

From: Errol Lawson
To: [fracking inquiry](#)
Subject: Comments on the Report of NT Fracking Social Impacts | Beetaloo sub-basin case study
Date: Tuesday, 2 January 2018 4:59:18 PM
Attachments: [Social Impact consultation report Comments.docx](#)

I would be pleased if you would accept the attached Comments on the Report of NT Fracking Social Impacts | Beetaloo sub-basin case study Katherine (15 December 2017) for referral to the Inquiry Panel

Thank you

Errol Lawson

Katherine 15 December 2017

The purpose of this submission is to present an alternative version of the meeting held in Katherine on 5 December on the Social Impact of an unconventional gas industry. My view is that the meeting (Report at Attachment A) failed to elicit any useful information on the potential Social Impacts of Fracking. My contention is that there was useful information offered but it was not received, let alone noted and reported, because of the insistence of the presenter to follow a predetermined format outlined below which the attendees stated with increasing insistence was derived from:

1. An oversimplified description of the process; of the below ground processes of Fracking with no mention of the above ground activities. The attendees who opposed fracking have long since regarded this representation of Fracking as incomplete and misleading.
2. The economic impact report of ACIL Allen; incomplete in that it failed to consider economic impacts beyond Plugging and Abandonment and deficient in that it failed to break the predicted jobs into separate stages of Exploration, Production and Plugging and Abandonment, and the jobs within those stages into the three classifications of Direct, Indirect and Induced (Reference HIS Report December 2012) and show estimates of the phasing over time of the jobs in each of these classifications, noting that Direct jobs are highly skilled and predominately FIFO, Indirect may be a mixture of local and FIFO and Induced, effectively where the incomes are spent, will be proportional to the FIFO to Direct ratio.
3. The list of "issues" against which comments by attendees was expected suffered from the assumptions that Katherine was a green field as far as experiencing events which had a Social Impact and that an Unconventional gas industry would be the first ever event which could have a social impact.

The briefest consideration of the history of Katherine and surrounding region demonstrates that it has been subject to many events which have had social impacts. I define a social impact as a consequence of an unexpected event which interrupts the day to day activities of the people of the affected community. The scale of the unexpected event can range from catastrophic to minor inconvenience. This phenomenon of disturbed normality has been called punctuated equilibrium (Eldridge and Gould). The list below would be sufficient to show that the people and communities in the region regularly experience events the equilibrium punctuate whether they originate from Nature, Government or the Private sector:

- The 1998 flood
- The 2006 flood
- The Federal Government Intervention
- The withdrawal of Live Cattle Export licence
- The 2007 Closure of Gold Mines
- Poor 2015 tourist season-High Aussie dollar, high fuel process
- Mt Todd gold mine potential to contaminate the Edith River
- PFAS contamination of the Tindal aquifer

Additionally at a level of magnitude below the events listed above, there are daily events at the personal level which have a social impact, both positive and negative. The social impacts of the sample of any interrupting event generally include:

- Health concerns, short/long term, infants, pregnant women, children aged and infirm
- Identifying others who are seriously affected and need help
- Loss of business, recovery path including bridging support
- Loss of income
- Property destruction/damage/loss of value
- Wrestling with insurance issues, including Class Action complexities

The issue is not “What are the Social Impacts?” Consideration of the list above would indicate that there are social impacts occurring in the daily life of Katherine region and yet the Katherine Community continues on as a viable entity.

The real issue is “What capacities do the people have that enables them to manage the numerous social impacts and still persevere as a vital community?”

At the community consultation on 15 December 2017, I endeavoured, without success, to address that issue by raising the subject of the strong Social Capital, which I addressed in my submission of Social Licence (Reference to Fracking Inquiry May 2017). In that submission I outlined the strengths of the Social Capital in the Katherine region, based on the existence of multiple interlocked networks. I was seeking to establish with the consultants an understanding which is deeper than a list of consequences felt by people when the unexpected occurs. My contention is that just as a Social Licence is conferred by these multiple community networks so to the quality of Resilience is derived from these networks.

