hold some public meetings it would be more difficult to undertake effective consultation.

FT asked whether the location of the demonstrator would influence the final dismantling site decision. MC advised that the demonstrator location would not be decided until after public consultation and explained with reference to the six phase programme when all of these decisions were to be made.

The Chairman asked if the recent press coverage had been as a result of the letters having been sent out. MC confirmed that it had. SL asked what had been in the media articles in Devonport. JW gave a brief summation of the article in the Plymouth Herald. JT also made reference to the Dunfermline article published recently. MC said that the first meeting with elected representatives would be held the following day. He was asked how many meetings would be held. He said that offers had been made to all sites affected and that elected representatives needed to take up the offer by the end of November. There was potential for about a dozen meetings. The Chairman commented that these would provoke a series of headlines in local newspapers.

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

SM asked whether it was possible to confirm how much the project would be delayed by. MC explained that it could be looked at in a number of ways and that he would be able to give a more definitive comment about the timetable after the Programme Board meeting in November, as it was dependent upon an endorsement by the Programme Board. However, he was looking at ways to maintain the August 2011 date and was aiming for success at the Programme Board. He would then share the outcome towards the end of November.

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

MC presented a new slide setting out the selection of site options. This had not been included in the agenda pack.

Action 9.7: EW to circulate the additional slides.

This showed that there were 12 sites identified as potential candidates for ILW storage and 2 for dismantling. Of the 12 potential ILW sites, 5 were Nuclear Decommissioning Authority sites, 5 were MOD and 2 were commercial.

MC said that he would not be naming the sites at the meeting.

IA said that only two sites had been identified for dismantling, which were inevitably Rosyth and Devonport. He asked how MOD were going to get through the Scottish problem, because this meant that they in effect only had one site, so there could not be consultation. MC said that they had to go through the whole process. IA asked why there were not more than two sites for dismantling. ST said that they had used a funnel process to down-select the short listed sites.

IA asked why MOD was bothering with consultation if they were down to one dismantling site. PD asked why there were not more sites going out to consultation. IA said that they would be going to Plymouth as they could not go to Scotland. He asked how MOD thought that would go down in Plymouth.

PD suggested that MOD should think about taking more than two sites for consultation. He asked why there were not more than two, and whether it would be clear at the consultation why there were only two sites. MC said that they would show how they had done the analysis.

JT asked if the consultation would say which the recommended or preferred site was. MC said that it would explain the analysis. However, sites might change during the SEA process. He was asked if they would list the other sites by name. ST said that the funnel filters would be explained at the public consultation to show how their potential sites and their suitability had been arrived at. Any preference for particular sites would also be explained in the public consultation.

TA asked if the NDA had been part of the filter process in selecting the 12 ILW sites. MC said that it had. DC asked if local authorities could challenge the filters and suggest alternatives. MC said that they could. DC asked at what point local authorities could say that they did not agree with the filters. SJ said that local authorities were not part of the statutory consultation process. The Chairman said that local authorities could challenge at the public consultation stage. They could not do so at the preliminary engagement stage.

NS asked when the 12 and 2 sites would be announced. MC said this would be after the statutory consultation. The sites would be named approximately two months before the public consultation commenced.

IA asked how they could be sure the funnel did not start at the sharp end. He said that he had asked this question at the previous meeting. SJ said that the site selection criteria followed the statutory requirement that they had to consider all reasonable options. IA said that the information had not been shared with the group. SJ said that it had not yet, but the MOD could not knock out sites that were considered reasonable.

DG asked why they could not name the sites that had been eliminated. MC said that the government would not allow that at this stage. DG asked why they could not say why Barrow had been eliminated. SJ said that they would say at the public consultation why sites had been eliminated.

Action 9.8: MC to discuss internally in MOD revealing the strategy for announcing sites and to support this by identifying the work that had been done by down selection.

The Chairman said that a key message must be that there would be interest in why only two dismantling sites had been named and the methods must be robust.

JW said that they could not discount a northern site because it was technically possible to carry out dismantling there so it had to go forward.

