Final version approved on 24/07/2026 by the NCCPE directory

Project Plan

Co-development of NCCPE resource for racially equitable public engagement

Vanessa Mignan Jenkins

Emily Dawson

Siddharth Kankaria

Table of contents

01 Project overview **3**
- Objectives 3
- Stakeholders 3
- The resource in brief 3
- Prioritising social justice 4

02 Governance and collaboration structures **5**
- The 7 governance and collaboration structures 5
- RACOI Matrix 6
- Decision-making process and conflict resolution 7
- Trust and transparency 8

03 Equitable and anti-racist co-development **8**
- Authorship and recognition principles 9
- Equity commitments 9
- Raising concerns 10
- Anti-racist approach to conflict resolution and repair 10
- Contributors and stakeholders' wellbeing and trauma-informed practice 11

04 Project methodology **13**
- Development stage 1: Scoping 13
- Development stage 2: Blueprint 14
- Development stage 3: Resource development 14
- Development stage 4: User testing and final refinement 15

05 Project timeline **16**
- Timeline table 17

06 Risk management **20**
- Risk mitigation table 20

07 Review process **23**
- Review stages table 24

08 Monitoring, reporting, success measures **26**
- Monitoring 26
- Reporting and success measures 27

Appendix **28**

01 Project overview

Objectives

The objective of this project is to co-develop an accessible, action-oriented online resource that helps Public Engagement Professionals (PEPs) embed racially equitable practices throughout the public engagement cycle. The resource responds to evidence that racial equity is often treated as an add-on rather than a central standard in public engagement. By focusing on user-centred design, practical tools and reflective practice, the project will support change in institutional and individual engagement practice.

Stakeholders

The primary audience and co-creators of the resource are Public Engagement Professionals (PEPs), whose needs, experiences and feedback shape the resource.

The NCCPE is the commissioning body and platform provider. The IAG-RE contributes as a partner in co-development and review. The project lead for the NCCPE is Alison Wright.

The resource team, Vanessa Mignan Jenkins, Emily Dawson and Siddharth Kankaria, will coordinate and develop the resource. Vanessa Mignan Jenkins is the project lead for the resource team and Emily Dawson is the Equity lead.

The resource in brief

The resource is modular, interactive and practical, with accessible tools. It is co-authored, user-tested and grounded in lived experience, evidence and collaboration. After handover, NCCPE will sustain and update the resource through annual content reviews, feedback and liaison with

key partners.

Prioritising social justice

This project is grounded in our commitment to social justice. Our approach recognises that equitable public engagement requires changing practices and processes, redistributing power, centring minoritised voices and strengthening trust within and across communities of practice. The project will prioritise these principles throughout its duration.

→ **Centring racial equity:** Racial equity is embedded throughout the project and must be prioritised explicitly and centrally.

→ **Inclusive co-development:** The resource is co-developed with PEPs, the IAG-RE, in collaboration with a diverse range of PEPs. Their lived experience, expertise and critical perspectives influence the content and structure.

→ **Accessible and contextualised design:** We are committed to designing a resource that is accessible, usable and relevant for PEPs working in a variety of institutional, cultural and geographic contexts. This includes plain language, layered content and multiple entry points for different levels of experience and need.

→ **Diverse representation:** Contributors from diverse racial, cultural and professional backgrounds will be actively engaged throughout the project. Case studies, scenarios and examples reflect a variety of perspectives, avoiding tokenism and authentically representing the diversity of racialised experiences in public engagement.

02 Governance and collaboration structures

This project models the change we seek in public engagement practice by emphasising shared responsibility and accountability among all stakeholders, especially those from racially minoritised groups, fostering a sense of collective purpose.

The 7 governance and collaboration structures

→ **The project leads:** responsible for day-to-day management and coordination
Members: Alison Wright and Vanessa Mignan Jenkins

→ **The resource team:** responsible for content development, coordination and delivery.
Members: Vanessa Mignan Jenkins, Emily Dawson and Siddharth Kankaria.

→ **The working group:** accountable for the resource major approvals, scope changes and responsible for making final decisions on these matters.
Members: Alison Wright, Niyah Campbell, Sophie Evans, Natalie Wall, Fola Afolabi (4 IAG-RE representatives), Vanessa Mignan Jenkins and Siddharth Kankaria.

