



Meeting 1

JNCC-NGO Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies

Sub-Group

12th January 2015

To find more about JNCC's OT and CD programme visit:
<http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=4079>

JNCC/NGO Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies Group Shared Priorities Sub-Group

Notes of the meeting on 12th January 2015, 1pm

Room 1, JNCC, Monkstone House, City Road, Peterborough PE1 1JY

Attendees:

Jenny Daltry, Flora and Fauna International (JD)
Jonathan Hall, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (JH)
Tara Pelembe, Joint Nature Conservation Committee (TP)
Mike Pienkowski, UK Overseas Territories Conservation Forum (MP)
Peter Richardson, Marine Conservation Society (PRi)
Paul Rose, Joint Nature Conservation Committee (PRo)
Catherine Wensink, UK Overseas Territories Conservation Forum (CW)

Apologies:

Tom Appleby, Blue Marine Foundation

1. Welcome and introductions by JNCC

PRo, as Convenor, welcomed all to the meeting. Following informal discussions before the meeting, he proposed that MP chair the sub-group, which the meeting agreed. CW agreed to draft a note of the meeting.

2. Ways of Working

MP added his welcome to all. Particularly for those who had not attended the meetings of the main group, he recalled that the purpose of the meetings were to restore better collaboration between NGOs and UK Government over matters concerning the UK Overseas Territories (UKOTs) and Crown Dependencies (CDs). The priority was to try and work towards an agreed framework of priorities for support from GBNI¹ for conservation work in UKOTs. It was not to set out priorities for UKOTs, as this was for each of them to do, but to see how resources from GB and NI could be deployed most effectively.

Some progress had been made in this area. UKOTCF had volunteered at the second meeting of the main group to undertake a consultation to secure views on priorities from individual organisations. Whilst some, including all UK Governmental bodies and some NGOs had not replied substantively, others had. The responses used different levels and approaches, but had been valuable in putting together an initial overview. (UKOTCF had incorporated views from its member and associate bodies and others in the UKOTs, where available, and had kept these bodies informed of the process, while not troubling them to make full responses. Responses were collated for the third meeting and circulated as a Word document (**Paper 2014/14** - Proposed priority conservation actions for the UKOTs/CDs – August 2014: listed as Paper 3 for 3rd meeting on 12th September 2014 on the draft agenda and the paper itself; Paper 2 on the final agenda). This used the Aichi targets as a way of organising input, following on from a workshop UKOTCF had held for the same purpose in 2011. Subsequently, JNCC had tried to pull in UK Government input, secured mainly by extracting information from existing documents, and had added this to UKOTCF's existing document, also converting this from a Word table to an Excel spreadsheet. This had been reported at the

¹ Minutes of the main group have noted: There is a general problem in that "UK" is widely used to mean both of two different concepts: (1) Great Britain and Northern Ireland (GBNI); and (2) all UK territory (including GBNI, UK Overseas Territories (UKOTs) and Crown Dependencies (CDs)). In this document, we try to be clear on meanings, and so use GBNI for (1) and UK for (2), partly to avoid a very long phrase for the latter.

fourth (latest) meeting in December. Both UKOTCF and JNCC had attempted to extract and summarise some possible priorities for the group to consider.

It was noted that the membership of the sub-group had been partly self-selecting. It was not exclusive and, if others wanted to contribute, they could. A summary of discussions would go to the main group.

It was agreed that the style and format of meetings would evolve as the meetings progressed. Remote communications would be used to complete tasks and discuss matters wherever possible.

Draft Terms of Reference: PPro referred to **Paper 2014/27** for others to consider. It included Annex 1: List of Immediate priorities as identified by the meeting of the JNCC/NGO Overseas Territories Group on 15th December. This provided the basis for the need for the meeting.

The group felt that the wording in the second sentence of the first paragraph in “Sub Group Brief” needed amending to read: “The meeting reaffirmed the need for all the parties in GB & NI working on the UKOTs and CDs to know what were the most important conservation actions to undertake, even if not all organisations were directly involved in undertaking them, as this enabled the collective focus of effort and energy, bringing cohesion and synergy in a resource-constrained world.” This is to reflect that the parties are those based in Great Britain & Northern Ireland (see footnote on the previous page).

3. Immediate shared priorities

The purpose of having a list of priority areas was to enable partnerships to develop and to allow natural partnerships to form, to enable resources to be used most efficiently, to help direct funds which may become available, to focus future work, and to demonstrate the need for further resources.

After information had been received in response to the consultation led by UKOTCF, both JNCC and UKOTCF had attempted to group points in to some common themes. There had been some overlap in these and some had been consolidated into one. These themes or priorities had been discussed in the last overall meeting, and would be discussed further in the present meeting.

It was clear that there was a need (particularly for UK Government) to relate these priority areas to the Aichi targets, and all agreed this should be done. However, many of the suggested priority areas would fit under several targets, but perhaps fewer Aichi strategic goals. There would be more flexibility (and simplicity in summary and presentation) by using the strategic goals, of which there were only 5. It was agreed that individual priority areas would be linked to Aichi goals, rather than targets, if this simplified matters in relating the priority areas to the Aichi process.

Specific points relating to the current list of priorities where there were still gaps included:

- The notable absence of capacity building;
- More detail was needed under marine conservation;
- The priorities should be related to Aichi strategic goals;
- The level of detail needs to be defined;
- Input from UKOTs needs to be considered further.

One NGO felt that there was a notable absence of mention of Red-Listing. A lot of species in UKOTs have not yet been reviewed for Red-Listing. Others felt that this was already incorporated in priority themes 1 & 4 of the minutes of the 4th meeting of the main group and

the notes for this sub-group. It was agreed that the most relevant listing is at global level with analyses for each territory.

