

**Biodiversity South West Management and Steering Group**  
**Renslade House, Exeter,**  
**19<sup>th</sup> January 2009**

**Attendees:** Naomi Brookes, Basil Greenwood (NE), Simon Brenman (chair) (SWWT), Justin Milwood (WdldT), Phil Tolerton (NE), Imogen Davenport (DWT), Mark Robins (RSPB), Matt Low (NE), Elly Andison (EA), Deborah Elton (FC).

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
<b>1. Apologies</b>	
Claire Sampson (GOSW)	
<b>2. Minutes and Matters Arising from January 09</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Action:</b> NB to talk through GOSW engagement with BioSW with SB</li> <li>• Discussion about engagement with landscape partnership ensued – there is a need to ensure join up with these two partnerships to avoid duplication of effort. The European Landscape Convention offers an opportunity for engagement and to come up with mechanisms for landscape scale delivery.  <b>Action: SB and NB to engage with landscape partnership and Protected Landscape Forum. NB to attend regional Landscape Partnership meeting. NB to meet with Cathy Fitzroy and Dave Dixon.</b></li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">NB/SB</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SB/NB NB NB</p>
<b>3. Regional Delivery Plan</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Delivery Plan brief has gone out to tender with consultancies and tenders expected on 30<sup>th</sup> March. A criterion has been put in place to assess tenders. A small working group consisting of JM, ML, SB and NB has been set up to assess tenders and award contract on behalf of partnership. <b>Action: NB to organise conference call and process.</b></li> <li>• <b>Phase 2</b> – There needs to be unity around phase 2. Once we have collated baseline data Steering Group needs to decide on process to draw together Regional Delivery Plan.</li> <li>• There remain concerns around the Regional Delivery Plan (RDP) and ensuring that it becomes more than just a tick box exercise and that it doesn't miss regional and local organisations. This could lead to disempowerment of organisations. There is therefore a need to put in place something more aspirational so that RDP help strategic delivery of national and local priorities. Conversations with national need to be two way to ensure this.</li> <li>• Bringing LBAPs and delivery organisations on board is essential in making this a success. Process needs to focus on getting more biodiversity delivered across the region. There will be no additional resources allocated against RDP so there is a need to consider how current budgets relate RDP. Need to see how Phase 1 shows gaps in delivery and then consider how this will be resourced. This snapshot will form basis for discussion on delivery. This will involve potential organisational changes; advocacy is therefore a key part of this process and parallel to developing plan itself.</li> <li>• <b>LBAP/Delivery Organisations RDP Event</b> – Need to organise event for LBAPs and delivery organisations to advocate and raise awareness of RDP. Steering Group felt that we need to be honest – we don't know what solutions are as yet. Need to highlight that we are considering how we can lever in funds and the policy changes that need to be put in place to make changes happen.</li> </ul>	<p>NB</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where are the multi agency partnerships delivering effectively in the region? PT has drawn together some information which answers some of these questions.</li> <li>• HLS will be a key delivery tool within this process. The budget for this will double over the next couple of years and there is a desire to ensure more effective delivery. Phase 1 will allow an analysis on which BAP habitat we are achieving and then help to target to fill in the gaps.</li> <li>• RDP needs to harness energy of partnership and to reflect delivery organisations hopes and aspirations. It needs to revisit prioritisation of SNA and bring together potential difference between Nature Map habitat targets and those in RSS (however partnership does not want to get sidetracked with debate around targets, but do need to consider aspirational regional targets versus national etc). Finally it needs to weigh this against outcomes of Phase 1 evidence.</li> <li>• Climate change and habitat/species vulnerability needs to be a consideration.</li> <li>• Some discussion around NE targets to delivery 18,695ha of BAP habitat through HLS. Also target to deliver 3 new landscape scale projects in region. NE also has fundraising targets for the region.</li> <li>• Discussion around funding and competition for funds – will the RDP change this and help shape future direction? Advocacy effort is needed to help unlock funds.</li> <li>• Steering Group highlighted that there is already a suite of landscape delivery projects on the ground with short term funds secured – should NE be supporting these to meet its targets? The RDP will help with this as it will identify those projects already up and running and those to support. The group recognised that there is an equal priority on existing and new projects – need to balance where there will be the best added value gains. This needs to be balanced for RDP.</li> <li>• Communication – how do we communicate to local delivery partners? This should be through chairs and co-ordinators of LBAPs. We need to communicate our objectives (to reflect their hopes/aspirations) to these LBAPs at a workshop. The consultants need to be a part of this process and need to outline the process that they are putting into place to gather Phase 1 data. The workshop should also be used to identify priorities and blockages which can be fed into Phased 2 on the plan. The workshop will be used to set out Phase 1 and start thinking around Phase 2.</li> <li>• The workshop will be open to other organisations in region – especially those that may not have contact with LBAPs or work regionally. A facilitator will be needed to help chair discussions and harness knowledge of attendees. Need to start developing new accountability culture that will be required as part of RDP. But also to help lead us. Importantly the event will be a forum for LBAPs to raise any concerns that may have. There is a need to discuss the need to have a more strategic distribution of resources to region and highlight some of the policy barriers that need to be addressed.</li> <li>• <b>Action: NB to organise venue in either Exeter or Taunton. Need also to organise format and communication about event ASAP.</b></li> </ul>	<p>NB</p>
<p><b>4. TOR and BioSW Budget</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion about TOR for partnership. <b>Action: SB to add comments and circulate to Steering Group for comment and conclusion.</b></li> <li>• Budget – David Henshilwood has had a dialogue with RBF chairs about RBCs/budgets etc. There has been a mixed picture nationally about</li> </ul>	<p><b>SB</b></p>

<p>formalisation of RBC employment by NE. In SW positive experience as have NB as RBC and ML as NE internal Biodiversity Lead. This has not been reflected in other regions. David Henshilwood has outlined that 0.75FTE of RBC role dedicated to RBF. Also indicated that there is a possible £10,000 available to partnerships if we can agree projects to execute with this money.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget is satisfactory for this year. There is a need to re-engage Water companies in partnership over and above budgetary support.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>5. Regional Monitoring Framework</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are concerns about the Devon framework forming the basis for a regional model, there need to be taken on board and communicated to any contractors to build from.</li> <li>• There is need to simplify current model and to 'sell' regional programme to enable organisations to do work.</li> <li>• Dorset also has a framework in place which should inform Regional Programme.</li> <li>• The final product doesn't need to be all singing and dancing, but provide a framework. It needs to consider whether it is fundable year on year and make use of national tools. Needs to ensure it works with LRCs in development. Will it monitor BAP habitat?</li> <li>• <b>Action: NB and ML to draw together tender brief for Monitoring Project and include some pros and cons of the current different models. Send to LRCs for comment.</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>NB/ML</b></p>
<p><b>6. Date of next meeting</b></p>	
<p>TBC</p>	