



Stakeholder Engagement, Facilitation & Mediation

R K Partnership Ltd
Ellsdone
Torbay Road
Castle Cary
Somerset, BA7 7DW
Tel: 01963 351008

Finding Sanctuary: Process Group

REPORT

Meeting: 19th April 2010

Report: 29th April 2010

CONTENTS

Attendees2

Agenda2

Actions from last meeting.....3

Actions of Last Meeting

What	Who	By when
Write proposed ground rules for SG meeting and email them in advance of the next SG & present them at the SG meeting on 11 Feb for approval. - Done	RKP	3 Feb
Remind relevant councils of their role within the process i.e. input via the Local Groups. - PT have agreed to write them a summary of the project and what is going on at present following TH attendance at LGA meeting in London.	Tom Hooper	25 Jan
Respond to Marinet saying no to their application to join the SG with rationale.	Tom Hooper	20/01/10
Update the Protocol and send to SG - Done, latest version of SG protocol dated Jan 2010	RKP	3 Feb
Contact the British Chamber of Shipping to invite them to be either a member of the SG or consultative stakeholder group - depending on outcome of the SG. BCS want to be on the SG as member and not a NCS	Tom Hooper	27/01/10
Contact the BASC to invite them to be either a member of the SG or consultative stakeholder group - depending on outcome of the SG. NCS	Tom Hooper	27/01/10
Contact the JNCC re having campaigning organisations on the national group. - FS with other RPs have attempted to keep a similar level of membership, FS was missing Geological rep, conservation (MCS on other 3 RPs) and MCA for safety.	Tom Hooper	29 Jan
Prepare a short brief for SG members on the role and organisation of Local Groups and the protocol for dealing with enquiries. - PT have a broad level understanding of role of LGs now	Project Team	29/01/10
Write a couple of sentences to go at beginning of the Protocol to clarify the purpose of the SG in the MCZ process - Done	Tom	3/2/10

Attendees

Present

Richard White Wildlife & Countryside Link
Dick Appleton British Ports Association
Jim Masters Devon Maritime Forum
Tom Hooper Finding Sanctuary
Spike Searle Finding Sanctuary

Apologies

Andy Green Canoe England, British Canoe Union
Louise Lieberknecht Finding Sanctuary

Agenda

10.00 Review & Agree Agenda

Actions of last meeting

Steering Group Meeting Review

Steering Group

- Applications to join
- Changes/resignations
- Press Statements

11.30 Break

Process Planning

- Sequencing meetings
- Dealing with the 1st iteration
- Named Consultative Stakeholders
- Role of IFCA / MMO
- Local Groups

13.00 Lunch

Working Groups

15.00 Break

Steering Group Meeting (June)

Scoping the Aims and Agenda for the meeting

Next Steps

Reflection and evaluation

17.00 Finish

1. Actions of Last Meeting

What	Who	By when
Write proposed ground rules for SG meeting and email them in advance of the next SG & present them at the SG meeting on 11 Feb for approval. - Done	RKP	3 Feb
Remind relevant councils of their role within the process i.e. input via the Local Groups. - PT have agreed to write them a summary of the project and what is going on at present following TH attendance at LGA meeting in London.	Tom Hooper	25 Jan
Respond to Marinet saying no to their application to join the SG with rationale.	Tom Hooper	20/01/10
Update the Protocol and send to SG - Done, latest version of SG protocol dated Jan 2010	RKP	3 Feb
Contact the British Chamber of Shipping to invite them to be either a member of the SG or consultative stakeholder group - depending on outcome of the SG. BCS want to be on the SG as member and not a NCS	Tom Hooper	27/01/10
Contact the BASC to invite them to be either a member of the SG or consultative stakeholder group - depending on outcome of the SG. NCS	Tom Hooper	27/01/10
Contact the JNCC re having campaigning organisations on the national group. - FS with other RPs have attempted to keep a similar level of membership, FS was missing Geological rep, conservation (MCS on other 3 RPs) and MCA for safety.	Tom Hooper	29 Jan
Prepare a short brief for SG members on the role and organisation of Local Groups and the protocol for dealing with enquiries. - PT have a broad level understanding of role of LGs now	Project Team	29/01/10
Write a couple of sentences to go at beginning of the Protocol to clarify the purpose of the SG in the MCZ process - Done	Tom	3/2/10
send out agenda to the SG. - Done	RKP	3 Feb
Local Groups to be given a summary of the FS interim guidance. - Done	Louise	11/2/10
Set Steering Group dates to the end of the year - Done, 9th June, 7th October and 10th Feb 2011	Tom & Rob	29/01/10
Circulate Process Group dates to absent members (with PG notes) - Done, next PG meeting 9th July (more need to be set by end of today - 19.04.2010)	RKP	
Ask for greater clarity from Peter Jones re his research job/mandate - convey his answer to PG who will then decide by email, whether to make recommendation to SG - TH has responded to say that he can have access to SG and WG, and given dates. PJ said he will attend all meetings. TH to find out if he will be there for sure so that RKP can notify all group members.	Tom	ASAP
Pull together all PG recommendations for the SG into one summary report - Done	Jim	3/2/10
Circulate Jim's summary PG recommendations report to the SG - Done	RKP	3 Feb
Book Gipsy Hill Garden Suite for PG meeting April 19 th - Done	RKP	19/01/10
Report of PG meeting 18 January - Done	RKP	22/01/10

