

MEETING MINUTES

Central North West Stakeholder Reference Group

Meeting #3

Date	20 July 2023
Time	11:00am – 1:00pm
Presenters	Kim Mallee (KM) Charlie McAlister (CM) Alicia Leis (AL) Suki Hopgood-Douglas (SH)
Location	Cradle Coast Authority Chambers, Burnie

Attendees

Name	Organisation
Romy Greiner	Community Member
Alan Bradford (online)	Advance West North West
Greg Fenwick	Kentish and Latrobe Councils
Mathew Skirving	Devonport Council
Chris Griffin	Northern Tasmania Development Corporation
Iona Flett	Cradle Coast Authority
Alina Bain (proxy online)	Regional Development Australia Tasmania
Cheryl Fuller (proxy)	Central Coast Council

Apologies

Name	Organisation
Elise Kaine	Community member

Agenda

Ref no.	Item
1.0	Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country
2.0	Update: Mapping Important Places
3.0	Presentation: What is Community Benefit Sharing (CBS)?
4.0	Short Break
5.0	Pulse Check: CBS level of understanding in community
6.0	Discussion: Planning for CBS with community
7.0	Activity: Considering factors to inform CBS
8.0	Q&A, Wrap up and next steps

Minutes

Ref no.	Item
1.0	<p>Welcome and Acknowledgment of Country</p> <p>AL acknowledged country. AL introduced the session and facilitated a whip around the room for introductions and to those who were participating online.</p> <p>The previous SRG Minutes were endorsed.</p>
2.0	<p>Update: Mapping Important Places</p> <p>CM provided an update on the progress in relation to the mapping important places initiative.</p> <p>SRG members noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has there been any contact or direct engagement with schools/ CWA etc? • How are we sure the data is robust and representative? • How long is the tool open [online] for? • How will the data be used and how will it be weighted? <p>CM verbally summarised answers to these questions:</p> <p>There has been some direct engagement with interested groups in the region, however not with schools as yet. ReCFIT is investigating a coordinated approach to engaging with schools in the north west.</p> <p>The qualitative data, provided in the descriptions once a pin is dropped, is showing key insights and themes. Also once a data drawdown is collected at the end of July, demographic and metrics such as age and postcode will provide insights. The quantitative data, i.e. number of submissions is not statistically significant.</p>

3.0

Presentation: What is Community Benefit Sharing (CBS)?

The SRG members engaged with a presentation from Kim Mallee, Director of Community Power Agency.

Questions asked of the group during the presentation were:

Have you seen community benefit sharing in action previously?
Are there any community visions / strategies that would inform what is important to central and north west districts?
What opportunities can you identify in relation to benefit sharing?

The input from the SRG was as follows:

- Would the government legislate for community benefit sharing? ReCFIT indicated that the purpose of REZ was to provide a framework for project proponents to operate within, which would include benefit sharing.
- Is training within the community part of benefit sharing?
- Is housing regarded as benefit sharing?

SRG experience with CBS:

SRG members noted a range of experience with community benefit sharing including the following experiences:

- TasNetworks utilised a youth forum to deliberate on community benefit sharing options. A grant program model was landed on.
- Bell Bay Aluminium – regional fund:
 - Handed to regional body to manage,
 - Rio Tinto global provided \$100,000 to distribute to small businesses.
 - There was an underspend, and the model was flexible enough to pivot and channel towards an Aboriginal tourism project.
- West Coast renewables example – absolute need for collaboration on youth and training,
 - 115 members – industry-based,
 - Touched 4500 people,
 - Challenge is who is responsible for coordinating?
- Whole-of-life support is an important principle – concern is that council or community receives a ‘sugar hit’ in funding but wears long term cost.
- Community is wary of money ‘buying’ agreement – the community wants more than just money.
- Don’t replicate or cost-shift from existing funding.
- Community benefits must be proportional to the level of funding e.g. a percentage of capital expenditure:
 - Enables investment and continued revenue.
- Permanency – lifetime of project.
- Legacy – infrastructure at end of life,
 - Removal and remediation.
- Do we consider percentage of profits?
 - Is cost per MW transparent? If capacity, yes. This reflects impact of investment regardless of profitability. Would be built into cost base of project.

