

West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group Review Report

This is the version of the report for full WC SSG release. A draft has been previously circulated to the Chair and Secretariat, but no comments have been received and only two minor editorial changes have been made.

1 THE REVIEW

The West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group (WCSSG) commissioned this independent evaluation from Golder Associates as part of its wider periodic review of activities and arrangements. The Terms of Reference for the evaluation are attached.

Our evaluation is based on comparison with good practice, observation of full and subcommittee meetings, and face to face or telephone interviews with Members and other stakeholders. We conducted one round of structured interviews and then a second round, mainly to explore emerging conclusions, after Members' discussion at the January SSG meeting (20 in total, plus several additional informal discussions).

Our interviewees were unfailingly generous with their time and insights and we are grateful for their help. However, our report is based on our own analysis and interpretation. It is informed by what people have told us, but it is not a systematic record or a compilation of their views. There were some differences of opinion (major differences in some cases), we may have misunderstood some of what was said, and we cannot claim to be speaking for everyone. Our comments therefore need to be considered alongside Members' and stakeholders' direct feedback.

Finally, we recognise that the roles the WCSSG undertakes are extensive, intellectually demanding and time consuming. Comments-based reviews such as this one can seem overly critical, so we do need to clearly record our and our interviewee's perceptions that much of what the Group does, it does well. In pointing out any areas that might be strengthened we (and the stakeholders we consulted) are very conscious that the Group is mostly made up of volunteers who are taking on considerable responsibility – sometimes working as equals alongside paid consultants and staff – mainly without financial reward.

The wider community and the owners, operators and regulators of the West Cumbria sites should be grateful for their efforts, and of those members of the public that also put so much time into attending and preparing for meetings.

2 OVERALL IMPRESSIONS

Although it was not a universal view, the majority of our interviewees felt that the SSG fulfilled a necessary role but was perhaps (as one member put it) currently 'just bumbling along' without a clear agreed sense of mission and that its meetings too often lack interest and energy.

The WCSSG has been effective and has improved transparency and communication between the various parties. It has a core of committed Members who contribute an enormous amount of effort and expertise. However, its proceedings not always been engaging and the more hard-pressed stakeholders may well not be finding attendance valuable enough. What works should be retained but the time is nevertheless right for some judicious updating. We agree with those Members who suggest that evolution over (say) the next 12 months is essential if the Group is to retain its full vigour and relevance.

None of our interviewees seemed to believe that there was any single change that would radically transform the value of participation or improve the Group's ability to inform, safeguard and reassure the community. Rather, they pointed to different combinations of potential improvements in focus, content, and organisation or format which when taken together would have the desired effect. Different people suggested different, and sometimes incompatible, changes but we nevertheless believe there is enough common ground and that a consensus for action is possible.

The remainder of this report summarises and comments on these emerging themes: role & priorities; meetings, subcommittees and alternative forums; membership; and additional questions included in our Terms of Reference.

3 ROLE & PRIORITIES

Evolving Role

There seems to be a consensus on the importance of the SSG and its public meetings. Even if there are no major issues of community concern at present, something may arise and the SSG forum must be available. It is a valuable safeguard and helps maintain trust between industry and community.

The NDA and site operators are key stakeholders but the main 'customer' for the work of an SSG continues to be the local community. The SSGs are not 'owned' by the NDA, and they are not necessarily bound by NDA guidance on role and arrangements, though they are integral to its stakeholder engagement arrangements and are funded by it. NDA guidance recognises that individual communities may have additional interests and histories that lead to a wider remit or a different balance between roles, so it can be thought of as a benchmark, setting out what the NDA expects in return for the investment it makes in terms of financial and secretariat support.

The Sellafield Local Liaison Committee was the template for the NDA's original 2004 model and so had to change relatively little. The revised 2009 NDA guidance gives the SSGs a more focussed role alongside other channels of influence and communication. It also recommends that they streamline their activities, emphasising:

- Receive and comment on progress reports and forward plans for the sites;
- Represent the views of the community by providing advice to NDA, operators and regulators;
- Provide an opportunity to question operators, NDA, and regulators on behalf of the community.

The WCSSG was not one of those that revisited its terms of reference in response, so the significance of the changes for its role and arrangements has yet to be considered in detail. However, this emphasis seems consistent with Members' views.

These activities are not ends in themselves. They are intended to support:

- Programme development and monitoring;
- Constructive challenge and oversight of operations; and
- Communications and consultations.

Each of these is covered in more detail below, with comments where relevant and potential improvements.