TA asked if the radiological risk of towing vessels around Land's End had been taken into account. The Chairman said that local authorities would not be given more opportunity to comment than the public and that the sites would be named soon. He asked how MOD would handle early views made outside the public consultation.

b. Technical Summary Report/Technical Options Study

JW introduced the technical options section of the presentation. They had offered a meeting with the reviewers. They would agree the context and then issue it.

PD said he was encouraged by this and the contentious parts had been excised. DC said that there was still some irritating language but that there was no need for a meeting. He asked whether now was the time to consider a technical peer review (in which three people would look at the data being provided). JT said that they had only had two weeks to comment following nearly a year's delay in issuing the document.

MC commented that he thought that this recommendation had been completed, but that if members of the SDP AG did not think that this was the case that he would consider it. LN asked the group to consider if it was necessary to advise that this needed to be done at this point, and at what point peer review of technical data was most effective.

TA said that if they lost six months in Phase 2 with a busy period in Phase 5 with the demonstrator, they would have nothing to do for two years.

DM suggested that the political arguments must also be considered as part of this process. This group has to be the group that put forward any political point of view. She continued that the cut up versus cut out debate had been going on for a long time.

DM spoke about keeping one whole segment intact to be a visible reminder of having nuclear submarines.

SL said that there were generic principles to guide MOD as well as the EIA Regulations at further stages in the process. The Technical Options Study could not make decisions, but would inform decisions that had to be made. The Chairman asked if MOD could give guidance on what happened at the various stages so that there was a regulatory logic from start to finish.

JW said that ship breaking and nuclear decommissioning regulations had not been combined on the same project in the UK before.

The Chairman said that clarity was needed over the processes.

Action 9.9: JW to set out the regulatory processes.

PD confirmed that the peer reviewers have looked at the report and that he was quite encouraged by it. He confirmed that the components that members of the SDP AG had previously had an issue with had been removed.

DC commented that he couldn't see the necessity for a meeting to resolve the wording; particularly bearing in mind the distances that some people would have to travel he confirmed that it would be easier to comment via email.

JT observed that one of the main difficulties has been the period of time that has elapsed since the workshops took place as it is difficult to remember back with clarity a meeting that took place over a year ago. She confirmed that it would probably be easier to comment via email.

LN commented that the key issue would be in understanding when this work needed to be undertaken. DC confirmed that we needed to be able to understand the pieces of data that were particularly significant and to know what that data is.

MC acknowledged the points raised and said the key thing was making sure that if a meeting is not required a timetable for engaging needs to be established.

BG spoke about the reference to the Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) and asked if the Scottish Government's position on radioactive waste policy had been taken into account. JM said that the disposal route would be the GDF or whatever disposal solution was available. SJ said that with reference to the Scottish Government's position, in terms of the SEA 'geological' had been removed from the text. Whatever solution was agreed would be fed into it. PD said that although a GDF was policy, it was in fact an aspiration. MC said that the assumption was that final disposal would be via the national solution and it would be up to other departments to deliver this. They would be looking for an alternative site in the interim. FB said that the GDF was being consulted on and that MOD wastes in Scotland did not have to stay in Scotland. MOD wastes accounted for less than 5 per cent of the UK total inventory. SL said that a national policy was in place and that until a facility is built MOD was acting sensibly to align with policy. JT said that there was a very political context to this in Scotland and that nuclear power and submarine wastes were different. There were implications of moving waste cross-border. FB said that the Scottish issue would have to be addressed. MC stated that this would be reviewed during the 'P' for "Political" in the PESTLE analysis.

IA said that he was frustrated at the lack of visibility of the political input. If cut up is the preferred option he asked how they could gauge if there were political pressures to make the submarines disappear. He questioned whether political pressure would override the technical solution. MC said that there would have to be a balance of all the factors. The Technical Decision Making Conference would not be the last opportunity for political input, there was still the public consultation. JW said that the purpose was specifically to get MOD to a position where it could say which its preferred technical option was. This was the first step and then they would apply political input. MOD do not currently have a preferred solution.

The Chairman said that they would ask MOD when PESTLE would be visible publicly and to SDP AG.

Action 9.10: MC to state when PESTLE would be visible to the SDP AG.

