

MCCIP Partnership Development Day Notes

24 February 2006

Defra Whitehall Place, London

Participants:

Phil Alcock, Scottish Executive (SE)
Samantha Armstrong, Environment Agency (EA)
John Baxter, Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Peter Carter, Department for Trade and Industry (DTI)
Michelle Colley, UK Climate Impacts Partnership (UKCIP)
Andy Deacon, Defra Global Atmosphere division
Stephen Dye, Marine Climate Change Impacts Partnership (MCCIP)
Secretariat
Patricia Falconer, Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (Cefas)
Kate Francis, Cefas
Beth Greenaway, Defra Marine Environment division
Evanthia Karpouzli, SE
Katherine Kennedy, Cefas
Dan Laffoley, English Nature (EN)
Emily Lewis-Brown, WWF
Natasha Lough, Countryside Council for Wales (CCW)
Larissa Naylor, EA
Victoria Paris, Welsh Assembly Government (WAG)
David Viner, Climatic Research Unit (CRU), University of East Anglia
Olly Watts, RSPB
Craig Wallace, Natural Environment Research Council (NERC)
Mike Webb, NERC

1. INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOME

- 1.1 Andy Deacon from Defra's climate impacts team and the chairman for MCCIP welcomed all participants. He explained that there were deliberately not many Defra people present, as he wanted partners to develop the partnership collectively, rather than via dictates from Defra. Andy highlighted that Marine Climate Change has a high news profile, so the event was especially timely to reinvigorate the partnership. Andy briefly explained links to UKCIP and EU programmes.
- 1.2 Kathy Kennedy lead introductions and profiled her stakeholder engagement experience. Kathy emphasised that a two way

communication process was required, it was important for all to be involved in some difficult discussions.

- 1.3 The day was about setting up a sustainable partnership. Kathy confirmed that while some participants were already fully engaged with MCCIP, some were not so familiar with the partnership. It was agreed that all participants would be referred to as partners, but this should not be seen by anyone as being forced into the formal partnership arrangements which were developing! Kathy said that although Ireland was not represented at the event, MCCIP will work to engage them afterwards.

2. PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PRESENTATION

- 2.1 Kathy read from objectives slide to ensure key messages were shared and understood. Stressed MCCIP is not a policy making partnership, its about sharing scientific evidence to support policy makers and communication to stakeholders. Key activities of the MCCIP Secretariat were outlined as a hands-on support to the partnership to assist with collaborative working.
- 2.2 Kathy commended SAHFOS for their scientific input into the partnership, but highlighted the urgency of setting governance arrangements in place. Kathy confirmed that following the workshop, arrangements for the steering group, the sustainable funding for the partnership, a communications strategy and a business plan would be developed.
- 2.3 Kathy raised the potentially difficult issue of communications and understanding MCCIP brand when partners disagree. It was important to reach consensus on this issue before problems arose. Also, Kathy encouraged those present to steer a broad direction and new development ideas for the partnership.

Questions/discussion

- 2.4 Beth Greenaway wanted it made clear that Cefas is not running MCCIP - it has to be independently run. Kathy confirmed that this was the intention, but highlighted the difficulties of creating a separate identity for the MCCIP Secretariat while still at the design stage.

3. INTRODUCTION TO MCCIP

- 3.1 Stephen Dye confirmed that the MCCIP Secretariat is hosted at Cefas but will be independent. Stephen outlined the background to the development of this initiative and explained CRU's role in public outreach. The MCCIP key objective, Stephen said, was concerning the effective transferring of information from scientists to policy makers. Stephen stressed that MCCIP was not working in isolation, but

highlighted the importance of involvement with MDIP and other groups.

- 3.2 Stephen explained the change of scale of the models used to show marine climate change, and the global-scale ocean circulation information which is available to use to put UK marine climate change impacts information into context. An important role of the MCCIP Secretariat would be to aim to ensure that all partners get what they want from the partnership.
- 3.3 The communication model for MCCIP was explained, along with the key output of the Annual Report Card. Stephen outlined the next stages of the project – this workshop, followed by agreeing communications and governance; the website launch 10 March; a Science Workshop in Spring 06; the Annual Report Card and briefing notes by Nov 06; and role of secretariat during these phases.

