

**Nature Map Working Group Meeting
Minutes 16th September 2008**

Attendees: Basil Greenwood, Naomi Brookes, Simon Bates, Colin Studholme, Matt Low

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
<p>1. Apologies</p>	
<p>Jeremy Clitherow, Phil Tolerton, Victoria Whitehouse, Craig Dixon, Tim Corner, Ray Perrins, Mark Robins</p>	
<p>2. Minutes and Matters Arising</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ML will discuss will talk to Matt Sperring about holding NM on behalf of BioSW. • SB is developing process for vulnerability analysis of priority BAP habitats in SW that will capture things around connectivity etc for SWCCIP Biodiversity Group. This will have good links with Nature Map and will be discussed at NM Technical Group, chaired by Simon. SB has developed TOR for Tech Group and a potential members list. • Visioning report from John Waldon – there was a feeling that although the report reflected what had happened at the workshops it had missed an opportunity to really pull together this experience. Group wanted the report to pull together a framework to help people understand what can be achieved through these workshops and consideration of how to pitch this to the region. Devon are producing profiles which will be brief and aimed at planners primarily. This will include a simple overview and basic information on what's there – it then might build into a more refined local vision. • Gloucestershire also have very detailed profiles for their SNAs in the Severn Vale Project area. • NB to pull together a document which captures differing approaches to refining SNAs as 'Taking SNA Delivery Forward'. To inc: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Profiles – are concise, with standard info available for partners and are a useful first stab at capturing more info about SNAs • Visioning – useful when developing delivery projects and good for stakeholder engagement. • Role of this group is to facilitate ideas for groups to develop their thinking on how to take forward Nature Map. • Partnership meeting in March – outputs from meeting to be circulated along with the guidelines on taking Nature Map forward as outlined above. Development Plan for NM needs to be developed. 	<p style="text-align: center;">ML</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SB</p> <p style="text-align: center;">NB</p>
<p>3. Working Guidelines and Change Protocol</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NB introduced changes made to protocol and timetable for implementation. Comments discussed from David Villis which outlined concerns around the role of Local Authorities. Group acknowledged that more thinking needs to be put into role of local authorities in delivering NM and the need for more advocacy and the links with GI. • Guidelines and change protocol to be published on website and process to be transparent and open, and modified as necessary. • Regionally consultation needed when change of 5% of specific area covered/ mapped. • Definitive version of NM to be held on BioSW website (which will be central repository of info) and held by NE. • Gloucestershire Submission – not submitted to this meeting. They need to 	

<p>submit to Gloucs LBAP. There are some local concerns about the revised map which need to be resolved. This will then be presented to this group CS. CS will design criteria for submission – Submissions to be made as presentation to group and rational for change recorded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria possibly needed to assess submissions – Tech Group to develop. 	<p>CS CS NB/SB</p>
<p>4. Development and Advocacy Plan for Nature Map</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BG acknowledged that we had achieved a lot so far – NM is in draft RSS, some LAAs, targeting AES, assisted in obtaining funds etc. There is sense though that activity has plateaued and that there is a need for more impetus/ drive. Some feeling from partners that NM is not relevant or a priority and that there is negativity towards it. It is time to review key activities, where are the gaps and the must do's. Need a clear idea of the things we must do, identify who to do and take forward (not just NB). Need to showcase NM implementation – i.e. Butterfly Cons work on Dartmoor. Need to monitor and report back on activity. Several areas to explore: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to identify barriers to delivery so know what steps need to be taken. What added value does NM bring to local delivery – Devon working with planners, Gloucs has it in LAA. NM provides a mechanism for selling/promoting to a non-conservation organisation. Do local conservation organisations refer to NM when planning landscape scale working? Is it on local delivery agenda? Outputs from workshop session attached to min's – outlines 7 key areas for delivery. Brief front end development plan needs to be drawn up and record workshop outputs/develop. NB to develop. Hard choices of priorities need to be made – establish task and finish groups as necessary. 	<p>NB</p>
<p>5. DONM</p>	
<p>Date of next meeting 6th Feb 1330 – 1530 Renslade House, Exeter</p>	