Can Programme Monitoring be Improved?

Members take an interest in overall NDA strategy and performance and easy access to senior NDA staff encourages this; but it is a 'sites' stakeholder group, so that is where the emphasis should be (and generally is).

Some feel that SSG works best when they can plan their activities around strategy or reporting cycles. Some think this has not been sufficiently clear but the NDA site strategies will probably provide a natural focus when next updated. Sites will brief the WCSSG on the programme so that it can then monitor delivery against targets and contribute to future revisions. The emphasis should of course be on targets relevant to the SSG's core business. It is not SSG Members' job to supervise the site operators in parallel with the NDAs but because of the safety and environmental significance it *is* arguably within its remit to satisfy itself that the NDA does manage the operators properly.

Many of our interviews discussed the balance between monitoring and influencing, and the value of SSG meetings and subcommittees as a vehicle for influencing NDA and site management strategy (including investment and socio-economic strategies). Some seemed to feel that alternative forums – perhaps with more authority as a body in this context - are more conducive to influencing and partnership working, as discussed in more detail later in this report. If so, this would facilitate a tighter focus on site strategy delivery. What needs external scrutiny, and what needs democratic accountability?

More generally, the main feature in alternate full group and many subcommittee meetings is presentations by site management or third parties followed by Q&A sessions. These obviously help keep people informed and are an opportunity to ask questions, but as at other SSGs they tend to be high level and there are often few (generally fairly benign) questions. SSGs everywhere seem to have difficulty setting the agenda in terms of the information they want as opposed to that which site management select, no matter how well-meaning and open the presenters are – it is of course always difficult to 'know what it is, that you don't know'. We acknowledge, though, that some subcommittee Chairs put considerable effort into pre-meetings etc. to get the agenda and information content right. We comment on meeting formats later, but deal with the meaning of constructive challenge below.

Can Constructive Challenge be Improved?

Although there is arguably now less emphasis on it in the NDA guidance, there was also support for an oversight or 'constructive challenge' role to expose any issues needing attention and give the community confidence that someone is 'on the case' on *their* behalf as well as the regulators (who may seem more remote). Other forums may cover strategic and economic matters as partnership working develops, but there was often a sense was that only the SSG had a real remit for oversight as the NDA guidance describes it.

But there were differences of opinion as to what oversight means in practice and on the right balance between oversight and other roles, and raised the problem of limited knowledge and experience in the Group. Issues of potential concern do need to be identified and followed up, but interviewees seemed to think that the WCSSG should generally concentrate on routinely assuring itself that regulatory and safety management processes and then being responsive to events or regulatory strategy issues rather than scrutinising everything in detail. Some stressed that SSG's purpose is to help safeguard the local community, so potential safety and 'well-being' impacts have to be a major driver in determining priorities for attention.

We agree, but this strategy requires that Members do take a reasonably systematic approach to the task and do pick up on the right issues. It should not mean spending more time in aggregate on scrutiny or additional meetings, but of spending time in a more focussed and effective way. Members were most likely to argue that focussed/detailed oversight should be carried out at Subcommittee level and reported back – probably more fully than at present - to full group meetings. Our observation is that full group meetings are poor forums for oversight-related discussion, and our impression was that there is a general reluctance to probe deeper with the public and media present, especially if people have other forums to pursue matters of concern.

Some Members and representatives of Cumbrians Opposed to a Nuclear Environment do ask questions and follow up on responses, but overall the level of challenge in both subcommittees and full group meetings is modest and some issues that are raised belong more properly to other communication channels. It may be that current levels of transparency and performance mean there are few issues to pursue, but this may not always be the case and we suggest that the WCSSG consider how it might toughen its oversight role without extending it unduly. We can make detailed suggestions if required.

There was less clarity about whether it was the WCSSG's job to oversee operational performance or programmes which are mainly concerned with clean-up or risk reduction. They may well be of interest but are arguably not core SSG business.

Can Communications and Consultations be Improved?

Interviewees generally agreed that the WCSSG does not take decisions or offer a single view. Several pointed out that facilitating communications and consultations means just that, and that the communications and consultations should be with the community as a whole, not just SSG members. It is not an SSG's job to interpose itself unnecessarily in direct communications between the NDA or sites and stakeholders. In particular, although they offer one route the SSGs generally are not the main means by which NDA should communicate with its key stakeholders.

Interviewees commented on the relative effectiveness of different communication routes. They seemed reasonably positive about the communications and consultation role and gave examples of where the SSG had provided a useful forum.