→ **The IAG-RE:** involved at key stages, with clear processes for integrating feedback into decisions affecting equity, practice, or content, ensuring all voices influence the outcomes.
Members: the IAG-RE members.

→ **PEPs contributors and co-authors:** consulted at key stages for input. Some PEPs will be involved at every stage, providing input and staying informed throughout the process. In contrast, others will participate only during specific consultation phases,
The project will maintain continuous engagement with volunteered PEPs, providing regular updates and opportunities for feedback to ensure their voices influence the resource and address concerns about inclusivity and representation.
Members: Volunteered PEPs

→ **NCCPE directory:** commissioner, informed throughout and consulted if a situation requires it.
Member: Sophie Duncan and Asli Tatliadim

RACOI Matrix

Activity / Decision	Resource team	Working group	IAG-RE	PEPs contri-butors	NCCPE directory
Project plan development	R	C/A	C	O	I
Project plan approval	C	A	C	O	C
Scoping consultation	R	C	A	C	I
Content drafting	R	C	C	C	I
Feedback integration	R	C	I	I	I
User testing design and facilitation	R	C	I	C	I
Major deliverable approval	C	A	A	I	C
Content review	R	C	C/A	C	C/A
Risk identification and escalation	R	A	C	O/I	C/A

Change in scope, budget, or timeline	R	A	C	I	C/A
Final resource sign-off	R	A	A	I	C
Communications and reporting	C	R	C	I	I

Legend:
R = Responsible
A = Accountable/Approving
C = Consulted
I = Informed
O = Out-of-the-loop

Decision-making process and conflict resolution

All significant project decisions will be reviewed through the relevant governance structures before approval. The governance bodies will consider the following questions:

- Does this decision promote racial equity?
- How does this decision affect the distribution of power?
- Are contributors and knowledge holders appropriately acknowledged and recognised?
- Is this decision or process extractive, or does it place an unfair burden on any parties? And if so, how could this be ameliorated?
- Have contributors and partners who are directly affected by the decision had the opportunity to review and provide input before it is finalised?

Conflicts will be addressed through transparent, collaborative processes that prioritise fairness, with regular check-ins to identify and mitigate power imbalances among stakeholders.

In the event of a conflict, the working group will first hold an open discussion to identify the underlying causes and allow each member to express their concerns and perspectives. If no resolution is reached at the end of the discussion, the group will proceed to a

closed discussion. The issue will be brought to the NCCPE Director and Equity lead for further review and decision.

Trust and transparency

Trust and transparency are foundational to the success of the project. We will prioritise open communication and honesty in all interactions. Project leaders will maintain accessibility to information regarding the project.

03 Equitable and anti-racist co-development

The co-development of this resource is built upon a hybrid model that emphasises equitable and anti-racist practices.

The resource team will implement ongoing monitoring and evaluation of equity outcomes, with regular reporting to stakeholders to ensure transparency and demonstrate progress toward our social justice commitments.

Collaboration and consultation with PEPs will occur through questionnaires, interviews, collaborative design sessions and user testing sessions. The working group will ensure that PEPs are actively engaged at every stage of the project. As a result, the resource will reflect the diverse

voices of all participants as well as those who will benefit from it in the future.

Authorship and recognition principles

The working group will ensure that all contributors are appropriately recognised for their contributions.

→ **Shared authorship:** All individuals who make contributions to content, design, facilitation, governance or review will be recognised as co-authors or contributors, with their input explicitly acknowledged in accordance with their preference. People who do not want to be named will still be acknowledged as being part of the process anonymously. *For example, 30 people were involved in developing this resource, including name #1, name #2, and so on.*

→ **Inclusive recognition:** Contributors' preferred names, affiliations and roles will be respected.

→ **Transparency:** Authorship and recognition criteria are communicated and revisited regularly to guarantee fairness and clarity.

Equity commitments

The project will embed equity throughout all phases.

1. Practitioners experiencing racial oppression, people with lived experience of racist oppression and other minoritised voices will be actively supported to participate in governance, content development, review and evaluation.
2. Participation processes, meetings, workshops and project materials will be designed to maximise accessibility and minimise barriers to participation.
3. All contributors will be encouraged to engage in reflective practice, acknowledge positionality and power and commit to ongoing learning and unlearning.
4. Discrimination, racism, harassment, bullying, exclusionary behaviour and microaggressions will not be tolerated. Participation will be supported by the project team who will

moderate conversations. Exclusionary behaviours are likely inevitable given how people have been socialised; these will be discussed 1-on-1 as appropriate and, hopefully, will become learning and unlearning moments.

