

**Biodiversity South West Steering Group**  
**Renslade House, 18<sup>th</sup> Sept 2008**

Attendees: Naomi Brookes, Basil Greenwood, Simon Brenman (chair), Justin Milwood, Phil Tolerton, Roger Covey, Emma-Rose Herrerra, Claire Sampson, Imogen Davenport, Mark Robins

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<b>1. Management Group - SB, BG, NB</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussed MoA and ToR after sight of East of England MOA. MOA should capture business side of partnership, setting out expectations, clarity around roles and responsibilities and duties of partnership. This should have some read across from England Biodiversity Strategy and much could be captured in core services for delivery. It will capture some detail around what we do i.e. work to deliver EBS, driving forward habitat and species targets in SW.</li> <li>• Core partners would be those that either contributed financially or in kind or would be the signatories of the MOA.</li> <li>• Lead partner to be retained as SWWT as they are budget holders and it is important to maintain this facility. Therefore MOA will be between SWWT and other Core Partners.</li> <li>• Core partners to have a role on Steering Group and should receive all papers, even if choose not to attend. Insert sentence - ‘In addition to above signatories Core Partners will include LRC’s and LBAPs, SWPLF (and poss. SWCCIP?)’. This is so they do not have to contribute financially but are important to progressing core business.</li> <li>• Annex 1 should also include ‘services’ as these are the operating scope of the partnership and Co-ordinator role. Amend the role of lead partner and NE to account for changes to employment and define role of partners.</li> <li>• Wider partnership to be re-titled Biodiversity South West Network – will meet every 6 months and form email ‘network’ for dissemination of info.</li> <li>• TOR to be a distillation of the MOA.</li> <li>• <b>NB to incorporate changes into MOA and TOR and circulate to SB and BG</b></li> </ul>	<b>NB</b>
<b>Steering Group Meeting</b>	
<b>Apologies</b>	
<b>2. Minutes and Matters Arising</b>	
<p>Simon welcomes Claire Sampson to the group from GOSW who is now picking up this work from Helen Thompson.</p> <p>SB has researched RSWT approach to fund raising for wider Trust activity. They see themselves as positioning and enabling funding for other Trusts. Engages with potential funders to position WTs as good for delivery and puts them in a position to bid for funds. SB would see BioSW in similar vein.</p> <p>NB to research possibility of volunteer support. Will explore possibly with SERC. It</p>	<b>NB</b>

<p>could be that it would be more project based and on behalf of working groups. <b>NB to prepare task list.</b></p> <p>National Trust would be keen to re-engage with partnership. <b>NB to follow up.</b> NB also spoke to Mark Durk, FC about funds. They can not financial support BioSW but keen to talk through other ‘in-kind’ support.</p> <p>Need to discuss agriculture group with Tim de Winton as group felt there was a role for such a group and that [partnership would be keen to be involved. Also need to consider water and wetland group. <b>NB to follow up.</b> Wetland vision launch could be used to re-invigorate this group.</p>	<p><b>NB</b></p> <p><b>NB</b></p>
<p><b>3. Partnership Business</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group felt there was a need to make more of where we are and achieve better outcomes. Need to plan next steps and a programme of what’s coming up. Need to commit to organising a series of symbolic events along the lines of the National Trust event. Group felt there were 3 themes for this year – functional, directional and symbolic. There is a climate change adaptation event in October. Follow up could be Biodiversity and Growth Agenda.</li> <li>• <b>Planning and Development Group –</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RSS submission being prepared by group. Most issues raised by group were to do with sustainability appraisal. ID felt group should focus on biodiversity agenda and sign up to any REN submission.</li> <li>○ All comments to be fed to ID and ID to sign off on behalf BioSW with couple of lines to absolve those org’s who can’t sign, i.e. GOSW.</li> <li>○ Need to update habitats list in appendix one to include all UK BAP priority habitats in SW and a link to S41 species list. <b>NB to complete.</b></li> <li>○ ID will represent BioSW and Planning Development Group on NE organised GI forum. Question about how we monitor GI needs addressing.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>BIRG –</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RP presented findings from workshop around Regional Monitoring Group based on Devon Framework.</li> <li>○ Concern that Devon framework had not picked up key things such as re-focus to landscape scale working and need to monitor this. Approach advocated is more sites based and traditional.</li> <li>○ <b>RP to produce brief to outline what regional monitoring might look like and to use to reach consensus – needed ASAP.</b> Must include a purpose/aim and be contemporary. Also seek to reach an approach which provides a mechanism for ‘fast track info’ so that beaurocrats can see value, but also a slower more quantitative approach to get a sense of year on year progress.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Nature Map Working Group –</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Producing simple guide to wrap up all work on producing profiles/taking forward SNAs.</li> <li>○ Some issues around Planning and NM – need an ‘idiots’ guide. Also something outlining relationship between NM and GI and climate Change.</li> <li>○ Need to build a community of practice to support local advocates.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>ALL/ID</b></p> <p><b>NB</b></p> <p><b>RP</b></p>
<p><b>4. England Biodiversity Strategy Re-fresh</b></p>	

