



## **Working in Partnership Copeland**

### **Minutes of the 1st meeting of the Copeland Working Group**

**Held at** MS Teams  
**On** 19 November 2020  
**Commencing at** 10:00 AM

---

**PRESENT:**

Mark Cullinan	Independent Chair
Nick Gardham	Independent Facilitator
Andy Ross	Genr8 North Ltd
Gary Bullivant	Irton Hall Ltd
David Faulkner	Private Resident
Cllr David Moore	Copeland Councillor & Nuclear Portfolio Holder
Rob Ward	Nuclear Sector Manager for Copeland Borough Council
Steve Smith	Nuclear Projects Manager for Copeland Borough Council
Gillian Johnston	RWM Community Engagement Manager
Claire Dobson	RWM Copeland Community Coordinator
Barnaby Hudson	RWM Siting Manager
Craig Taylor	RWM Communications Manager

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Annabelle Lillycrop	RWM Community Engagement Manager
Steve Reece	RWM Head of Site Evaluation
Mike Brophy	RWM Head of Community Engagement
Steve Wilkinson	RWM Project Manger
Andrew Parkes	RWM Head of Site Characterisation
Duncan Grimes	Independent Evaluator (Traverse Ltd)
Serife Gunal	Independent Evaluator (Traverse Ltd)

#### **1. APOLOGIES**

1.1. Apologies were received from Bruce Cairns, RWM Chief Policy Advisor; Mark Walker, Genr8 North Ltd.

#### **2. INTRODUCTIONS**

2.1. RWM welcomed everyone to the meeting. As there were several new attendees to the meeting, a brief introduction was given by each attendee. This included identifying the members of the Working Group and those who will support.

#### **3. MINUTES, ACTIONS AND MATTERS ARISING**

3.1. Minutes of the previous meeting were agreed.

3.2. Members were updated on the action arising from the previous meeting. Actions were closed off. Any outstanding actions are to be carried forward to the next meeting.

#### **1. RATIFICATION OF THE INDEPENDENT CHAIRPERSON APPOINTMENT**

RWM proposed that Mark Cullinan was formally accepted as the Independent Chair for the Copeland Working group. This was unanimously agreed by the members. RWM formally handed over the Chair of the meeting to Mark Cullinan. The chair thanked everyone for confirming his appointment.

## **2. AGENDA ITEM 3: GDF PROGRAMME UPDATE**

- 2.1. **Cumbria County Council** - RWM informed the members that there has been no further contact from Cumbria County Council about joining the Working Group. He noted that there is a Cumbria County Council meeting taking place at the moment and currently is unsure if the topic of the Working Group might be discussed at this meeting.
- 2.2. **Parish Council** –RWM & CBC met with Cumbria Association of Local Councils (CALC). CALC has circulated information regarding this meeting to CALC members and the topic of GDF has started to appear on some of the parish council meeting agendas. RWM has subsequently received an invitation to provide a talk to Whicham Parish Council and the South Copeland Partnership in December, to which the chair and RWM will attend. Dave Faulkner informed the group that he had a meeting with Millom Without parish council to explain his position as an Interested Party within the Working Group.

The Chair suggested that it should be a co-ordinated approach to all Copeland-wide parishes, to prevent areas who do not get any initial engagement feeling they are not part of the process. He also stated that the Working Group do not yet have a centralised message agreed to go out to the community. He felt that CALC should be invited to the Working Group to ensure that a universal message can go out simultaneously to all areas. It was noted that although the invitation to the meetings mentioned was to RWM, the Working Group would be represented by the Chair and that the Working Group should consider how it wishes to engage in future.

RWM proposed that a 6-week engagement plan leading up to Christmas could be drafted to inform the members of the events being attended.

The Chair expressed the opinion that he felt it was important to get the communications strategy in place. He went on to also express a view that he felt CALC should now be invited. The Chair proposed that an invitation be extended to CALC to join the Working Group. This was agreed by the members.

- 2.3. **UK Wide** – RWM noted that there is no change with initial discussions in rest of England and Wales. RWM continue to engage with several potential interested parties.

**ACTION 1 – An invitation be extended to CALC to join the Working Group.**

## **3. AGENDA ITEM 4 - WORKING TOGETHER**

- 3.1. Independent Facilitator led the members through a group discussion on how the Working Group can move towards communicating effectively with each other between Working Group meetings. He also led the discussion on the decision-making process within the Working Group and how this can be achieved without having to wait for the next scheduled meeting. He gave an example of online tools such as Google Group which can be used. He invited comments and suggestions for the members of the Working group.

RWM, has a collaboration portal called Salesforce, where members of the Working Group can see and share email, reports, meeting minutes, etc. This is currently undergoing IT Security checks so is unlikely to be available for use before the end of the year. Any solution for a collaboration portal for the Working Group will need to be compatible with NDA systems, which are restricted.

