



**Y Comisiwn Annibynnol ar
Ddyfodol Cyfansoddiadol Cymru**
**The Independent Commission on
the Constitutional Future of Wales**

Have your say...

GLYNDWR CENNYDD JONES

JULY 2022

1. What matters to you about the way Wales is run?

With Nicola Sturgeon having recently addressed the Scottish Parliament about her plans for a second independence referendum, and the Commission on the Constitutional Future of Wales, established by the Welsh Government, currently considering options for fundamental reform of the UK's constitutional structures, the four home nations of these isles are approaching a crossroads in their shared journey. The situation is made more pronounced by Sinn Fein's May 2022 election victory in Northern Ireland, joining a Conservative UK government in London, a Labour senedd in Wales and an SNP parliament in Scotland.

Unitary states, such as the UK, face ongoing challenges in acknowledging the partial autonomy and diversity of their constituent nations, especially in cultivating and sustaining a sense of belonging to the larger political body. Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland today hold legislative competence over all matters not explicitly reserved to Westminster, which implies a form of federalism, but without the usual sharing of sovereignty across parliaments.

With many now asserting a multicultural Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish or English character before claiming a form of dual nationality which also embraces a British personality, it is legitimate to reconsider the nature of Westminster's parliamentary sovereignty such that it more appropriately encompasses authority only over select key isles-wide functions held in mutual interest and regard by the nations. The pressing strategic issue going forward relates to whether sovereignty, as currently understood, should be shared across these five territorially defined identities (including that of Britain) in a traditional federal arrangement or instead assigned individually to the four nations—Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and England—which in turn would delegate or pool parts of their sovereign authority to common central institutions of a fundamentally British civic character.

The make-up of individuals' identities is complex and partly comprises their beliefs, social affiliations, and relationships within national groupings. The fact that 45% of Scottish voters would have preferred to end the Union in 2014 might suggest a lessening in appeal of the British identity. However, some pause is required before jumping to this conclusion as the dual identity of the Scottish people within the UK has complex roots and meanings, including pride in past achievements and a continuing awareness of the cultural and social connections forged between the populations of the isles over many centuries. The same is true of the people in Wales. Admittedly the situation in Northern Ireland is more complicated.



British ideals and values are partly forged by geographic, historic and cultural influences which usefully bridge the demands of world interdependence and the desire for increased autonomy in the nations. Looking forward, the challenge is to capture these principles in a new constitutional framework which strengthens arrangements for self-government—through emphasising common respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality and rule of law—within an isles-wide civic societal structure typified by pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice and solidarity.

It is now widely conceded that the devolution measures of the 1990s were insufficiently thought out. If England does join Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland in establishing a parliament, then the UK will require new provisions for governance. In today's world, nearly two hundred states are underpinned by written constitutions. Surprisingly, the UK is not.

The UK is becoming increasingly diverse culturally, ethnically, legally and politically. An accepted approach to successfully embracing and managing such variations is to revise and improve the nature and quality of governance. The application of a more deliberative democracy, exercised at the national level rather than that of central institutions, is predicated on the assumption that genuine decision-making demands active participation by the public in society's debates and developments, over and above that of simply casting votes at elections. The fact that written constitutions make the machinery of government more accessible and transparent is one of the most persuasive arguments for their application.

Creating such a written framework for these isles could prove invaluable across the political spectrum, with some finding reassurance in attempting to articulate the more distinctive elements of the UK's practices in a codified constitution or treaty, and with others seeking to cement the sovereignty position of the four nations individually in relation to a common British civic structure. An overview of such possibilities are outlined in my summary article [A New Model for the UK](#) on the website of the Institute of Welsh Affairs (or on pages 50 to 55 of the booklet [A League or Union of the Isles](#) which is enclosed with this submission. An e-book version is available [here](#).)

It is important that the ongoing Commission on the Constitutional Future of Wales is considered as preparation towards a wider UK constitutional conversation involving all political parties and elements of society to explore the nature of the Union going forward—so that it can be made modern and fit for purpose for the twenty first century.



2. What do you think the priorities for the commission should be?

The Commission on the Constitutional Future of Wales must recognise all UK nations' political and constitutional realities when exploring the future of the Union.

