

# UK MINERALS FORUM

Chairman – Dr. Brian Marker - [brian@marker.freeserve.co.uk](mailto:brian@marker.freeserve.co.uk)

Secretary - Duncan Pollock - [pollock25@talktalk.net](mailto:pollock25@talktalk.net).

**Minutes of the Inaugural Meeting of the UK National Minerals Forum, held at Burlington House , London W1 on Friday 11 May 2007 at 10.00am.**

## **Present;-**

Dr. Brian Marker –Chairman  
Duncan Pollock - Secretary

Peter Bide – DCLG  
Andrew Bloodworth – BGS  
Chris Dobbs – Tarmac  
Richard Gill – DTI  
Chris Hall – BCC  
Lester Hicks – DCLG ( part meeting only )  
David Highley - BGS  
Nick Horsley - WBB Minerals  
Peter Huxtable – BAA  
Nigel Jackson – CBIMG  
Bob LeClerc- CBIMG  
Hugh Llewellyn – DEFRA  
Hugh Lucas- Aggregate Industries  
Andy Price –Dorset CC and POS  
David Sandbrook –SLR  
Damian Testa BCA  
Simon van Der Byl – QPA

## **1) Welcomes and Introductions**

Brian Marker welcomed members to this inaugural meeting of the UK MNF and said the intention was to use the day as a scoping session.

## **2) Launch 7.11.06**

Reported:- Baroness Andrews had launched the Forum at the House of Commons on 7. November 2007. Nigel Jackson expressed his pleasure that Brian Marker had agreed to chair the first meeting of the Forum. He reported that the Forum had a long gestation. The launch on 7.11.06 had validated the process as had the attendance of CLG, DEFRA and DTI. He said that it was up to the meeting to determine where to go from here. There was a need to identify solutions of mutual benefit . He reported that there was particular frustration on the industrial minerals side at not having the

round table process long established for aggregates. There was a need for all minerals industries to be able to discuss the concepts of long term supply and demand.

Members noted that at present there were no reps. from the NGOs an issue which needed to be addressed.

### **3) Ownership and Management:-**

This topic was discussed using the Briefing Note circulated with the Agenda papers.

Although the Forum was “owned and managed “ by the CBIMG and was a CBI Minerals Group initiative. Members felt there was a need to determine how to include those beyond CBI so that the Forum was not purely seen as a CBI lobbying initiative.

On funding, Nigel Jackson reported that CBI Minerals Group would provide initial funding with the principal source being the LWM conferences. There was a discussion on whether the ALSF could provide funds. This seemed unlikely in the immediate future as was any prospect of financial support from CLG,DEFRA or DTI. ALSF funding would be pursued but would limit the scope of the group and might constrain its activities. Andrew Bloodworth reported that there might be the possibility of modest financial support from BGS.

Andy Price felt that if the Forum was to command respect, it needed an all-embracing membership. He compared it with the successful Dorset Coast Forum where membership was open to all interests. He felt that at present the papers and membership read like an industry pressure group. Peter Bide for CLG agreed and felt the Forum needed to engage with the NGOs on issues like the National Parks.

Nigel Jackson reported that he estimated that the Forum would cost £10,000-£20,000 pa. with the main costs being the secretariat, running of sub groups, costs of meetings and of any expert advisors.

Richard Gill reported that DTI could provide accommodation for meetings which members felt would help to show the independence of the forum.

In concluding this part of the discussions, members agreed the Forum needed to address the disconnect between resource use and public perception. There was a need to communicate and educate to change the mindsets of public opinion. It was essential to keep the dialogue going.

### **4) Scope of UK MNF:-**

The scope of the Forum was discussed at length and in particular whether to include oil, gas deep mines and marine aggregates.

Agreed :- (i) the scope should read –“ All UK surface and underground minerals extraction except oil and gas” This would include marine aggregates and recycled materials .

(ii) information on the Forum should be passed to the oil and gas and deep-mined coal industries..

