

Full Steering Group Meeting No 7

SG14-08

Venue: Defra, York
Date: Friday 16 May 2008
Start: 11:00

Present:

Andy Greaves (Defra-MSED) Chair; Stephen Dye (MCCIP Secretariat); Emma Verling (JNCC); Dan Lord (Defra-CEOSA); John Pinnegar (Cefas); Paul Buckley (MCCIP-Sec); Matt Frost (MECN); Victoria Paris (WAG); Craig Wallace (NERC-RAPID); Martyn Cox (Scottish Government); Jackie Maud (EA); Andrew Hill (CCW); Dan Laffoley (Natural England); Laurence Rooney (AFBI) Emily Lewis-Brown (WWF); **by teleconference for item 3:** John Baxter (SNH)

Apologies:

Ed McManus (MCCIP Secretariat); John Hamer (CCW); Bill Turrell (FRS); Alexander Downie (SEPA); Matt Service (AFBINI); Kathryn Humphrey (Defra CEOSA); Olly Watts (RSPB); Alistair Montgomery (Scottish Government); Kevin O'Carroll (BERR)

Agenda item 1: Update on actions from the previous SG meeting

Old Action (MF)- The group were informed that within MECN Nova Mieszkowska has taken on this action. The overall aim is to finish this paper on research priorities by November for submission to the next SG.

Action 14-08-1: First draft to be sent to SD by end of May. First draft for SG by end of July.

Points arising from Actions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 – (all on UKCIP08)

Discussion on the potential for marine case studies prior to launch of UKCIP08. Following meetings of the UKCIP SG and User Panel it is clear that the pre-launch work will use *examples of* UKCIP-type output rather than *actual* UKCIP08 output which will be embargoed until launch. A number of parties have been approached by the Secretariat regarding the opportunity to produce pre-launch case-studies and most felt it better to wait until UKCIP08 is launched. At this point the actual UKCIP output would be available. The SG decided not to pursue any other pre-launch case-studies.

MCCIP has been told that the requested intermediate time-slice for 2011-2040 will be conducted as part of the full run through, however this may not be available in time for the launch.

The action to forward of the Marine Scenarios powerpoint raised issues on communications in 'plain English'. The SG was reassured that UKCIP has the same need to communicate to stakeholders as MCCIP and this will be part of the reporting procedure. In the lead up to UKCIP08, MCCIP should provide a simple briefing on the marine outputs for the SG.

Action 14-08-2: SD / KH to turn UKCIP08 presentation, circulated following the last SG, into a simpler short briefing on UKCIP08 marine outputs. To include confirmation that 2011-2040 is definitely to be produced.

Points arising from Action 7 (encouraging sustained input by partnership):

This short paper, to be sent to partner organisations should be completed in time for the mid-term review and this needs to be in the context of the finance paper (SG10-08) discussions - (Agenda item 2). Brief discussion on the need for a clear presentation of what the deficit is, and has to be based upon the future business/delivery plans set by the SG. This communication also needs to stress the importance of attendance at SG / working group meetings and feedback between these meetings.

Action 14-08-3: Secretariat to carry forward *Action 7* (cross ref with Agenda item 2) for the mid-term review.

Points arising from Actions 10,11: Feedback on ARC

Informal feedback from high levels in government has been very good, but some more-formal feedback would be useful for the SG. The number of respondents to the questionnaire almost doubled following the mail shot. Examining the online surveys provides a lot of information and a further update is requested. One useful group to identify in future surveys would be non-contributing scientists.

Action 14-08-4: AG to approach director level in Defra

Action 14-08-5: Short synopsis to send round to the group in time for the next product meeting – based on paper at March SG. Deadline June 9th (PB)

Action 12: Updates on MCCIP communications undertaken by SG members

Action 14-08-6: everyone to update PB / KH on an ad-hoc basis. KH/PB to send out a request reminding.

Points arising from Action 13: Business Plan

Feedback received and the plan updates, SG agreed this is complete.

Action 14-08-7: Business plan – PB to send round updated business plan.

Points arising from Action 15: Update of EU FP7 project on Ocean pH.

CNRS in Villefranche are coordinating an EU-FP7 Collaborative project called EPOCA – European Project on Ocean Acidification, a short summary of its objectives is available.

Action 14-08-8: DL to send acidification note (*done 20/05/08*) to MCCIP Sec for forwarding.