The fact that the four constituent nations of the UK took different tacks in their responses to the Covid-19 challenges in recent years has reaffirmed the national borders extant within these isles. Further, the trend for significant divergence in policy stances across the various parliaments has compounded other clear political disagreements centred on constitutional change, with different parties holding power in each institution for over ten years. The customary argument that absolute parliamentary sovereignty should rest continually and solely with Westminster now stands challenged.

To protect the UK's unity post-Brexit, the Welsh Government has suggested federalism as a possible way forward, mirroring unionist views in Scotland. However, federalism, whilst admittedly delivering more powers to Wales, offers restricted opportunities for expanding Scottish autonomy beyond the present status quo and does little to tackle the UK's future relationship with the European Union (EU) in a way that is satisfactory to the Scottish Government. Federalism would likely deliver reform of the Barnett formula, as desired by the Welsh Government, but would impact negatively on the Scottish block grant, strengthening the attraction of a second independence referendum.

Some politicians may even consider it intolerable to restructure the UK along federal principles, seeking instead to expand Westminster's reach through Brexit. This would cast an ever longer shadow over the devolution settlements as the UK economy adapts to functioning separately from the EU. Repatriation to Westminster of EU competences in fields otherwise devolved could also hasten calls for Scottish secession. However, the Scottish National Party's (SNP's) present platform of pursuing an independent Scotland within the EU is problematic in today's circumstances. By definition, it necessarily confines and restricts the nation's ability to facilitate a single market with its largest trading partner, England.

A federal solution likely acts only to entrench many of the structural difficulties extant in the present devolution arrangements, which largely mirror a federal order but without the formal sharing of sovereignty across national parliaments. As the traditional understanding of UK state sovereignty adjusts to the practicalities of an interconnected world, made more apparent since 31 January 2020, there is an opportunity for those advocating greater autonomy for Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland to progressively present a more sophisticated platform of debate for self-government, or even 'modern independence', which wholeheartedly subscribes to outward facing international structures.



Interestingly, Westminster's tacit acceptance of Scottish, and by some implication Welsh, independence as a legitimate option, further to the 2014 referendum in Scotland, suggests that sovereignty is ultimately determined by the populations of the nations separately and not by the people of the UK collectively. To argue that it is the British people who are first amongst equals is wilfully to ignore the long established, respected status of the home nations in European history.

The challenge to both Conservative and Labour parties is to become more formally representative of the nations within their organisational structures. The make-up of the Liberal Democrats is already federalised, and the strength of the nationalist movements in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland is at a level uncommonly seen in other multinational states globally. Accepting that the federal horse has already bolted (particularly before the relentless wave of SNP electoral successes in recent times), might not the more collaborative elements of the political spectrum from unionism to nationalism find some common ground, if not a strategic compromise, in a new constitutional partnership for the future?

After all, Britishness as a concept is much older than the UK and it is unrealistic to argue that the Welsh or Scottish people, in notional independent territories, would start considering the English as fellow Europeans instead of fellow British.

If we were offered a hypothetical opportunity to constitute Britain from 'scratch' once more today, would we not straightforwardly recognise the sovereignty of the different nations and peoples in these isles and seek to work within a robust social, economic and security partnership directed by a limited, but mature, political legislature? Such a model is explored in my enclosed booklet [A League or Union of the Isles](#).

Devolution involves a sovereign Westminster, in effect, delegating a measure of sovereign authority to the devolved institutions. A League-Union of the Isles turns this constitutional approach on its head, advocating four sovereign nations of radically different population sizes (Wales c. 3.2m, Scotland c. 5.5m, Northern Ireland c. 1.9m and England c. 56m) delegating some sovereign authority to central bodies in agreed areas of common interest such as internal trade, currency, large-scale economic considerations, defence and foreign policy, with the British monarch continuing in role.

We must draw on shared experiences, both past and present, in forming an underlying bedrock of effective collaboration for the century ahead. If we do not, there is danger that our island relationships will fracture. Conceivably, Wales might even find itself in a UK of two nations only, where Scotland has moved to independence and Northern Ireland has unified with the Republic of Ireland. The Commission must consider the political and constitutional realities across all four nations when exploring the nature of the Union going forward.



3. Thinking about how Wales is governed, by the Welsh Government and the UK government, what are the strengths of the current system, what aspects do you most value and wish to protect? Can you provide examples?