JT asked if MOD had implemented the Frazer Nash recommendations. PD said that SDP AG had recommended an independent technical study of the QA data.

MC said that if the advice was that this did not cover the gap then the group should advise further.

PD said that SDP AG had asked for QA to be carried out by two or three people they trusted. The Chairman said that they would ask MOD to carry this out at a later stage. He did not understand how the Decision Making Conference would work. MC said that MOD would provide a plan on who would review, how and when.

JW said that the SDP AG and MOD reviewers would be different. MC said that this needed to be developed and shared with the group. DM said that the name Decision Making Conference should be changed as it was misleading. MC agreed and DC said that a more appropriate title would be Integration Workshop as it would deal with integrating data.

JW clarified that the term decision making conference refers to the methodology to be applied where as the purpose of the conference would be to identify the preferred technical option.

PD would set out what was meant by Independent Peer Review (IPR). IAG had discussed this earlier and there had been disagreements.

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

SM asked about worker dose or dose to the public. JW said that they had included it but it was unlikely that there would be any.

DC asked if the Demonstrator would help in deciding what was ALARP. IA asked if use of robotics would be maximised. JW said that robotics did not necessarily minimise worker dose. BP said that mechanisation would be an answer.

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

c. SEA Update

SJ gave a brief introduction covering off the areas that had not already been discussed. SL commented that the stage that they were at was currently looking at generic principles that lead into further areas of regulation. Another level of justification has to be submitted when you reach the point of EIADR regulations.

MC said that the copy of the NTS circulated with the agenda was advance information and he asked that it be neither copied nor circulated.

d. Communications – website and newsletter

EW introduced the communications section outlining that the website had seen a significant level of activity over the past three months with 19,201 hits in July, 14,572 hits in August and 17,886 hits in September.

JM commented that this was a significant increase compared to the previous website and was over a 100 fold increase.

EW informed members of the SDP AG that the website was updated on a rolling basis. There are three new sections to be added as the project moves towards public consultation: SEA non technical summary information, consultation – relating to specific events that will be taking place in particular locations and a further section for feedback.

EW outlined the purpose of the newsletter as discussed at the previous SDP AG. It will be available on the website and also circulated by email to those that have registered an interest.

5. Regulator Presentation

SL gave a presentation on behalf of the regulators:

During the period where the nuclear reactor is still in the submarine, it is exempt from external regulation and the MOD are responsible for regulation. This is undertaken by DNSR (Defence Nuclear Safety Regulation) team. One of the difficulties faced by the regulators is that at this point in time the regulators do not have the right to tell the MOD what needs to be done.

The vires that enable this to happen come into play when a site is selected and a body undertaking the work has been chosen. Regulators play a key part in providing advice and influencing decisions at this early stage to prevent problems from occurring moving forward.

The regulators now meet on a frequent basis with each other and the MOD at the RIF (Regulatory Interface Forum). The European Directives which establish the SEA enable the impact of the proposals to be assessed and the comments to be taken on board.

All necessary legislation is in place to cover such a project. Existing regulatory requirements may already exist if the site is already established and licensed. If the site is currently authorised but not licensed, part of that site would have to be licensed for the work to go ahead.

In between this are EIAD Regulations for Reactors. These only come into play when there is a site for the work to be undertaken, a body to undertake the work and something to do on the site. These regulations require all elements and items connected with the nuclear reactor in its operational life to be considered against their impact on the environment.

EIADR require the licensee to put together a presentation up front of what is going to take place, how it will take place and how any hazards are going to be mitigated. The area to be explored is the impact of dismantling on the environment and how this is to be mitigated. This often requires information, to justify assertions, that is not already available. Work cannot be progressed until the EAIDR has been assessed by HSE.

EIADR includes both consultation with other regulators and also statutory consultation.

It is important to remember that wherever work is done, regulations will be equally applicable.

DM asked if, once the fuel has been removed from the submarines, the reactor is subject to the Mutual Defence Agreement. SL confirmed that they were. DM said that this was an important point for the public consultations. JM said that they could not go to other countries. DM said that there was a perceived conflict between safety and security. BP said that a big argument against reactor core storage was that knowledge would be lost over time. By dismantling the reactor cores knowledge would be retained as the team would keep involved.