The current “event” of PFAS contamination of the aquifer is a current example of these networks in practice. The consequences for the community are already severe across the entire community and are continuing to unfold. One community response has been to establish a PFAS Community Consultation Committee (Ref Terms of Reference) with members drawn from several of the community networks. The committee includes people who are pro-fracking, anti-fracking and neutral. Respective positions on fracking are acknowledged as irrelevant to the PFAS issue and the committee gets on with its business of alleviating the social impacts of PFAS without the distraction of opposing positions on Fracking.

References

ACIL Allen FINAL REPORT To SCIENTIFIC INQUIRY INTO HYDRAULIC FRACTURING IN THE NORTHERN TERRITORY
THE ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF A POTENTIAL SHALE GAS DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORTHERN TERRITORY
October 2017 (Attachment A)

IHS Report December 2012 America’s New Energy Future: The Unconventional Oil and Gas evolution
and the US Economy Volume 2: State Economic Contributions

SOCIAL LICENCE--Some Observations. Errol Lawson Submission to the Fracking Inquiry 3 May
2017 (Attachment B)

Eldridge, N. & Gould, S.J. (1972). Punctuated Equilibria: An Alternative to Phyletic Gradualism. In T. J. M. Schopf (Ed.) *Models in Paleobiology*. (pp. 82-115) San Francisco, California: Freeman, Cooper & Company.

Katherine PFAS Community Consultation Committee Terms of Reference (at Attachment C)

Attachment A

NT Fracking Social Impacts | Beetaloo sub-basin case study
Social Impact Assessment – Supplementary consultation
Coffey | 2018121_Suppl_Consultation_20171215_Katherine.docx 1

Notes of consultation

Location, date and time

Date: Friday 15 December 2017

Time (from / to): 5:30 pm – 7 pm

Community/town: Katherine

Venue: Knotts Crossing

Estimated attendance

Adults Children (<14 years) Total

Males 6 0 6

Females 5 0 5

Total participants 11 0 11

Communities / organisations represented at consultation

- Katherine community members
- Pastoralist (Pastoral lease manager)

Questions and answers / concerns/issues raised

Concerns/issues

- A community member believes employment is not broken down into direct/indirect opportunities and is a weakness in every report. Until this is established you cannot expect a response.
- A community member made the statement that there is a complete level of mistrust in the process, government and companies coming into the area. It becomes difficult to sit through presentations when the community's views are not being listened to. The government will accept the mining company's interests at the community's expense. Living through PFAS contamination. The lies are insulting.
- A community member who is a retired engineer believes the project management in the schedule presented is not plausible. We cannot be asked to comment on this. Our mistrust is well founded.
- A community member believes this will affect us whether a long way away or next door.

NT Fracking Social Impacts | Beetaloo sub-basin case study

Social Impact Assessment – Supplementary consultation

Coffey | 2018121_Suppl_Consultation_20171215_Katherine.docx 2

- A community member believes the mining companies will accept the terms and conditions, then plough through sacred sites, contaminate the water, and say sorry. Social rejection of the entire practice. The damage is done.
- A community member stated Rio Tinto cannot afford rehabilitation.
- A community member stated their complete distrust of the NT and Federal Governments – the oil companies are in their pockets. Bonds, paper signatures mean nothing. Nothing from the government will change their mind. Australia for our children's future is needed.
- A community member has concern for the stress the community is under. The skills and characteristics and social networks the community has keeps them resilient. They've been through this over and over.
- A community member has an issue with the fracking believed to be taking place on the Barkley Tableland

Questions and answers

Question 1

A community member questioned the amount of jobs presented in the model - 170? What is this worth

if it has the possibility of destroying the water quality? All these jobs won't go to local people – they'll go to other states/overseas.

Answer

The presenter made the observation some jobs in this industry are very specialised. A lot of production is by machines. However opportunities might be created, for example, studying an engineering degree.

Question 2

A community member asked what the breakdown of the specialities is. No other scenario is given

here.

Answer

The presenter responded the final draft report has details about local involvement.

Question 3

A community member stated a lot of mining companies have left Katherine with high debts. What will happen here if they leave and leave a mess? How will this affect us? Badly?

Answer

The presenter responded that the final draft report has a section on social license to operate and the financial indemnities the companies will be required to make.

Question 4

A community member asked who will make the regulatory checks?

Answer

The presenter responded that the final draft report talks about independent third party assessment. Community members can become involved.