2. Review Steering Group Meeting

A review of the Steering Group meeting held on 11th February 2010 was undertaken to help inform what changes would be beneficial, or what could be done better or differently next time.

2.1 Process Group Report and Feedback at SG meeting

The PG discussed the feedback on the PG report given at the February Steering Group meeting and any issues arising from it. The PG all felt that the current method of feedback given at the Steering Group meeting was labored and time consuming and didn't give all PG members a chance to respond to queries from SG members. It also made it seem like the PG is above the SG and not equal to it

The timing of PG feedback and placement in the agenda was discussed as some PG members felt that it should be the first item, although RKP pointed out that many SG members has requested that this not be the case.

The PG felt that there was still a lot of reluctance amongst SG members to actually make any marks on the map due to a lack of confidence in their own ability and knowledge. The PG agreed that it was important to highlight that this is a data driven process and that SG members need to utilise the vast amounts of data put together by the PT to enable them to make a more informed decision.

The PG **AGREED** to recommend the following to assist in more effective future SG meetings:

- That PG report should be sent out to SG members before SG meetings
- To ask SG members if they have any questions arising about PG proposals and to send these in writing to the PT before the SG meeting.
- At SG meetings SG members will be asked to agree to recommendations in the PG report, but that these recommendations will not be discussed at the meeting, unless an issue has been raised in advance in writing by an SG member and the person who raises it, after discussion with Rob Angell / Project Team/ insists on it being brought to the meeting for discussion
- That RKP or the PT will remind the SG, at the start of the SG meeting, that they are a decision making group and will be asked to agree to things throughout the day.

3. The Steering Group

3.1 SG membership

Several members of the SG are being replaced or swapped for other people who represent the same or similar organisations. For the members resigning and being replaced, the organisation remains the same and therefore it is the organisation's choice to change members representing them. Therefore PG cannot comment on it. However, where the membership organisation is changing, there is room for the PG to comment on suggested replacements and their suitability.

- Dick Appleton is being replaced by Sandie Wilson, Portland Port Ltd, but will not leave until the autumn. He will therefore attend the June SG and July PG (with Sandie possibly shadowing). However, Sandie will not necessarily replace DA on the PG.
- Dave Bond (commercial hand-lining) being replaced by David Marshall
- Armand Toms (commercial fishing) resigning and being replaced by Paul Trebilcock (Chief Executive CFPO)

- Jonet Waldock (SWRDA) replaced by Colin Cornish

The PG queried the replacement of Jonet Waldock by Colin Cornish, because he solely brings renewable expertise, rather than the overall economic brief that was requested from the SWRDA member. The PG also noted that Cheryl Hiles is representing SW Regen who are the SWRDA renewables energy agency for South West England. Some other marine industries such as boat building have been in contact with the PT asking why they do not have representation on the SG.

Therefore the PG recommends:

- The PT write to SWRDA reiterating that their representative is on the SG to input on south-west economic issues and to ask them to confirm that CC is capable of fulfilling this role.
- That SWRDA is forwarded concerns from marine industries of economic importance such as boat building, as they should be representing those wider interests on the SG.