Action 20: Contacts with the Republic of Ireland (RoI).

Involvement from the RoI was strongly welcomed. The SG agreed to invite RoI onto MCCIP-SG and develop their input to the partnership. Note that Galway contributed to the 2007-08 ARC.

Action 14-08-9: RoI to be invited onto the SG. PB to pick up at next regional co-ordinators meeting and then Secretariat to scope out their involvement scientifically and financially.

Action 21: Halpern paper

Discussions have been held in OSPAR on the Halpern paper results and its methodology. The SG have noted some scientific concerns and understand that these are being progressed in the appropriate scientific manner.

Agenda item 2: Financial status

The finance paper SG10-08 was discussed with a breakdown of FY0708 final numbers and status of income as at start of current FY.

Table A: It was noted that spend to date is about £18k greater than the income for the project to end of FY07/08, and the in year spend was about £20k more than the forecast for the year as at the tender. Processes that have been put in place over the last year were designed to mitigate for this overspend, and bring it within budget over the lifetime of the project. A deficit remains based upon both past spend and future confirmed income.

Table B: In light of the deficit it will be necessary to justify to the sponsors what MCCIP produces for the generated income, at the moment it is difficult to see what partners get for their contributions apart from the ARC. A more detailed break down on the activities within the 4 non-ARC work breakdown structures is needed. Also if we include the in-kind contributions from scientists and others we can demonstrate value for money of the ARC and other components of MCCIP. This would also put other costs for secretariat / SG into context.

Table C: Discussions focussed on the need for this to reflect the expenditure related decisions made by the last SG. The forecast should be an accurate forecast. As a matter of urgency this must be **re-forecast based on the delivery of 1*ARC, 1*ST, and 1*Final Event (as agreed by the SG)** to quickly ascertain the sustainability of proposed activities in relation to current and future funding. This should be formalised during the mid-project review. The forecast income needs to include the proposed income as well as the confirmed income.

Table D: Cefas has a good track of the status of each sponsor, and happy that provisional sponsors are coming through, but they have to be noted as provisional for Cefas purposes. Note WWF and NE need to be invoiced, and some partner contributions depend upon results of the mid-project review.

Action 14-08-10 Tables A-D circulated that include all these issues. Explain what is paid for under each activity. Include contribution in kind for overall 6 years as a rough estimate. **To be circulated (EM) in the next 3 weeks to DL / MF and MC.**

Action 14-08-11 Circulate final version to SG. (with the Q1 finance information July)

Agenda item 3: COWG feedback and adaptation proposal

Initial discussion was on the output of the MCCIP-UKCIP workshop for Regional Partnerships. Other members of the SG may have links to their local Regional Partnership, which would be useful for the SG to know and further highlight links.

Action 14-08-12 MCCIP Sec to attend the regional co-ordinators meeting.

Action 14-08-13: Secretariat to send out request for SG to feedback where they are already involved with regional partnerships.

A further discussion was held on the proposal to hold an MCCIP Adaptation workshop with first reference given to the earlier discussions regarding affordability as a priority. Overall it is considered a useful activity but would need to be self funding and should be appealing to potential sponsors. Another point of view was that this may be challenging for a single workshop and it is not clear how far adaptation has spread into marine beyond coastal considerations. MECN have produced a report on what is happening in Marine Adaptation which would be useful to consider.

It was proposed that we break the workshop down into more manageable tasks. One possibility would be to run a preliminary workshop this year and then run a more involved workshop next year focussed on how the requirements of stakeholders had developed during the year. This could be a positive way for RoI to get involved in the development and delivery of a tangible product.

Is this workshop aimed at a community who aren't engaged who would need to be engaged? To determine this the planning for the workshop should include conversations with key contacts in the stakeholder sectors and find out what adaptation activities are taking place already – what do we need to know about adaptation and how can MCCIP deliver this information? Is there merit to wait until after UKCIP08? Are there any other countries ahead of us at the moment?

Given concerns about the audience and the difficulty in determining of the initial objectives and costing, but in recognition of the utility of the activity, the SG supported the workshop in principle and asked the COWG to move it forward in a staged way with a need to gauge views from different sectors. Adaptation in the coastal environment is going on and, for example, the oil and gas sector have this factored in for their infrastructure planning/development. MCCIP needs a clear idea of the degree to which adaptation is a component of marine planning in all sectors. About 2 years ago RoI produced document including marine adaptation called 'Sea-Change'.