- 3.2. RWM proposed a weekly update looking at the past week and the week ahead which can be electronically shared with all members of the Working Group. He also suggested a need to have a protocol in place to allow the communications & media team to respond at pace to communications that might not necessarily require all members of the Working group to agree a response. A similar point was raised regarding comments and questions sent in by the general public via the contact centre and the process by which the Working Group is notified of the questions and the agreed response given to these questions/queries.
- 3.3. It was suggested that there is a need to react quickly to any comments/questions that are put to the Working Group via the website/contact centre and proposed a response should come via the Chair and/or RWM. Anything that requires a response agreed by the members of the Working Group should be communicated either through the weekly update suggested by RWM and/or discussed and agreed during the Working Group meetings.

- 3.4. RWM to compile a weekly update report template to be used to communicate to the members of the Working Group. He suggested it be populated with the weekly updates by cease of work on Friday, to be circulated to the Working Group members by Monday morning.

**ACTION 2 – RWM to produce a weekly update report template.**

- 3.5. The Independent Facilitator noted that some communications, such as social media change very quickly and if a response is needed by the Working Group, it isn't always possible to wait until the Working Group meets. He posed the question to the members on how information can be disseminated to the Working Group and decisions be made in real time.

It was noted that the Working Group will have a dedicated communications lead. It was suggested that any social media communications that needs a quick response would be fed into and dealt with by the communications lead as a member of the Working Group. RWM explained they are currently acting as the communications lead are continually scanning media for content and take a view on whether it warrants a reply.

It was highlighted that RWM is part of the Copeland Working Group and has its own role as the developer of a GDF. Also, it noted that in relation to social media content, RWM's position is not necessary the same as the other Working Group members and that the content should not conflict with the position of the Working Group.

The Chair proposed that if there was a Copeland related issue, it should come to the Copeland Working Group for a decision on a response, with wider generic issues being more flexible on who is involved in the response. The suggestion of the weekly update report will support this Working group with those decisions. Annabelle Lillycrop confirmed with the Working Group that any public communications which require a quick response is actioned by the Chair. This was agreed by the members.

- 3.6. The Independent Facilitator closed the discussion session with a suggestion that he would provide a list of suggestions on how the Working Group can communicate effectively with each other in the short term while the Salesforce -based collaboration portal is being progressed.

#### **4. AGENDA ITEM 5 & 6 - TERMS OF REFERENCE & DECLARATION / REGISTER OF INTERESTS**

The Chair noted that a copy of the Terms of Reference was circulated to the members of the Working Group prior to this meeting. The Chair took the Working Group members through the highlighted outstanding issues for discussion and agreement.

- 4.1.1. **Working Group membership** – It was proposed the Lake District National Park be considered to join the Working Group. RWM noted that from the previous meeting with the Lake District National Park they had attended, that they appreciated being kept abreast of the process and would potentially look to join a Community Partnership once formed. The Chair noted that he is due to attend a meeting with the Chair of the Lake District National Park on another matter and suggested he speak to them to understand their position before a formal invitation is extended. RWM has also met previously with the Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership (CLEP) and there was a similar understanding.

The Chair proposed that the Working Group continue to brief both the Lake District National Park and the Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership on the progress of the Working Group with potential of becoming members of the Community Partnership. This was agreed by the members of the Working group.

- 4.1.2. **Quorum** – The Chair proposed the number of members needed for a Working Group be two thirds (2/3) and would include the Chair and the facilitator. A concern was raised that two thirds of the Working Group may be too high a number and noted that the local authority tends to only have a third of their members. The Independent Facilitator noted that quorum could be high if for decision making only. Working Group decisions would not necessarily be made during all Working Group meetings, therefore quorum for attending a meeting could be lower than two thirds. It was agreed that a representative of the IPs should be present at the meetings.

- 4.1.3. **Voting Rights** - Voting Rights were discussed. The Independent Facilitator raised the question whether a vote could be taken if only the Chair, Facilitator and RWM were present. A question of whether RWM should hold voting rights as part of the Working Group as raised. RWM commented that the policy states RWM will be a member of a Working Group as part of the partnership and so similar voting rights to other Working Group members should perhaps be considered.

It was suggested that each representative group (e.g. RWM, CBC, IPs) has a single vote and not each

individual.

The Chair felt that further discussions were needed before a decision could be made and made himself available for anyone who wished to discuss it further. Any discussions would be transparent and fed back to the Working Group.