It was also brought to the attention of the group that Wildlife and Countryside Link is no longer represented on SG as RW is now only representing the Wildlife Trusts

3.2 Applications to join the Steering Group

There has been a National Stakeholder Analysis and the results suggested that Finding Sanctuary was missing representation from 'safety', 'geology and geomorphology' and 'campaigning conservation NGOs'. Thus the PG considered the **applications to join the SG** from; Marine and Coastguard Agency; School of Geography and Environmental Sciences, University of Plymouth; and Marine Conservation Society.

3.2.1 Marine and Coastguard Agency

The MCA was approached by the PT with regards to fulfilling the role of representing safety, They have shown an interest and the PG agreed for them to be offered either full membership of the SG or the option of becoming a Named Consultative Stakeholder. TH will email all SG members to confirm their agreement before proceeding to contact the MCA again to offer them the opportunity to engage with the project.

3.2.2 School of Geography and Environmental Sciences, University of Plymouth

The PG considered the School of Geography and Environmental Sciences, University of Plymouth application and noted the following:-

- That the geological and geomorphological interest should be represented on the SG by Natural England, but that having an expert with whom to consult would be beneficial.
- RKP highlighted that having individuals on a SG who are only there as experts is risky as they don't have a constituency or represent other people. However, they do bring knowledge and could be brought in on a consultative role.
- PG were unsure of the relevance a representative could bring as a full SG member and suggested the University of Plymouth be asked to input as a Named Consultative Stakeholder (and also work closely with Louise and the PT to aid with WGs for specific geomorphological features).
- That the SG would need to decide when to ask for expert advice, but that it could be requested for a specific site or after the 1st iteration once feedback from the SAP has come back.

3.2.3 Marine Conservation Society

Following on from the previous PG meeting in which the Finding Sanctuary Process Consultants (RKP) advised that there was a case for an environmental campaigning organisation as a stakeholder in this process, the National Stakeholder Analysis also showed that the MCS are members on each of the Regional Project Stakeholder groups except for FS.

The PG discussed who would represent MCS in the south-west if they were invited to join the SG. TH informed the group that it would be an associate, Dominic Flint from Torbay. RW felt that he would be a good addition and has a very good understanding of the data.

The PG were uneasy about the idea of MCS being invited to join as they felt that it might upset the balance of the SG due to MCS's high profile campaigns for certain sites for MCZs, and that this may prevent them from fully engaging in the FS process. However, due to the loss of Wildlife and Countryside link as a SG member, with Richard White now only representing the Wildlife Trusts and not campaigning NGOs as a whole, this sector now appears to be under represented on the SG compared with other sectors such as recreation and commercial fishing.

RKP stressed that the PG needed to come up with a strong rationale for recommending that MCS should not be able to join the SG.

Members of the PG agreed that MCS be invited to join due to the recent changes in SG membership with regards to campaigning NGOs. However, if MCS wanted to accept an invitation they would need to:

- Agree to the conditions attached to their membership and work collaboratively within the SG.
- Understand that they would be working within the ENG like ALL other SG members and must adhere to the SG protocol.
- Leave all previous statements at the door including the sites they suggested through their recent campaign.

RW noted that MCS are being invited to sit on new SW Marine Biodiversity grouping.

PG members felt it was important that the SG was aware of their reluctance to invite MCS to join the SG. TH will include this in his email to SG members asking for their agreement in inviting MCS to join.

The PG **AGREED** to recommend the following to assist in more effective future SG meetings:

- MCA to be offered full SG membership or NCS status (following agreement from SG)
- That Malcolm Hart, Geomorphologist, would be offered NCS status (and to be able to work directly with PT if required)
- MCS to be offered a place on SG, but with clear condition that they must adhere to the SG protocol and be an active part of consensus-based process. Make it clear that they cannot bring their national campaigns goals for MCZs to the table, because SG is working to goals set by the JNCC guidance (ENG)
- Dave Bond's replacement by David Marshall has the support and agreement of the South West Hand-liners Association and was therefore a suitable candidate.
- The PG felt that Paul Trebilcock was a suitable replacement for Armand Toms as he is the Chief Executive of the CFPO, a member of the MPA Coalition and has strong links with the industry.