Summarising the nature and functions of today's UK, the introduction to the report *Devolution and the Future of the Union* (Constitution Unit, University College London 2015) explains that the 'economic union provides the UK with a single market, with a single currency and strong central fiscal regime. The social union provides the social solidarity which binds the UK together, by redistributing revenue, and pooling and sharing risk through welfare benefits and pensions. In the political union, every part of the UK is represented in the Westminster Parliament, which manages the economic and social unions, and as the sovereign parliament can itself reshape the political union.' Over the past two decades, a greater body of understanding has been fostered in Wales with regards to its specific needs, distinct from those for the UK as a whole.

Devolution

It was Ron Davies, former Secretary of State for Wales, who said, before the dawn of the Welsh Assembly in 1999, that 'devolution is a process not an event.' Since then, Wales has experienced executive devolution with secondary law-making powers from 1999 to 2007, executive devolution with enhanced secondary powers between 2007 and 2011, legislative devolution under a conferred powers model from 2011 to 2018, and legislative devolution under a reserved powers model from 2018 to the present day. During this period there have also been three Scotland Acts, each augmenting powers north of the border. Nevertheless, England continues to be omitted from the devolution reforms without its own discrete national parliament.

Today, Wales and Scotland hold legislative competence over all matters not explicitly reserved to Westminster, which implies a form of federalism, but without the usual sharing of sovereignty across parliaments. The statutes founding the devolved institutions are analogous to the constitutions regulating federal systems, both providing for and limiting powers of the legislatures and administrations, and dividing responsibilities between the territories and the centre. Established by approval through referenda, the parliaments in Cardiff, Edinburgh and Belfast hold a measure of political entrenchment which has legal foundation in the Wales Act 2017, Scotland Act 2016 and Northern Ireland Act 1998, confirming devolution as a permanent component of the UK constitution—and detailing that the UK government will not normally introduce bills in Westminster to legislate on devolved spheres of competence. Still, Brexit challenges this.



More broadly, as highlighted by Dr. Andrew Blick in his article *A United Kingdom Federation* (Federal Union 2018), the Human Rights Act 1998 partly reflects the Bill of Rights existing in most federal systems, while the Supreme Court operates several roles associated with a similarly titled body in a federal jurisdiction. The Joint Ministerial Committee, though found wanting in its application, somewhat replicates a federal mechanism for states to participate in important central decision-making. Despite this constitutional scaffold, the Senedd in Wales remains an institution lacking real influence and power, particularly to effectively represent the aspirations and needs of the people of Wales within an increasingly complicated UK context. The customary argument that parliamentary sovereignty should rest solely at Westminster is under question.

4. Are there any problems with the current system, and if so, how could they be addressed? Again, please provide examples.

See essays in the enclosed booklet [A League or Union of the Isles](#).

- *A Federation or League-Union of the Isles?* on pages 32 to 39.
- *These Isles* on pages 40 to 49.

5. Thinking about the UK government, the Welsh Government and Welsh local government, what do you think about the balance of power and responsibility between these 3 types of government – is it about right or should it change and if so, how? For example, who should have more power, or less?

The balance of power and responsibility across the nations requires rethinking. The following summarise the various applications of a partially sovereign and sovereign Wales in relation to a selection of potential isles-wide structures.

Devolution: *A sovereign Westminster delegating some sovereign authority to the devolved institutions.*

See response to question 3 in this submission.

Federalism: *A partially sovereign Wales sharing sovereignty within a UK Federation.*

In a federation, sovereignty is shared between central and constituent national or state governments. Each level has clearly articulated functions, with some



powers pooled between them, but none has absolute authority over the others. An individual is a citizen of the central overarching structure and the state within which they reside, participating democratically in electing representatives to the legislative parliaments at both levels of government, usually with a party political system operating across the whole. Central institutions are in place to implement many taxes. Examples of federations include Germany and the USA.

Agreed practices and rules are confirmed through a written constitution, which details the division of responsibilities between the federal and state tiers. It identifies those powers assigned to the centre which may typically cover: the armed and security forces; border, diplomatic and international affairs; shared public services; cross-recognition of legal jurisdictions; currency and monetary policies; a single market, and select taxation. The remainder rests with the states. The constitution also apportions powers across two chambers of a central parliament. Representation of the states in the second chamber is desirable, allowing a firm place for them to consider laws on behalf of the whole federation, with decisions such as joining or leaving international bodies, and constitutional changes made subject to its approval. The constitution and charter of rights, by which public institutions must abide, are enforced by a Supreme Court.