Action 14-08-14 – MF to send MECN 10 pager on marine climate change adaptation.

Action 14-08-15: JP to forward ROI adaptation report to Secretariat.

Further discussion followed on the suggestion that MCCIP workshops could be used to further consider the mitigation agenda as opposed to (or in addition to) adaptation, given that adaptation is facilitated if mitigation measures are in place. Concerns were raised that this would be a major change to MCCIP's remit, and it may not be the forum where these decisions could be made. Overall the issue of mitigation was felt to be an extension beyond MCCIP's current boundaries, the SG would need to change this in the mid-project review.

However, mitigation is an important issue and the risks associated with not considering this topic should be recorded in the Risk Register. Who should consider mitigation if MCCIP does not? Currently, producing policy recommendations is

beyond the remit of MCCIP. To do so would require an agreed redefinition of MCCIP's role.

The overall view was that MCCIP could provide a suitable forum to highlight mitigation issues but not for us to take forward mitigation without a major change in MCCIP.

Action 14-08-16: CEOSA (KH) to uncover for MCCIP what work on mitigation in marine environment already ongoing and SG/midterm review to consider position.

Action 14-08-17: COWG to consider the issue of mitigation as a component of the workshop.

Action 14-08-18: Secretariat to contact people in sectors and gauge interest in both adaptation and mitigation workshop.

Agenda item 4: Special topic discussion

The ARCWG will take on the ST in place of an ARC for this year. Craig Wallace has stepped down as ARCWG chair; the SG formally thanked him for his role chairing the ARCWG and its production of the ARC.

Initially the concept of the ST and initial case-studies as shown in SG12-08 was discussed.

The overall feeling was that this is a strategic and complimentary output for MCCIP at a stage when an explanation of the importance of ecosystem linkages would be advantageous. We would need to be selective in the components to clearly link to and build on the ARC.

On individual 'stories:

Global Theme-Ocean acidification – topic can broaden out to lead into shifting species distributions. For the full linkages we will need something else such as broad patterns of ocean circulation to pull this story together. Widen acidification to be in 'oceans of change' with currents and temperature. We still need to keep a strong focus on ocean acidification so have this as a separate topic. If we cannot easily fit the ocean acidification topic into this theme then there is no reason why we should not produce a standalone output on acidification. The SG feels that it is positive to include a global perspective, and as such is sea ice also worth considering? It was suggested that this is the key global issue and there are problems with models and understanding at the moment. Is there opportunity for us to capture something fresh which will have implications for UK and leads through to shipping, temperature rise etc.

Concern raised that there are too many 'Stories', but at the moment we have to develop with the thought that some may not be completed. The role of leads for the 'Stories' will be key and there should be a sense of empowering leaders to focus down on the most important story they have in their community. Overall the SG was happy that flexibility should be kept and that it should not prescribe the content for the scientists, and to allow new wildcard information to be included.

Concern was expressed that the stories are still in the silos, are we just re-iterating what we have in the ARC. Group reassured that this is just a presentational artefact

of the paper SG12-08. A mock up should be produced soon to demonstrate how the whole product fits together. This would be mainly visual with some text inter-linkages. It was suggested that titles should be more interesting to draw in audience.

There was concern on the ability of such a product to deliver the complex ideas and science. However, the stories needn't be complex but should inform that there is complexity (at Global and UK scales) and back this up in the supporting documents.

Language such as 'ecosystem services' are starting to be more commonly understood and therefore similar text could be used.

WWF are leading the production of a report on ocean feedbacks on climate that will come out later in the year, the ARCWG need to avoid too much overlap, ELB and SD to keep ARCWG aware.

Action 14-08-19 – ARCWG to progress topics as described by paper SG12-08 – include high latitude story.

Action 14-08-20 – ARCWG delegated to continue to refine the special topic concept leading to delivery in March 2009.

Delivery of ST

Discussion on the costs, schedule and mechanism for delivering the ST the ideas should be taken and developed by the ARCWG.