### **5) Aims and Terms of Reference :-**

These were discussed in great detail in relation to the draft set out in the Briefing Paper. Set out below is a consensus view based on those discussions :-

*Aim : To provide an overarching National Minerals Forum, drawing together all key stakeholders as necessary, to debate and inform government and the public on the strategic and prudent use, sustainable management, development and supply of UK minerals.*

*Draft terms of reference:*

- 1. To inform understanding of reasons for the demand for minerals and how that might be met taking into account the principles of sustainable development.*
- 2. To inform understanding of the nature and distribution of mineral resources and the constraints on their development.*
- 3. To debate optimum approaches to management and mitigation of the impacts of mineral working.*
- 4. To debate the effects of current and proposed legislation and policy for mineral working and supply, especially where conflicts are likely to arise between different measures and where cumulative impacts of measures do not seem to have been taken into account.*
- 5. To disseminate approaches to resolving actual and potential problems, pointing out solutions that are agreed by the membership of the forum, and the alternative views when consensus cannot be reached.*
- 6. To draw attention to key sources of information and to encourage that these should be kept up to date.*
- 7. To develop a better interface between the industry, government and other key stakeholders on mineral issues.*

In the discussion there was a debate on whether Chatham House rules should apply. It was agreed that this would be inappropriate – there would be a need to report proceedings, put out reports and accept the risk of minority views as a fact of life. There was unlikely to be harmony on all topics.

It was also agreed – (i) that the terms of reference of the Forum would need to be reviewed once membership of the group had been widened.

- (ii) the draft terms of reference should be circulated to members for views.

## **6) Structure and Membership:-**

The following views were put –

- The Forum should not be too large but needed to be inclusive.
- It needed to concentrate on England but had to have a UK-wide remit
- Government reps. from Wales, Scotland and NI should be invited to attend and should see minutes and reports.
- Relevant Agencies should be invited to attend eg. EA, Natural England and others as necessary.
- Key NGOs should be invited eg – CPRE, RSPB, CNP, FoE, WWF, WCL, CLA, NFU.
- For the Nation States it would also be reasonable to invite SEPA, SNH, CCW, CADW etc.
- DTI advised membership should also include customers e.g. – Highways Agency, HBF.
- The number of attendees would need careful management for practical and management reasons. It was important to match attendance to the issues so as not to create a large Forum for the sake of it.

## **7) Operational Model:-**

The subject of the role of Government reps. was discussed. It was agreed that they would be there as both observers and advisors. They would not be able to commit Ministers but would be able to report to them.

The main topic was then discussed in the light of the Issues Paper circulated with the agenda. The following draft amendments were agreed :-

Issue 1. this should include fireclay and needed to include topics such as “sustainable and responsible supply”, “sourcing/landbanks”, “need to supply” and “replenishment of reserves”. Participants should include the Coal Authority and all RAWPS .

Issue 2. –should include the future of AONBs and participants should include all RAWPs.

Issue 3. –should include the Planning White Paper and the role of RIAs.

Issue 4- BGS were carrying out research on carbon and minerals and suggested the Forum should put this issue on the back burner pending progress on the research.

Issue 5 –should be expanded to include policy conflicts and the issue of capacity.

The Forum set-up was discussed at this point and members felt strongly that it would need a constitution and rules and should be structured around: -

- -a small management team and secretariat
- a steering group
- a plenary group.

Agreed:- (i) the Issues Papers should be amended  
(ii) NGOs and Agencies should be invited to comment on the draft set up along with associated papers, terms of reference etc.  
(iii) a full inaugural meeting should be convened , ideally in July 2007 to review and agree the role and work of the Forum.

## **8).Reporting**

Discussed:- how reporting of Forum work might be dealt with.

Agreed :- (i) there should be detailed and comprehensive reports to the full Forum.

(ii) – Chatham House Rules were not appropriate. It would be up to the full group to agree what to report.

(iii) – Minutes (maybe “sanitised”) should be put on a Forum web site.

(iv) – BGS offered to host such a web site.

(v) – any press notices should be agreed by the group and left to the Chairman to finalise.

(vi) an initial factual press notice should be given to the technical press to report the establishment of the Forum, after the invites had gone out to the NGOs/Agencies.

## **9) LWM 2/3**

Reported:- LWM 3 would be held at the QE 2 Centre, London on 3.11.08. It was intended to provide a platform for the outputs of the Forum. It would also be run on an interactive format with discussion tables.

## **10) Forum Working Sub Groups:-**

Agreed:- (i) these could not be established until the full membership had been set up.

(ii) there was likely to be a need for perhaps, 5 issue groups with 5 chairs. At least one of these groups would need to cover environmental issues.

**11) Timetable:-**The following key dates were identified :-

- 3.11.08 – LWM 3
- Sept 08 –main Forum reports to be completed.
- Sept. 07 – Sept 08 main work cycle. Sub groups needed, perhaps, 3 meetings in the year to complement 3 meetings of the plenary group.

## **12 Date of Next Meeting :-**

Monday 2 July 2007 at 10.00. Venue to be confirmed as either the Geological Society or at IMM, Carlton House Terrace London SW1.