A federation sets out to provide constitutional clarity and stability across the states, with shared mechanisms in place for advancing joint interests and resolving disputes. It also capitalises on potential for realising some economies of scale in delivering centrally held functions, allowing for a proportional redistribution of the joint prosperity generated by the federal capital to the states. However, in the UK context, questions remain as to how England, with approximately 85% of the total population, could be integrated successfully into a federation without causing disputes between both UK and English levels, and also whether the intended benefits of various functions being exercised closer to the people could be realised in such a large unit. England's regions may well be the only practical option for inclusion in a UK-wide federal system.

Confederalism: *A sovereign Wales pooling a few key functions within a British Confederation.*

A confederation is a union of sovereign member nations that for reasons of efficiency and common security have assigned a limited portfolio of functions and powers to a joint body. In contrast to a federal constitution, a confederation is usually established by treaty which addresses crucially shared interests such as internal trade, currencies, defence, and foreign relations. Returned representatives take part in central decision-making processes more in the nature of trustees acting on behalf of their member nation's affairs. National



parliaments, not individuals, are formally represented in shared institutions, with people first relating to their member nation and next to the confederation. Collective budgetary funds are raised annually through each member nation's contributions of a defined proportion of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The nations operate distinct tax regimes and are free to act unilaterally in all areas, unless centrally assigned. The Benelux Union has developed along these kinds of lines.

In the UK context, a confederal treaty would enable Westminster to continue as the parliament of England, with a Confederal Assembly established to deliver a limited range of central powers. Each member nation would adopt its own institutions within a broad constitutional framework—protecting the integrity of political processes and ensuring fundamental rights—whilst encountering the advantages and challenges of running a sovereign state within what is best summed up as a loose alliance or partnership. A treaty on issues of shared concern aims to mitigate any risks and costs associated with fragmenting previously held joint functions, noting that competitive considerations between member nations inevitably complicate relationships within the structure of a confederation.

Two of the more pressing challenges of adopting a pure confederal model concern the matters of large-scale economic management and currency controls. Since the central body is relatively weak, decisions made by a Confederal Assembly would require subsequent implementation by individual member nations to take effect. These pronouncements are therefore not laws acting directly upon members, but instead have more the character of agreements between nations, which are always open to challenge and review, creating uncertainty in collective, strategic aims. However, the attraction of a confederation, comprising member nations of radically different population sizes, is driven by a view that the UK already has more diversity than is often found in federations.

Confederal-federalism: *A sovereign Wales delegating some sovereign authority to a League-Union of the Isles.*

The model proposes a confederation of Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, and England, with aspects of federal-type control built into key policy portfolios to reflect the principles of equality and solidarity among member nations. Each nation holds all powers and rights which are not by treaty assigned to joint institutions, operating distinct legal jurisdictions. The British monarch continues in role as Head of the confederation.



A Council of the Isles acts with mechanisms in place to address the asymmetry between population sizes of member nations, specifically through the composition and distribution of seats. Members of the Council are typically elected for a four-year period by the electors of each nation, convening annually for a fixed time unless urgent business is demanded. The Council assumes its own standing orders, confirming a Presiding Officer and Executive whose Prime Minister and Ministers are responsible for enacting power on specific matters involving defence, foreign policy, internal trade, currency, large-scale economic considerations, and isles-wide affairs.

Each Bill considered by the Council is circulated to the National Parliaments of Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, and England, in advance of final reading, with member nations empowered to make objections or suggest amendments before voting. This provides a counterweight to any aspirations of the centre to aggregate power within its core, and to act unilaterally on issues such as defence and foreign affairs. On passing, the Head of the confederation confirms the Bill as an Act of the Council of the Isles. The ultimate authority on the legitimacy of any laws and rights assigned to the centre remains with the Supreme Court.

A Committee of Member Nations (comprising the Council's Prime Minister and Minister for Isles-wide Affairs, and the First Minister of each member nation), convenes regularly to discuss more general considerations which demand a degree of cooperation and harmonisation of laws across borders, over and above the key functions enacted in Council. These include: postal, telephonic and internet communications; railways, roads and associated licensing; airports, ports and traffic controls; coastguard and navigational services; energy, water and related infrastructure; income and corporation taxes; rates of sales, weights and measures; copyrights, patents and trademarks; scientific and technological research; broadcasting; meteorological forecasting; environmental protection; civil defence; emergencies, and the prevention of terrorism and serious crime.