- i) Consider commissioning lead authors for each topic (maybe 7 people) – and consider paying them a set honorarium of around £700 rather than a daily rate. Would some scientists be prepared to take this on and be recognised as lead co-ordinator?
- ii) Perhaps a kick off process with conference calls rather than big workshops would increase efficiencies. Joint meeting with the agreed theme authors.
- iii) If workshops are necessary then the most effective delivery plan will be required .
- iv) Can design be undertaken in house (of one of the partners)?
- v) Consider possible use of cartoons / artwork? Merit in getting professional artwork involved- but cost effectiveness is also necessary.
- vi) Science writer? in the ARC there remain some sections that are difficult for the audience.

Action 14-08-21: ARCWG to progress the ST production.

MF accepted nomination as ARCWG chair given the assurance that bulk of the work is to be completed before the end of the calendar year. Need to develop the delivery timetable ASAP.

Key dates to note will be the March 09 International Polar Year events. The production plan needs to avoid clashing with any finale event for that.

Note, add DL's name to the list on the ARCWG.

Agenda item 5: Risk

The Risk register was accepted.

The risk of too many initiatives calling on a few key people should be upgraded to high as MCCIP, UKMMAS, OSPAR all need inputs in the next 12 months.

A further column needs to be added to the register to show the importance of the risk.

A risk arising from earlier discussion is of MCCIP not actively considering mitigation. A strategy for managing expectations of MCCIP may be required.

Further risks may arise from miscommunication.

Action 14-08-22: PB to update risk register with issues raised and to update the risk on competing needs to high.

Agenda item 6: AOB

UKCIP marine scenarios

The 'coasts' to be used for sea-level rise are still to be finalised but to be based upon best scientific choices rather than limited to administrative boundaries, and will be continuous around the UK. Scotland is likely to be represented by 3 coasts, England, Wales and NI are still under discussion.

The user interface is being designed for non-specialists and the access will be to the climatology type outputs. Technical users for non-commercial use will be able to access some higher resolution (daily) outputs via a separate programme (LINK).

SD will be involved in the write up of the marine and coastal scenarios and the MCCIP SG will be asked to review the documents. UKCIP has the same remit as MCCIP on communication of technical information to a wide set of stakeholders, and MCCIP SG re-stated the need for documents to be readable (e.g. will an exec summary be separate from the rest of the report to provide a concise 2-page brief for policy makers?). Some further questions followed on the technical aspects of the models being used.

Action 14-08-23: SD to continue to stress that the UKCIP08 marine report executive summary must be easily understandable. KH and SD to include information on what summary documents will be included in the marine report in the briefing document for the MCCIP SG (*Action 14-08-2*)

Action 14-08-24: Background information on the models currently used to be provided in short briefing document.

Mid-term review

Under the contract for the MCCIP Secretariat a 3rd year review is required, and a number of partners have sponsorship funds committed with reference to this. The review has to be completed in time for it to feed into plans for FY0910. The process

has to renew the contract in light of ongoing requirements of the SG and future plans as the current deliverables were established before MCCIP SG was formed and are in some cases now low priority for the SG.

The review should come from the perspective of the whole SG but be led by a smaller group. It was agreed that the process would include short telephone interviews with all partners to decide a set of questions that should be asked, (What went well / why – what didn't go well / why? etc.). The review should discuss activities the secretariat has completed / carries out / will carry out in relation to the new business plan.

Action 14-08-25: EM and AG to have a small meeting with a sub-group after the financial update. AG / Secretariat to take forward to consider how best to approach this process and to present and circulate prior to the next SG. Contact partners for a list of questions that the partners need addressed in the review.

Charting Progress 2

Defra is contracting Cefas for OSPAR QSR Climate Change chapter – UK leading on CC impacts report separate from and earlier than the CP2 process. CP2 subsequently will be built out of 3 feeder reports based upon the three UKMMAS evidence groups which will bring together monitoring based on the vision of clean, safe, healthy, biologically diverse and productive seas. Each chapter of each feeder reports will include climate change issues, and the individual chapter authors will be tasked with including them. MCCIP discussed its role in drawing together the climate change sections in Chapter 7 of the full Charting Progress 2 report. Feeder reports finished by end of March 2009 and then to be synthesised into Chp7 of CP2 by end of April 2009.

The SG highlighted that there is a lot of pressure on the scientific community to work on OSPAR, CP2, UKCIP08, MCCIP special topic etc. Therefore there is a need to streamline and harmonise the work through the community. See note above (under item 5) regarding risk of lack of capacity in the community.

MCCIP would be happy to sign off on the CP2 Climate chapter, as long as it has a recognition of MCCIP's role. Overall feeling that MCCIP itself was an outcome of CP so there is direct relevance for MCCIP to contribute to CP2.

