

UK MINERALS FORUM

Chairman – Dr. Brian Marker - brian@marker.freeseerve.co.uk

Secretary - Duncan Pollock - pollock25@talktalk.net.

Minutes of the Second Meeting of the UK National Minerals Forum, held at the IMM , 1 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1 on Monday 2 July 2007 at 10.00am.

Present;-

Dr. Brian Marker –Chairman
Duncan Pollock - Secretary

Natalie Bennett –Natural England
Peter Bide – DCLG
Andrew Bloodworth – BGS
Ruth Chambers –WCL/CNP
Dwight DeMorais- BCA/Lafarge
Chris Dobbs – Tarmac
Bob Fenton- CBIMG/MAUK
Richard Gill – DTI
Chris Hall –CBIMG/BCC
David Highley - BGS
Nick Horsley - WBB Minerals
Nigel Jackson – CBIMG
Bob LeClerc- CBIMG
Hugh Llewelyn – DEFRA
Bill McKenzie - CLG
Jeremy Murfitt- Aggregate Industries/CBIMG/QPA
Simon van Der Byl – QPA
Paul Wilcox – Staffs CC/POS

Apologies :

David Brock –Mills and Reeve
Peter Huxtable – BAA
Andy Price – POS
David Sandbrook –
Damian Testa – BCA

1) Welcomes and Introductions

The Chairman welcomed members to this second meeting of the UKNMF and explained that the meeting formed the core,steering group of the UKNMF . Since the

initial, 11 May scoping meeting. Natural England and WCL had joined the group. A note of the Chairman's meeting with Ruth Chambers (Wildlife and Countryside Link/Council for National Parks) had been included with the agenda papers. A note of his meeting with Natalie Bennett and Colin Prosser (Natural England) was tabled. The Chairman felt that both meetings had been useful and constructive and had focused on the aims and objectives of the UKNMF.

Both were present, today and this would give a better balance of representation.

The Chairman reported that the meeting had three main purposes: -

- (i) to look again at the Aims and Objectives and Terms of Reference with the objective of finalising them.
- (ii) to look at the topics/issues to decide whether they were correct and then to identify the key groups. Also to decide which were the most important.
- (iii) to consider the working groups to deal with the issues and to decide how they should function, who should be on them and their timetable.

2) Minutes of the 11.May 2007 Meeting

These were agreed with two amendments: -

-Attendance list –corrected spelling of Hugh Llewelyn.

- Page 2 –item 3, third Para., final line , amend to read :- “....of modest support in kind from BGS.

3) Dorset Coast Forum

Noted, the full report on the terms of reference of this, circulated with the agenda papers. Thanks were expressed to Andy Price (Dorset CC) for his help in providing this. It was felt that the structure of this Forum provided a useful guide for the working of the UKNMF and in particular the organogram on the fourth page.

Agreed – Nigel Jackson would prepare a similar diagram for the UKNMF and which might be appropriate for the web site.

Members felt the Dorset Forum had a useful, wide ranging membership that helped its effectiveness and which raised the question – was the current membership of the UKNMF too packed with industry representatives?

4) Ownership and Management

This item was discussed in the light of the comments set out in the notes of meetings with WCL and Natural England.

WCL felt the group was too industry heavy. There was a need to widen the membership in particular with more mpa involvement. Natural England agreed and asked for a more balanced representation. It was pointed out that the UKNMF was developing from its inception stages and it was hoped and expected that more interests would join in the coming stages. Both felt that the non-use of Chatham House rules was helpful.

In the discussion on this issue, the following key points were put: -

- The membership did need balancing but if the group became too large it would become ineffective.
- There would be a resource problem both to Government and to local government in provision of more representatives.
- It was open to WCL and the Planning Officers Society (POS) to field a wider membership.
- It was not “industry dominated” rather “industry populated” – essential in order to cover the wide range of UK minerals to be dealt with.
- There was a need to include representation from the Environment Agency, English Heritage, devolved Governments and devolved agencies.
- The relationship with the All Party Parliamentary Minerals Group and MPs generally needed to be explored.
- It was important that the Forum was a strategic overview group and that it should not become a lobbying group.
- The work of the group would involve identifying areas both of consensus and of disagreement.

Agreed

- i. The Chairman should the following bodies with invites to be represented
:- Environment Agency –Mark Southgate
- English Heritage – Jon Humble
- RSPB – Mark Avery
- WAG – Sue Martin
- Scottish Exec. – John McNairney/Ian Mitchell
- NI – contacts to be investigated.
- ii. Other bodies who could attend would include – Coalpro, Building Stone Reps., Andy Tickell (CPRE)
- iii. Invitees who could not attend should be copied in to papers and minutes
- iv. The emphasis of the Forum should be” people need minerals” –“how should this be addressed ? ”

5) Aims and Terms of Reference

In the discussion on this item, the following key points were put :-

- There was a need for mineral working in the UK and the Forum should be about future supply issues.

- The Forum was not intended to duplicate responses to policy consultations – it should be a “big picture”, strategic overview group.
- The Forum was not intended to duplicate other groups or NCG. However it would be appropriate for its papers to go to NCG and vice versa where relevant.
- Terms of reference no. 5 seemed unclear but seemed intended to allow for the background of dissenting views to be explained.
- Use of “pragmatic” on page 2 of the Dorset paper provided a useful form of wording
- Term of reference no. 7 was a key aim to be inserted before no. 1

Agreed: -

- i. The aims and terms of reference should be amended in the light of points made and in the light of the views of WCL and Natural England.
- ii. The amended aims and terms of reference should be recirculated to the group for further comment.
- iii. The aims and terms of reference would need to be kept under review as the work progresses and would, in any case, need to be reviewed after the Living With Minerals Conference (LWM 08) in Nov. 2008.