3.3 Steering Group member conduct outside of SG meetings

There had been press coverage quoting Jim Portus (who represents both offshore commercial fishermen and is a member of the MPA Coalition) stating that they want to guarantee that no fishing areas will be made into MCZs. RW (of Wildlife Trusts) wrote a letter of reply to the press which was also published. The PG discussed whether SG members could or needs to set rules for Press Releases and whether the SG needs to say something to Jim Portus in this case. At present it was noted that:

- SG protocol only mentions that if a SG member wants to make comments on behalf of the SG, they must have the agreement of all SG members and / or the Project Manager. However, there is nothing in the protocol regarding criticism of the FS process of MCZ planning
- If what a SG member is saying in the press is different to what they're saying within the group, it could undermine the process. However, it isn't up to the SG to stop any members from talking to the press as long as they engaged fully during meetings.
- The PG were concerned that relationships within the SG may deteriorate because of this press coverage and RW's reply. The fact that it is being discussed in the PG shows that it has already had an impact.

It was then suggested by the PG that:

- All campaigning organisations on the SG, will be told that they are expected / asked to leave all public agendas at the door and engage fully in the process.
- As long as SG members keep to the SG protocol and aren't defamatory of the process in public, there is no need to add sanctions to the SG protocol.
- RKP will ask SG members who state known positions during SG meetings to reframe them as "needs".

The PG **AGREED** that:

- At present there is no need to set rules regarding SG member behaviour outside of SG meetings or the sanctions that would follow such an issue.

4. Process Planning

4.1 Planning LG, WG and PG meetings

The PG looked at the FS project plan / timetable and were asked to review it and comment on whether all meetings were relevant and if anything was missing. The following suggested changes and additions were proposed:

- Top row should be inputs to process/process and not just process group.
- Local Group 'activities' are missing and the section on the website with the calendar etc are missing any dates from May onwards.
- August needs to be included as it is possible that many of the LG meetings will take place during August.
- Need to carefully coordinate the LG and IWG meetings as the LGs are likely to feed more into the inshore Working Groups than to the Offshore WGs.

It was also noted that:

- The window between 1st and 2nd iterations is very short so if there are Working Group meetings set for mid September, Local Group meetings need to have happened at least 3 weeks in advance to allow anything that comes out of them to have been processed in time to be included.

- Following a WG meeting, the PT need at least 5 days to process all outputs before beginning to prepare for the next WG, therefore IWG and OWG meetings need to be at least a week apart.
- There is the potential for FS and SG to view other regional project 1st iterations in September

The PG **AGREED** that

- PT and Rob will look at windows for future WG meetings and then for future LG meetings.
- To update the FS project plan / timetable

4.2 Public availability and comments on 1st Iteration

The PG discussed the date of public release of the 1st iteration. It was noted that the SAP feedback, which is not expected to be available until the end of July, will feed into the 2nd iteration due in October via the WGs. The PG were informed that the PT would be keen to present the most recent developments to the Devon Maritime Forum on the 30th June and a workshop for leisure stakeholders on the 23rd June.

The PG **AGREED** that

- The 1st iteration will be being worked on by the PT to send to the SAP by 30 June.
- The Recreational workshop on 23rd of June will see aspects of the 1st iteration
- The 1st iteration will be made publicly available via the FS website from the 30th June
- The 1st iteration, will be in the public domain and therefore people may choose to comment on it but comments will not be actively asked for as this is not a public consultation. Any comments received will be dealt with by the PT
- That LGs be notified immediately that the 1st iteration becomes available.
- LGs be encouraged to discuss the 1st iteration at their meetings

4.3. Named Consultative Stakeholders

There are now three groups who have opted to become NCS:

- British Water-ski,
- United Kingdom Cable Protection Committee (UKCPC)
- British Association of Shooting and Conservation

The PG discussed what information or briefing these groups would need to engage with the Steering Group and planning process. It was agreed that the PT should supply them with the following relevant documents and materials should prior to and following SG meetings for reference but not for comment:

- Updated SG handbook
- Copy of SG
- Copy of full ENG and FS Summary Document.

It was also agreed that NCSs should be offered an induction session by the PT if they would like one.

What do they get asked to comment on?

