

Steering Group Meeting

Venue: Defra, Whitehall, London

Date: Tuesday 05 Sep 2006

Present:

Beth Greenaway (Defra) Chair; Stephen Dye (MCCIP Secretariat); Paul Buckley (MCCIP Secretariat); Patsy Falconer (Cefas - notes); Emily Lewis-Brown (WWF); Richard Westaway (UKCIP); Matt Frost (MECN); Olly Watts (RSPB); DL Dan Laffoley (EN); Brendan Forde (DoENI); John Hamer (CCW); Kathryn Humphrey (Defra Global Atmosphere); David Connor (JNCC); Martyn Cox (Scottish Executive); Victoria Paris (WAG); Larissa Naylor (EA); Craig Wallace (NERC Rapid); Chris Reid (SAHFOS)

Video-conference:

John Baxter (SNH); Sandy Downie (SEPA)

Welcome and Introductions

The meeting began with “round the table” introductions. Chair advised that Defra GA to chair future meetings.

1. Steering Group (SG) minutes plus actions update

1.1 Prior to commencement of discussions, there was a query regarding the section headers and concern that the titles did not reflect the ensuing text. The MCCIP Secretariat advised that ARC was still a work-in-progress and the EAP review process would ensure that titles reflected corresponding text. Further ARC discussion to follow.

1.2 The Chair asked for an update on the list of actions from previous SG meeting on 21 June 06.

The outstanding actions are as follows:

- a) Outstanding action to circulate to Steering Group the notes of the of British Irish Council (BIC) Ministerial meeting.
- b) Outstanding action on IACMST involvement in MCCIP
- c) Outstanding action to seek funding from industry – See below for financial strategy discussions.
- d) Outstanding action on Crown Estates to advertise MCCIP to the seabed and users development group
- e) Outstanding action to appoint members of the Expert Advisory Panel (EAP). The Secretariat confirmed submissions regarding suggestions had been received. 5 people had been approached for involvement; agreement from 3 experts across different disciplines. SNH agreed to be the SG link on the EAP.

f) It was tabled that the MCCIP Communications Strategy (part of business plan) should be updated as we go through the ARC process. Specific reference was made to an overall QA of the MCCIP project. For example, what have we learned in year 1; what has worked, what hasn't; what do we do in the future?

It was agreed there needs to be an annual review process, for example, spring of each project year, to look at these issues.

Actions: *Secretariat to chase IACMST involvement, seabed development group (Crown Estates) and to set up process for MCCIP annual review;
DoENI and Defra GA to circulate BIC notes from recent meeting to the SG members*

2. Business Plan redraft

2.1 The MCCIP Secretariat advised that the main changes to the plan concerned contributions from the Crown Estate regarding the executive summary. MECN had contributed to the contextualising of the political setting section – addressing MCCIP UK wide as well as putting into the context of the EU setting. The aims & objectives section have been simplified; milestones and tasks had been moved into an appendix; an additional appendix had been added to include the funding mechanism for MCCIP.

2.2 The Chair requested comments from SG members.

It was agreed that:

- the scientific setting section of the plan did not place enough emphasis on urgency of science through to policy;
- project dates were incorrect and needed amendment;
- the milestone section needs further review (dates should be included where possible);
- reference to be made to the administrative support the Secretariat gives to the project;
- SG members agreed that the EAP reviews ARC rather than inputs to it;
- the business plan should include mechanism for the SG to meet annually to review the forthcoming year's work programme.
- the SG members must help deliver / decide future MCCIP products / objectives. Members to highlight initiatives and internal policies from their own organisations that link with MCCIP. The MCCIP process is not just about initiating new research – it is coming together to bring best out of each other.
- the SG Terms of Reference (TOR) needs to be more reflected within the Section 3.2 of business plan.

2.3 The OSPAR requirement (to provide a review of implications on climate change within the UK) was discussed. Is MCCIP in a position to help with this assessment?

- It was mentioned that this task was passed to ICES who will undertake the review.
- It was agreed MCCIP work could contribute to the task and an agreed action is ensure links between MCCIP and the OSPAR process. Said OSPAR requirements are also to be issued to the SG.
- In order for MCCIP to action this and other ad-hoc tasks, it was agreed that there would need to be a continuing review of existing MCCIP priorities within current funding remit.

2.4 With the Annual Report Card (ARC) 2006 launch due end Nov 06, it was agreed that the business plan needed to be updated in time for this. The ARC is only one of MCCIP's products.

