



**Working in Partnership Copeland**

**Minutes of the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Copeland GDF Working Group**

**Held at** Herdus House/Microsoft Teams

**On** Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> October 2021

**Commencing at** 09.00

**PRESENT:**

**Voting Members:**

Mark Cullinan	Independent Chair
David Faulkner	Private Resident
Gary Bullivant	Irton Hall Ltd
Cllr David Moore	Copeland Borough Council, Councillor & Nuclear Portfolio Holder
Cllr Andy Pratt	Cumbria District Association of Local Councils (CALC), Chair
Gillian Johnston	RWM Community Engagement Manager

**Other Working Group Members:**

Pat Graham	Chief Executive Copeland Borough Council
Steve Smith	Copeland Borough Council, Nuclear Projects Manager
Rob Ward	Nuclear Sector Manager for Copeland Borough Council
Nick Gardham	Independent Facilitator
Chris Shaw	Cumbria District Association of Local Councils, Copeland Liaison Officer
Barnaby Hudson	RWM Siting Manager
Steve Wilkinson	RWM Project Manager
Gillian Thorne	RWM Working Group Communications Lead
Claire Dobson	RWM Copeland Community Coordinator

**Supporting Attendees:**

Kelly Anderson	RWM Community Engagement Manager
Anne Broome	RWM Copeland Community Coordinator
Sue Shepherd	RWM Copeland Community Coordinator
Justin Chamberlain	RWM Head of Campaigns Attended for Agenda Item 8
Alex Briggs	MHP Attended for Agenda Item 8

**In attendance:**

Karen Agnew	RWM Secretariat Copeland GDF Working Group
Dawn Walker	RWM Secretariat
Jordan Pugh	Arvato Copeland Ambassador
Serife Gunal	Traverse

**APOLOGIES:**

Mark Walker	Genr8 North
-------------	-------------



## Working in Partnership Copeland

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. This was Copeland Working Group's first hybrid meeting.
- No apologies were received, however no representatives from Genr8 North were in attendance.

### AGENDA 1: IDENTIFY VOTING MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP, ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST, MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING.

- Recorded voting members from each organisation.
- Any changes to voting members to be notified.
- Assuming members attending the meeting hold the vote for themselves/their organisation unless they say/declare otherwise.
- Minutes of previous meeting are a correct record – correct record of the meeting confirmed.
- Confirmation of no required amendments to members declarations of interest however the Chair declared an interest which has no conflict.
- The Chair declared his appointment to the Board of North Cumbria Integrated Care (NCIC) Trust.

### AGENDA 2:

#### OUTSTANDING ACTIONS AND REVIEWS

Chair reviewed outstanding actions of which there were none.

### AGENDA 3:

#### OPPORTUNITY FOR UPDATES FROM WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

#### Copeland Borough Council

Copeland Borough Council held a Members Briefing on the 28<sup>th</sup> September following the Working Groups review of objectives and recommendation. On 6<sup>th</sup> October the Strategic Nuclear Energy Board (SNEB) subsequently considered the work undertaken to date by the Working Group and supported the recommendation to form 2 x Community Partnerships. SNEB recommendation was then forwarded to Copeland Executive on the 14<sup>th</sup> October where the recommendation was supported with a unanimous vote. This decision is subject to a call-in period which ends on the 25<sup>th</sup> October.

Q – Was the Executive vote unanimous with no dissent?

A – Whilst not everyone is supportive of a GDF, it was clear that this was the right decision to make.

Q – What are the next steps from Copeland Borough Council, will there be a formal response?

A – Once the call-in period ends, we will formally advise the Working Group.

#### RWM

RWM confirmed that they supported the formation of 2 x Community Partnerships in Copeland.

#### Parish Council



## Working in Partnership

Copeland

A briefing was held for Parish Councils on the 29<sup>th</sup> September.

Moving forward Parish meetings will be separated into Mid and South, to enable more detailed discussions in each Search Area. Further meetings will be held on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> November and an agenda will be issued via CALC.

Two parishes in the South have requested a more detailed map which shows the Parish Council boundaries and Area for Consideration, within the South Copeland Search Area. These maps are being prepared and are intended to be circulated on Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> October.

A meeting was also requested by Beckermest Parish Council and this will be held on the 17<sup>th</sup> November.

Q - At the meeting with the Parish Councils on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> November, will the relevant Copeland Councillors be invited?

A – It is the Parishes only at this stage.

There were no further updates.