Questions/discussion

- 3.4 Kathy informed those present of the recruitment campaign being run for an MCCIP programme officer, which would be a shared post with the Euroceans project manager.
- 3.5 Emily Lewis–Brown posed a question on evidence of marine climate change impacts. Stephen responded on the necessity to use modelling in support the aims of MCCIP, particularly on issues of adaptation.
- 3.6 David Viner highlighted MCCIP's potential to have a facilitating and co-ordinating role for research funding. Stephen clarified that MCCIP will inform funders, not lobby for funds. Beth added that funders will be part of the partnership anyway. It was agreed that MCCIP would not have a fund manager role.
- 3.7 Sam Armstrong asked about the-role of briefing notes. Stephen said that the partnership needs to decide how to set up the Annual Report Card process (as this is linked with the briefing notes development), and a few options for approaches were discussed. It was acknowledged that producing Annual Report Cards was a challenging and difficult task, especially the delivery of the first one. Beth confirmed she wanted the briefing notes to cover FAQs.

4. DISCUSSION SESSION

- 4.1 Kathy explained the focus of the session was for everyone to check their own organisations' understanding of the partnership, communicate their expectations of the partnership and the Secretariat, identify and seek to mitigate problems and risks, and agree measures of success.

Question 1: How high up the agenda is Climate Change in your organisation?

4.2 Each participant communicated their organisations' approach to Climate Change:

RSPB – high profile concerning impacts on seabirds – has raised public profile of Climate Change issues too.

EN (Natural England) – seen as high priority – an Extraordinary Council Meeting focused on Climate Change was planned for 16 March, to include a session on marine Climate Change issues. The meeting was intended to set the direction of the organisation with regard to their Climate Change research contributions. Oceans 2025 headlines were reiterated, along with the sustainability issue concerning natural landscapes.

CCW – high priority internally, with corporate seminars and training courses addressing need for organisation wide action on climate change. CCW's Council has established an Advisory Group to consider the organisations response. Already engaged in a wide range of climate change related partnership projects at UK and Welsh level. Threatened coastal conservation sites of particular concern with continued monitoring of MarClim sites and demonstration project to incorporate consideration of sea level rise and flood risk into conservation management of estuarine sites.

EA – aspects are important, e.g. sea level and tidal surges, plus Water Framework Directive responsibilities re: ecosystem. It was felt that some directives had been written without Climate Change issues in mind, and that this partnership needed to underpin evidence-base, and consider how to be proactive in adapting legislation (rather than reactive).

DTI –DTi are heavily engaged in matters associated with climate change, and would welcome feedback from other organisations in order to establish priorities for Marine Climate Change.

Defra – has a global interest – links to other strategies and policies. Wants clear messages to feed into policy.

UKCIP – marine is considered as a sector along with many others – important because stakeholder requests for information on marine issues are increasing. Want this partnership to build capacity to answer such stakeholder enquiries.

SE/SNH – of high importance – explained organisation structures to focus on Climate Change issues, especially related to biodiversity. SE was holding a Climate Change meeting in March and invited MCCIP Secretariat to attend. SE was about to issue a Climate Change strategy and MCCIP would be mentioned as a way to take forward. SE had a Marine Science sub Group which will link to MCCIP.

NAW – reported similar to EA view.

WWF – Marine Climate Change interest and awareness is increasing following work done last year. Media interest increasing. Wants MCCIP to provide information for lobbying for mitigation at national and international level. Adaptation and mitigation stressed. How will

Marine Climate Change impact on industry as well as environment be managed? Sees lots of opportunities for using the outcomes of the partnership's work. Suggested ecosystem-wide issues with low certainty but high risk should be included in discussions.

NERC – Climate Change is very important but so is everything else! Commitment to marine science is manifested in new ship. NERC funds excellence so need to make a strong as possible case, linked to key priorities and be aware of limited resources. Knowledge transfer issue discussed. Lots of “blue skies” science funding to academics but worried that the outputs are not properly understood or communicated to key stakeholders. Oceans 2020 represents large proportion of NERC research budget.