<p>NB presented paper on EBS framework and the thinking around this. Some concern from the group that this was a very top down approach. But it did offer an opportunity for the region to agree accountabilities, make an offer to BIGs on delivery through NM etc. Question whether this framework comes with resources? Felt it also didn't address the fact that the barrier to delivery was often Statutory agencies and how they work. Some felt that it may help identify policy blockages and address these. It could be useful in highlighting funding need to Defra and securing resources for delivery.</p> <p>Group wanted to establish what it meant for LBAPs and how they work. Felt there needed to be recognition that regions enabled delivery through working with LBAPs and were not responsible for delivery our selves. Group felt framework could potentially alienate LBAPs. There needs to be a process in place in SW to ensure that this is not the case.</p> <p>Also raised the issue of the tight November deadline expressed in the framework for production of outline delivery plan. It was also felt that it didn't really outline how it will improve delivery. Overall felt that the language was negative, despite there being some real positive outcomes captured. This needs reviewing and feeding back to national. There also needs to be some understanding of what the national ask is and expectation. Also what is national role? <b>SB will discuss with other regional for a chairs and SB and NB to feedback groups concerns to Pete Brotherton.</b></p> <p><b>NB to start drawing together thinking on how BioSW will approach regional delivery plan. NB will also communicate the plan to LBAPs and early thinking on how it will be actioned in region.</b> It could be that we ask LBAPs to 'offer' BAP delivery and we take this to national.</p>	<p><b>SB</b> <b>SB/NB</b></p> <p><b>NB</b> <b>NB</b></p>
<p><b>5. Strategy for Funding</b></p>	
<p>NB to circulate strategy draft to group for comment. Lou, fundraising manager at RSPB to be invited to next meeting to discuss with group.</p>	<p><b>NB</b></p>
<p><b>6. Steering Group</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chairing arrangements – historically the chair was shared between EA and SWWT and or NE. SB happy to chair group until EA recruited replacement for ERH. This position will then be reviewed. There are positives to a shared chair.</li> <li>• Role of Steering Group – there is a need to re-engage group and share workload. Although NB in post there shouldn't be expectation that she will carry all work forward. Delivery plan needs to be broken down into accountabilities. NB needs to provide clear tasks to group.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>7. Communications</b></p>	
<p>Discussion held around providing an opportunity to promote BioSW work and NM delivery through digital media. This is a possibility to consider as the opportunity arises, but should be used with care to enhance promotion of work and raise profile of biodiversity movement. Could use though website using partners own products i.e. SWWTs Living Landscape DVD.</p>	
<p><b>8. AOB and DONB</b></p>	
<p>3<sup>rd</sup> Dec 2008. Renslade House, 10.30am to 12.30pm</p>	