- The Secretariat advised that current commitment is to focus on ARC 2006 production. The business plan could not be revised by the Secretariat in time for the next meeting in mid-Oct.
- The Scottish Executive volunteered to assist with business plan updates / review.

Actions ***Secretariat to submit amendments re project dates, milestone dates, annual review within work programme section and reflection of SG TOR within section 3.2 by 30 Sep***
SG to feed any other business plan comments through by 30 Sep
Secretariat to ensure links with MCCIP / OSPAR requirement
OSPAR requirements to be circulated to SG
Updated business plan to be presented at next meeting (18 Oct 06)

3. Financial update

3.1 The Secretariat presented an update on financial contributions received since June meeting. In total, approx £112k has been confirmed by partner organisations with a further £30k confirmed in principle. If levels of indicative funding currently forecast for future years were confirmed, then the funding gap (i.e. non-committed funds) for MCCIP to be fully funded was in region of £25k. * It was stressed however, that if indicative levels of funding decreased that this funding gap would increase. All agreed that MCCIP was generally in a "healthy funding position". MCCIP Secretariat thanked partners for their contributions to date and also thanked those partners who had not committed funding, but had committed time in-kind.

* Based on Cefas costs as specified in tender bid to Defra

3.2 The issue of seeking industry funding was discussed. Could MCCIP really be seen to be including all knowledge if industry was left out?

- There was discussion on contacting the Oil and Gas Industry.
- The basic levels of funding were there to provide the basic concept of MCCIP, but with additional funding, the idea could progress to the next level.
- It was concluded that MCCIP must have a formal financial strategy that we would then use when approaching new SG members / seeking new sources of funding.

3.3 The concept of taking MCCIP European-wide was discussed – i.e. using an “MCCIP model” for funding other similar initiatives.

- Whilst this was deemed a good idea, it was felt that we should wait until MCCIP was fully underway (ARC card launched etc) before this was taken forward.
- It was agreed we could only “sell” the MCCIP model when we actually have “something to show”.

3.4 Funding – new partners mentioned their intention to provide funding. The Secretariat would follow this up with these individual partners.

Actions ***MCCIP Secretariat, Natural England & Environment Agency to prepare financial strategy, possibly in time for ARC launch or for the coming new year (2007)***
MCCIP Secretariat to progress funding discussions with individual partners

4. AOB – Newsletters, Website, future events

4.1 Website – The Secretariat reiterated that focus was on ARC production and some web updates still outstanding.

- It was agreed that the MCCIP website needs to be updated and ready for tie-in with ARC launch; as well as being on web, ARC needs to be downloadable. There also needs to be links to partner websites and a key dates list.

Actions ***MCCIP Secretariat ensure ARC is downloadable, has links to partner websites, includes key dates and all ready for ARC launch***

4.2 Newsletter – The Secretariat advised that the plan is to have a bi-monthly (every two months!) newsletter. The intention was to “piggy back” on the current MDIP (Marine Data and Information Partnership) newsletter by essentially using the same mechanisms (and license), but with an MCCIP design. The first MCCIP newsletter was due Oct 06.

- It was agreed that that the MCCIP newsletter should have a quote from relevant ministers (Defra and devolved Parliaments) on the value they

see from MCCIP, to give it identity and to stand it above other initiatives

There followed discussion on MCCIP newsletter circulation list.

- It was suggested a blind-ended e-mail account be set up whereby those who want to subscribe to newsletter send e-mail. Distribution list is then updated on a regular basis.

There was a request for clarification on newsletter content.

- It was agreed it should include items such as partner initiatives, new funding / projects, newly published material, conferences.

There was a request to link MCCIP to regional groups initiatives as there are many climate change initiatives being undertaken. It was agreed:

- SG to promote MCCIP within their own organisations.
- within the UKCIP initiative there is scope for including reference to the MCCIP newsletter within UKCIP's own newsletter.
- MCCIP would be cited at a forthcoming Defra GA cross-regional programme.
- the newsletter needs to be linked to the MCCIP Communications Strategy. The Chair was conscious of impending ARC launch and asked for support from the SG to QA the newsletter.

Actions ***Seek quote from Ministers endorsing MCCIP newsletter and provide update at next meeting***
Include reference to MCCIP within next UKCIP newsletter
Advertise MCCIP at cross regional-event
Partners to supply topical info for newsletter to the Secretariat by end Sep
Newsletter review sub-group to be set up

4.3 Future Events / Products – MCCIP is not just about the ARC.

SG was asked for feedback on MCCIP post ARC.