The Committee, with the support of the Council, also holds controls for confirming contractual-type arrangements for supplying any requested public services to member nations. To cover the common functions and agreements in place, the Council levies charges upon each member nation according to a defined proportion of their GDP annually relative to that of the League-Union of the Isles as a whole. These monies are paid into a consolidated fund from which the interest on the UK public debt continues as a standing charge. The centre aims to promote equality across all territories by sharing a measure of baseline investment for infrastructure projects, operating formal instruments for resolving disagreements. National Parliaments are discouraged from misusing any advantages they possess in areas of potential contention including, for example, the economy of England, the oil of Scotland, and the water of Wales. Some



central responsibility is also assigned for pensions and what are currently termed National Insurance Contributions (appropriately renamed), mitigating elements of financial risk and promoting ongoing solidarity. Further, federal-type mechanisms may be introduced to support fiscal decentralisation from the UK position.

The National Parliament of each member nation sits as the sovereign, legislative and representative body of its people, enacting powers and laws on every issue not identified as within the Council's competence. A Government with executive powers, comprising a First Minister and other ministerial positions as required to oversee the various offices, is appointed from the nation's parliamentary members. The superior judges are nominated on the advice of an independent authority. Nations sub-divide their lands through Acts of National Parliament, defining the composition and responsibilities of local or regional authorities.

An independent Wales: *A sovereign Wales delegating some sovereign authority to the EU.*

Wales acting as a sovereign nation within the EU is, in principle, a workable model. However, a practical difficulty rests with Wales's largest trading partner England and its uncertain relationship with Europe. A form of isles-wide constitutional framework is essential to facilitate the necessary economic, political and social understandings, or at very least an Atlantic Union, of EU nations, comprising treaties between Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, and the Republic of Ireland. In June 2016, the Welsh public effectively voted against EU membership, creating some doubt about the likely political traction of a future sovereign Wales joining the EU, but there are indications the mood may be changing, if only steadily.

The potential for Wales to act unilaterally outside any European or isles-wide agreements is impossible in the era of enhanced cross-border cooperation, which demands some pooling of sovereignty within supra-national frameworks. It has been suggested that Wales's operational interactions with England could be addressed through a bilateral treaty of sorts, but this approach is likely to prove unsustainable, with ambiguity and doubt over collective aims resulting in a drift of capital and employment prospects towards the larger neighbour to the east. The challenge is highlighted in the report *A Constitutional Crossroads: Ways Forward for the UK* (Bingham Centre for the Rule of Law 2015) which highlights that the 'border between England and Wales is crossed about 130,000 times each day' and that '48% of the Welsh population lives within 25 miles of the border with England.' The picture as we move into the third decade of the 21st century is probably more complex still.



Note about local or regional authorities within a more empowered Wales

Hypothetically, an autonomous Wales could be underpinned internally by five regional authorities partially mirroring the geographical composition of present regional seats for Senedd elections, and constituted by the amalgamation of enclosed principal areas or unitary authorities for local government, and the restructuring of other relevant bodies. These may cover: the health boards; police, fire and rescue authorities; and consortia for education, social services, transport, and trunk roads. Enacting Welsh government policy, such authorities would promote economies of scale; clarity in directing long-term planning and delivery; accountability for achieving shared outcomes across geographical areas; improved governance, and increased capacity.

6. As a distinct country and political unit, how should Wales be governed in the future? Should we:

- **broadly keep the current arrangements where Wales is governed as part of the UK, and the Westminster Parliament delegates some responsibilities to the Senedd and Welsh Government, with those responsibilities adjusted as in Q5, OR**
- **move towards Wales having more autonomy to decide for itself within a more federal UK, with most matters decided by the Senedd and Welsh Government, and the Westminster Parliament decides UK-wide matters on behalf of Wales (and other parts of the UK) OR**
- **move towards Wales having full control to govern itself and be independent from the UK OR**
- **pursue any other governance model you would like to suggest**
- **alongside any of these options, should more responsibilities be given to local councils bringing decision making closer to people across Wales.**

There is a pressing need to investigate some common ground, if not a strategic constitutional compromise, in the form of a new isles-wide partnership of modern sovereign nations for the future. My recommendation, as detailed in the enclosed booklet [A League or Union of the Isles](#), is a model of confederal-federalism.

