

Summary of feedback and responses from the consultation of membership, re-structure of sub groups & voting rights

Organisation	Feedback	Response
IOM Government	Noted membership arrangements – accept the new terms of reference as drafted	Noted – no amendment required
Whitehaven & District Trades Council	Disappointed that they have been de-selected as a member of the committee	In principal happy to re-instate – need to determine who Whitehaven Trades Council represents – secretariat to write to confirm
Ponsonby Parish Council	Unable to accept the proposal to reduce the number of Parish Councils represented to 4 Proposed working groups ignore the financial and commercial scrutiny of the NDA	Discussion around recommendations identified in Weightman report and the Emergency Planning exclusion zone – agreed that 5 parishes will be represented on WCSSG – (including Gosforth) – situation to be re-assessed following outcome of Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) review Finance covered in Sellafield Performance Plan. Commercial implications would sit within Nuclear Materials and Spent Fuel Management working groups
Co-opted member	Feels re-organisation is appropriate – commented that previous working groups were badly supported by local councillors – a more responsible approach is required	Agreed and will encourage more involvement from local councillors
CORE	Grateful of the offer for CORE to become a member of the WCSSG – but campaign’s	Noted – Offer will remain open to CORE if at any time in the future they wish to reconsider.

	<p>interests are best served by remaining outside the committee</p> <p>Reservations about the topics allocated to the proposed new working groups</p> <p>Unhappy that Commercial sub committee is to be disbanded</p>	<p>A lengthy discussion took place as there were other conflicting views on how the sub committees should be structured – final structure was based around what is going to happen on the Sellafield site over the next 20 years and how that aligns to NDA strategy. (see separate report on rationale behind restructure of working groups).</p> <p>Discussion around the table - Commercial activities will be integrated into one of the new sub groups</p>
Cumbria Constabulary	With significant changes to policy in terms of ‘policing gaps’ Cumbria Constabulary believe the role of the constabulary should be better reflected in the WCSSG membership.	Agreed – Cumbria Constabulary will become advisors to the main committee and will maintain a role on the Emergency Planning working group – given that this group will be broadening to include security within its remit.
Allerdale Borough Council	<p>Several comments relating to grammatical/clarity issues with terms of reference ie: ‘sites’ instead of ‘site’</p> <p>Main point raised - ABC requested that they be granted three elected members on the main committee the same as Copeland Borough Council and Cumbria County Council</p>	<p>Noted, amended terms of reference to reflect suggested changes.</p> <p>This suggestion was discussed at length with the outcome reflecting current authority responsibilities – ie: Sellafield sits within the Copeland BC constituency – CBC has planning authority (minus waste) for Sellafield</p>

		<p>Ltd. Cumbria County Council has planning authority for all waste issues at Sellafield. ABC has no statutory responsibility for issues effecting the site. Also taken into account was proximity and number of representatives from within each borough – percentage of workforce residing within the borough of Copeland is higher than that of Allerdale. As such membership for local authorities will remain status quo – ie: CBC and CCC 3 elected members, ABC – 1 elected member.</p>
Office of Nuclear Regulation (ONR)	<p>Main point raised was concerns regarding the re-structure of the new working groups – ONR felt they would be better aligned with the operational directorates.</p>	<p>A lengthy discussion took place as there were other conflicting views on how the sub committees should be structured – final structure was based around what is going to happen on the Sellafield site over the next 20 years and how that aligns to NDA strategy. (see separate report on rationale behind restructure of working groups).</p>
Environment Agency (EA)	<p>Main point raised was concerns regarding the re-structure of the new working groups – Although suggestions were different to ONR and CORE.</p> <p>Current constitution concentrates on Sellafield and LLWR, asked whether it would be prudent to refer to Windscale as this is still a separate nuclear licensed site. Could this be</p>	<p>See separate report on the option chosen for new working groups</p> <p>Agreed that Windscale could be referred to in the WCSSG terms of reference – however, if other communities wished to engage in communications NDA could not at present</p>

	<p>extended to other nuclear sites in West Cumbria, whilst recognising that this is an NDA funded committee.</p> <p>EA are listed as advisors to the main WCSSG – EA asked if it should also be made clear that EA are advisors to the working groups.</p> <p>Are reps from schools/youth groups/colleges included in the working groups.</p> <p>With regard to local parish councils and voting, it may be worth considering future proofing to allow 1 vote for each parish, or part thereof which falls within the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) of a nuclear licensed site in West Cumbria</p> <p>May wish to consider another working group to consider the Integrated Change Programme and other enablers such as skills, supply chain, knowledge sharing, R&D etc.</p>	<p>fund it.</p> <p>This was agreed.</p> <p>Secretariat to contact education authority and discuss.</p> <p>Parish Council membership was discussed at great length as it was also questioned by CBC. Decision was taken to keep current Parish Council representation ie: Seascale, Ponsonby, Gosforth, Beckermest, Drigg and Carleton – further discussions may need to take place at a later date following the outcomes of the Weightman report and recommendations falling from it.</p> <p>Two meetings during the year are allocated to current themes. Such items can be discussed at those meetings.</p>
Gosforth Parish Council	Trade unions already have an established on-site forum with senior management for expressing views. It is unnecessary for each of the large unions to be individually represented on the Stakeholder Groups – 1	Given that the unions represent a major stakeholder group – ie: Sellafield Ltd employees status quo will remain.

	<p>member to present the Trade Unions view on matters should suffice.</p> <p>The attempt to reduce the number of local parish council reps is totally undemocratic – the basis for local parish representation should be as per the original 6 parishes (now 5) – each parish member should have one member on the main committee with the ability to nominate substitutes in their absence.</p>	<p>See above – Parish Council membership to remain status quo for reasons set out above.</p>
<p>Copeland Borough Council</p>	<p>Socio-economic concerns would be best represented at the main site stakeholder group.</p> <p>Further consideration should be given to the potential to establish an independent secretariat.</p> <p>Structure of group should be reviewed in 12 months.</p> <p>Terms of reference for the three new working groups are identified and agreed prior to their adoption.</p> <p>Increase in the local authority members included within the structure</p>	<p>Agreed – this was agreed when the socio economic sub committee was disbanded.</p> <p>NDA national policy dictates guidelines for secretariat. Secretariat delivered by SLC under contract to NDA. Any changes would have to come from NDA.</p> <p>A further review will be undertaken as per the NDA’s guidance document – ie: every 5 years</p> <p>Generic terms of reference will be drawn up to allow members to decide if they wish to be involved. However, the detailed terms of reference will be drawn up by the members of the new groups once established.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	Seek clarification that the four main meetings per year are dedicated to socio economic and performance plan reporting and not two scrutiny and two topic meetings.	Consensus that two meetings per year should still remain to discuss topical issues as highlighted above in the EA's comments.
Working group	Voting rights	The group discussed voting rights against the NDA guidance for site stakeholder groups – in particular 4.8 – the SSG has no responsibility for decision making on the site, therefore voting should be avoided. However any matters that require formal resolution – (which will primarily be the election of a Chair and Vice Chair) should be done on the basis of simple majority. For this reason and because no consensus could be reached the status quo will remain – ie: 3 CBC, 3 CCC, 1 ABC, 5 parishes.