- 4.1.4. **Deputies** – The Chair informed the Working Group that in the event of a member not being able to attend, deputy representatives should be allowed to attend in their place and would have voting rights. Working Group members will be responsible for organising their own deputy. In relation to a deputy Chair, it was agreed by all members that the Independent Facilitator would be the deputy Chair.
  - 4.1.5. **Protocol and Confidentiality Agreement** – RWM noted this area relates to the conversation at the beginning of this meeting with regards to IT security and will still need to be resolved. RWM to come back to the members of the Working Group with some potential options to resolve this.
  - 4.1.6. **Online Training** – One of the members noted during the eLearning training it refers to organisation's policy on fraud. He asked the question how this would relate to the Working Group. RWM explained that, as the Working Group doesn't have a legal status, RWM is the responsible body for all statutory duties but that the training hopefully will make the Working Group members aware of the policies and their individual responsibilities where relevant. The reason for asking WG members to undertake the learning is because they could be more exposed to certain issues and so this provides them with a basic level of support. Employees of organisations other than RWM will have their own policies to adhere to.
  - 4.1.7. **Conflict of Interest of Chair** – All members agreed that the remaining members of the Working Group would decide if there was a conflict of interest relating to the Chair.
  - 4.1.8. **Dispute Resolution** - All members agreed that the Working Group would look to resolve disputes within the group.
  - 4.1.9. **Working Group Meetings** – To be held on a monthly basis and reviewed if needed. Subgroups will be formed as required by the Working Group. These subgroups will feed back into the main Working Group meetings.
- 4.2. The Chair concluded the review of the Terms of Reference document noting that it is a live document which will come under review as the Working Group progresses. All members agreed they were happy with the content to date.
  - 4.3. The Chair asked if the Working Group was happy with the content of the declaration of interest form. It was agreed in the previous meeting to follow a similar format to the Copeland Borough Council form. RWM asked for clarification that where it references family members, that would be the Working Group member and their partner. This was agreed.

**ACTION 3 – RWM to provide suggestions at the next meeting to resolve the Terms of Reference and associated documents.**

The chair called a fifteen minute break to the meeting.

## **5. AGENDA ITEM 7 - GEOLOGY OF COPELAND**

The Chair welcomed everyone back to the meeting and introduced, Head of Site Characterisation for RWM, to give a presentation on the geology of Copeland and the inshore area off the coast. The presentation used publicly available information, including the National Geological Screening data.

**ACTION 4 – Presentation to be circulated**

## **6. AGENDA ITEM 8 - COMMUNICATIONS & MEDIA UPDATE**

- 6.1. **RWM provided the Working Group with an update on communications and media.**
  - 6.1.1. Social Media – RWM currently posting 3 times a week using pre-prepared content. As discussed above, RWM will liaise with members of the group to ensure that responses represent the Working Group, not just RWM, and are turned around efficiently.

6.1.2. Working Group Communications Role – Candidate will be in the role from the 14<sup>th</sup> December.

6.1.3. Newsletter – Currently over 120 subscribers. This number is steadily growing. It was agreed, with the current subscribers and the number of stakeholders engaged at the launch would warrant, that the newsletter will start to go out as well as being published on the Copeland Working Group website. Communication Lead met with the Chair to discuss the content for the first newsletter which will be an introduction by the Chair. He suggested subsequent newsletters could potentially include an offer for community groups, businesses and organisations to contact the Working Group if they wish to have further engagement with them. He also suggested a summary report of the Working Group meetings and a link to the minutes be included in the monthly newsletter.

6.1.4. RWM stated that should the Working Group wish to ratify the minutes prior to them being published. The Chair confirmed that a summary report of the current meeting be issued with the newsletter which allows the Working Group to confirm the minutes at the next meeting before being published for historical record.

6.1.5. Interested Parties agreed with the help of the Communications Lead will provide a brief introduction to themselves to be included in the newsletter.

6.2. Next Steps – Interviews of the Facilitator and other members of the Working group to be arranged. Filming for the virtual exhibition is continuing. A follow up briefing could be arranged with the Whitehaven News journalist.

6.3. As there have been several new members joining the Working Group, RWM suggested a review of the Communication & Engagement plan be arranged. RWM suggested an action to agree a 6 week Engagement plan.

**ACTION 5 – Communication Lead to Contact the Interested Parties to prepare a brief biography statement.**

**ACTION 6 – Communications Lead to draft the newsletter and share it with the members.**

**ACTION 7 – Communications Lead to share the slides presented in today's meeting with the members.**

## **7. AGENDA ITEM 9 – WORK PLAN**

7.1. RWM gave a brief presentation looking at creating a work plan for the Working Group. The workplan should be structured round the three main purposes of the Working group: to gather information and understand community issues, to identify a Search Area or Areas and to identify members of the Community Partnership(s). It was suggested that a collaborative planning workshop be run before Christmas to agree a work plan.

**ACTION 8 – RWM to present the chair with a proposal for a planning workshop.**

## **8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

8.1. Copeland Borough Council suggested Cumbria Data Cooperative be invited to a future Working Group meeting to give a presentation talk on their involvement communities. RWM suggested although the work of the Cooperative looks very helpful it would be better to identify the needs that the Working Group has and what its engagement plan is before inviting specific solution providers to this meeting. The Facilitator will be helping the group draw up this plan.

8.2. RWM asked the members if there was any specific training presentation topic they wanted at the next meeting. It was suggested that the Principal Environmental Assessment Manager, RWM be invited to present on the environmental characteristics of Copeland. This was agreed by the members.

**ACTION 9 - Facilitator to begin work on a Community Engagement Plan**

**ACTION 10 – Members to let RWM know of any particular knowledge/ training needs**

## **9. DATE FOR THE NEXT MEETING**

9.1. One of the members asked if the next scheduled meeting on the Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> December could be rearranged for Friday 11<sup>th</sup> December as it conflicted with another meeting he was attending. This was agreed by all members.

Signed: Mark Cullinan  
Copeland Independent Chair