Attachment B

SOCIAL LICENCE--Some Observations

Abstract

This paper was prompted by the observation that after some years of interaction between the gas industry, NT government and regional stakeholders and communities, a Social Licence conferred by the populace on the gas industry for the development of an unconventional gas production field has not emerged. The situation in the Northern Territory is paralleled by the Findings of the SA Government Inquiry into Unconventional Gas (Fracking) in the South East of South Australia: Final Report 29 November 2016. Finding No 1 states:

Without social licence, unconventional gas exploration/development should not proceed in the South East of South Australia. The committee found that social licence to explore/develop unconventional gas does not yet exist in the South East of South Australia

This paper examines the characteristics of the industry from three different aspects and concludes that the necessary and sufficient conditions do not exist for the emergence of a Social Licence for the unconventional gas project.

Definitions

The term Social Licence is not amenable to precise definition. The two most useful and recent definitions I can find were provided by Mr Troy Bell MP, the Member for Mount Gambier and by GISERA, in their respective submissions to the SA Government Natural Resources Committee in June 2016. Mr Bell offered the committee a definition of the term social licence:

The term “social licence,” or “social licence to operate,” generally refers to a local community’s acceptance or approval of a project or a company’s ongoing presence. It is usually informal and intangible, and is granted by a community based on the opinions and views of stakeholders, including local populations, aboriginal groups, and other interested parties. Due to this intangibility, it can be difficult to determine when social licence has been achieved for a project. Social licence may manifest in a variety of ways, ranging from absence of opposition to vocal support or even advocacy, and these various levels of social licence (as well as, of course, the absence of social licence) may occur at the same time among different interested parties.

GISERA, a collaborative vehicle established by CSIRO and Australia Pacific LNG reported in a 2013 literature review;

The term “Social Licence to Operate” or “Social Licence” is gaining prominence in the resources sector as the industry increasingly focuses on recognising the interests of communities affected by mining activities. As originally conceived, the notion of a social licence to operate reflects the idea that society is able to grant or withhold support for a company and its operations; with the extent of support being dependent on how well a company meets societal expectations of its behaviour and impacts. A social licence is tacit, intangible and context specific. It needs to be earned and is dynamic, as people’s experiences and perceptions of an operation shift over time. (INQUIRY INTO UNCONVENTIONAL GAS (FRACKING) IN THE SOUTH EAST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA Pages 35-36. Parliament of South Australia 36 Natural Resources Committee Tabled in the House of Assembly and ordered to be published 29 November 2016. ¹

¹ The complete extract from pages 35-36 is at Appendix A.

There might be merit in extracting a list of key words from these definitions and assessing the performance of the gas industry against each key word. But giving imprecise data the appearance of precision does nothing to improve its quality.

In the following section I describe a real world example in the Katherine Region and identify the activities of a successful campaigner in transforming a negative local attitude into a Social Licence, generalise these characteristics into principles and assess the performance of the gas industry against these principles.

Mt Todd success story.

The example in the Katherine Region is the transformation of the community attitude to the environmentally degraded abandoned Mt Todd gold mine from highly negative to supportive of the efforts of Vista Gold to re-establish the mine. This conversion has been brought about by the efforts of Brent Murdoch², Director and General Manager of Vista Gold Australia, who:

1. Employs local people
2. Communicates regularly with the community via the Media and presence at Katherine Show
3. Is consistent in responding to concerns about pollution of the Edith River in an open and non-defensive manner
4. Is a single point of contact who can speak for the entire local organisation
5. Conducts a series of visits to the Mt Todd site

Generalising these activities yields some basic principles:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Employs local people | Has a permanent presence in the community |
| 2. Communicates | In charge of public relations across the project |
| 3. Consistent in responding to concerns | Fundamental to the formation of Trust |
| 4. Single point of contact | Identifies as the Go-to person for latest information, Controls the release of information (Trust and communication skills are essential); corrects misinformation whatever the source. |
| 5. Site visits | Facilitates development of communication, trust and relationship building. |

This examination of re-formation of a Social Licence for the Mt Todd gold mine identifies basic principles for the formation of a Social Licence between an Industry intending to undertake a project and the Community which would be affected by that project. An unconventional gas project would be on a much larger scale, and there may be problems in scaling up. However even allowing for possible bias, I am unable to identify any behaviour or activity which matches these principles. The following comparison gives my assessment of the match between the principles and the gas industry activities:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Has a permanent presence in the community | <i>May include sub-contractors and service providers, but not as part of the social fabric.</i> |
|--|---|

² I have Mr Murdoch's permission to use Mt Todd as an example of formation of a Social Licence.