Monitoring and oversight often look back at what has happened. Consultation usually looks to the future. We observed the recent NDA strategy consultation event and the full group meeting which concentrated on socio-economic matters. Success factors mentioned included a clear focus and extended discussion on a current topic, the participation of key players, a minimum of routine business, and a format/layout that encouraged interaction and debate. On the basis that one should do more of what works, Members presumably will want to build on this approach. If the WCSSG facilitates consultation through events, they need to be early and detailed enough to help other bodies respond. All SSGs seem to want a schedule of forthcoming consultations from the NDA, DECC and sites with early warning where possible so that they can organise their agenda and events accordingly.

The Sizewell SSG organises public debates on important or contested issues which seems to us to be good practice in extending communication into the community, although we recognise that Members may prefer to avoid topics that might generate unnecessary anxiety.

4 FULL GROUP MEETINGS AND SUBCOMMITTEES

Might Changes to SSG Structure to Helpful?

Almost everybody we have interviewed to date has been willing to contemplate some streamlining of the SSG's structure. There is awareness that subcommittees will always manage to fill their agendas but some of their work may not actually be essential. There is always a risk that subcommittee are created on the basis of the importance of an issue rather than on the actual need for additional effort.

We proposed a range of options in interviews for discussion, ranging from 'business as usual' to a 'core business only' model which reduced demands on Members by cutting subcommittees and using all four full group meetings for core business. However, no one was really able to articulate an alternative vision or say which subgroups were superfluous, though some would consider reduced frequency.

The problem is that the sites covered by the WCSSG are so big and / or diverse that it is hard to see how to provide oversight in particular without subcommittees. It may even be that, depending on the balance of roles, the subcommittee structure and remits may actually need strengthened at some point rather than being cut back. Our conclusion is therefore that the WCSSG should improve what it has rather than start with radical cuts. It should consider whether each subcommittee in turn **MUST** exist as a standing body or whether its business can be cut back or dealt with in full group meetings, time-limited working groups, or ad-hoc-off events.

For example (and it is only an example), one suggestion was for a subcommittee for each site only. It might work if Sellafield operations and decommissioning remained as two subcommittees, providing socio-economics can be covered by a combination of full group meetings and alternative forums.

The original subcommittees were Environmental Health and Emergency planning. However, it might be argued that the work of the Environmental Health Subcommittee is mostly done outside its meetings and it could be convened only as and when a major issue arose, leaving an overview of discharge and monitoring data to a full group session. An example of a current issue would be beach particles, but we are not yet clear where this is being covered.

On-site emergency planning is relevant, but should the subcommittee return to its off-site focus and could duplication with other forums be reduced, even if it might mean extending their membership? Do those other bodies and forums provide enough of constructive challenge? We note that some other SSGs have an annual open meeting instead of a subcommittee, because it is of such direct relevance, and maybe interest, to site neighbours.

We have no definitive views but will contribute to this discussion if requested to do so, in respect of those subcommittees that we have attended.

How can Full-group Meetings be made more interesting?

At present, alternate full group meetings are intended as ‘scrutiny’ meetings (mainly reports and issues arising) or ‘events’ focussing on one or more topics of interest in more depth. This seems to work well enough and the meetings are decently run.

However, the ‘scrutiny’ meetings in particular have historically been rather dull, especially for those who also participate in other forums and may not be hearing the material for the first time. In particular, Members seem clear that effectiveness and sustained interest depends on the scrutiny meetings being more than just a string of routine high level progress / subcommittee reports: *“people say they will take the report as read, them read it out anyway – what’s the point of that?”* In fact, full group meetings are poor forums for scrutiny if that means oversight as discussed above. But at a higher level they do deliver communication, consultation and monitoring, particularly linked to strategic programmes.

For instance, some envisage the main business of alternate meetings being a ‘-6/+6 months’ review of site strategy delivery, with much reduced extra reports. Various suggestions have been made to help make meetings more useful and /insightful, including fewer but longer and more focussed reports, better formats around bigger topics, perspectives from different sites/third parties on a single issue of interest, more reliance on written reports circulated before events to free up time for questions, trying harder to reduce time devoted to ‘clutter’ and admin, separating observers from Members, greater variety of formats, layouts and agendas to encourage more people to contribute etc. Certainly, a greater proportion of Members should be contributing to discussion, perhaps even emergency services and others who currently sit out items they are not leading. Small group work would encourage them.