Question 2: What do you expect from the MCCIP Secretariat and Partnership?

4.3 There was a wide-ranging discussion on key expectations as follows:

- **Communicate** who is doing what and helping to make beneficial links.
- Be an honest broker. **Handling differences** of scientific opinion.
- Communicate variety of views – dataset users can make their choice.
- Provide **evidence** not policy.
- Co-ordinate communication of outputs/initiatives of interest as a **conduit of information** for marine science stakeholders and feeding up to policy makers.
- Give us a picture of what is going on – **broad picture** to determine priorities please.
- Platform for joining things up. Not commission research but assist with **developing collaborations** on particular topics.
- MARCEM ? needs to digest into key issues – could be powerful to communicate this to policy people.
- Quarterly **forward look** on policy issues and science issues.
- Making partners aware of **opportunities**.

Question 3: What is partnership?

4.4 It was agreed that the partnership was a platform of co-ordination. It remained the responsibility of every partner to make it work within the various organisations. The Secretariat need to explain what is expected from partners on a strategic level and a practical level. It was acknowledged that regulators have seen partnerships come and go so may be sceptical – so need to establish and maintain high profile if to be taken seriously and gain adequate financial commitment.

Question 4: What suite of skills should MCCIP have?

4.5 There was broad agreement along the following lines:

- Lots of “**antenna**” – many initiatives of potential interest to partners
- Good written skills
- **Gravitas**/authority
- Must seek to **gain consensus** on key priorities
- Accessibility
- High **profile** to attract interest
- Credibility – build track record
- Clear and understandable **outputs** from MCCIP
- Need to get out and involved in various meetings going on
- Key success measure will be when people come to MCCIP for advice
- Partnership needs to **add value to partners** – cataloguing work but also provide ecosystem overview and perspective – build up layers of data.

Question 5: Problems & risk?

4.6 The discussions centred around defining the boundaries of the partnership, and it was agreed not to duplicate effort of elsewhere, so to focus on Marine Climate Change Impacts. The risks of overload – getting into too much detail too quickly was identified. This would be mitigated by filtering and balance, and keeping strategic. The risk of the partnership becoming geographically constrained would be mitigated by ensuring evenly spread to deliver whole UK approach. A clear plan on website could outline report cards focus for next 5 years. This would also help to prioritise communications. Larissa Naylor outlined Australian report card work which had been scheduled this way.

Question 6: How will we handle disagreements?

4.7 Kathy highlighted that there were bound to be disagreements amongst partners, for example, when policy does not go far enough for NGOs. The Partnership needed to stay integrated even if partners were having difficulties on certain issues publicly. It was agreed that tensions are inevitable and may not be appropriate to be resolved in this forum.

4.8 The management of the partnership may have to change in response to new pressures and new knowledge, and partners needed to be clear how the partnership will handle new issues. It was suggested that the partnership build on the UKCIP experience – where technical queries may be filtered to others, not necessarily handled by MCCIP.

4.9 The need to clarify UKCIP and MCCIP boundaries and interactions on their respective websites was highlighted.

- 4.10 It was highlighted that MCCIP would supply “quality assured knowledge” for assessment of risk on specific sites (e.g. SSSIs, World heritage sites). There was a key role for CRU in this aspect.

Question 7: What are the expectations of QA?

- 4.11 Two main Quality Assurance roles were outlined. It was agreed that **Quality of Science** should be a role for the Expert Advisory Panel. **Quality of product** (e.g. web pages, briefing notes) was a different issue, and Kathy agreed to produce guidelines for first Steering Group meeting to consider.

5. PRESENTATION 2 – PRODUCTION OF AN ANNUAL REPORT CARD

- 5.1 Stephen Dye outlined the challenge – clean, healthy, safe, productive and biologically diverse seas – and the indicator framework. Annual Report Cards were easily understood by decision makers, and could be theme based or region based. An example of an effective Annual Report Card was highlighted from healthywaterway.org from Australia. Stephen suggested some different themes for ARCs and suggested 1 would be produced per year.