Raising concerns

Some issues may arise during the events and will be addressed in real time. However, for any other concerns, a web form will be available for individuals to submit feedback or complaints. To ensure clarity and transparency, here are the main steps for handling complaints or raising concerns:

1. The web form allows users to provide anonymous feedback, raise concerns with project leads, or escalate issues to the multi-party project escalation team. This team will consist of the NCCPE directory and the Equity lead. All submissions via the web form will be accessible to both project leads.
2. Upon receiving a complaint, the project leads will jointly conduct an initial review. The matter will then be assigned to the appropriate individuals based on the submitter's preference or what the project leads deem most relevant. Concern submissions will be acknowledged within three working days.
3. For sensitive issues, such as racial equity or discrimination, the Equity lead must be directly involved in the investigation and response process.
4. The relevant team will agree on a response or action plan within ten working days and will communicate the next steps to the submitter, provided contact information is available.
5. All actions, outcomes, and lessons learned will be documented and reviewed regularly during project meetings.

Anti-racist approach to conflict resolution and repair

The project will seek to address conflict in ways that prioritise accountability, learning and respectful relationships.

1. Where appropriate, concerns will first be addressed through early, informal and facilitated conversations.
2. When additional support is required, an independent or neutral facilitator may be engaged. Participation in mediation or facilitated dialogue will not be expected from a person who has experienced harm.
3. Responses will be proportionate to the nature and severity of the issue, recognising the distinction between unintended harm, repeated harmful behaviour and serious misconduct.
4. Where appropriate, restorative approaches will be used to rebuild trust, promote accountability and improve future practice.
5. Matters that cannot be resolved within the project governance structure may be referred to the NCCPE Directory and Equity lead for further review, with a response expected within ten working days.
6. All reported concerns and agreed actions will be documented and monitored to support organisational learning whilst preserving appropriate confidentiality.

Contributors and stakeholders' wellbeing and trauma-informed practice

The project recognises that discussions about racism, inequity and lived experience of racist oppression can be emotionally demanding.

In racial equity projects, it has been our experience that centring the experiences of people who have experienced oppressive racism and been racialised as minorities can run up against certain forms of white supremacy. This happens because the ideology of White supremacy works to obscure the racial privilege associated with Whiteness and proximity to Whiteness. At the social level this equates to not having language for the White privilege equivalents of racist experiences (i.e. "Driving while White, not being pulled over). At the personal level this often shows up in the form of "what about-ism", where White people pull on other forms of oppression they have experienced, which may be real and valid, but in drawing them into conversations about racism this practice often decentres

racism and people with lived experience of oppressive racism, and recentres the experiences of White people in the room. At worst, this can turn into an exercise in what Robin DiAngelo calls "White fragility", the cliché that a While woman will cry over racism, recentring herself in a room of people with lived experiences of oppressive racism.

This is why a trauma-informed approach will guide engagement throughout the project. We will provide a framework to support difficult conversations and will offer regular opportunities for contributors to reflect on relationships and interactions, and to raise emerging concerns before they escalate. We will

1. Ensure that sharing lived or personal experience is always voluntary and that contributors may choose how and whether they participate in sensitive discussions.
2. Support emotionally safe meetings through clear agendas, ground rules, agreed ways of working, opportunities to pause participation and structured check-ins where appropriate.
3. Enable flexible participation by accommodating contributors' communication preferences, availability and wellbeing needs wherever feasible.
4. Monitor contributors' well-being and adapt project processes when stress, exclusion, or harm is identified.
5. Offer opportunities for debriefing, peer support and follow-up after challenging discussions or workshops. Where appropriate, contributors will also be signposted to external wellbeing resources and support, recognising that additional help outside the project may be beneficial. Information about confidential counselling, employee assistance programmes and specialist support services will be shared, with access details made available in project communications and on request.

04 Project methodology

The project will adopt an iterative methodology, engaging the working group and PEPs throughout the development process to ensure the resource is relevant, practical, and responsive to user needs. Rather than relying on single-point consultation, the resource will be developed through successive cycles of discovery, design, refinement, and validation.
An open call for expressions of interest for PEPs is available on the NCCPE website, and they will be given priority during the resource development phase. We will also use the NCCPE communication schedule to reach out to PEPs via NCCPE newsletters, general emails and the NCCPE PEPs network LinkedIn group.