‘Event’ days must likewise tackle substantial issues in interesting ways. The SSG needs to respond quickly to any emerging issues, and many of our interviewees talked about the implications of a more response-driven approach. Events may concentrate on an emerging issue, informing people more generally about an important topic, bringing disparate parties together to seek a way forward, or the aim may be problem solving. As well as being relevant and interesting to Members, they should aim to pull in and engage - as participants, not observers - other stakeholders and members of the public. Members should not be afraid to bring in facilitation or technical support for specific purposes if funds allow.

Comments on Subcommittee Reports

Several interviewees said that if they were not regular attendees, they had little idea what the subcommittees did. Subcommittee reports to full group meetings vary considerably and can be very brief, procedural rather than informative. It may be that subcommittees should be given longer at alternate ‘scrutiny’ full group meetings, so that their work and insights can be shared and their future priorities influenced. Greater understanding might encourage more Members, or even members of the

public, to attend subcommittees, and enable the SSG to close down subcommittees if resources were better deployed elsewhere.

Comments on Accessibility to the Public

Meeting venues are freely accessible to members of the public and press and they were made welcome at all the full group and subcommittee meetings that we attended. They seem content with the way they are treated and the opportunities they have to ask questions or suggest issues for the SSG to investigate. However they are very few in number.

Some see this as a problem, but an alternative view is that there is no reason why ordinary citizens should choose to attend the SSG unless there is something of particular interest or concern to them. More interesting topics and formats will perhaps bring a few more in but all SSG meetings struggle to attract new faces unless there is a particular issue of concern (and in West Cumbria, these are mainly outside the SSG's remit e.g. 'new build'). A realistic aim might be to start by building up a larger core – maybe a dozen - of engaged and informed attendees that is more diverse than the SSG currently has.

If all meetings are in the daytime, it obviously limits the range of members of the public who can attend. Recognising that Members are busy people and are volunteers, a strong case could nevertheless be made that there should be more opportunity for e.g. those in full time employment to attend. It might not bring many more to scrutiny meetings or subcommittees, but could be important for events of wider interest as discussed above.

The website has useful information on it, but is more geared towards Members than the community. If the Group wants to use it to involve more people, it will have to add new sorts of material and proactively 'push' information to the community.

Experience elsewhere suggests that advertisements and publicity drives may bring in one or two extra but that the expense is not justified unless there is a particular event of wider potential interest. The WCSSG probably has its publicity about right.

Comments on Transparency

The WCSSG operates with a very high level of transparency. In contrast to most other SSGs, all meetings are open to the public, including subcommittees, and the press are invited. This transparency is laudable and important, but experience at SSGs generally does suggest that Members sometimes need time to discuss internal business and think in private. Interviewees told us that time before and after the meetings is valued for this reason, and also for the opportunity it offers for informal and one-to-one discussion. If they feel that this is an issue, Members might consider short 'CoRWM style' community member business meetings in private before main meetings. There may be particular sensitivities in respect of the Emergency Planning subcommittee, because of the security angle.

Comments on Meeting Notes

Opinions varied on the appropriate format for meeting notes. Some thought verbatim records are essential as a record of who said what. Others said that no one would read 40+ pages and/or the time and cost of producing them could not be justified. Since other SSGs manage with briefer minutes, continuing with verbatim accounts needs justifying. A shorter record of key points and actions which could be read and circulated to others would certainly be helpful.

Can Feedback from Meetings be Improved?

Although it facilitates communication and consultation with those that attend, the WCSSG – along with other SSGs and comparable forums - struggles to reach back into Members' organisations or the wider community. It finds it difficult to canvas views before meetings or consultations and then feed back points arising and the results of discussions. Around the NDA SSGs, people in represented organisations who are not themselves SSG members often say they receive no feedback from their organisation's nominee on the Group. No SSG has, so far as we can determine, really solved the problem, but there may be things that can be done to keep the pressure on and also make it easier for Members to meet their obligations e.g. producing summary notes and papers that can be circulated, specifying issues where an organisational perspective is expected.

Comments on the Role of the Chair

The role of the Chair and Vice Chair in managing meetings has not been an issue in interviews to date and we have no comments to add. The interests of the subcommittee Chairs inevitably shape the scope of what they cover and the way in which they cover it. This is acceptable, so long as they keep the focus on core WCSSG business and there is a consensus amongst Members.

In most SSG's, the Chair also has a particular role in respect: of liaison with other bodies; maintaining good relations between the Group and its stakeholders; and making statements to the media on behalf of the Group (rather than as an individual).

