



**Chairman – Dr. Brian Marker-** [brian@amarker.freemove.co.uk](mailto:brian@amarker.freemove.co.uk).

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

**Minutes of the Seventh Meeting of the UK Minerals Forum, held at The Geological Society, Burlington House, Piccadilly, London WC1A 1DU on Tuesday 2 December 2008 at 10.30am.**

**Present:-**

Dr. Brian Marker –Chairman  
Duncan Pollock - Secretary

Natalie Bennett – Natural England  
Andrew Bloodworth – BGS  
David Brewer - Coalpro  
Ruth Chambers – WCL/CNP  
John Cummins - DoENI  
Richard Gill – DBERR  
Lester Hicks  
David Highley  
Nick Horsley- CBIMG/SAMSA/Sibelco  
Peter Huxtable – CBIMG/BAA/IOM3  
Bob LeClerc – CBIMG  
Hugh Llewelyn -Defra  
Hugh Lucas – CBIMG/QPA/AI  
Nigel Jackson –Lafarge/ CBIMG/QPA  
Sue Martin – Welsh Assembly Government  
Richard Read HampshireCC/POS  
Andy Tickle- CPRE  
Simon van der Byl –CBIMG/ QPA  
Chris Waite – SEERA/SEERAWP  
Paul Wilcox – Staffs CC/POS  
David Wilkes -CLG

**Apologies:**

Bob Fenton-CBIMG/MAUK  
Chris Hall –CBIMG/BCC  
Dwight DeMorais – BCA/Lafarge  
Chris Dobbs – CBIMG/QPA/Tarmac

Peter Doyle –English Stone Forum  
Jon Humble – English Heritage  
Bob LeClerc - CBIMG  
Jeremy Murfitt – CBIMG/QPA/ AI

### **7/1.Welcomes and Introductions**

The Chairman welcomed John Cummins (DoE NI) to his first meeting.

### **7/2. Minutes of the last Meeting (22.9 08)**

These were agreed

### **7/3) Matters Arising, Not Dealt with Elsewhere**

There were none

### **7/4 Living with Minerals 3 (3.11.08)**

#### **(i) Report Back on Event and Discussion**

Reported:- by Nigel Jackson – This was the second LWM event to be held at the QEII Centre and had benefited from using the largest, single floor space available. The aim had been to get 350 attendees, which had looked ambitious in the light of the emerging financial situation. In fact that number was exceeded. The aim was also to get 20+ sponsors/exhibitors – in fact there were 34. Despite some pre-conference worries, the electronic voting system had worked well. Feedback so far received had been very positive and supportive. The aim had been not to lose money and the event had actually made a small profit, which it was hoped could help to fund future work by the UKMF. The objectives of the event were for it to be enjoyable, informative and entertaining – these had been achieved.

The Chairman endorsed the above comments and expressed his thanks to all involved including the 4 Working Groups.

Members expressed the following views on the event: -

- It had been very successful and useful based on a good format
- There had been some problems with the voting system where sometimes the information needed to assist choice of vote was inadequate and the countdown times had sometimes been too tight for multiple-entry voting.
- There was a need for more very senior industry execs. to attend. Only two CEO's were identified and while there were pressing issues for others, to do with the financial situation and regulatory investigations, the conference was dealing with strategic issues which merited .broader top-level engagement.
- It was also of concern that so few local authority elected members were present and more MPA representatives generally were needed, especially from significant mineral-producing areas.

- Some of the audience’s questions following the votes could have been more forthcoming and from a wider base of stakeholders.
- There was a need to get a better balance of attendees –66% were industry orientated. However, this was much better than at previous LWMs. And it was recognised that for some organisations, especially in the public and NGO sectors, only a small number of (usually HQ) delegates would ever attend.
- An alternative, non –London venue was discussed as means of improving accessibility and broader attendance, but not generally favoured.
- Members suggested that to better engage MPAs, a separate smaller, regional briefing and discussion event should be arranged with senior planners and elected members from the top ten mineral authorities. This was felt to be worth exploring.
- Despite some attendance from NGOs they did not feature much in the q/a sessions, though as noted above numbers were fairly small .
- Some of the voting questions could have benefited from being framed in less technical terminology.
- There was a need to attract more attendees from outside England, despite the costs and logistics of travel. LWM3 was still in reality a debate about issues of most immediate concern in England. North Wales MPAs were mentioned as an area to target for attendance at future LWMs.

In conclusion, Nigel Jackson pointed out that the costs of UKMF activities were always under review. LWM 3/UKMF was funded out of CBI/CBIMG and thus moving the main LWM event out of London could be too much of a financial risk. He did, however, favour a “top-ten MPA separate, regional event with a focus on issues of most concern to elected members”.