Development stage 1: Scoping

The first stage will establish the scope and direction of the resource by identifying PEPs' needs, priorities and success criteria.

Stage 1 methodology: A mixed-methods approach will be used, comprising an online questionnaire to gather broad input on current practice, challenges, and priorities; semi-structured interviews with a purposive sample of PEPs and relevant stakeholders to explore user needs, contextual factors, desired outcomes, and implementation considerations in greater depth.

Findings will be synthesised into a **scoping document**, which will define target users, user needs and priorities, success criteria, pedagogical and functional requirements, design principles and project scope.

The scoping document will serve as the basis for **concept approval**.

Development stage 2: Blueprint

Using the approved scoping document, the resource team will develop a **draft resource blueprint** describing the overall concept and structure of the resource.

The Blueprint will define:

- module architecture;
- learning journey;
- learning design principles;
- content structure;
- interaction model;
- assessment and reflection opportunities; and
- supporting resources.

Stage 2 methodology: The draft Blueprint will be shared with PEPs for structured review through individual co-design interviews and/or asynchronous feedback. Participants will evaluate the proposed architecture, sequencing, relevance, usability, and completeness of the design, with feedback informing revisions to the Blueprint.

The refined blueprint will serve as the agreed specification for development and will be submitted for **concept and structure approval**.

Development stage 3: Resource development

Following approval of the blueprint, the project team will develop the resource in accordance with the agreed learning design, module architecture and interaction model.

Stage 3 methodology: This stage will involve creating all learning content, activities, assessments, supporting materials, and digital assets required for the resource. The approved blueprint will guide development to ensure consistency with the identified user needs, pedagogical principles and project objectives.

The outcome of this stage will be a complete functional prototype of the resource.

Development stage 4: User testing and final refinement

The completed prototype will be evaluated with the NCCPE, the working group and PEPs to assess its usability, relevance, and effectiveness in supporting the intended learning outcomes.

Stage 4 methodology: Feedback will be collected through a combination of guided walkthroughs of the prototype, where PEPs will explore the resource and provide feedback on their experience; semi-structured interviews or feedback discussions to capture perceptions, challenges, and suggestions for improvement; and short questionnaires or feedback forms to gather structured responses on usability, relevance, and overall user experience.

User testing will explore:

- ease of navigation and accessibility;
- clarity and relevance of content;
- learning experience and module flow;
- perceived usefulness for practice; and
- opportunities for improvement.

Feedback from user testing will be analysed against the project's success criteria and used to make final refinements to the resource before release.

05 Project timeline

The delivery plan is organised into a phased development process, moving from initial scoping through content production, iterative testing and final delivery, in close collaboration with NCCPE and the IAG-RE.

Due to delays during the contracting and kick-off phase, the timeline was adjusted to create a more realistic and achievable development schedule whilst maintaining the planned project completion and handover date of **30 November 2026**. Consequently, rather than progressing through strictly sequential phases, content development, website integration and user testing will occur in parallel where appropriate. This phased overlap enables modules and interactive components to be reviewed and integrated progressively, allowing user feedback to inform development as the resource evolves rather than after completion. This approach lowers the risk of major revisions late in the project whilst making more efficient use of project time and resources.

To reduce risks linked with overlapping phases, clear coordination mechanisms will be established to monitor progress, quality and dependencies across all streams. Regular cross-functional meetings will ensure that updates, feedback and issues are shared promptly and that adjustments can be made quickly to address any challenges. Dedicated leads for each workstream will be responsible for promptly flagging risks and joint milestone reviews will be scheduled to ensure that quality standards and timelines remain on track throughout the project.