It was decided NCSs should be asked to comment on the 1st iteration. The PG agreed that SG members would decide when to request feedback from NCSs, although it was suggested that:

- Most will only need to be consulted once an iteration has been agreed upon
- Feedback from all NCSs will need to be discussed at the same time. However, it was noted that UKCPC may need to be consulted in time for/at a WG meeting.
- NCSs be asked for feedback on SG proposals and not WG proposals, therefore they would be sent the outputs from the June SG meeting along with the SG report for their reference.

It was agreed that comments and feedback from the NCSs should be sent via the PT to the WGs to inform the next iteration.

It was **AGREED** that:

- TH would send NCSs an updated copy of the SG handbook, ENG summary document and offer them an induction into the project.
- NCSs would be sent the SG report following SG meetings for reference, but could not comment on the contents.
- NCSs would be sent iterations and asked to comment on them where necessary as decided by the SG.
- Comments and feedback on site iterations from the NCSs would be sent to the WGs to inform the next iteration via the PT
- WGs can / should seek NCS input to their work if they feel it is appropriate / needed.

4.4 Role of Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Agency (currently SFC) [put full wording in for non PG readers for both acronyms] and Marine Management Organisation on Finding Sanctuary

The PG discussed the role of the SFC/IFCA/MMO on Finding Sanctuary and recognised that shadow IFCAs are already up and running and the IFCA and MMO will be in existence during the run of the project. The PT have discussed their role with the organisations and the PG noted this as:

- All Finding Sanctuary Steering Group members should have an equal voice and responsibility to shape recommendations that meet the Government's Ecological Guidance and this includes the Sea Fisheries Committees (SFC) and the Marine Management Organisation (MMO).
- As agencies who will have responsibility for the enforcement of MCZ management measures, the SFC and MMO should not have a role in actively generating site suggestions through the Working Groups. However, with expert knowledge on marine activities in the region they will have an important role in feeding back, advising and helping decision making within the Steering Group.
- Their viewpoint in particular will focus on the enforceability of sites, advising on enforcement practicalities when project groups consider any possible MCZ management measures (eg byelaws or, in the context of managing fishing activity, possible options for using the CFP).

4.5 Local Groups

The PG discussed the recently revised TOR for the LGs to ensure it includes some wording about how their proposals will feed into the WGs.

The PG **RECOMMENDS** that:

- Sites proposed by the LGs will be processed by the PT and only those that meet the ENG will be passed onto the WGs for consideration. However, the raw proposals from the LGs will be placed on the wall for reference by the WGs at their meetings.
- The PT supplies the LGs with adequate feedback.
- Bullet Point 4 of the TOR highlights that where available; MCZ site proposals from LGs should be based on the best available data.

5. Working Groups

RKP took PG members through the sequence of steps that the PT and RKP have developed for the WGs (noting that this may be iterative and not just one pass through each step). The aim of the WG meetings is for them to propose network(s) that achieve the ENG guidance

- PT to show WG where unique sites that have to be included in MPA network e.g. deep sea canyons
- The WG to discuss which sites have the most advantages and which are the most contentious and to discuss why in each case.
- The WG to discuss if the contentious sites have to be included in the network and if so, if they could be made less contentious (and how)

The PG noted that:

- If the WGs base their work on current data this may mean them having to revisit it if new data becomes available.
- The SAP could be asked to help decide what data is up to scratch and if there is conflicting data, which set to use.
- We could end up with variations on a proposed network based on different assumptions, but all variations would meet the ENG. However, these different network suggestions may have different impacts on different species and / or sectors and this commentary needs to be part of the FS recommendations.
- It would be beneficial and logical to aim to resolve discrepancies between possibilities, enabling decisions to be made more locally rather than leaving the final decision up to government.
- There is a difference between WG members individually proposing sites and them using their knowledge to collaboratively develop and make suggestions as the WG.
- Differences of opinion between sectors on a site is different to differences of opinion on the scientific data that sites are based upon.

PG members agreed that sites should be sent to the SAP/government with any that are contentious being highlighted and if they are necessary to meet the ENG. The PG recognised that up to two thirds of the network might be agreed upon by all SG members, leaving only 1/3 of the sites as contentious and up for discussion. It was that they it would be desirable to avoid reaching a state which results in a traditional negotiation, where people assume there is only one outcome, when there might be alternative options.

6. June Steering Group Meeting

The PG also discussed what the SG could be expected to achieve at the June meeting.