The proposition is underpinned by the principles of social, economic, defence, and indeed political, equality and solidarity amid member nations, efficiently tackling our mutual interests, whether regional or global, and empowering each territory to address its own distinct combination of challenges and needs.



In constitutional terms, the new partnership is introduced through a codified confirmation that all powers and rights rest with the individual nations, which in turn delegate or pool a balanced portfolio of strategic functions and objectives to the centre by means of an agreed confederal treaty, with aspects of federal-type controls built into specific mechanisms.

- To sustain our economic union, the proposal assumes a common currency, bank and market, as well as an isles-wide responsibility for macro-economic decision making. This particularly aims to support fiscal decentralisation away from the current UK arrangements.
- The social union is maintained through the guarantee of individuals' rights of movement, residence and employment across all member nations, along with continuation of the British monarch in role.
- In upholding our joint security, the forces of defence and organisation of foreign policy are both held centrally. This is the protective rock on which our shared principles and values, as projected through common, practical functions, can develop, be maintained, and prosper.

In application and execution, the balance of social, economic, and security interests are effectively enacted through a limited but mature political union comprising a central **Council of the Isles** to which individuals elect representatives, in addition to their respective **National Parliaments**. Each territory operates its own legal jurisdiction, with a Supreme Court of the Isles acting as the ultimate authority on the legitimacy of any laws and rights which are assigned to the centre by treaty.

A **Committee of Member Nations** which comprises the First Ministers of the individual territories and the Prime Minister of the Council promotes cooperation, where necessary, on matters that, whilst requiring cross border coordination, are the direct responsibility of the National Parliaments. Further, the sovereign member nations independently hold four seats at the UN General Assembly but aim to retain the single collective permanent seat on the UN Security Council so as strongly to represent our shared geopolitical interests at the top diplomatic table—balancing change with continuity.

Therefore, the model embeds the values of equality and solidarity within its strategic objectives and practical structures, providing opportunities for these ideals to be reinforced in action through promoting partner members' financial robustness and security going forwards. As a counterweight to any encroachment or misuse of powers in enacting the shared functions, and since sovereignty rests with each nation, the right of secession is implicit in the model, subject to appropriate referenda and other treaty-bound checks and balances.



A federalist may ask, what is the difference between a League-Union of the Isles and a UK Federation?

It is the case that many of the central functions map across and, in both models, individuals participate democratically in electing representatives to established legislative parliaments at two levels of government. However, a fundamental difference rests in the nature of decision-making processes underpinning the application of shared functions.

In a UK Federation, a top-down model of representational authority remains within an overarching framework of clearly delineated responsibilities assigned to the territories and that of the core, which remains the centre of gravity. This is especially true in party political terms. There is no mistaking which body both spins and holds the threads. The territories remain within their bounds, discouraged from taking on a greater role in governing their peoples in time. The umbrella political identity is a powerful construct, likely constraining genuine national development, progress and reform.

In a League-Union of the Isles, on the other hand, the weight of influence and purpose rests with the nations. The centre exists to serve in facilitating the delivery of the common social, economic and security aims, as already outlined. Individuals elect representatives to take part in central policy decision-making processes mostly on behalf of their member nations' interests.

To restate some text from question 2... *'As the traditional understanding of UK state sovereignty adjusts to the practicalities of an interconnected world, made more apparent since Brexit, there is an opportunity for those advocating greater autonomy for Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland to present a progressively sophisticated platform of debate for self-government... which wholeheartedly subscribes to outward facing supranational structures'* as offered by a form of confederal-federalism.

7. Overall, what is most important to you in about the way in which Wales should be governed in the future? Is there anything else you want to tell us?

The application of sovereignty within the nation. As I have not yet had the opportunity to make a verbal approach to the Commission, I would like to signpost a recent interview with the Federal Trust, which usefully captures my main concerns and recommendations: <https://fedtrust.co.uk/video-confederal-federalism-a-model-for-the-united-kingdom/>

I look forward to being in touch. Thank you.

Glyndwr Cennydd Jones

July 2022



In responding to these questions, we would welcome views on how the current forms of governance, and any proposals to change governance in the future, might impact on the Welsh language.

Responses to consultations may be made public. To keep your response anonymous (including email addresses) tick the box.

Submit your comments by 31 July 2022

email to: ConstitutionCommission@gov.wales

or post to:

The Independent Commission on the Constitutional Future of Wales

Cathays Park

Cardiff

CF10 3NQ