## (ii) Working Group Sessions, Discussions and Voting

Reported: -by the Working Group convenors-

WG1/2 –Andrew Bloodworth (BGS) – He felt the questions had needed more time to frame and to pre- publicise to the delegates. He had struggled with the deadlines, not just because he was tasked with two WGs but also because of late, significant views from WG members on draft reports. WG2 in particular had difficulties with “transient” membership. He felt running two WGs was too onerous. WG1 had also been too industry orientated. Without the input of BGS research into WG2 it would have struggled. If the WGs were to continue, there might need to be a proper research based input to aid the discussions.

WG3 – Lester Hicks reported that the WG had produced useful findings in a relatively new area for examination (carbon emissions from initial mineral extraction and transport) but had relied very much on Jerry McLaughlin (QPA) for analytical work. Future progress on voluntary action by the sector to reduce mineral carbon under the UKMF umbrella would require some earmarked resources to collect data and monitor progress. The industry had made it clear during the work of WG3 that it did not favour being brought under statutory carbon trading measures. If that was to be avoided it would have to show it could tackle reductions in carbon emissions by reducing its energy use, and benchmarking and monitoring progress. This was the area that follow-up to the LWM3 work cycle would need to concentrate on.

WG4 –Simon van der Byl (QPA) reported that he felt the selection of voting questions had been too rushed and too late. There was a case for the questions being generally framed at the start of the WG process so as to aid the discussions and the framing of the final presentations. WG4 had been poorly attended with only 4 members most of the time.

The role of the WGs was then generally discussed. Members made the following key points: -

- Was there a continuing need for 4 WGs ? Why not deal with just one topic pa?
- There was an immediate need, however, for the 4 WGs to debrief from LWM3 - considering the messages from the voting results, any other outcomes from LWM3 and giving their views on future actions in their subject areas.
- The WG cycle if continued should be 6-9 months rather than the present one-year base.
- The framework of the reports of the WGs had all been agreed at their last sessions. They needed to be finalised and put on the UKMF website.
- Not all WGs had yet cleared their final reports –e.g. WG3/4

Agreed –

(i) the 4 WG reports should be completed and amended, where necessary, in the light of LWM3.

-(ii) they should then be circulated in draft to WG members for comment.

-(iii) they should then be circulated to the full Forum membership for final comment.

Action:- Convenors and members

### (iii) LWM 3 Briefing Document

This was discussed in the light of the previously circulated critique by Dr. Andy Tickle(CPRE. He reported the CPRE’s considerable disquiet at the document, which had not been produced in draft for prior comment as had been agreed; nor did it follow the Forum Terms of Reference (1 & 6). He particularly disliked the WG boxes entitled “Agenda for Action) which had not been agreed by the WGs nor by the members. He felt the handling of the LWM3 Briefing Note had not reflected well on the UKMF process. Its glossy presentation gave the impression of a final document rather than the presentation of provisional material for the delegates at LWM3 to consider and comment .. In the short term, the Briefing Note should be replaced by a generally agreed document on the outcome of LWM3 and the cycle of work leading up to it. And, longer term, there was a clear need for better consultation procedures to enable UKMF to continue as a valuable forum.

The Chairman posed 2 questions to aid the discussions: -

- i. How to deal with the present Briefing Note?
- ii. How to manage the process in the future?

Nigel Jackson made the following key points: -

- The process of final sign off could have been better although all working group text had been signed off by convenors. He agreed that it should have been made clearer that the document was work in progress. He apologised for these points but indicated that we are still learning to manage what is quite a complex process involving many stakeholders.
- Clearly more time would have helped both to produce the document and to consult on the final draft. It had been intended to circulate the document before the event but with the need to contract out the drafting and preparation to Barrie Hedges and the need to achieve a good level of presentation, the time available was limited but the lessons learned.
- It needed better caveats to the effect that it was not a finalised document and also covering the status of members particularly from Government.
- He felt it was, however, a useful basis for a redrafted finalised LWM3 outcomes document.

Members then offered the following views: -

- The title – “Shaping UK Minerals Policy” was unfortunate, giving the appearance of being a quasi-Government policy document unless caveated
- The 4 WGs needed one more go at amending their parts of the document.
- The boxes “Agenda for Action” needed amendment and re-captioning perhaps as “Key Discussion Points”. Much of the document was good and should not be lost.
- It should not be necessary to use Barrie Hedges for the redrafting-this could be done in-house. although Daybreak would then modify the final document before it goes on to the website
- It needed to be made clearer that the Government officials. on the Forum were “observers” and not “representatives”.
- Some other members agreed the Briefing document had been too glossy and “finished” for a draft document – though, overall, views were mixed on this point.
- There were insufficient funds to do a reprint- an e-circulation only of the final version was felt to be appropriate, but with clear references to its status as superseding the pre-LWM3 Briefing Note.. Contacts in the EU and all LWM delegates should be included in the circulation.