Although one participant was unsure about the inclusion of volunteers as resources, the group decided that they should be included.

All agreed that the wording of each priority would become important but, for the time being, the focus should be on the key headings expressed fairly loosely initially.

4. The table of organisational priorities

PRo referred to **Papers 2014/14, 2014/24 and 2014/25** (the versions of the table of organisations' views of priority areas). It was agreed that to try and fill gaps in the spread sheet of priorities and to address some concerns raised in the last meeting was not worth special attention. However, those organisations which had not supplied information would be encouraged to do so, and the tables would be kept current to incorporate this periodically. Significant efforts would not be deployed to try and extract this information from them.

A compromise between consensus and detail was needed. It would be advantageous to have all parties agree, but the more precise the priorities are the more difficult it will be to agree on them. By far biggest gaps were the views of government bodies. This is not going to be easily incorporated in to this exercise, as the Defra contract to analyse gaps in knowledge (originally planned for the previous year) will report in the latter half of the current year.

RSPB indicated that it is a member of a consortium, led by Centre for Ecology and Hydrology (CEH) and including the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (Cefas), the Natural History Museum, which had been awarded the contract under Defra to undertake the gap analysis.

One NGO felt that an important aspect of the current exercise was how to work better with JNCC and to identify areas of overlap. If in the end there was no prospect in partnering with JNCC, they would hesitate in spending too much time on this exercise.

The group felt that the exercise should include all aspects, as this would be the most efficient way of working, although it recognised that some aspects would not fall under the remit of all organisations involved in UKOT/CD work.

JNCC noted that NGOs do not currently have a simple way of identifying what others do, although others noted that this had existed in previous years – so that it was worth including these even if JNCC could not be involved in each. One further potential aspect is to include the business sector to identify new ways of working. This will become more significant as services industry and natural capital is further explored.

At the moment, input from the UKOTs has not been included, except via some of the UKOTCF input. All agreed that this should be done, provided that did not involve imposing work on UKOT personnel.

JNCC felt that its role is networking and co-ordination, using its expertise and transferable skills in support of the work being done in the UKOTs, for example, in marine protected areas and knowledge of the work being done in England and Wales. There are some areas where they do not have expertise, for example on habitats restoration, education and resource mobilisation.

5. Workshop

The purpose of the proposed workshop was discussed. In the previous meeting of the main group, the Chair had expressed disappointment with the progress of group and in developing the priorities, but had wanted to avoid too many meetings of the group. The idea of a workshop was suggested as a way of securing interim conclusions before a further JNCC/NGO meeting. It could also attract other communities to the group, with Defra and FCO as observers, UKOTs (where possible and complementing the links managed by UKOTCF) as well as academics. The Chair then realised that the workshop needed a lot of thought, objectives, and some paper-work and preparation. The sub-group had been set up to complete this preparatory work. The timing of the workshop was envisaged something like March/April, with the main group meeting some time after that, probably in May. The possibility of the Defra contract consortium linking in this process was discussed.

As part of the JNCC data-access project, over 40 organisations had been contacted. Linking up with these organisations might also provide additional information relevant to this exercise (and there is, of course, overlap with the existing group).

The group agreed that there were already platforms for input from the UKOTs, for example the recent CIEEM invasive workshop and the UKOTCF-organized conference in July.

The purpose of the workshop would be to discuss the 8-10 priority areas (the 7 from the main group, adjusted as necessary in the light of the discussion in Item 3 above) in the context of supplementary information. One output of the workshop might be to report on new partnerships formed and areas of work which JNCC has added value. JNCC suggested that this would be half a day and perhaps to take the data access project meeting with it, for the other half-day. RSPB felt that linking with a possible workshop in the Defra-contract programme would be impracticable.

In our workshop, a carousel method could be used, whereby attendees would be divided into groups. On one model, each group would have a chair and facilitator and its own breakout room. With 20 minutes per theme, each group would discuss each theme in turn, with the themes possibly grouped in pairs to limit the number of sessions. Each team would be instructed not to get too bogged down in wording of each priority as this would be a separate exercise.

The report of this exercise could be made available without too much effort. In essence, the exercise would be carried out in order to flag up ideas.

6. Recommendations to the full group

The sub-group agreed the following next steps:

- UKOTCF would regroup all information in the spread-sheet in to 8 priority areas and start linking them to Aichi strategic goals where possible without creating a huge document. (CW& MP)
- This would then be sent to JNCC so they can add any further information they had from UKOTs. (JNCC)
- Members of the sub-group would then review the document to see if it makes sense before consulting more widely. (All)
- A possible participants list (about 40) would be produced and circulated to subgroup for initial comment.(JNCC)

- A paper on preparing for workshop including possible chairs and facilitators to be circulated initially to the sub-group for comment. (TP to draft; PRi to send the sub-group the programme for a previous similar workshop, for ideas)
- A suitable location for the workshop to be identified, with 4-5 breakout rooms as well as main room needed. JNCC Peterborough was one option but also others would be considered (PRo to book JNCC rooms provisionally, and to consider alternatives)
- The record of this meeting to be drafted and circulated to sub-group members initially for comments; then share with main-group current chairs; and then circulate to whole group (CW to draft and MP to circulate).

7. Date of Next Meeting

The workshop preparation would be done remotely. If needed, a Skype meeting to discuss interaction around the attendance could take place on 10th February 2015.

8. AOB

JD would fill in FFI column of the priorities table and would ask Durrell to provide input.

The meeting ended at 3:30pm.