Timeline table

Phase	Timeline	Key Activities	Outputs / Deliverables	Stakeholders	Validation
Phase #1: Contracting and kick-off	15 Jun – 20 Jul 2026	Project initiation, governance setup, alignment with the NCCPE processes and platform	Agreed project plan, detailed schedule and governance structure	Project leads, NCCPE directory	Project plan approved ***by 20 Jul***
Phase #2: Scoping and co-design	15 Jul – 14 Aug 2026	Analysis of NCCPE/IAG-RE scoping document, questionnaire and interviews with PEPs, working group meeting on scoping, success criteria and user needs mapping	Co-designed scoping framework	Working group	Scoping document validated ***by 14 Aug***
Phase #3: Structure and experience design	3 Aug – 4 Sept 2026	Development of module architecture, user journey and diagnostic tool design	Draft resource blueprint (modules, structure, learning design, interaction model)	Resource team, working group	Draft blueprint finalised for PEPs review ***by 4 Sept***

Phase #4: Review and design refinement	4 – 28 Sept 2026	Structured review of initial blueprint and refinement of blueprint	Refined resource blueprint structure and content direction	Resource team, working group, NCCPE directory	Blueprint approval to proceed to full development ***by 18 Sept***
Phase #5: Full content development	11 Sept – 24 Oct 2026	Content, tools and case studies developed collaboratively through iterative input from NCCPE, IAG-RE and PEP users	Full draft resource	Resource team, working group, NCCPE directory	Internal QA and readiness for testing ***by 24 Oct***
Phase #6: Website Integration	5 – 30 Oct 2026	Integration of content into the NCCPE platform	Functional draft resource on the NCCPE platform	NCCPE	Technical readiness confirmed ***by 31 Oct***
Phase #7: User testing, analysis and iteration	19 Oct – 10 Nov 2026	User testing with PEPs and NCCPE to refine usability, accessibility and learning pathways	Improved resource incorporating user feedback, refined tools and navigation	PEP users, resource team, working group, NCCPE directory	Completion of user testing and iterative refinement sign-off ***by 10 Nov***

Phase #8: Final refinement and quality assurance review	10 – 23 Nov 2026	Final editing, accessibility checks, content polishing and consistency review	Final version of resource ready for publication	Resource team, working group, NCCPE directory	Final version of the resource online ***by 23 Nov***
Phase #9: Final delivery and handover	30 Nov 2026	Final formatting, documentation and handover	Published-ready resource and supporting documentation	Resource team, working group, NCCPE directory	Project sign-off ***by 30 Nov***

06 Risk management

The project will adopt a proactive approach to risk management throughout all phases of development. Risks will be reviewed regularly by the resource team and working group, with mitigation strategies monitored and updated as the project progresses. Risks will be documented in the project risk register and discussed at governance meetings where appropriate.

Risk mitigation table

Risk	Potential impact	Responsability	Mitigation strategy
Delays in project delivery	Missed milestones and reduced time for testing or refinement	NCCPE project lead and resource team	Develop a detailed project schedule with regular progress reviews; overlap development, integration and testing activities where appropriate; prioritise critical tasks and maintain contingency time before final handover.
Low contributor engagement or availability	Reduced diversity of perspectives and delays in co-development	NCCPE project lead	Schedule meetings well in advance, provide flexible participation options, distribute materials early and maintain regular communication with contributors.

Scope expansion	Increased workload, timeline pressure and reduced project quality	Working group	Agree project scope during the scoping phase, document decisions and assess all proposed additions through the governance process before approval.
Delays in governance, reviews, or stakeholder decisions	Development activities delayed or rework required	Working group	Schedule governance review points in advance, circulate materials early and clearly define decision-making responsibilities and approval processes.
Conflicting stakeholder priorities	Reduced consensus and slower decision-making	Resource team lead and NCCPE project lead	Use agreed governance processes, facilitate transparent discussion, document decisions and apply the project's equity decision framework when resolving differences.
Technical challenges with website integration	Delays to publication or reduced functionality	NCCPE and resource team	Engage the NCCPE platform team early, undertake staged integration throughout development and test functionality progressively rather than at project completion.
Accessibility requirements not fully met	Resource does not meet accessibility standards or user needs	Resource team	Apply accessibility principles throughout development, undertake accessibility reviews before publication and incorporate feedback from user testing.
User testing identifies significant	Additional development required	Resource team	Conduct iterative user testing on completed modules as they become available and implement

issues late in the project	and potential timeline impacts		improvements progressively throughout development.
Contributor conflict or concerns relating to equity or inclusion	Reduced participation, trust or project cohesion	Designated Equity Contacts and Working group	Implement the project's reporting, conflict resolution and restorative practice processes, provide multiple reporting pathways and respond promptly to concerns.
Loss of key personnel	Reduced project capacity and potential delays	Project leads	Document project decisions, maintain shared project documentation, distribute responsibilities across the Core Team and identify contingency arrangements where possible.