- It was agreed there was a need to have a conference or similar in early 2007 to disseminate what we have done so far. This would be linked to the aforementioned annual review.
- It was agreed that within the ARC back-page to include provision for feedback and how others could get involved / participate in MCCIP.
- It was agreed that at the next meeting we include a session on where we take MCCIP.
- The Secretariat reminded the SG that there had been a major change to original project plan in that first ARC is being launched month 11 instead of month 18.

Actions ***At next meeting, discuss where we take ARC and aim to firm arrangements for annual conference. Ensure ARC output is linked to MCCIP objectives.***

4. The SAHFOS Marine Climate Encyclopaedia Presentation

5.1 Web encyclopaedia presentation by SAHFOS. SAHFOS advised that the initial outlay on web design was approximately £3k and this has enabled progress to current level (i.e. website is up and running) but further funding is required to move the project forward. After the presentation, discussions held on how this item specifically relates to MCCIP.

- It was agreed that there was concern regarding the two initiatives – in terms of duplicating effort; asking same information from same people (i.e. contributors); how would potential funders differentiate between the initiatives; issues of potential conflict; correlation of information.

It was tabled “Is encyclopaedia a knowledge transfer mechanism for MCCIP; can it also be seen as an MCCIP product?”

- There was wide ranging general discussion on this and it was agreed that the encyclopaedia could have a more global perspective and was possibly a niche for headline info for journalists, media. However it was also agreed MCCIP is a considered view rather than alarmist. MCCIP seeking to capture information and relay it to a wider audience, not to seek headlines.
- The following issue was raised – If there was a formal link between the two initiatives how does MCCIP control content of encyclopaedia info (bearing in mind MCCIP has own internal review process for information). I.e. What input would / should MCCIP have on what goes on the encyclopaedia website? If MCCIP is endorsing the encyclopaedia then essentially the UK Govt. is endorsing it and therefore there needs to be an element of control.
- In response to the above, SAHFOS advised there was unlikely to be a conflict of interest between MCCIP and the encyclopaedia, but if so, this would be brought to MCCIP’s attention. It was noted that the outside community might be nervous if input to encyclopaedia is controlled.

It was agreed that to overcome these concerns:

- There was a need for clarity between roles *of* and relationship *between* the encyclopaedia and MCCIP / ARC.
- As a cautionary note, there may be a fatigue if we are not careful. This issue being two-fold:
 - 1) How do we align both websites to ensure they are not confusing to the customer/viewer;

- 2) How do we streamline information to ensure the science is not confusing?
- It was agreed to formally document the relationship between the two initiatives and to ensure there is a branded SG response to any enquiries regarding them.
- It was further commented that whilst there is potential for mutual benefit here, we have to go back to what the principal aims of MCCIP are – i.e. **to provide high quality evidence on marine climate change impacts, and related advice, to policy advisors and decision-makers.**
- It was confirmed that the encyclopaedia does not contain advice or opinions; it is a summary of fact and an assessment of what our state of knowledge is.

Action ***SG to agree form of words for relationship agreement showing links, differences between the two initiatives and for this wording to be clearly demonstrated on each website***

6. ARC discussion

The Secretariat presented mock-ups of the ARC - content & design and asked for comments. With imminent launch any concerns need to be tabled now.

6.1 There followed discussion on content & design of the ARC.

The Secretariat explained process of information gathering (since June meeting). Experts were asked to contribute and this contribution was summarised into 100-150 words for the ARC (briefing notes on the topics are also to be made available). The summary and briefing notes would be linked back to the full submissions of the contributing scientists. (Note not just one expert has contributed to a topic summary.)

ARC Content

It was agreed that the ARC is not about recommendations; it is a summary of our knowledge. It gives peer-reviewed quality advice on what the climate change impacts are. The first ARC is providing info on what we know up to now; thereafter what has happened since last 12 months of preceding ARC (with a hind cast to previous ARC).

It was agreed:

- That some summaries were too verbose, had too much detail. Although first ARC was a scene-setting card, it still had an important job to do for laying the foundations of subsequent years' cards.
- To separate out the **key facts** to give a much sharper focus. At its current word level, it is almost an additional explanation to the briefing notes.
- ARC summaries were not "headline" enough. ARC should be a quick snap-shot for people to zoom in on.