Agreed: - the document should be reconsidered by the WGs (electronically) and signed off by the full UKMF by the end of March 2009

Action:- Convenors, Secretariat and members.

### **7/5 The Future of The UKMF in the Light of LWM3**

### a) The Forum Itself

There was wide support for the work of the UKMF and thus for it to be continued. There was a discussion on whether 1 or 2 elected members from the MPAs should be invited to attend. This concept received mixed support. POS was generally felt to provide the best representation from the MPAs in terms of practicality, continuity and understanding of the issues under consideration..

### b) The UKMF Operating Model

The NGO reps. reported that they felt the “Other Issues for Discussion” item on the agenda was unnecessary and of limited interest. However, there was much support elsewhere for these, which were felt to be useful if kept as a minimal list with reporting and/or discussion kept brief. . EU items were felt to be particularly useful.

There was then a wide-ranging debate about the role of the Forum, its use and the need, or otherwise, to cover these additional items. The issue of use of Forum material to assist members’ lobbying, in particular was discussed. This latter point caused concern and raised again the need for any Forum outputs to be agreed before being put on the website. For instance, Terms of Reference 1/6 were felt to be relevant to this discussion

It was stressed that the UKMF was useful in its own right and its work did not need to be wholly focused on the LWM4 cycle.

Agreed:-The UKMF should be maintained with, perhaps, a three meetings pa. cycle.

### Chairmanship:-

The Chairman having left the room, the issue of the future chairmanship of the Forum was discussed. The following key points were made: -

- It was felt vital to retain the principle of an independent, experienced chairman who could have the confidence of the members.
- It should not be a permanent posting but should be based on review to the Forum’s two-year cycle.
- A Vice Chairman should also be sought with a view to succession planning – likely candidates should be sought
- Brian Marker had indicated he was willing to continue as Chairman

Agreed, unanimously, :-

- i. Brian Marker should be retained as Chairman for the current cycle.
- ii. A Vice Chairman should be sought.?? Keith Duff/Lester Hicks ?

The meeting asked the Secretary to record its thanks to Brian Marker and Duncan Pollock for their past and continuing services to the Forum.

At this point Brian Marker resumed the Chair.

### c) Future Work programmes for the UKMF/Working groups. :-

The possibility of ALSF funding for both the Forum and the WGs was discussed and was felt worth pursuing.

Agreed: -

- i. The further WG work specified in 7/4 ii & iii above, to round off the WG cycle, should be concluded by e-correspondence by the next UKMF meeting (later fixed for 13 March 2009) including suggestions for future work.
- ii. Forum members should also be asked for views on future work by the end of January 2009.
- iii. The next Forum meeting should discuss in detail future work programmes and priorities.

#### **7/6 UKMF Website:-**

Reported:- by Andrew Bloodworth - the website was now operational. It was vital for members to check its content and report back before it was formally launched –

[www.ukmineralsforum.co.uk](http://www.ukmineralsforum.co.uk)

It can also be reached via links on the BGS website.

Discussed:- the need for procedures for posting items on the website.

Agreed: -

- i. All content needed a formal approval process ending with the Chairman's sign-off.
- ii. A proper launch was needed in January 2009.
- iii. The main contact for comments arising from the web site should be Bob LeClerc at CBI.

Action :- Chairman and Secretariat

#### **7/7 Other Issues of interest :-**

- i. Planning System Reform – Reported by David Wilkes (CLG) –the Planning Act 2008 had now received Royal Assent. Regulations enabling the CIL provisions would be laid in 2009. At present it seemed unlikely that mineral *extraction* would be caught by the levy.
- ii. Mine Waste Directive- this issue was progressing with EC decisions expected on 3.2.09. There would be a further consultation on the UK regulations in 2009. At this point members suggested pursuing the idea of an Environment Agency rep. on the Forum. A possible name could arise from the MWD contacts.
- iii. Soil Directive. This issue was currently on the back burner.
- iv. Inert waste: - no progress at present.
- v. APMG - -Agreed: -this item was of limited value and should be taken off future agendas.
- vi. Freedom of Information:-Reported:-the consultation from Staffordshire County council had been agreed as not appropriate for the UKMF to consider.
- vii. EU Raw Material Strategy: -Agreed:- details of this should be circulated with these minutes

Action :- Secretary

**7/8 Any Other Business –**

Hugh Lucas (AI) raised a discussion on the County ALSF projects. It seemed that both in Somerset and Derbyshire the funds were going straight to central coffers and not being used for specific ALSF projects. POS representatives pointed out that the structure of government funding of local authorities did not allow earmarking of funds. While MPAs could lobby for retention of the money on aggregates-related work, they could not compel this. Members felt LGA and DEFRA should be informed of the disquiet at this development.

**7/9 Date of Next Meeting:-**

Friday 13 March 2009 at the IoMMM HQ, 1 Carlton House Terrace, London, SW1Y 5 DB