The Chairman said that this needed to be kept comprehensible to the public for the consultation process.

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

6. Review of Membership

MC introduced the topic, briefly recapping the discussions at the previous meeting and the decisions that he has taken regarding the membership on the group, particularly in regards to the two former members of the group from Lancaster University.

The group were also asked to consider the position in light of events that had occurred since the last SDP AG, namely the resignation of Peter Lanyon and Dr Littlewood.

MC outlined the decision taken was based on the gap analysis, as covered in the letter he circulated and that it was his view that the position had not changed in regards to the two Lancaster University representatives.

SS explained that she relied on Dr Jane Hunt to say things that she couldn't say and that Jane has huge knowledge on the subject area that assisted her and that Jane would often say things that no one else would say. IA agreed with the points raised by SS. MC commented that he couldn't see a case for having representation from Lancaster University as their previous role was now undertaken by Green Issues Communications, in their role as convenor and there was no need for duplication of resources. MOD were not aware that Lancaster University were ever at meetings in any capacity other than as their role as convenor.

DM suggested that the group considered having Jane Hunt as a corresponding member of the group, because Jane Hunt had only previously missed meetings due to illness and this would mean that she would be able to comment via email and there was no reason why she could not be supplied information to comment on which could be fed back to the full AG.

LN confirmed that the constitution allows for two levels of membership: attendance at the meeting and by correspondence. MC asked whether this was the consensus of the group, a number of members said that it was not possible for them to comment as they were in attendance on behalf of an organisation and

therefore it was not appropriate for them to comment. PD supported the inclusion of Jane as a corresponding member. DC commented that he found her support on stakeholder engagement to be invaluable. ST commented that she had already fed back to the Consultation Sub Group her thoughts through PL. PS raised the issue of the formal tender process that had taken place, in which Lancaster University did not submit a tender. JM confirmed that one of the two individuals concerned was part of a consortium but they withdrew from the process.

TA commented that he joined the group in 2005 and that he felt that whilst the history of the project is important it does carry with it unfortunate connotations. JT commented that we don't want to forget history and we do need to have that link. She didn't see JH acting in the role as convenor but saw her there for her independence and expertise. LN asked the group if this meant that they wanted to recommend to the MOD that JH be included as a corresponding member of the group. SL questioned what the role of a corresponding member actually meant, who would be responsible for taking into account the views of a corresponding member and how would they be aired? DC suggested that a corresponding member is someone who would get the papers of the meeting and could feed in their thoughts to the chairman. EW informed the group that there were currently two corresponding members of the group.

MC asked for clarification of what a corresponding member was and what role the group were proposing that JH would fulfil. He also asked whether it would be a paid or unpaid role and that he needed a proposal to come from the SDP AG for him to consider. DC offered to explain his thoughts as a post meeting action.

Action 9.14: DC to outline what is meant by a corresponding member and what role JH would fulfil.

DM suggested that the role should be a paid role.

LN asked the group to consider the recommendation from PD for an Environmental Justice specialist to become part of the group.

PD proposed that the group should consider Professor Andrew Blowers. MC enquired whether he would be able to cover the gap created by the resignation of Dr Littlewood. PD briefly outlined Professor Blowers' background. LN asked the group whether they felt that this role was still required, as the initial query had been raised a number of years ago. MC enquired what the requirement to the group was and what the justification of the position would be and where it would add value to the meeting.

Members of the group struggled to be able to understand where value could be gained to the group at this time and that whilst it might have been something that could have been of value in the past that it was not so relevant now. MC suggested that there was no case for this position at the moment as he saw it and the SDP AG agreed. DC suggested that if the need arose for someone to attend to cover this area as a one off that this could be arranged.

The discussions regarding the need for an ethicist were covered under this topic.

Peter Lanyon's resignation was the next item to be discussed. MC said that he was saddened that he has gone from the group, but that he did not agree with the reasons. He thanked him for the work that he had undertaken over many years.

