



Ministry
of Defence

DE&S Policy Secretariat

Defence Equipment & Support
#2043, Maple 0a,
MOD Abbey Wood
Bristol, BS34 8JH

Email: DESSEC-PolSecSxxxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx



Mr Whyte

Our Reference:
11-07-2013-113118-002

Via: request-xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.xxx

Date: 8 August 2013

Dear Mr Whyte,

Request for Information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000

Further to my letter of 12 July 2013, I am now writing to provide you with a final response to your request for the following:

In 1968 Rosyth Naval Dockyard started servicing and refueling nuclear powered submarines. Blood samples were taken from 197 male workers, starting in 1968 for a ten year period. It was noted there was a significant increase in chromosome damage and the level of chromosome damage increased as the dose level increased. These tests were conducted by H. Evans.

- 1. Can you please supply any information you have on the steps taken to ensure chromosome damage was kept to the minimum?*
- 2. What follow up treatment, if any, was prescribed for those affected?*
- 3. Are similar tests still being conducted on Rosyth Naval Dockyard Workers working on nuclear submarines? If not, have you any information stating why these tests were suspended.*
- 4. Are similar tests being conducted on Submariners based in nuclear submarines? If not, have you any information why this is the case.*

I am treating your correspondence as a request for information under the Freedom of Information (FOI) Act 2000.

Following a search for information within the Ministry of Defence (MOD), I can confirm that we hold some information within the scope of your request. I enclose a copy of the document, 'Radiological protection of service and civilian personnel: House of Commons Defence Committee Report 1990,' which contains information regarding the MOD's policy and practice, as at 1990, on radiological protection. The document was available in the public domain at the time but has since gone out of print.

As you may be aware, the FOI Act only extends to requests for recorded information. It does not require public authorities to answer questions unless they already hold the

answers in recorded form. The Act does not extend to requests for information about policies or their implementation, or the merits or otherwise of any proposal or action – unless the answer to any such request is already held in recorded form.

Under section 16(1) of the FOI Act, however, we have a duty to provide advice and assistance where possible, and you may find it helpful if I explain that maintenance of operational submarines is no longer carried out at Rosyth Dockyard, and that the site is owned by Babcock Ltd so the dockyard workers are no longer MOD employees. Also, I can confirm that such blood tests are not conducted on Royal Navy submariners; the tests in the study were undertaken for academic research purposes and would not be relevant in routine radiological protection.

If you are not satisfied with this response or wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Deputy Chief Information Officer, 2nd Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xx). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain dissatisfied following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate your case until the MOD internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.ico.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely,

DE&S Policy Secretariat