2. Identifies as the Go-to person for latest information *No public relations activity such as interactions inviting discussions and resolution of concerns and misunderstandings.*
3. Fundamental to the formation of Trust *Consistency in denying any grounds for concern; No attempt to develop a foundation of Trust*
4. Controls the release of information *Industry controls the release of information supportive of the project, but allows inconsistencies to persist eg the number of wells implied by the extent of the resource.*
5. Facilitates development of communication etc. *No sign of recognition of the need for development of communication, trust and relationship building.*

The very brief analysis of the activities and behaviour of the proponents of the unconventional gas project above is probably sufficient to explain the lack of a Social Licence. However it begs the question as to whether the industry could, if it wanted to, do anything about it. The question is:

Is anything intrinsic in the unconventional gas industry which would prevent the implementation of these or similar principles for the formation and maintenance of a Social Licence for the unconventional gas project, albeit scaled up.

Discussion

I first became aware of the unconventional gas proposal in November 2013, and over the intervening years and as far as I can see, the industry has not changed its approach and has refrained from meaningful dialogue with those who express concerns about the long term social, environmental and economic consequences of their proposal. The interaction with community groups which have raised issues of concern has been adversarial. In no way could the interactions between the gas industry spokespersons and community groups opposing the unconventional gas project, be characterised as following the same approach as that of Vista Gold for the formation of a Social Licence.

Intent

By way of understanding this refusal to engage in meaningful dialogue, I had examined the possibility that the industry pays lip service to the need for a Social Licence, confident in the knowledge that the Law is on their side. The basic belief is summed up in reported interactions between some pastoralists and exploration people as:

Even if a land holder/occupier objects, after a period of negotiation and mediation, the Crown will enforce access over the landholder objections.

The behaviour stemming from this belief is certainly present in some areas of the industry expressed in the statement, “we are coming whether you like it or not and you can’t stop us.” It is not clear if this behaviour stems from sub-contractors, service providers or the company holding the exploration licence. It matters not to the stakeholders who attribute such behaviour to the industry as a whole. None of the five activities identified above for the formation of the Mt Todd Social Licence are present. Particularly absent are:

- Identification of a Go-To person who has authority to speak for the total conglomerate of enterprises associated with the unconventional gas project.
- Consistent in responding to concerns by stakeholders
- No site visits e.g. an open day at the Amungee IV well could have garnered positive responses.

From this analysis there can be no surprise that the unconventional gas project proposed for the Katherine Region has no Social Licence from the majority of stakeholders. There are some stakeholders e.g. pastoralists, sub-contractors and service providers who have benefitted from work for the project. I suggest that these are commercial arrangements and are not evidence of a Social Contract.

Pervasive factors

The presentations of industry representatives to the Pepper Inquiry lead me to additional explanations, generally applicable to the industry as a whole. That is that the industry has both a structural impediment to the formation of a Social Licence and a cultural/philosophical mismatch between their internal belief systems and the behaviour necessary to support a Social Licence with stakeholders.

Structural Impediment

The structural impediment arises from:

- The gas industry project includes a number of competing companies/joint ventures pursuing their own programs.
- Within those companies/joint ventures and supply chains, the separation of functions into a set of elements which deal with specialised activities.
- The common denominator is the APPEA whose main public activities appear to be promotion of the project and neutralisation of opposition.

But APPEA has no authority to direct an across-the-industry program to develop a Social Licence, involving the permission from companies and their supply chain sub-contractors to orchestrate the interactions between outsiders and elements within the unconventional gas project. As the Mt Todd example demonstrates, the formation of a Social Licence requires a single point of contact between the industry and the community stakeholders. That single point of contact must be able to speak for all the industry and be able to respond to concerns/complaints arising from the stakeholders, from all sections of the industry. That person must also have the support, high level support, from the industry to correct industry employees whose behaviour is incompatible with the formation and maintenance of a Social Licence.

This structural impediment is sufficient to ensure that a Social Licence cannot emerge. There is a further obstacle which goes to the core of the belief system of the industry.