6) Press Release

Noted – the press release circulated with the agenda papers had been sent to Quarry Management but had yet to appear. WCL reported that the papers for this meeting had been circulated to their member organisations and would be considered by their Land Use Planning group on 3 July.

7) Website

BGS confirmed their agreement to administer and host the Forum website. They had registered two domain names – www.uknmf.org.uk and www.uknationalmineralsforum.org.uk. Both would be linked to minerals.uk.com and to the BGS site.

BGS also reported that they would be able to facilitate the website with graphic design.

Agreed – the website should contain: -

- The aims and objectives of the group.
- The programme of work and meetings.
- The minutes of meetings –in full, not sanitised.
- Details of membership, with links.
- Minutes should be self-explanatory, depersonalised and with acronyms explained.
- Draft minutes should be cleared by e-mail by the full group membership prior to publication.

8) Living With Minerals 2008

Reported – this even would be held at the QE 2 Centre London SW1 on 3 November 2008. There would be an afternoon session and an evening reception at the House of Commons.

The format would be interactive and might use a professional facilitator. There would be a full opportunity for Conference working groups to report their deliberations.

9) UKNMF Working Groups

These were discussed on the basis of the Issues paper circulated with the agenda papers. Members made the following key points: -

General –

- Issues 1,2.4 & 5 were long-term issues whilst Issue 3 was very short term.
- Issue 1 was already subject to on-going research by other groups, some funded through ALSF. It was important not to duplicate this work.

Working Groups –

- Working groups should be based on three meetings a year, each of about 3 hours duration.
- Discussion papers produced by the secretariat/ convenor should guide their work.
- Working group papers should be circulated to LWM 08 delegates plus groups might wish to put up a speaker on their topic.
- Groups should be prepared to pose questions in their final reports where answers were not obvious. In this respect, their brief/spec. would need careful wording .
- Groups should interact and not work in isolation.
- It might be possible for groups to commission research within the scope of limited resources.
- Some of the tasks were very onerous eg. Carbon footprints.
- It would be expected that groups should define the shape of their task, decide how to proceed and then give a steer/frame for future work. ie. not just provide possible answers but also directions for future work. The role of the groups would also be to join up issues not currently related- a longer-term task.
- Any papers from the groups should be circulated to the LWM 08 delegates 2-3 weeks before the event.

10) Topic Issues

Issue 1 -

Reported –The Surface Coal Forum was already up and running and there was a need to connect up. POS were already represented on that group.

The Chairman felt that the key point here was that of declining reserves, does it matter? is it serious ?

Agreed-

- i. The Issue should be retitled –“declining reserves- the threat to future supply”
- ii. The BGS research on “safeguarding Minerals Supplies “ and the Capita research on the dearth of applications were highly relevant to this task.
- iii. BGS should be the lead convenor.
- iv. The question of customer representatives on the working groups should be considered.

Issue 2-

This was felt to be a longer-term issue. Government policy was not currently changing although there remained a threat of legislation to further restrict mineral working in the National Parks and AONBs. Also to take away landbanks and dormants in those areas. There was ALSF research in progress on this topic. Members felt it was both a longer-term issue and a secondary one, which might be merged with the work on Issue 1. DEFRA, however, stated that Government policy on mineral working in National Parks and AONBs was stable and there was no intention on making what is already a restrictive policy for these areas even more restrictive.

Issue 3

This was felt to be a short-term issue. There was a current Government consultation White Paper on the issue with a 17 August deadline. The subject would only become relevant once the Government had responded to the consultation exercise. It might be appropriate for a paper to be prepared for a working group for discussion in the autumn.

Agreed-

- i. Members should provide to the secretary copies of their responses to the White Paper.
- ii. POS should provide the lead convenor, if possible.

Issue 4

This was felt to be a high priority task and should cover climate change, carbon footprints, proximity of supply, and the role of the industry in adapting to climate change and demand for minerals arising.

Issue 5

This was also felt to be a high priority task. It should focus on environmental and health and safety policies rather than planning. Work should also include impacts of other legislation on mineral working and the issue of UK “gold-plating”.

Agreed-the CBIMG was the appropriate lead convenor.

11) Priorities

After a lengthy discussion the following priorities were agreed: -

There should be three working groups as follows: -

- Issue 1 (including Issue 2)-Security of supply
- Issue 4 –carbon and proximity
- Issue 5 –EU legislation .

Working groups would be able to commission a modest amount of work to support their tasks.

12) How to Proceed

In the discussion on this item the following key points were put: -

- Although Government departments could attend the groups a fuller involvement was unlikely to be possible.
- Issues 1/2 – BGS could lead
- Issue 4 DEFRA would consider an appropriate lead.
- WCL would like to attend 1,4,5
- Natural England would like to attend 1,4 & maybe 5
- CBIMG could attend all.

Agreed-

- i. The working groups should be based around three, three hour meetings in the coming year
- ii. They should concentrate on strategic overview issues.

13) Timetables

Agreed as on the agenda paper

14) Any Other Business-

Resources:- Agreed, the groups would have access to limited funding for research, membership would be free, convenors would chair the groups, note the proceedings and progress the work Groups should be limited to 5-6 players.

15) Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 19 September 2007 at 10.00am at DCLG, Eland House, Bressenden Place, London Victoria.

DTP 10.7.07