Questions/discussion:

- 5.2 Stephen clarified that the ARC test stage on his slide was about consulting confidentially with external users not close to Climate Change issues. Kathy said that at the first steering group meeting, there will be a paper explaining the approach we have developed to meet the challenge of producing the first year ARC, and the rationale behind the decisions which have been taken.
- 5.3 There was a discussion on the need to identify audience to deliver a useful product and not lose credibility for future years. Also, the need to identify commonalities of user requirements was highlighted. It was agreed that the ARC was a vehicle to report trends, and that Briefing Notes would be required to underpin the ARCs. David Viner outlined his experience of the European Environment Agency ARC model.
- 5.4 Kathy stressed the need for steering group meeting soon to take forward these discussions, and agreed that Briefing Notes would be stepping stones for the production of the ARC.
- 5.5 Beth Greenaway highlighted the need to establish what potential work MCCIP would require from data providers in order to feed into the ARC. Kathy replied that focus groups would be tasked with this.

6. PRESENTATION 3 – MARINE SCENARIOS

- 6.1 Michelle Colley explained that UKCIP was set up to provide information to a wide variety of organisations on Climate Change and how they may have to adapt. Michelle showed the UKCIP02 slide of four climate change deterministic scenarios depending on emissions scenarios over 2020-2080 timescale. Michelle said this dataset was widely applied in the terrestrial environment, and she cited examples of applications. "UKCIPnext" was the Hadley Centre development on the conceptual change of analysis to a more probability/risk based way of thinking. The plan was to develop a web-based product with varying complexity of information to satisfy different end user needs. The project was at user consultation stage, and the potential role for MCCIP in the delivery of UKCIPnext was outlined.

Questions/discussion:

- 6.2 There was a discussion on deterministic and probabilistic model approaches. David Viner queried the depth information involved. Andy Deacon stressed that the developing models were following international guidance, and suggested that the probabilistic model route is the way forward for decision makers.
- 6.3 Michelle confirmed that the next UKCIP scenarios would be available in 2008.

7. The lunch break followed, and Emily Lewis-Brown left at this point.

8. GROUP WORK

Participants were split into the following three groups to focus on different aspects of MCCIP:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| A) Decision making systems: | Phil Alcock, Scottish Executive
Dan Laffoley, English Nature
John Baxter, Scottish Natural Heritage
Andy Deacon, Defra GA
Mike Webb, NERC
Peter Carter, DTI
Kathy Kennedy, Cefas
Kate Francis, Cefas |
| B) Communications: | Sam Armstrong, EA
Michelle Colley, UK CIP
Olly Watts RSPB
Patricia Falconer, Cefas |
| C) Science: | Larissa Naylor, EA |

Beth Greenaway, Defra
David Viner, CRU
Craig Wallace, NERC
Natasha Lough, CCW
Victoria Paris, NAW
Emily-Lewis Brown, WWF
Evanthia Karpouzli, Scottish
Executive

9) FEEDBACK SESSION

The groups fed back the main findings of their discussions as follows:

A) DECISION MAKING SYSTEMS

Dan Laffoley presented back to main group.

Steering Group arrangements

- **Chaired by Defra**, Quorum of 4, total of **approx. 10 SG members** to ensure workable committee
- SG members to nominate deputies with full delegation
- **Funders and contributors in kind to be on SG**. Make recommendations to Defra on SG members and then invite agreed organisations/individuals.
- Need those who can commit the necessary time
- SG could co-opt experts as required
- SG member(s) to have mentoring role for particular products e.g. ARC
- Stability of members long-term to give strength
- Meet twice in first year – fix dates now – one before publishing ARC and one after for reviewing and forward planning
- **First meeting in Scotland in June**
- Use some SG meetings as networking opportunity by hosting at research lab and including presentation(s) possibly from Expert Advisory Group member(s)
- Make use of telephone conferencing between now and first meeting esp. with ARC mentor
- Key role in providing **Communications QA** for briefing notes and ARC via obtaining feedback on drafts from the represented organisation's communications/PR departments to ensure messages are "fit for purpose" clearly communicated to target audiences. Use of Plain English and Welsh/Irish languages.

