

Marine Climate Change Impacts Partnership (MCCIP)

Steering Group meeting notes

21 June 2006

Scottish Executive, Edinburgh

Present:

Beth Greenaway, Chair, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), Marine Environment division

Phil Alcock, Scottish Executive (SE)

John Baxter, Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)

Paul Buckley, MCCIP Secretariat

Adrian Butt, Defra Global Atmospheres division

Val Byfield, Natural Environment Research Council

Michelle Colley, UK Climate Impacts Partnership (UKCIP)

David Connor, Joint Nature Conservation Council (JNCC)

Mike Cowling, The Crown Estate (CE)

Sandy Downie, Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)

Stephen Dye, MCCIP Secretariat

Patricia Falconer, MCCIP Secretariat

Kate Francis, MCCIP Secretariat (notes)

Matthew Frost, Marine Environmental Change Network (MECN)

Andy Hill, Countryside Council for Wales (CCW)

Evanthia Karpouzli, Scottish Executive (SE)

Dan Laffoley, English Nature (EN)

Sarah Le Claire, States of Jersey

Alistair Montgomery, SE

Kevin O'Carroll, Department of Trade and Industry (DTI)

Norman Radcliffe, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)

Stephen Roast, Environment Agency (EA)

David Viner, Climatic Research Unit, University of East Anglia (CRU)

1. Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1 All were welcomed to the first full Steering Group of the partnership. SE were thanked for hosting the meeting and the revised agenda was outlined. The main discussions would be to firstly agree the way forward for the partnership including the roles of the Steering Group (SG), Expert Advisory Panel (EAP) and secretariat and to give guidance on the process for the development of the Annual Report Card (ARC). The ARC content would be the focus of the workshop session arranged for the following day. Following brief round-table introductions, the chair reminded all that they were equal members of this group and encouraged participation accordingly.

2. MCCIP overview

- 2.1 The Secretariat provided an overview of MCCIP and how it fitted into the wider science/government communities, to act as a gateway for improved communication to enhance the way the information and data relevant to marine climate change is used. The challenge of presenting this information using the ecosystem based approach was outlined. The key output of MCCIP would be the production of an ARC which brings together quality assured, scientifically valid information which could be used by a number of key stakeholders including policy makers.
- 2.2 The chair invited questions but there were none at this juncture.

3. Work In Progress/Business Plan discussion

- 3.1 The draft business plan, which drew on the original tender information and previous SAHFOS work, was discussed. It was highlighted that the MCCIP secretariat were keen to interact with Steering Group and invited comments on whether the MCCIP Business Plan presented met the partners' expectations.
- 3.2 There was a query on the boundaries of the partnership (page 4), and whether the issue of flooding should be included. It was agreed that although flooding was more the domain of the EA than MCCIP, MCCIP would touch on coastal region issues. There was general agreement that sea level and mitigation issues need addressing through MCCIP to provide "one stop shop". The prevailing view was that MCCIP was eager not to duplicate other areas, but would draw on other arrangements and seek to add value to them through effective MCCIP signposting. It was therefore agreed to include sea level impacts within the boundaries of the MCCIP and amend the MCCIP Business Plan accordingly.
- 3.3 The example of the UKCIP experience in the context of covering impacts and mitigation, which took into account what mitigation specialists are doing, without duplication was considered. It was agreed that the Executive Summary needed to be rewritten in acknowledgement that some people will only read that part of the ARC so all key messages need to be presented there. The definition of "Climate Change" used needed to be included in the introduction to ensure common understanding of the term is applied throughout MCCIP documents. All partners were asked to feedback any other comments or revisions on the Business Plan to the MCCIP Secretariat by 30 June 2006.
- 3.3 The importance of partners being involved in the development of the Business Plan and the MCCIP outputs between meetings was discussed, as it was not reasonable to expect the MCCIP Secretariat to do all of the necessary work. Partners were encouraged to help develop the Policy and Science aspects of the plan. It was suggested that 4-5 Steering

group members were tasked with helping to build the Business Plan. Following discussions, representatives from three partners agreed to steer the development of specific sections of the Business Plan.