In West Cumbria, this happens less often because there will rarely be a consensus SSG view, there is more of a political dimension, and the local authorities have much more of a direct role. There is also more scope for confusion in media reports about which 'hat' the Chair is wearing and interviews may well cover both SSG and more overtly political topics.

A case could therefore be made that the Chair should be politically independent. Some interviewees took this line, but most still seemed to rate effectiveness highest, providing there is no obviously partisan behaviour, and were less convinced of the need for strict independence. Several interviewees pointed to the difficulty of finding a committed independent candidate. Our view is that there should, as a minimum, be clear guidelines setting out the scope of what the Chair may comment on when representing the SSG. Members obviously need to resolve this issue before the next Chair is elected.

Can Overlap with Alternative Forums be Reduced?

There are many forums in West Cumbria for discussing NDA and site performance and the socio-economic and operational issues arising. The SSG might be thought of as having to compete for a clear role and for its Members time. Clearly some rationalisation and division of functions between the SSG and other forums would be useful if it reduces duplication and improves focus. The work load on key Members is already high and the SSG will naturally seem less relevant if the key parties have already discussed elsewhere programmes and plans or issues of potential concern.

Socioeconomics seems to be of major interest to almost all individual Members and their organisations. It is also an area where a wide range of local authorities and other bodies – both within and without the SSG's membership - have their own responsibilities and interests. The range of alternative forums is probably widest and the potential for duplication greatest.

It is possible that a body or forum other than the SSG might monitor and facilitate input to decisions on site socio-economic and investment programmes, but the evidence seems to be that this is not (or not yet the case) and so the WCSSG still has a significant role to play. Socio economics in one form or another could almost fill every full group meeting if it were allowed to, so the WCSSG does need to come to a consensus as to where its boundaries lie.

The atmosphere at full group meetings is not confrontational but the format and dynamics tend to place the community representatives on one side and NDA and industry on the other. For this and other reasons, it is often an unsatisfactory environment for partnership working.

Some Members see the SSG as a potential distraction and a poor vehicle for influencing the NDA or site management on strategic matters and they are looking to strengthen direct relationships. Others, who may have fewer alternative channels, worry about exclusion and loss of transparency. Some interviewees were aware of the greater use made at other sites of parallel 'neighbours forums' with a parish focus, and of proposed (and potentially useful) regional local authority/NDA/operator forums.

It may be that rather than cut back the SSG, there might be scope for making more use of SSG mechanisms and / or exploiting opportunities to hold joint events or reduce duplication between other forums. We have not reviewed the work of these other forums and so cannot offer a definitive view. Either way though, this does seem an area to address urgently.

5 MEMBERSHIP

Is the Membership Appropriate?

Most thought that the membership of the group represents a reasonable cross section of the community but that more could perhaps still be done to broaden the range of organisations involved - particularly those that reached constituencies otherwise under-represented. Against the new NDA criteria, the membership is short of other local interests such as businesses and the voluntary sector.

The age range is also limited and diversity of ethnicity and background is low. Many interviewees said the SSG needed more youth (if only relative youth) and diversity. However, to retain this type of new member – and there are potential candidates e.g. in some parish councils - meetings have to be interesting and relevant and make only realistic demands on people's time as discussed earlier.

Interviewees noted that union representatives played an important role. Members of Cumbrians Opposed to a Nuclear Environment (CORE) attend both main group and Subcommittee meetings. They make a significant contribution which is also clearly valued by the vast majority of Members. Access to information and participation by knowledgeable pressure groups is important to public confidence and so needs to be maintained. Pressure groups generally prefer to participate from the public benches rather than formally join an SSG.

6 ADDITIONAL ISSUES

We summarise below emerging insights on the specific issues identified by the WCSSG for consideration which have not been covered above.

Comments on Coverage of Non-NDA Sites

The main nuclear-related issues of local interest are all outside the SSG's remit (e.g. GDF, disposal to landfill, and 'new build' issues). However, although the NDA distinguishes between 'its' sites and other local nuclear-related issues and projects, the community presumably does not – or at least not to the same extent- and many Members are involved in parallel forums and debates. The possibility of more joint or coordinated events was mentioned several times by interviewees.

New build would bring significant pressures and tensions and from our experience would need a separate construction liaison group that met frequently. This may be best managed as a subcommittee of the WCSSG, or it could be independent or local authority sponsored. New build may seem a long way off and therefore a low priority, but again from experience the arrangements should be thought through by all those potentially involved as soon as possible.