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

MC asked whether the NGO representatives felt that they were adequately represented in light of Peter's resignation. PD felt that the NGOs were adequately represented at the SDP AG but that the gap was at the sub group level. DM commented that it would not be possible to replace Peter but that they would try to think about what he would have said had he been present.

Terms of Reference

The Chairman said that the proposed revised Terms of Reference for SDP AG were in the agenda pack, with suggested amendments shown in bold. They had needed reviewing as the project had moved on. The name had changed and he had been appointed as chairman. The references in 1.1.3 to SDP Programme Board should be amended to Steering Group and in 3.1.2 to SDPPB to SDPSG.

Under 1, the 6th bullet point should be amended to include all consultations.

Under 4, the proposed amendment concerning minority opinions should be revised with the deletion of the last five words.

BP asked if the Terms of Reference were to include all consultations, whether SDP AG would continue or would it have reached the end of its natural life. MC said that once they had made decisions about the project, they would consider if there were a role for the SDP AG.

The Chairman said that this would be discussed next time. It would be necessary to plan a mid to long-term work plan for the group.

SL said that if MOD did not need the group or it no longer had a role, that should be made visible.

ST said that once the project became operational, the work of the group would transfer to Local Liaison Committees.

Action 9.16: MC proposed that the next meeting would look at Nuclear Decommissioning Authority stakeholder groups and their local liaison groups which SDP AG might devolve into.

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

MC proposed that Les Netherton should be re-elected as Chairman of SDP AG. This was seconded by Peter Stacey and approved unanimously.

A discussion then took place regarding whether the records of the meeting should be described as notes or minutes. It was agreed by the group that a summarised record is taken of the key discussion points and associated actions recorded and that these records would be formally called the minutes of the meeting.

7. SDP AG Operation: Sub groups

LN introduced the discussion by highlighting the issues of governance, the sub groups are sub groups of the AG and that communication was particularly important. The sub group felt that the AG may feel that they are not aware of some of the things are going on. LN confirmed that he had been asked to chair the Consultation Sub Group. He mentioned that the sub groups were going to be under non disclosure agreement because they were having advanced visibility of information in advance of public consultation. LN proposed that after each sub group a summary of the meeting should be sent to the AG and that this document would also identify which documents were going to be sent to the AG and when. LN asked if they were happy with these proposals. The AG unanimously agreed with this proposal.

LN introduced the concept of the SEA sub group and explained that they would operate under non disclosure agreement. DC suggested that an NGO representative should be on both the Consultation sub group and the SEA sub group and asked if the NGOs had someone in mind.

LN outlined the areas that the Consultation Sub Group felt it would be helpful for a representative to have: experience of consultation, work considering options appraisals, the willingness and ability to sign a non disclosure agreement and the time/ability to be able to attend meetings.

DM proposed IA. IA informed the group that things had moved on since DM had spoken to him and that he felt that he was in an impossible position and therefore would have to decline the nomination, as much as he would have liked to have been involved. He also said that he would not have felt able to sign a non disclosure agreement. Members enquired what an NGO meant in this context? JT and DM both said that they would not feel able to sign a non disclosure agreement. LN commented that if no NGO representative came forward the sub group would have to think again. PD asked whether SM and the NFLA could be considered as an alternative?

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

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

LN took the opportunity to mention to the group that as we move further forward towards public consultation that members should think about what potential conflicts of interest they have, so that problems can be prevented from arising before they do.

8. AOB (Notified)

EW informed those members who are able to claim travel and subsistence that scanned copies of receipts can be sent through whilst the postal strike is on, so that claims can be processed so long as original receipts follow on after the strike has concluded.

SM informed members of a report that the HPA had released recently regarding radiation risks.

Action 9.20: SM to circulate a link to the report to all members of the SDP AG.

FP asked whether it was worthwhile putting in things that might be of interest to members of the SDP AG in the calling notice. He also informed members that at the end of the financial year the Radioactive Waste Inventory closed.

JT notified members of the protest in Plymouth at the end of the month (October).

Details of the submarine visit to Rosyth the following morning were then confirmed by EW.

9. Date and Location of Next Meeting

Next meeting to be held in April in Cardiff, date to be confirmed.

DRAFT