4.0	15 min break
5.0	<p>Pulse Check: CBS level of understanding in community</p> <p>When asked on a scale ranging from ‘never heard of it’ to ‘a once in a generational opportunity’ SRG members noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A benefit-sharing model might be labelled: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ‘Compensation’, ○ ‘Purchasing social licence’. • Will be positive, only for some people. • The community has a long memory – many people will be cynical.
6.0	<p>Planning for CBS in community</p> <p>SRG members noted the following possible needs and aspirations for the community, which could utilise funds from benefit sharing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cradle Coast NRM strategy outlines priorities for environmental benefits and would be a good place to start. • Cost of living and housing pressure. • Population drain of the younger generation. • There are currently three discussions going on in the region: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pumped Hydro, Marinus and REZ – Can we coordinate? ○ This would lower the fatigue levels in the community. • Rural cooperatives – could deliver more. • Integration and strategy are critical principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Transmission, storage, and infrastructure should be grouped together and brought to the community table for discussion. • RDA’s 2023 Strategic Regional Plan outlines community needs. • Community benefits must flow through contracts across feasibility, construction and operating entities. • SRG members noted there are many strategies across the region that articulate challenges and needs for community. • Scale of CBS and the neighbourhood-level sharing concept: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Goes beyond compensation and hosting, ○ This is really important for overcoming resistance. • Planning phase is creating angst. • Benefits must flow early. • There’s interest in seeing how benefits could flow equitably across multiple projects. <p>Multiple projects</p> <p>SRG members were asked how they could see a regional multi-project benefit sharing model work. Members noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance framework – what could it be and how could it be supported? e.g. Cradle Coast may support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Utilise the governance of other existing grant programs – build capacity within it and further support to enable delivery and management.

- Neighbourhood concept must be front and centre, particularly at conception.
- Concern on the number of players involved:
 - How do we aggregate the key players (developers), regarding multiple players each having their own process.
- Who is accountable for coordinating? ReCFIT?
- Project location is solvable – the key issue here is transmission.
- Government rules on REZ – must align incentives with social responsibilities.
- Guidelines must be enforceable.

Opportunities and identified focus areas for CBS

SRG members were asked to offer regional opportunities for future benefit sharing:

- Housing
- Digital literacy and access
- Youth and training
- Cost of living
- Cheaper power
- Job creation / job retention / talent retention
- Energy
- Food
- Health
- Environmental (NRM strategy).

SRG members identified a need for initial conversations to begin within community:

- REZ SRG is a good place to start.
- More community members are needed.
- Collaborate and build capacity with an informed group first to design and then consult more broadly.
- Must be a layered approach to face-to-face engagement on CBS:
 - Councils
 - Industry
 - Currently lacking state government support – AWWN has a plan
 - The current SRG is too limited in scope.
- Engaging neighbours – as some are highly cynical:
 - Sincere and appropriate consideration should take place before another governance body is established.
- Simplify by bringing all proponents to the table (of all projects currently being discussed in the region):
 - Re-think and use appropriate means of communication,
 - Can we stop all other consultation processes? Is that possible?
- Must build understanding and capacity to understand:
 - This presentation would be very helpful to share with more people in the community.
- Will need to build trust.

7.0

Considering factors to inform CBS

Factors to inform community benefit sharing were discussed throughout the

	CPA presentation.
8.0	<p>Wrap up and next meeting</p> <p>The SRG noted the following as a summary from the discussions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will other government entities come together into this discussion? • Will the election cycle impact this process? • Councils will need to lean into this process. • Barriers are being created from poor existing processes. • Within the region it appears that the project level issues are solvable, but it is the transmission and regional REZ impacts that will be harder. • Legislation must be the hook to make guidance enforceable. • Elected members must be briefed. • Can the outcomes of SRG discussions be reflected in the draft guidelines? Is there ability to strengthen the guidelines? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The future directions paper will be instrumental in reflecting SRG feedback.

Actions

No.	Action	Owner	Due
1	Send Minutes to SRG for one round of feedback	ReCFIT	
2	Provide CPA presentation to SRG if possible	ReCFIT	