6.1 Working on WG work

The PG discussed how the work of the WGs would be communicated to SG members and when they should first receive it. The importance of SG members having the opportunity to comment on WG proposals was recognised by PG members

The PG **AGREED** that:

- SG members will be presented at the June SG meeting with WG work. This work should be filtered by the PT to ensure the sites meet the ENG, this would prevent time being wasted discussing sites that do not meet it.
- Members of both WGs will need to explain why sites are being put forward.
- The raw outputs from the WGs would be placed on the wall for reference.
- Having both the raw and processed outputs from the WGs, SG members would have the opportunity to review sites for suitability and possibly select an alternative site from the WG proposals if it is found that a site wouldn't work for a reason unknown previously. The SG will be able to comment on each site
- All of the SG work will be processed by the PT for input to the next round of WGs and as part of the compilation of the 1st iteration

6.2 The 1st iteration

The PG discussed the use of the term 'sign off' regarding the 1st iteration and agreed not to use the term as it sounded too final and suggested that SG members would not have the opportunity to add to or alter any proposals coming from the WGs. Therefore, the PG agreed that it was better to say that the 1st iteration is:

- *'A representation of the work of the SG to date'*.

PG members highlighted fact that those members not belonging to a WG would have a lot of catching up to do in order to fully engage with the proposals. However, it was also recognised that the interests that would be most affected by a MCZ in either offshore or inshore waters were represented on the WGs so hopefully the remaining SG members might have less concerns with the WG proposals. .

The PG **AGREED** the meeting aims for the June SG meeting:

- To review and build on the WG outputs in order to prepare the 1st iteration to send to the SAP from FS as a *A representation of the work of the SG to date'*
- SG members will have the opportunity to add or take-away from the sites proposed by the WGs.

The PG **RECOMMENDS** that:

- The PT and RKP highlight that although SG members are being asked to agree to the iteration, this is not the same as saying that they are happy with each suggested site and that they are completely final.
- That Local Groups and the ENG do not need to be discussed again at the next SG meeting.
- The SG should be shown the template for the standard form for sending off the 1st iteration, but that the PT will fill it in after the SG meeting.

7. Next Steps

The next PG meeting dates are **July 9th, September 2nd and 9th December 2010**

9th July PG meeting agenda points:

- Review the sequence of WG/SG/LG, lessons of timing - plan next block of activity
- Agree replacement for DA

8. Actions

Action	Who	By When
Find out if Peter Jones will attend all meetings so that RKP can notify all group members.	TH	As needed
Rob to let SG/WG members know if Peter Jones to attend a meeting i.e. as a courtesy	Rob	As needed
To write to CC and SWRDA to request CC is fully briefed on ALL aspects of maritime industry, not just renewable	TH	By 30 th April
Email SG members to ask for agreement on contacting MCA to offer them either full SG membership or NCS role	TH	By 30 th April
TH to have informal chat with JP regarding his statements in the press and the effect they are having on the project and the process	TH	May 7th
For PT to establish windows within which future dates for IWG meetings can be set.	Rob/PT	Before 23 rd April
To get back to LG coordinators with windows for potential LG meetings	Rob/PT	By 30 th April
Double check with JNCC what their expectation for what is and isn't put in the public domain regarding the 1 st iteration of sties	TH	May 7th
Offer NCS induction and send them ENG, updated SG handbook and TOR	TH/PT	By June 9 th
Write short briefing for NCS people on what they can expect (process)	Rob	Before June 9th
Points agreed by SFC & MMO in relation to FS passed onto SG as point of information	TH to email	April 30 th
Add in agreed amendments to LG role & send to PG members for sign off via email	TH	May 14 th
Alert SG members to amendments/updated handbook LG TOR	TH	May 21 st
Write a briefing on WG outputs; for example, each polygon will be numbered and to include accompanying succinct points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WG narrative points • PT comments on why a site has been selected in relation to ENG • Any other useful info e.g. from regional profile 	Rob & PT	By 1 st June at latest
Prepare note re SG meeting (Aims and agenda) for circulation to all SG members	Rob	By 1 st June
Send SG members notes comparing interim guidance to final /draft ENG in advance of SG meeting	PT	June 1 st
Develop proposals for discussion at July PG meeting on DA's replacement - verbal and informal	Rob & TH	By 9 th July