Expert Advisory Group

- **Small group** of scientists who could be paid for their input
- High level representation from NERC

- Chair to provide leadership and continuity – consider an **independent chair**
- Members to be **geographically spread**
- Key role to provide **Science QA** to briefing notes and ARC (“quality and rigour”)
- Consider **changing membership** depending on the development of issues/focus of briefing notes etc.
- Make use of technology for group activities, i.e. email rather than succession of meetings
- Make use of the networks of the core group to develop a directory of key specialists **-use journal review model**
- Use open calls for gathering information relevant to briefing notes – be specific so filtered information is supplied

Creating a community

- MCCIP has key role to **help create** a Marine Climate Change community
- MCCIP Secretariat to attend all SG and EAG meetings and **produce minutes/digest** for wider circulation and publishing on internet
- Possibly have a **conference** for all interested parties (all partners and wider scientific community)
- Annually repeat a **workshop/conference event for MCCIP partners**, so organisations and individuals who are not represented on SG or EAG do not become disengaged with the partnership and/or its outputs. Maybe coincide with launch of first ARC?
- ARC – need to define users and what questions they need answered. Pressures and states. 2004/05 trends and context. **Consult on first draft ARC soon.**

Risks and barriers

- **Profile and relevance**
- MCCIP must remain politically significant and become high profile in order to succeed
- Important to have credibility – demonstrated by “**usable products**” – quality and relevance of first product is key
- Must define success – strategic **aim to develop and grow** the partnership
- Each partner has a role in **promoting the partnership** within their organisation and within their current external networks
- This needs to be backed up by MCCIP Secretariat raising awareness of partnership through marketing the brand
- The partnership needs to build in the capacity to adapt to changing structures and/or roles of partner organisations (e.g. Natural England)

Boundaries

- “Marine Climate Change” – from High Water Mark out to sea, not constrained by 12 or 200m boundaries – consider European and global dimension.

B) COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

Olly Watts presented back to main group.

Identity

- Need clear objectives, deliverable and define audiences

Audience

- Wider communication best done through individual partner organisations
- Don't design/cater to public, but some outputs might be of interest
- Front ending = **Using salient points** of MCCIP in simple language on website in the margins linked to source info
- Stakeholder engagement map
- BBC Horizon-effect

Role

- MCCIP should **speak on behalf of the results** not the individual partners.
- MCCIP speaking on behalf of expert advisors – partners responsible for carrying message to their audiences, within the procedure agreed by the partnership

Media

- **Funding issue** – MCCIP haven't got the money to advertise
- Would look to partners to assist with resource provision for this via their media teams – especially Defra, as speaking on behalf of government = gravitas
- If a priority, MCCIP growth could justify more involvement – e.g. may need to dedicate resource to media when MCCIP brand is known and expanding.

Uncertainty – precautionary principle

- What is the risk of not acting
- Over/under adaptation

- **Protocol for communicating issues** so don't over/under react – MCCIP should manage this carefully
- **Reputational issues** (integrity/honesty) most important – especially at the beginning
- Peer review process? Disclaimer?
- Very audience dependent – recognise and deal with **conflicts of interests**

Annual Report Card

- MCCIP to provide co-ordinating role on communication of report, collecting feedback, a resource for media enquiries
- Build in **communications of outputs** as part of planning process
- Annual output must create resonance with our audience
- Piggy-back on general marine momentum

Events/topics

- Birds! High profile, uncontentious
- Implications of Water Framework Directive
- Coastal resorts/ports
- Energy installations on the coast
- Ocean acidification
- Embedding CC in legislation/policy

Problems & Solutions

Make the spirit of the partnership clear from the start to overcome many of the following:

P: Different vested interested of partners and possible competition amongst partners/organisations

S: Agreement of protocol/rules of developing partner positions

P: Conflicting science

S: Precautionary principle – what if?

P: Resources & ambition mis-match

S: Targeted communications, prioritisation, making use of partner resources

P: Why go to MCCIP?

S: Identify & promote our USP – many others out there, raising profile (all partners to contribute to this, starting from now)

P: Legal issues. Right to publish? Availability of information?

S: FOI Act – constant, communication early warning

C) SCIENCE

David Viner presented back to main group
Initial brainstorm headings were priorities, understanding, external expertise, data, gaps, modelling, uncertainty, science topics.