Cultural Mismatch

To this point the paper has taken a view of the industry and its activities and behaviour and analysed those features as they are found or not found. This section starts from one of the many social science theories and analyses the industry from that perspective.

Social Capital is

The cultural/philosophical mismatch was evident in the presentations of the Origin Team, particularly the use of the phrases “public good” by David Close and “benefit of all” by Ross Evans. The paragraphs including these phrases are at Appendix B

The language is redolent of the mid to late 19th century philosophy expounded by Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mills known as Utilitarianism. This is often (incorrectly) taken to mean when a decision or action is under consideration the sole guiding principle is “the greatest good for the greatest number”. The two references cited elaborate on this founding principle with the following caveats:

- Do no harm.
- If there is an increase in the Good as an outcome, Equity requires that there should not be an increase in the Bad elsewhere in the Society.
- Be aware of the human tendency to favour the immediate increase in the Good and discount the long term increase in the Bad.
- If an increase in the Bad is foreseen for some sections of Society, Justice requires that those sections are heard and
- Have an alternate plan for comparison of the Good/Bad ratios.

There does seem to be a pattern of attitude and behaviour within the industry which is consistent with its self-identification as the provider of Good and a belief system based on the mantra of “the greatest good for the greatest number.” This mantra is a serious oversimplification of the philosophical theories of Bentham and Stuart Mills and I submit has led to an insistence that the unconventional gas project in the Northern Territory is all Good and there will be no Bad, either during the project or into the future.

SUMMARY

This paper poses three reasons for the failure of the gas industry to achieve a Social Licence with the communities located in the Katherine Region for an unconventional gas exploration and production.

The first, characterised as “lack of intent” relies on the Crown enforcing entry against the wishes of the land holder/occupier and is present in some but not all, sections of the project.

The second, characterised as “structural impediment”, suggests that even were the intent present, the structure of the industry, both horizontally between competing companies/joint ventures, and vertically, down through the supply chains of the service and support sub-contractors, would frustrate the intention.

The third, which goes to the belief system which drives the actions and decisions of the gas industry, is traceable to the utilitarianism model of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mills.

The simplistic version alluded to by one of the Origin Team, is:

The greatest good for the greatest number.

As outlined above the simplistic version is a most pervasive obstacle to the formation of a Social Licence.

CONCLUSION

This analysis indicates that the necessary and sufficient conditions for the formation of a Social Licence to the gas industry for the exploration and production of unconventional gas by the stakeholders in the Katherine region do not exist.

References

Hospers, John. *Human Conduct; An Introduction to the Problems of Ethics*. Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc. New York 1961.

INQUIRY INTO UNCONVENTIONAL GAS (FRACKING) IN THE SOUTH EAST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA
Parliament of South Australia 36 Natural Resources Committee Tabled in the House of Assembly and ordered to be published 29 November 2016

Appendix A

INQUIRY INTO UNCONVENTIONAL GAS (FRACKING IN THE SOUTH EAST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA Parliament of South Australia 36 Natural Resources Committee. Page 35-36

Mr Troy Bell MP, the Member for Mount Gambier, appeared before the NRC in June 2016 to talk about community concerns around social licence. "This is a contentious issue," he said. "Every week, there is either an article or an opinion piece, both for or against fracking in the South-East." These articles were so numerous, Mr Bell noted the difficulty of keeping track of them: "The folder would be very thick if I put in every article that's been written." Mr Bell offered the committee a definition of the term social licence:

The term "social licence," or "social licence to operate," generally refers to a local community's acceptance or approval of a project or a company's ongoing presence. It is usually informal and intangible, and is granted by a community based on the opinions and views of stakeholders, including local populations, aboriginal groups, and other interested parties. Due to this intangibility, it can be difficult to determine when social licence has been achieved for a project. Social licence may manifest in a variety of ways, ranging from absence of opposition to vocal support or even advocacy, and these various levels of social licence (as well as, of course, the absence of social licence) may occur at the same time among different interested parties.