### **AGENDA 4:**

#### **ONBOARDING INDUCTION FOR COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP MEMBERS**

Slide shared – onboarding pack for Community Partnership members.

This is being shared today to seek input.

The plan is for the Chair to have a 30-minute chat with each member and explain the Community Partnership and what their role will be. The Community Engagement Managers will be responsible for the ID verification process of each member

The onboarding pack will contain the following items:

- Chairs welcome letter
- Initial team members and contact details, to include Chair, RWM Lead, Copeland Borough Council lead and CALC lead
- Working with Communities Policy
- Community Guidance Booklet
- Site Evaluation Booklet
- Community Partnership Agreement
- Initial Evaluation Reports
- Search Area Evaluation Reports that are relevant
- MAPs – both full Copeland and separate maps
- Digital footprint guide

At a later stage the following documents will be available:

- Who are RWM?
- LLWR and RWM
- Top 10 FAQ's

The pack does contain a lot of information however the Community Engagement Managers will be responsible for supporting prospective members if required.

Q – Is it worthwhile to have a short piece in pack from the summary report?

A – Agreed



## Working in Partnership Copeland

There will also be a “who’s who” document, this will include the Community Partnership Officer role which will be advertised soon and include CBC and CALC representatives.

The aim is to keep to a minimum the e-learning modules however every member will need to be trained in GDPR on an annual basis. The Community Engagement Managers will organise this. There is also planned training on H&S and what is a GDF.

### **Action – CEM to arrange GDPR training**

Q – As we are going out to communities to encourage people to join, this extensive onboarding could put people off, what is the relevance for H&S training?

A – It’s more about personal safety. The training isn’t mandatory but there is a duty of care and this will continue to be offered.

A – The mandatory eLearning training will relate to GDPR, anti-bribery and anti-fraud.

Q – A Working Group member stated that they had sat on two funding bodies and have never been asked to undertake anti-bribery and anti-fraud training, is this essential?

A – At this stage a cautious approach has been adopted to reduce the risk from future questions and challenges and the process has been designed to cater for all prospective panel members regardless of experience or skillsets.

Q – As prospective Community Partnership members will have to go through a process, recruitment, interview and induction the approach seems too corporate, remember these members are voluntary.

A – RWM will review the onboarding materials and requirements.

### **Action – This will be taken back to RWM for further consideration.**

Q - A Working Group member raised the point that when Parishes are being asked to join a Community Partnership some of the questions that will be raised will be around workload, from the members pack, that already appears to be a greater workload than expected. This will have to be kept in mind and it can’t be made over complicated.

A - The members pack will be able to be taken away and read at leisure, not everything is required straight away. Until the Community Partnership is formed, we are unable to determine what the workload will be. What we do know is that we have strong support teams from Copeland Borough Council, CALC, RWM and the Community Partnership Officer.

Q – What’s listed looks like a lot of material, is there a way of breaking it up and dividing it into what is required day 1?

A – Yes there is. A lot of it is guidance booklets. The pack is supposed to give people the information they require, it’s going to take time to go through the guidance, but we want to ensure that the right information is there from the start.

Q - Need to be clear what’s required for induction and then clear what’s required over the next 4/5 months. Will the GDF be explained?

A -Yes, the Chair will go through this with new members.

### **Action – The Chair will utilise their own experiences of onboarding to new organisations.**



## Working in Partnership Copeland

For the members who are going to sit on the CI Panel, there should be guidance, on how CIF works as well as information on anti-fraud or anti-bribery training. Online training can be good for people who are used to working in offices, but this may not be suitable for everyone.

Q – Will members be given the option to have the onboarding documents etc online instead, a lot of people will prefer this?

A – Yes, different formats will be available

No further questions

### **AGENDA 5:**

#### **COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT (CPA) – PLAIN ENGLISH DRAFT**

The current version of the CPA is still being worked on and has not been shared with the Working Group. A plain English version is important as this is not a legal document and needs to be understood.

Q - When will we have a final draft?

A – Feedback has been given to the RWM legal team, hopefully by end of week.

Q - How many pages now?

A - The bulk of the document is the Terms of Reference (ToR) which is taken from the Working Group ToR, it's about 35 pages in total, with the majority of the content in support appendices. The front end is now about 5/6 pages. For the onboarding, it is important that members are taken through this step by step.

The current draft was shared on screen.

CBC have legal people who can review the CPA, the Parishes do not have this capacity. If this document is produced in its current form, there is a danger that they will feel that they don't have the capacity to deal with it.