4. Agree Steering Group Terms of Reference

- 4.1 A revised draft version of the SG Terms Of Reference (TORs) was tabled, highlighting the main functions of the Steering Group. One of the major benefits would be to provide an open forum for communication of key marine and climate developments. It was agreed that the SG own the MCCIP process and should be the dynamic lead to drive the initiative forward. Some refinements to the TORs were agreed.
- 4.2 The definition of “partner” was explored, and it was agreed that partners included financial contributors and contributors in kind (including expertise). There followed a discussion on which other organisations should be represented on the Steering Group. In response to a query from MC, it was confirmed that IACMST were well represented through existing Steering Group members, and that organisations such as the Hadley Centre and the Met Office might need to be engaged with MCCIP at the evidence provider level rather than be part of the Steering Group.
- 4.3 Partners were asked to consider whether the accountability section of the draft TORs was required or not. The consensus was that “accountable to...” should be changed to “reporting to policy advisors (which would include the Defra Secretary of State and the devolved administrations). Partners were encouraged to feed back any other comments on the TORs to the MCCIP Secretariat by 30 June 2006.

5. Partnership agreement and development discussion

- 5.1 A spreadsheet which demonstrated the partners’ status and financial contribution, and the current shortfall of funds, was presented. Although partners were now confirming contributions for this FY, the overall picture was that an additional £30,000 per annum (including FY06/07) was required over the next 5 years to get to the £100k per annum that Defra had published on the tender documentation (and therefore the basis on which the Cefas tender had been developed). Partners were encouraged to confirm their contributions if they have not already done so, in order not to impact delivery of MCCIP.
- 5.2 It was noted that no MCCIP funding was sourced from industry at this stage. It was agreed that industry should be invited to be a financial contributor to MCCIP, and it was agreed to follow up with a major fuel company who had indicated a wish to support at an earlier stage.
- 5.3 It was agreed that an updated financial summary and an improved business plan was required in order to for several partners to seek to secure funding for MCCIP. It was highlighted that the shortfall for this FY

amounted to MCCIP requiring 2 more partners each contributing £5k. All partners were reminded to send any comments on the draft partnership agreement to MCCIP Secretariat by 31 July 2006.

6. Annual Report Card strategy and development

(taken after item 7)

- 6.1 The content of the ARC card would be discussed in detail at the workshop the following day. This meant that the SG discussions could focus on the process and timescales for the production of the card rather than content. The tight timeframe for the production of the ARC and the key dates in order to meet the November target were discussed. It was agreed that the November delivery date was strategically important to coincide with various planning cycles for the following year, and some key meetings taking place in November/ December where the ARC could be used as an evidence base. It would also be over 18 months since the launch of the partnership and the ministerial commitment to make a difference to the communication of science in this area.
- 6.2 The role of the Expert Advisory Panel (EAP) was highlighted, and the importance of receiving MECN data in time. It was agreed that the first year's ARC would be a prototype to demonstrate a new concept, and would be a developmental process to be improved on in future years. This year, the ARC would be focused on reviewing and synthesising the existing data rather than handling new data. It was agreed to produce the ARC in November, and for the MCCIP Secretariat, supported by the partners, to ensure sufficiently robust planning and management to achieve this date. A core group was required to develop the ARC over the summer and some key dates would be agreed at the ARC workshop.
- 6.3 Working back from the delivery date, the deadline for comments was set as 9 September 2006, and so partners agreed they needed to see a draft ARC around 9 August. It was confirmed that the ARC development would be run in parallel with consultation and the setting up of the EAP. It was agreed that a series of consultation workshops were not feasible because of the tight timescale. The contingency was to do the peer reviewing in stages to fit availability of contributing scientists.
- 6.4 It was suggested that as this year's ARC was considered a pilot, a user questionnaire for obtaining feedback should be attached to the final document. A whole series of conference activities to promote the ARC would be required. Concerns were raised about engaging experts over the summer period critical to the timeline, and it was agreed that this would be discussed within the ARC workshop, but that most who were likely to be called on had already had some warning or lead in, such as MECN and SAHFOS who had contractual commitments with Defra to provide information to MCCIP.