- The confidence levels section was not hard-hitting enough; the source of information missing.
- There was a need for consistency across different sections.
- To focus on content first and then focus on design.
- In light of the above, request made for SG volunteers to reduce ARC wording and pick out key messages (70 words max). Also, SG members with specific issues to were asked to respond directly to the MCCIP Secretariat individually with their concerns (e.g. sea mammals; sea-bed status; wave climate).

It was suggested at end of each section to include consequences of particular areas, but although this was thought a good idea, it added complexity and should be considered for future years.

The Secretariat reiterated their concerns to the SG over deadline / designs and asked for consideration in this respect.

There was discussion on how this process related to the EAP peer-review process. What does EAP need and when does it need it by?

The EAP need:

1. Agreed 70-word summaries as they appear in the ARC.
2. Confirmed briefing notes on which EAP can base whether summary is justified.

There followed discussion on the need for the SG members to review the content before it goes into the ARC. Concern was expressed over this and the possible confusion as to the role of the Expert Advisory Panel (EAP). It was agreed that the purpose of the EAP was to review the ARC summaries and briefing notes – hence the value of having a peer-reviewed process. If the SG is going to review also, then this de-values the EAP process.

It was agreed that role of peer-review would not change and it would have autonomy in that role.

It was also noted that some ARC topics were not complete (large-scale oceanic processes, stratification, fish and habs). The Secretariat advised this was in hand.

Action ***Members to feedback comments on specific sections to MCCIP Secretariat by 08 Sep 2006***
Members to provide feedback on headlines by 15 Sep 2006
MCCIP Secretariat to chase and complete missing sections
MCCIP Secretariat to include source of information
MCCIP Secretariat to supply reduced summaries and confirmed briefing notes to EAP by 12 Sep 06
EAP to peer-review by week 1 October

ARC Design

The outcome of ARC sub-group meeting on 03 Aug 06 was discussed. The ARC tabular design was presented. It was noted that this design had some omissions from sub-group meeting (see below).

Tabular example tabled by EA as a result of sub-group meeting

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5
Pic / Title	Fact	Future	Level of Confidence	Source / Link

It was agreed OK to use tabular design if the summaries were shorter. One member asked for symbology, especially if printing in black & white. It was agreed that further discussion was needed and the Secretariat was asked to submit more ARC designs to the SG ASAP.

Actions ***More ARC designs required (including tabular format and symbology) and these to be sent to the SG by date of next meeting (18 Oct 06)***

6.2 Case mock –up

The EA previously presented this at the ARC sub-group meeting. The purpose of the mock-up was to convey an ecosystem approach – i.e. to “join up the dots” of the ARC; to make it relevant to the public.

Comments were sought on whether we should we include the case study within the ARC?

- The Chair agreed in principle, but asked how we action within time-frame.
- One member expressed concern over what mock-up is - “scenario” type approach, which may conflict with recent SG members’ own organisation scenarios. Problem with endorsing MCCIP ARC if conflict was there.
- It was suggested to include case study as a press briefing.

It was agreed that whilst the mock-up was a good idea in principle, it would currently not form part of the ARC. It should still be taken forward, with design improvements sought.

Actions ***Case-study comments to EA by 15 Sep
Present update at next meeting for further discussion
Do not link nutrients and algal bloom; use map of UK and include Channel Islands or an “unspecific” coast (i.e. not just east coast of England) –***

7. ARC Launch plans

7.1 It had previously been suggested to launch ARC at the Bob Earll conference. However, it was agreed there were issues with this. Firstly, this

conference has been set up as a pay-to-attend event. Secondly, it is set up to achieve different aims from MCCIP. It was agreed that separating the two events made sense.

7.2 It was suggested to launch ARC via a 2-hour evening event, with invitations to key policy makers, contributing scientists etc. for the evening of Wed 29 Nov 06. Chair asked for comments on this suggestion.

It was agreed that the following would be discussed at the next SG meeting.

Actions ***Defra Press Office to be involved in preparing launch***
Launch needs to be made attractive for journalists to attend
Simultaneous launches (with devolved parliaments) to be considered
Venue to be considered - Suggestion of Port Cullis House sponsored by a Minister
Defra to help will help manage process; invitations etc
Inclusion of contributing scientists to the event
Members to look into arranging a “high-profile” speaker for the Launch
All of the above will be tabled at the next meeting

8. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 18 October 2006
Location: TBC