Q - When looking at the Declaration of Interest is it signed on behalf of the Parish or the individual who is representing the Parish?

A –The Community Engagement Managers will go through the CPA step by step with each member. It should be the individual who declares their personal interests.

Q - Once the Parishes have met with RWM on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> November, will RWM meet those who are interested and go through the document?

A – That's what we have planned, and it will be explained in the meetings on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> November. It is hoped that by going through this document, it will help to explain the role of the Community Partnership.

**Action – Draft CPA to be shared with Working Group members.**

### **AGENDA 6:**

#### **CURRENT POSITION ON COMMUNITY PARTNERHIPS**

Cumbria County Council were sent a letter, as yet we haven't formally heard back from them.



## Working in Partnership Copeland

Q – County Council letter, was there a date for response?

A - It was left as an open letter.

A – The Chairs intent is to write to County Council again after the Copeland Borough Council decision on the 25<sup>th</sup> October.

Q - What is the position of the County councillors who are within the Search Area? Can the County Council stop them joining the Community Partnership?

A – From the Community Partnership view, only the County Council corporate body can allocate a representative(s) to the Community Partnership. County divisional members may apply/invited as community individuals or as representatives of other bodies which they may be affiliated to but for clarity they will not be representing the County Council in this capacity.

Q – Have we got an indication of the numbers of prospective Community Partnership members? Policy states around 12, what's the number going to be?

A - The Community Partnership is probably going to start from a larger number than 12, I don't see a way to keep this number lower especially at the beginning. As the Community Partnerships continues, we could be talking 10 -15 years, it may well be possible to reduce the numbers.

A – The Selection Panel felt it's right that each Parish within the Area for Consideration can be represented at the table, the Community Partnership will have to look into voting members. The Parishes will put their reps forward but elections in 2 years, will have to allow for substitutions.

A – Membership will change all the time. As long as the Parish is putting them forward, they will be accepted. Aware there will be turnover, and we will work with them to get them inducted and up to speed.

Q – Is the Community Partnership led by the community or RWM?

A – The Community Partnership will be guided by the Chair. The Community Partnership will work with the support teams, but the Community Partnership will belong to the community whose early task is to recruit a Chair.

Q – Will the timeframes will be led by RWM?

A – There will be several touch points between the Community Partnership and RWM investigations.

Reminder that there will be subgroups and stakeholder forums for people to get involved.

### **Comms**

We are currently in the call-in period until 25<sup>th</sup> October and a variety of content has been produced for when and if 2 x Community Partnerships are formed. There is also a press release prepared for launch and the final newsletter from the Working Group as the launch of the Community Partnership marks the end of the Working Group.

An interim website has been developed for each Community Partnership that is very similar to the Working Group website, but we don't want to make too many changes as this is for the Community Partnership to decide. Beyond that, there will also be a leaflet, draft comms and engagement plan. One of the options being considered is a leaflet in each Search Area which details the Search Area, the role of the Community Partnership, Community Investment Funding and how to get involved. It is probably going to be circulated early Jan. Digital adverts will commence in December with print advertising early January. The digital and print will focus more on membership and how the community can apply for funding, two crucial part of the forming a Community Partnership.



## Working in Partnership Copeland

### Social Media

There is only one social media account for the Working Group, after discussion with the RWM social media team, it has been decided that we cannot carry this account over as we are unable to do this for both Community Partnerships. In terms of fairness, this account will be closed, and each Community Partnerships will start afresh.

Q – Social media account – can they not exist in parallel?

A – If we were forming one Community Partnership, yes, but we can't do it with two. Can't give a group of followers to just one Community Partnership, it wouldn't be fair.

Q – What about the information, can it be transferred?

A - The information has already been captured and will be transferred.

A - There may be options to overlap them for a while with messaging regarding following the Community Partnership.

Q - On launch date, what mechanisms are in place to allow distribution of the funding, is there information going out on this date? Have to be careful as we don't have a CI panel, how are the Community Partnerships going to communicate and manage this?

A – RWM have a method and have started to build a timeline of activities. We currently have a proposed Programme of Activities, which will need to be developed further and agreed by the Community Partnership.

A - The online portal will be ready to accept applications from formation day. There will be leaflets to give out from day one. The Grants team are ready for this. The Community Partnership Community Investment (CI) Panel will meet every 8 weeks, with the first panel scheduled for January 2022.

### Action - share the Grants team timeline.

Q - Can we review what options are available, to ensure there are no delays to the processing of CIF applications?

