

Digest of Steering Group Meeting No 13

Venue: Scottish Government, Edinburgh (and tele-conference)
Date: 28 April 2010
Start: 12:00

Present:

Philip Stamp (Defra) chair; Matthew Sayer (WAG); John Baxter (SNH); Kate Lonsdale (UKCIP); Jon Lartice (Defra); Paul Buckley (MCCIP-Sec); Matt Frost (MECN); Martyn Cox (Scottish Government); Alexander Downie (SEPA); Adam Mellor (AFBI); Dan Laffoley (Natural England); Kevin O'Carroll (BERR); Colin Moffat (FRS); Jane Edquist (Defra, ACC); Jessica Orr (CCW); Craig Wallace (NERC-RAPID); Kathy Kennedy (Cefas); Jon Tinker (Met Office)

Apologies:

Colin Taylor (BE); Mike Cowling (Crown Estate); Martin Edwards (SAHFOS); Jackie Maud (EA); Emma Verling (JNCC); Glenn Nolan (Marine Institute, ROI);

Agenda item 1 - Action points from the last meeting

Summary of actions -

Secretariat to seek opportunities around the launch of the ARC to speak to the SUDG.

Secretariat to thank RSPB for their support during phase I of the project and identify other NGOs to invite onto the SG.

Agenda item 2 – ARC 2010 progress update

The chair of the report card WG provided an update on where we are at with the ARC and what new elements had been proposed. Comments were invited on the progress made to date.

Some key issues to consider included:

- The need for a heads up on the key differences emerging this year ahead of the launch.
- Making the most of the new elements such as the regional maps and case studies.
- Links between other work such as CP2 and UKCP09 should be brought out more.

Agenda item 3 – ARC 2010 launch plans

It was explained that we have the opportunity to launch at the British Irish Council meeting in mid-July on 14th-15th July. There would most likely be 20 minutes for speeches and in addition interactive sessions with the ministers and some authors are proposed. We could also raise options for the next special topic while we have the ministers there.

Potential new themes for the special topic were discussed and suggestions for topics were invited. These will be developed after the meeting but before the ARC launch.

Agenda item 4 – Phase II progress update

It was explained that since the last SG meeting the business case had been agreed by the SG and work was now underway to secure funding.

In principal commitments could be provided by most partners and ways to secure additional funding through sponsored events was discussed. Additional funds may also be attracted for work on knowledge gaps.

The importance of continued in-kind contributions was stressed, which is probably worth more than the money physically brought into the project.

A work plan will be drawn up by midsummer outlining where we are heading and when.

Agenda item 5 – CSW update.

It was explained that the group met on 30th march to take forward new work on adaptation through climate smart working. The big issue for MCCIP is how different this is from impacts advice. Adaptation interventions are a lot more internal and about capacity building and we need to move forward with right balance of sectors. We also need to consider how scientific evidence can be brought to bear on CSW. It was at the recent meeting that it is better not as a snapshot of sectors for any one year but about progress over a number of years

Nominations for the CSW group were invited and there were currently seven volunteers to start work on a prospectus document.

It was agreed that as the concept is worked up further, there will be a need to bring in expertise from outside of the SG, either from other parts of our organisations or from external groups, engaging policy, adaptation and management professionals.

Agenda item 6 – Knowledge gaps

It was explained that MCCIP has given itself remit to look at knowledge gaps and in order to take this forward, we need more clarity on the size of task, who it should be delivered to and in what format.

It was agreed that the audience was both the research funders and marine managers and both should be approached about how best this work can suit their needs.

We need to be careful to ensure we have people undertaking this task that are competent enough to understand the science, but that will not clearly benefit from it.

In the interests of impartiality, we need a generic set of criteria to mark needs against and get external people in to help make unbiased judgements on it.

The basis of the work could be from charting progress 2 and the next MCCIP report card, both due out at around the same time in July.

PB
15/05/10