Boundaries

- Defined as the highest astronomical tide – dynamic
- OSPAR region, defined by stakeholders?

Scientific issues

List provided plus:

- Decoupling natural variability from human impacts
- What is our understanding of healthy biological diversity, clean and safe, productive
- Data/observation
- Modelling
- Expertise
- What is our state of understanding of how CC is impacting on marine environment
- How will CC interact with other pressures to impact the ecosystem
- When is an invasive species not and invasive species?
- Community structure changes
- Wave dynamics
- Construction of baseline marine climatology
- How will safety and cleanliness of marine environment change with climate change?

Skills and Gaps

Topic	UK	Ex UK	Level of understanding
Ocean acidity	PML		Low
Disease	?	?	?
Ocean transport	Seacol ?	?	Med
Storminess	HC POL reading CRU		Low
Hydrography & plankton	Cefas, NOC, SAHFOS, CEH		Low
Offshore structures	Civil Engineering, DTI		Low
Spatial policies	Lots	Lots	Observation good Predictive poor
Sub stock	Cefas		Low

Micro zoos	?	?	Low
Carbon cycling	Cefas, UEA, Met Office, CEH, NOC	Lots	Low
Food web	UEA, POL, NCOF		Low
Aqua	Cefas, SEPA	Lots	Medium
Invasive	See MarClim	?	Low
Marine Climate	Met Office, UEA< Cefas	Lots	Medium. Not as good as land
Sea bed	?	?	Low

- Data – mapping
- Models – conceptual, observed, predictive
- Inventory of datasets and models
- Without duplicating
- PDF = probability density functions – demonstrated the need for consistent and transferable terminology for conveying results
- Science led case studies
- Scientific topics
- Uncertainty
- Integrated modelling to examine linkages
- Characterisation of seas – baseline
- Define boundaries of natural variation

10. DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS

Steering Group suggestions/comments

- 10.1 It was agreed that a maximum of around 10 people would be on the SG in order to keep it of a workable size, but that this would not exclude meetings and/or workshops like this where all partners are invited and participate. There could be a big annual event for all (using a shareholder/board of directors analogy). SG could have focussed meetings with variable attendance. It was agreed that Minutes & papers of SG would be available publicly on website.

Expert Advisory Group suggestions/comments

- 10.2 It was agreed that a refereed journal model would be used for the development of Briefing Notes. The Steering Group would appoint internationally recognised experts based within the UK (e.g. Marine Lab directors) to be on the EAG. The Communications group assumed EAG would approve MCCIP outputs, and the Decision Making group had agreed.

Communications

- 10.3 There was broad agreement to develop this group's notes into a draft MCCIP communication strategy.

Anything else from group discussions

- 10.4 No other points were raised.

Funding

- 10.5 Kathy confirmed existing partner funding commitments and highlighted that the partnership needed a minimum of £100k pa to operate effectively. Some partners had committed funds for this FY. Kathy proposed that a draft partnership agreement which set out the rules of engagement and funding profile would be produced. NGOs must decide how to commit to the partnership. The Partnership agreement would have terms and conditions common to all partners. All partners and potential partners were asked to provide the MCCIP Secretariat with the name and contact details of their senior contracts people to get funding and terms & conditions agreed.

Steering Group arrangements

- 10.6 It was agreed that the Steering Group would meet in Scotland in June, and that there would be a telephone conference to progress the development of the Annual Report Card beforehand.
- 10.7 The SG Agenda for the June meeting would include:
1. Partnership agreement
 2. QA protocol
 3. ARC progress/strawman
 4. Work programme and business plan

11. CLOSING REMARKS

- 11.1 Andy Deacon thanked all participants for their ideas and guidance, and thanked the MCCIP Secretariat and Cefas for organising and facilitating the event. He asked that any further feedback on the points raised today, or any other suggestions or comments be made to Stephen Dye. Defra had already begun to make mention of MCCIP in a variety of channels, and Andy encouraged all partners to do likewise. There was general consensus that the day had been a successful platform for MCCIP to move forward.
- 11.2 The MCCIP logo presented to participants was agreed.

K Francis
26/02/06