Q – Having gone through the onboarding process, is there an expectation for new members to sit on the CI Panel. If this is the case then considering the onboarding process may take a few months, then the CI Panel maybe delayed? Is there an opportunity that the Working Group Selection Panel can be delegated the CI Panel responsibilities for the first three months for CIF application to be processed?

Q – Community Partnership members may not be able to sit on the CI Panel as they may have a vested interest in projects in their Parishes or are involved in seeking funding themselves.

A - The CI Panel membership as a minimum has to include RWM's Community Investment Manager, RWM Community Engagement Manager, Copeland Borough Council and Chair. The grants Manager has been asked for a timeline, including deadlines for applications and funding decision dates. Although the Community Partnership is forming in November, the first sitting of the CI Panel will be in January 2022.

Proposal – Initially utilise representatives of the Working Group Selection Panel (Chair, RWM, CBC) and CALC to form a CI panel. Memberships of the CI panel can be reviewed following the onboarding of prospective Community Partnership members.

### Consensus – agreed.



**AGENDA 7:**

**HANDOVER RECOMMENDATION FOR COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS**

**RWM**

RWM provided a briefing in July with regards to the opportunities of conducting a seismic investigation in the inshore area adjacent to the borough of Copeland. Based on Working Group recommendations RWM are committing to investigating the geology within the inshore area and are looking at securing the vessel with the expectation to commence this work in the summer months of 2022. The seismic survey objectives will be to attain a greater understanding of the Mercia Mudstone formation and tie into the existing surveys, which have been completed in the inshore area by other parties. As detailed securing a vessel and supporting regulatory approvals have a long lead time and in accordance with the Working Group recommendation RWM are committed to the summer months of 2022. RWM are seeking acknowledgement of support from the Working Group and the recognition that that this topic will need to be discussed early in 2 x Community Partnerships to ensure that aspects relating to community awareness can be discussed.

Q – Does this have to wait until the Parishes have had the opportunity to appoint someone to the Community Partnership?

A – As defined in Policy the accountability for investigations sits with RWM, and this is an RWM task. As a result, RWM are not directly seeking permission from the Community Partnership but acknowledges there will be a role for the Community Partnership, as this RWM activity may raise questions and concerns with the Community.

Q - If the community isn't happy, will RWM still go ahead and do it?

A – RWM are now in a position where they need to commit to do the seismic survey. Seismic is a long lead time item and we need to ensure it is recognised that this topic will need to be discussed as an early activity of the Community Partnership. As the seismic surveys will not be conducted until summer 2022, this will allow sufficient time to answer community questions and concerns. Depending on securing a vessel a seismic survey in summer 2022 would allow 5/6 months of raising awareness, gathering concerns and providing answers to questions raised.

Q – RWM will have to be cautious, it is with RWM to do this survey. There is an element of risk for RWM, as they need to book a vessel. The overall investigation works that RWM are planning will take years, and we need those Community Partnerships to request that information.

A - If the window for 2022 is missed, RWM will need to reschedule which will be subject to the market and external pressures, we shouldn't assume that this would be a simple 12-month deferment. The information to be provided by the seismic survey will be imperative to RWM investigations that support building an understanding of the geology in the inshore area.

A - There is a relationship between the Community Partnership program of activities and RWM investigations. We need to ensure there is clear messaging between RWM, Community Partnership and the community to ensure there is an understanding of the activities. This will help provide an opportunity for building trust.

Q – If it is a RWM decision as the developer, why couldn't the Working Group decide now to give support today, there is no reason to wait until the formation of the Community Partnership. The work needs to be done soon. We have been preparing various items and decisions to enable the Community Partnership to have a good start from day one. Could we not consider that this request from RWM today?





## Working in Partnership Copeland

Q – It stated in the press release that inshore would be a priority for geological investigations, it won't be considered much of a priority if lose the opportunity to conduct surveys next years. As far as South Copeland is concerned, if we don't do it offshore, then we don't do it at all as there is insufficient geology onshore.

Q - The decision we have taken for the Working Group to move to Community Partnership, then surely the Working Group can make a decision on seismic and RWM should have total confidence in ensuring the boat is secured for 2022.

Q - There is support from everyone in the Working Group for the work RWM are undertaking

Q - Why wait, the Working Group should make this decision?

Do we have the power in our remit that we can make that decision and pass to the Community Partnership?

Q - The question is do the Working Group support RWM's proposal and if they do, we can RWM advise representatives that they can report back its internal governance processes of our decision to support the proposal.