07 Review process

Review activities will be embedded within each phase of development, with contributors reviewing components as they are completed rather than waiting for a full draft.

To support efficient decision-making and minimise delays, the project will adopt the following review principles:

- Reviews will be scheduled in advance.
- Feedback will be consolidated into a single set of comments wherever possible to avoid conflicting advice.
- Review periods will generally be limited to five working days unless otherwise agreed.
- Feedback will be prioritised as essential, recommended, or optional, making sure that only changes necessary for quality, accessibility, accuracy or accordance with project objectives are required before progression.
- Decisions that require significant changes to the project scope or design will be considered through the project's governance structure rather than during routine content review.
- The resource team will be responsible for resolving routine editorial comments and incorporating agreed-upon revisions, whilst the working group will be responsible exclusively for strategic issues.

Review stages table

Review stage	Review date	Validation date	Review focus	Reviewers	Outcomes
Scoping review (phase #2)	5 – 12 Aug	14 Aug	Project scope, learning objectives, user needs and priorities	Working group, NCCPE directory	Agreed scope and success criteria
Draft blueprint (phase #3)	14 Aug – 2 Sept	4 Sept	Resource structure, module sequence, learning pathway, diagnostic tool and user experience	PEPs contributors	Approved draft resource blueprint for PEPs review
Blueprint	17 – 24 Sept	28 Sept	Resource structure, module sequence, learning pathway, diagnostic tool and user experience	Working group, NCCPE directory	Blueprint approval to proceed to full development
Rolling content reviews (phase #5)	11 Sept – 23 Oct	na	Individual modules, activities, case studies, tools and interactive content as they are developed	Working group	Progressive refinement of content without delaying development
Platform and accessibilit y review (phase #6)	23 – 30 Oct	na	Website functionality, navigation, accessibility and integration with the NCCPE	Working group	Functional draft resource ready for user testing

User testing and review (phase #7)	19 Oct – 10 Nov	na	Usability, accessibility, learning experience and content relevance	PEPs, selected users, NCCPE	Prioritised improvements incorporated into the resource
Final quality assurance (phase #8)	12 – 19 Nov	23 Nov	Delays to publication or reduced functionality	Resource team, Working group, NCCPE	Final resource approved for publication and handover

08 Monitoring, reporting, success measures

Project monitoring and reporting are designed to support prompt decision-making, transparent communication and effective project governance whilst minimising administrative burden. Monitoring activities will centre on project progress, delivery against milestones, emerging risks, resource requirements and governance decisions.

Monitoring

Project progress will be monitored through three complementary mechanisms:

1. Weekly project lead meetings

The project leads will meet weekly for one hour throughout the project to:

- review progress, timeline and milestones;
- monitor risks, issues and dependencies;
- confirm priorities for the coming week;
- resolve operational issues requiring project-level decisions; and
- identify matters requiring escalation to the working group.

Brief action notes will be recorded following each meeting.

2. Trello board for task management

Day-to-day project activities will be managed using Trello. The project board will provide a shared view of tasks, responsibilities, deadlines and progress.

The Trello board will be reviewed and updated regularly by the resource team to maintain an accurate picture of project delivery.

3. Project dashboard spreadsheet

A project dashboard spreadsheet will provide a concise overview of project status for governance and reporting purposes. The dashboard will focus on major milestones, providing an overview of the project's overall health rather than detailed task management. Key indicators tracked on the dashboard will include progress, milestones, completion status of core deliverables, risk, upcoming deadlines and review timelines. Access to the dashboard will be given to NCCPE leadership, the working group, the resource team and the IAG-RE.

Reporting and success measures

Reporting will be proportionate to the project's size and governance requirements and will use weekly project lead meetings, the Trello board and the project dashboard spreadsheet.

Success will be assessed against the quality of the resource, the effectiveness of the co-development process and successful delivery against the agreed project objectives.

Success metrics will be monitored throughout the project using the project dashboard, governance reviews and user testing findings, with outcomes informing the final project evaluation and handover.

Appendix

Link to project dashboard spreadsheet

Link to Trello board

NCCPE Brief

Resource team proposal

NCCPE x UCL Contract