Action 14-08-26: AG to send round document outlining MCCIP's role in the CP2 chapters for agreement by the SG.

SG responsibilities

VP is transferring job and stepping down from MCCIP (SG and COWG) interim responsibility on SG passes to Katherine Raymond until handed onto a replacement for VP. The SG formally thanked VP for her contributions to MCCIP.

Action 14-08-27: MCCIP Sec to update contact lists.

AFBI-NI keen to become more closely involved in all aspects of MCCIP including the possibility of sponsorship.

Action 14-08-28: - EM to meet up with AFBI, NI to discuss contribution to MCCIP and ARCWG involvement.



MCCIP Secretariat, CEFAS, Pakefield
Road, Lowestoft, Suffolk, NR33 0HT, UK
e: office@mccip.org.uk
t: +44(0)1502 562244 f: +44(0)1502 513865

Agenda item 7: DONM

SG meeting -York, Thursday 4th December
ARCWG meeting –London, 20th June

ANNEX 1 – ACTION LIST SUMMARY FOR UPDATE AT NEXT SG MEETING

Action 14-08-1: First draft to be sent to SD by end of May. First draft for SG by end of July.

Action 14-08-2: SD / KH to turn UKCIP08 presentation, circulated following the last SG, into a simpler short briefing on UKCIP08 marine outputs. To include confirmation that 2011-2040 is definitely to be produced.

Action 14-08-3: Secretariat to carry forward *Action 7* (cross ref with Agenda item 2) for the mid-term review.

Action 14-08-4: AG to approach director level in Defra

Action 14-08-5: Short synopsis to send round to the group in time for the next product meeting – based on paper at March SG. Deadline June 9th (PB)

Action 14-08-6: everyone to update PB / KH on an ad-hoc basis. KH/PB to send out a request reminding.

Action 14-08-7: Business plan – PB to send round updated business plan.

Action 14-08-8: DL to send acidification note to MCCIP Sec for forwarding.

Action 14-08-9: ROI to be invited onto the SG. PB to pick up at next regional co-ordinators meeting and then Secretariat to scope out their involvement scientifically and financially.

Action 14-08-10 Tables A-D circulated that include all these issues. Explain what is paid for under each activity. Include contribution in kind for overall 6 years as a rough estimate. **To be circulated (EM) in the next 3 weeks to DL / MF and MC.**

Action 14-08-11 Circulate final version to SG. (with the Q1 finance information July)

Action 14-08-12 MCCIP Sec to attend the regional co-ordinators meeting.

Action 14-08-13: Secretariat to send out request for SG to feedback where they are already involved with regional partnerships.

Action 14-08-14 – MF to send MECN 10 pager on marine climate change adaptation.

Action 14-08-15: JP to forward ROI adaptation report to Secretariat.

Action 14-08-16: CEOSA to uncover what work on mitigation in marine environment already ongoing and SG/midterm review to consider position.

Action 14-08-17: COWG to consider the issue of mitigation as a component of the workshop.

Action 14-08-18: Secretariat to contact people in sectors and gauge interest in both adaptation and mitigation workshop.

Action 14-08-19 – ARCWG to progress topics as described by paper SG12-08 – include high latitude story.

Action 14-08-20 – ARCWG delegated to continue to refine the special topic concept leading to delivery in March 2009.

Action 14-08-21: ARCWG to progress the ST production.

Action 14-08-22: PB to update risk register with issues raised and to update the risk on competing needs to high.

Action 14-08-23: SD to continue to stress that the UKCIP08 marine report executive summary must be easily understandable. KH and SD to include information on what summary documents will be included in the marine report in the briefing document for the MCCIP SG (*Action 14-08-2*)

Action 14-08-24: Background information on the models currently used to be provided in short briefing document.

Action 14-08-25: EM and AG to have a small meeting with a sub-group after the financial update. AG / Secretariat to take forward to consider how best to approach this process and to present and circulate prior to the next SG. Contact partners for a list of questions that the partners need addressed in the review.

Action 14-08-26: AG to send round document outlining MCCIP's role in the CP2 chapters for agreement by the SG.

Action 14-08-27: MCCIP Sec to update contact lists.

Action 14-08-28: - EM to meet up with NI to discuss contribution to MCCIP and ARCWG involvement.