This understanding of the concept is supported by a report by GISERA, a "collaborative vehicle established by CSIRO and Australia Pacific LNG to undertake publicly reported

research addressing the socio-economic and environmental impacts of Australia's natural gas industries". In a 2013 literature review, GISERA reported:

The term "Social Licence to Operate" or "Social Licence" is gaining prominence in the resources sector as the industry increasingly focuses on recognising the interests of communities affected by mining activities. As originally conceived, the notion of a social licence to operate reflects the idea that society is able to grant or withhold support for a company and its operations; with the extent of support being dependent on how well a company meets societal expectations of its behaviour and impacts. A social licence is tacit, intangible and context specific. It needs to be earned and is dynamic, as people's experiences and perceptions of an operation shift over time.

Appendix B:

Extracts from Origin-Hearing Transcript 10 March 2017

David Close page 6

The ability to negotiate land access is critical, not just for on-shore gas, but for the entire resources sector. We believe that it's government's role to determine whether a resource is developed and balanced the public good against other factors. A landholder veto would undermine this responsibility and put individual leaseholder rights above those of the public good. It would also put great responsibility and a burden on any individual to decide whether a project of potentially national significance should proceed or not. This is the role of government. A simple, clear land access framework creates a base which supports collaborative and equitable negotiations between companies and landholders.

David Close Page 6

The ability to negotiate land access is critical, not just for on-shore gas, but for the entire resources sector. We believe that it's government's role to determine whether a resource is developed and balanced the public good against other factors. A landholder veto would undermine this responsibility and put individual leaseholder rights above those of the public good. It would also put great responsibility and a burden on any individual to decide whether a project of potentially national significance should proceed or not. This is the role of government. A simple, clear land access framework creates a base which supports collaborative and equitable negotiations between companies and landholders.

Ross Evans page 9

At Origin, we believe that a veto on land access would prioritise the rights of an individual over the rights of the public. Instead, we believe it is the role of government to provide a regulatory framework that enables resources to be developed for the benefit of all.

Attachment C

Katherine PFAS Community Consultation Group TERMS OF REFERENCE

DEPARTMENT OF THE CHIEF MINISTER Page 1 of 5 10 October 2017, Version 1.0

1 Background and Scope

Per- and poly-fluorinated alkyl substances (PFAS) have been used in a wide variety of industrial and commercial products, including textiles, food packaging, inks, paints, and sealants, floor waxes, cleaning products, pesticides and fire-fighting foams.

These chemicals have been identified worldwide as emerging contaminants of concern due to their toxicity, highly persistent nature, mobility in the environment and significant potential for bioaccumulation and biomagnification.

The Northern Territory Government has assembled the PFAS Interagency Steering Committee (PFASISC) in response to community concerns from emerging contamination issues associated with the historical use of PFASs and an expectation from Government and the community that further actions be taken to address these concerns in the Northern Territory (NT). The primary function of the PFASISC is to lead the NT Government input into the Commonwealth led Inter Governmental Agreement (IGA) and the development and implementation of a strategy that will be used to manage PFAS-related issues in the NT.

The PFASISC will coordinate responses and tasks for managing PFAS in the Northern Territory.

2 Purpose

The Katherine PFAS Community Consultation Group (KPCCG) has been established to provide a mechanism for two-way communication with the community. The KPCCG will help with the timely sharing of the latest information relating to PFAS and receiving community specific information first hand from community representatives.

Information may be sourced or provided to the KPCCG either directly from NT government agencies, the Department of Defence or the PFASISC.

3 Role

The Katherine PFAS Community Consultation Group:

- Provides a direct communication and information conduit between the Northern Territory Government, Department of Defence and the Katherine community;
- Works in partnership with key stakeholders and community members to identify and understand community concerns regarding, the dissemination of relevant, timely and accurate information regarding PFAS in the Katherine area and ensure these are relayed to relevant agencies; and
- Provides advice to the PFASISC on the mechanisms by which the community wishes to be kept informed of government responses and information.

4 Membership

The KPCCG consist of representatives from the community of Katherine from a range of areas including business, local government, industry and community groups as well as subject matter experts representing the Department of Health, Power Water Corporation and the Department of Defence and the Department of the Chief Minister.

Term of Appointment

Members are appointed for a 12 month period. Members may resign at any time they feel unable to offer informed advice regarding their sector of representation. Members will be eligible for reappointment in another term.