Q - What's the best way for this activity to be communicated to ensure its accordance e with the agreed recommendation and released statements?

### **Action – GT / BH to review Comms material**

Proposal – Does the Working Group agree to support RWM's proposal of conducting seismic surveys off the coast of Copeland in the summer of 2022.

**Decision – Following a review of the Copeland GDF Working Group objectives and the decision to form two Community Partnerships, the Working Group recommended that initial geological investigations focus in the inshore area off the coast of Copeland. The Working Group has subsequently agreed that they would support RWM conducting seismic surveys off the coast of Copeland in the summer of 2022. RWM will look to finalise its contractual arrangements and permit requirements to support these surveys in the near future.**

### **AGENDA 8:**

#### **CAMPAIGNS TEAM UPDATE – UPDATE WORKING GROUP ON THE PROGRESS OF THE COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP WEBSITE AND BRANDING**

Preparing for future Community Partnership, 3 items to share:

Updating Working Group logo to two variants for Mid and South Community Partnerships

Updates to website

Intend to have both websites on a staging server and share with Working Group members

Preparation for CIF – number of items being worked on, posters, leaflets, presentation deck and social media content.

Q - The Welcome from Chair, will this change when a new chair is appointed?

A – Yes

Q - Will the Working Group minutes be retained, or will it be added to as we go?

A – it is the understanding that they will be retained and show the evolution of the Working Group to Community Partnership.



## Working in Partnership Copeland

The desire is that this will be an evolution from Working Group to Community Partnership, there may be people who are aware of Working Group but not Community Partnership. Better than just starting from nothing.

Q - Social media, difficulties of two out of one, what will happen to the Working Group web address, will it take them to Community Partnership website, or will it just be dead?

A – Should be an auto redirect, don't have it confirmed yet.

Q - FAQ where they questions asked of RWM and the Working Group to date? Or asked in Copeland in the last 6 months?

A - Generated originally as set of questions most commonly asked.

It would be useful to have some narrative around this, following the exhibitions and questions asked.

Q - Is the website it updateable? Especially around funding? Has somebody within the Community Partnership ability to manage the content and completed updates?

A – Once live, content can be updated as and when required. Updates will be completed via GT as the comms lead on behalf the Community Partnerships.

Q = So it's easy for this group to do then?

A – Yes

**Action – look at questions that have been asked across Copeland and make sure they are addressed. GJ/JC**

**Action – JC to check that WG website is an auto redirect**

### **AGENDA 9:**

#### **A.O.B**

In accordance with previous decisions, each IP has been invited to become an interim member of the community partnership relevant to their IP status for a period of 3 months.

#### **IPs**

Action from Selection Panel to talk to IPs about any intentions to join a Community Partnership.

Irton Hall confirmed they will not be joining a Community Partnership.

Dave Faulkner confirmed he would be joining South Copeland Community Partnership as an interim member for a period of 3 months.

The Working Group are awaiting formal notification from Gener8 North with regards to Community Partnership

Opportunity taken to thank Irton Hall representative for all his hard work.

### **AGENDA 10:**



**DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**11<sup>th</sup> November 2021**

<b>Ref 211021</b>	<b>MEETING ACTION LOG</b>	
Agenda 4 Onboarding and Induction for CP Members	Community Engagement Managers to arrange GDPR Training for new members	GJ/KAnd
Agenda 4 Onboarding and Induction for CP Members	Onboarding and training requirements to be taken back to RWM for further consideration	GJ
Agenda 4 Onboarding and Induction for CP Members	Onboarding and training requirements to be reviewed	GJ/Chair
Agenda 5 Draft CPA	Draft CPA to be shared with Working Group members	CD
Agenda 6 Current Position on CP	Share the Grants Team timeline	HC
Agenda 6 Current Position on CP	Excess Funding	GJ/DM
Agenda 7 Handover Recommendations for CP	Check the wording of the announcements with Comms Team	GT
Agenda 8 Campaigns Update	Check the FAQ cover Copeland in past 6 months	JC
Agenda 8 Campaigns Update	Ensure that the questions from across Copeland are addressed	GJ/JC
Agenda 8 Campaigns Update	Check Working Group website redirects	JC
<b>Ref 211021</b>	<b>MEETING DECISION LOG</b>	
Agenda 4 Onboarding and Induction for CP Members	Selection Panel to form the CI Panel	ALL
Agenda 7 Handover Recommendations for CP	Working Group decided to support RWM in undertaking Seismic Survey	ALL