

Full Steering Group Meeting

Digest of the meeting held on 4th December, 1100h at Defra, York

Present:

Andy Greaves (Defra-MSED) Chair; Stephen Dye (MCCIP-Sec); Emma Verling (JNCC); Jo Sampson (Defra-CEOSA); Paul Buckley (MCCIP-Sec); Matt Frost (MECN); Matthew Sayer (WAG); Craig Wallace (NERC-RAPID); Martyn Cox (Scottish Government); Adam Mellor (AFBI); Emily Lewis-Brown (WWF); John Baxter (SNH); Colin Moffat (FRS); Glenn Nolan (Marine Institute, ROI); John Hamer (CCW)

Apologies:

Alexander Downie (SEPA); Matt Service (AFBINI); Kathryn Humphrey (Defra CEOSA); Dan Laffoley (Natural England); Olly Watts (RSPB); Kevin O'Carroll (BERR); Jackie Maud (EA)

Agenda item 1a. Update on actions from last meeting

Summary of discussion:

- It was agreed that we need to continually keep a track of where MCCIP member organisations have been representing MCCIP.
- It was highlighted that the OSPAR QSR will include a section on climate mitigation.
- CEOSA to update the group on who is responsible for mitigation at Defra
- An adaptation paper from MECN has been submitted to the secretariat which could help with the adaptation workshop.

Agenda item 1b. Charting Progress 2

There was abroad ranging discussion on the role of MCCIP in producing the climate change chapter for CP2 and it was clarified that the climate change chapter would use the outputs from the individual feeder reports. This raised a number of questions:

- Will this constrain MCCIP to just pulling out messages for the climate change chapter from the feeder reports? It was felt that we shouldn't be limited to this as authors are writing a broader piece not just about climate change.
- There is a need to ensure the climate change messages from the feeder reports aren't out of date by the time they reach us. If parts are out of date, can we go back to the authors and say that they need updating, or can we make the changes.

It was confirmed that the climate change chapter would only be reviewed in the second stage of the CP2 review process in October. MCCIP could oversee an earlier review stage for the climate change chapter with MCCIP identifying appropriate reviewers.

The issue of sign off by the SG was raised and widely endorsed.

Agenda item 2: Financial status

The secretariat highlighted that confirmed income had increased significantly since the last SG meeting. The ongoing issue of how finances are reported was discussed and it was agreed that significant improvements had been made in the transparency of reporting since the last SG meeting.

A discussion on funding beyond the current lifetime of the project followed and we will need to secure further funds from new or existing sources. Looking ahead, it was suggested that a marketing tool might be appropriate to help secure funding in the future. This could build on previous one page summary of benefits of MCCIP membership.

Agenda item 3. COWG feedback

An outline of the structure of the adaptation workshop was provided and the aim of the day was to bring sectors together to promote action. With regards to workshop deliverables, it was felt that a standard report might just sit on people's shelves and it would be better to produce something interactive. Outputs should be focussed on actually doing things, getting something out of people and revisiting further down the line to check on progress [in 12 months time]. There is a need for a strong emphasis on the end of the day – i.e. what can you do?, what will you do? and what would it be useful for MCCIP to do?

To distill into the outputs, it would be useful for each invitee to provide a one pager to cover issues of assumed knowledge, will be really useful to have information on what different organisations are doing.

It was highlighted that there appears to be a lack of knowledge about the special topic to let people know that it is on its way.

Agenda item 4. Special topic

The ARCWG chair outlined proposals for the structure and timetable for delivery of the special topic. Progress made on final wording was discussed and a mock-up from the designers for 1 topic was presented to the group.

It was agreed that although the timetable was tight, it was still achievable on the timescale presented. To help deliver the card on time, it was agreed that the Welsh card could be launched later. The importance of having a Welsh card was emphasised by WAG as their reports need to be bi-lingual (i.e. Welsh and English versions have to be circulated together)

It was emphasised that at previous meetings, responsibility for delivering report cards had been assigned to the ARCWG and that we should proceed to launch.

The launch event was discussed and the chair explained that a launch venue was booked at Defra and that a minister should be available for launch. As part of the discussion it was emphasised that the secretariat had sought to launch at a Welsh or Northern Irish venue but for various reasons they were unable to host us on the

dates specified. We would anticipate that Wales and / or Northern Ireland would host future launch events.

The need for a media plan was raised, particularly with regards to the press release which had caused problems last time round.

Agenda item 5. Mid-term review

The chair presented the key findings from the mid-term review. It was generally felt that MCCIP had achieved much greater engagement with the scientific community than most other partnerships that were ongoing, particularly through the ARC.

Products

Whilst it appears that the ARC is our sole product, we are engaged in other activities (e.g. targeted workshops, newsletters) and these could be better highlighted. These activities could be brought out in a glossy document as suggested in the COWG agenda item. We could also highlight activities partners are doing individually that are related to MCCIP but we need to consider how we apply the MCCIP badge to these things.

With regards to prioritising what we would like to do, this should initially be drawn from the aspirational list of MCCIP objectives in the business plan. It is important that though that we focus on quality rather than quantity, it is the distillation of key high-quality products that is important.

One of the things we should consider is how MCCIP takes UKCIP outputs and distils this information for our end users, particularly considering impacts advice.

Objectives

Looking at the overall objectives for the partnership, the issue of mitigation was raised. It was felt that the mitigation issue is complicated and it doesn't seem that we are moving towards mitigation just yet. It was suggested that mitigation in government is seen as removed from impacts and adaptation. It was confirmed that we re-visit the business plan annually so we can propose changes if we need to at that time.

Industry partners

The mid-term review raised the issue of engagement with industrial partners. It was suggested that trade organisations might be more appropriate at this stage and it was questioned whether industry organisations for shipping and fisheries should be borne in mind.

The session closed with general agreement that the mid-term review was positive.

Agenda item 6. Risk register

The risk register was introduced and the inclusion of an extra column 'importance' was highlighted. The risk register was accepted. about representation.

Agenda item 7. Research priorities

It was clarified that this paper was being pulled together to put all information into one place from multiple meetings / conferences going on. This could work as an open live document. This would definitely be a useful product consistent with tasks in the business plan.

It was suggested that we could take this forward as a 2 page document from MCCIP, which would be valuable to organisations such as NERC. We should consider how it will link to marine science co-ordination committee; need to ensure it doesn't conflict with this.

Should be clear about who our target audience is and that the list is not about what we want to know, it is rather about what we need to know and what that information is needed for.

Agenda item 8. AOB & DONM

Based upon having 2 SG meetings a year then we should have the next meeting in May, York being an ideal location.

The meeting concluded at 16:00 hours

Paul Buckley
MCCIP Secretariat