Comments on the Secretariat

Interviewees have generally been very positive about the contribution of the Secretariat. An independent secretariat might be the ideal, but none of our interviewees could see how that might come about and several pointed out that an independently-minded secretariat with good access and knowledge of the issues was probably better for the SSG. We agree, providing that the Secretariat supports committee Chairs and Members and is not regularly put in the position of drafting reports or agendas which should be the responsibility of the Chairs. In West Cumbria, political independence might actually be more important than independence from sites. A need to change might arise, but for the moment things are generally working satisfactorily.

Comments on the Website

We carried out a detailed review of the WCSSG website. It was generally up to date although we found a number of places where it was not and there are some bugs and minor usability issues. All have been passed on to the Secretariat. Overall the website is 'fit for purpose', the content is appropriate, and the email alert service seems to work. Several Members said how much they appreciated the emails alerting them to events or warning of a forthcoming media story.

Comments on Capacity Building

The organisations represented change their nominees from time to time. Continuity is important to build expertise and keep a long term focus, and the experience of the longer-serving Members is invaluable, but on the other hand new members may bring new knowledge and ideas and help maintain the age profile. The idea of limiting the length of service for SSG Chairs and Members has been floated in the past, but without resolution as far as we are aware. People may appear irreplaceable, but so far someone has always seemed to step up to the mark when required.

Most new Members need help to become effective quickly. Familiarisation with the purpose and workings of the Group and with the sites it covers is supposed to be part of a structured induction process. It is probably not satisfactory to just respond to requests for assistance. No one outside the Secretariat seemed to know if a structured process existed, which implies that the Group should consider whether its arrangements are adequate.

Comments on Remuneration

We were asked to address remuneration, which we take to refer to the allowances paid to the Chair and Vice Chair and their possible extension to subcommittee Chairs. Some noted that allowances were quite generous compared to other public bodies, but this seems to us to be a matter for discussion with the NDA rather than our evaluation. More transparency over WCSSG expenditure would be welcome.

7 CONCLUSIONS

The workload on WCSSG Members is heavy and the issues they have to deal with – like the sites themselves - are complex and bound up with regional socio-economic. Many Members are involved in initiatives to bring new nuclear jobs to the area and yet they also have to be seen to be tough on the industry when required and perform an effective scrutiny role. The local political environment adds to the sensitivities and overlaps have to be managed with the plethora of other forums where nuclear matters are discussed.

The WCSSG therefore has a very difficult task to perform and a difficult balance to strike. On the whole, it has done a good job under the circumstances. It is certainly far from dysfunctional and we have been impressed by many aspects of the way it works and what it achieves. However, many seem to feel that its proceedings not always been engaging and the more hard-pressed stakeholders may well not be finding attendance valuable enough. There does not seem to be much enthusiasm for a step change, but there is a recognition that the balance of roles needs to be looked at, full group meeting formats and contents need attention, and that the subcommittee structure should be challenged.

A wide variety of improvements in these and other areas have been suggested to us, so – although we will of course be happy to contribute to the debate - we feel confident in recommending that the Group itself consider what should be done under each of our headings rather than making a single set of recommendations ourselves; looking hard, for instance, at the scope, composition and format each of the subcommittees in turn. Some judicious changes will invigorate the Group and set it up for the next 5 years, to the benefit of the community, the NDA, and the nuclear industry alike.

GDC

Our Terms of Reference

The review Terms of Reference included in our proposal were:

- Prepare a commentary on the current and future roles of the SSG, in relation to their original remit and evolving NDA and community needs. Take into consideration of the implications of multi-site and new build issues.
- Survey the views of SSG Members and selected stakeholders on the SSG's role, membership, Terms of Reference, and changes that might help it better discharge its responsibilities.
- Explore the perceptions of SSG Members about their own contribution, the demands of the post, and the factors that help or hinder individual and collective effectiveness.
- Present and discuss preliminary conclusions with relevant SSG Subcommittee. Prepare and present final report for full SSG meeting.

Some specific issues were subsequently identified by the WCSSG for consideration:

- Review purpose of West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group (WCSSG) in line with NDA guidelines.
- How does WCSSG fulfil its 'scrutiny' role – (how is it delivered).
- Membership – to include expectations of the overall committee.
- Sub committees – are they appropriate, do we need different ones / same ones, appropriate terms of reference.
- Secretariat – is it independent/ 24/7 on call service / format of meetings
- Website – is it 'fit for purpose'
- Outputs – minutes/ verbatim or not?
- Capacity and Training.
- Remuneration