(Schedule 1)

5 Responsibilities and Expectations

KPCCG members will be required to:

- Regularly attend meetings
- Read relevant documents prior to meetings
- Participate in a constructive and informed manner
- Respect and acknowledge the views and opinions of others
- Use agreed meeting outcomes of the KPCCG in all communication forums
- Reflect comments which have been provided by their formal community networks
- Share agreed meeting outcomes with their formal community networks
- Support the KPCCG, chairperson and secretariat by providing feedback on issues in a timely manner
- Remain focused on the issues relating to the discussion topic
- Be concise when presenting views
- Respect the confidentiality of views

Chairperson will be required to:

- Facilitate the meeting by managing the agenda and order of proceedings
- Ensure active participation by all committee members
- Encourage a variety of opinions to be heard
- Maintain decorum and ensure fairness and accountability

6 Meetings

Chairperson Department of the Chief Minister, Regional Executive Director. The Chairperson is to be a convenor and facilitator. The Chairperson is the conduit for information between the KPCCG and the PFASISC.

Frequency On a monthly basis or as necessary at the request of the group or the PFASISC.

Secretariat Department of the Chief Minister, Regional Coordinator. The Secretariat will be responsible for the preparation and circulation of the meeting agenda and minutes.

Quorum Majority of KPCCG members are present for the duration of the meeting.

Proxies Accepted.

Agenda and papers Distributed at least one week prior to the meeting.

Minutes and actions Distributed at a maximum of one week following the meeting. Minutes of the previous meeting must be confirmed at the meeting along with a review of action items

Location Conference Room, 1st Floor Katherine Government Centre

Meetings are closed to the public

7 Agenda Items / Papers

The KPCCG will operate under a standard agenda consisting of:

- Welcome and apologies
- Previous minutes
- Current and outstanding action items
- Updates and presentations
- Other business
- Close of meeting and next meeting date

8 Communication Protocol

- Communications emanating from group meetings should be a reflection of the agreed outcomes of discussions at the meeting.

- Any communication of a sensitive nature shall be recommended to the PFASISC for ratification.
- An advisory group member should not speak on behalf of the group unless prior approval has been agreed by the group.
- Group members should refrain from characterising the views of, or attributing comments to, other group members.
- Group members must clearly identify whether they are speaking in their capacity as an advisory group member, or as a private citizen, where appropriate.

9 Review

The effectiveness and membership of the KPCCG will be reviewed every 3 months in consultation with the PFASISC.

SCHEDULE 1

Proposed Membership Title	First name	Surname	Position	Company/Organisation	Suburb
Dr	Errol	Lawson	Resident	Resident	KATHERINE
Mr	Anthony	Bartlett	Resident	Resident (Tindal rural catchment area)	KATHERINE
Ms	Natalie	Ellis	Resident	Aboriginal Community Leader	KATHERINE
Ms	Eslyn	Fletcher	CEO	Katherine Region Allied Health Services	KATHERINE
Ms	Merlyn	Smith	Resident	Resident	KATHERINE
Mr	Robert	Jennings	CEO	Katherine Town Council	KATHERINE
Ms	Sue	Jones	Executive Officer	Chamber of Commerce	KATHERINE
Mr	Kevin	Grey	President	Chamber of Commerce	KATHERINE
Ms	Meg	Geritz	Community radio	8KTR Katherine Community Radio	KATHERINE
Mr	Allan	Domaschenz	Resident	Owner of Betty's Trash'n'Treasure	KATHERINE
Ms	Lisa	Mumbin	Chairperson	Jawoyn Association Aboriginal Corporation	KATHERINE
Mayor	Fay	Miller	Mayor	Katherine Town Council	KATHERINE
Ms	Petrena	Ariston	Resident	Top Didj Arts	KATHERINE
Mr	Warren	De with	Owner	Katherine	KATHERINE

Mr	Craig	Stevens	General Manager	Rod'n'Rifle (chairperson of AFANT) Tropical Treasures (ag industry)	KATHERINE
Mr	Jake	Quinlivan (Chair)	Regional Executive Director	Department of the Chief Minister	KATHERINE
Mr	Chris	Horton	Area Manager	Power Water Corporation	KATHERINE
Dr	Xavier	Schobben	Director Environmental Health	Department of Health, Environmental Health Branch	DARWIN
Mr	Mathew	Clarke	Katherine based representative	Department of Defence	KATHERINE
Mr	Nathanael	Knapp (Secretariat)	Regional Coordinator	Department of the Chief Minister	KATHERINE