- 6.5 Two illustrative versions of ARCs were circulated, and the partners were asked to consider how they intended to use the ARC. Potential use by ICES on behalf of OSPAR was highlighted. It was queried whether the ARC would be pitched at covering “shallow and broad” or “narrow and deep” information, as this would impact the uses of the product. Integral to the ARC would be the confidence level of each assessment (complete agreement, limited confidence etc) and the highlighting of current research gaps.
- 6.6 It was agreed that consistent terminology was required and so “Contributing Scientists” would be used to describe the scientists supplying input to the ARC and “Expert Scientists” would be used for the advisory panel members, who would be reviewing the contributions.
- 6.7 It was proposed that a small sub-group of Steering Group meet before 5 September to oversee ARC development before the next full meeting.
- 6.8 The launch of the ARC was discussed. It was suggested that the UNFCCC COP (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change – Conference Of Parties) in Bonn (Nov/Dec) could be used for an international launch to the climate community. Nationally, it could be launched at the Coastal Futures meeting on 30 Nov, arranged by Bob Earll, which was primarily for a marine audience. There were also autumn dates for the ECGD and the Fisheries Council to consider. It was agreed to explore possibility of arranging a Ministerial launch and to develop a launch plan before 5 September, with regard to the Marine Bill schedule.

7 Expert Advisory Panel discussion (taken after item 5)

- 7.1 The need for strong science expertise to ensure credibility and diversity, was outlined, and names of people to approach for EAP membership were invited. Expenses plus a small honorarium had been included in Cefas’ original tender. Potential members were discussed to cover the list of topics on the ARC, and a chair was proposed. It was agreed that the chair would have a key role in approaching other potential members, and that most EAP business could be conducted by email and telephone, reducing the need for meetings. The TORs were discussed, and the Secretariat agreed to draft Terms and Conditions of engagement for EAP members and to revise the EAP TORs to reflect the discussion.

8 Quality Assurance Protocol

- 8.1 The draft QA framework was briefly discussed. All partners were invited to feed back comments on the QA protocol to the MCCIP Secretariat by 30 June 2006.

9 Communications Strategy

- 9.1 It was highlighted that the document presented was a draft which needed a section on communications mechanisms, specifically the website and newsletter requirements, plus inclusion of other mechanisms and audiences.
- 9.2 Some positive comments on the website were articulated, and all agreed that the MCCIP logo created a good image. The need for a secure part of website for member log in was agreed as the priority development for the website (to include meeting papers, drafts etc), but it was agreed that the ARC development would take precedence over further web development until draft ARC is completed. It was apparent that not all had received the newsletter published on 7 June, and it was agreed that a short email would be produced in August instead of spending time away from ARC development to produce a lengthy newsletter. All partners were invited to feed back comments on the Communications strategy to MCCIP Secretariat by end July 2006.

10 Other MCCIP activities

- 10.1 A series of events and meetings had been attended by the MCCIP Secretariat to promote and present the MCCIP. The ongoing MCCIP Secretariat role in providing advice into JNCC draft SACs (Special Areas of Conservation) was highlighted.

11 Discussion on the MCCE (SAHFOS) and other related activities

- 11.1 The developing role of MCCIP in commenting on NERC knowledge transfer funding bids was highlighted, as the MCCIP Secretariat had recently written 2 letters of support (one for SAHFOS (Sir Alister Hardy Foundation for Ocean Science) encyclopaedia and one for PML CO₂/Carboceans). The Secretariat sought ratification from the Steering Group for its involvement in this activity, and queried whether the Steering Group should also be involved. It was agreed that this was an appropriate MCCIP function, and that where deadlines permit, partners would be contacted and asked to consider providing additional support. Activities would be reported bi-monthly. If/when MCCIP Secretariat was asked for endorsement outside or counter to MCCIP, this would be raised with Steering Group or the EAP (as appropriate) before communicating a response.
- 11.2 It was noted that SAHFOS would be seeking financial contributions to further the development of their encyclopaedia. It was agreed that the encyclopaedia would assist MCCIP in framing briefing notes, by ensuring they are distinct and limiting overlap. It was agreed that at present, there were insufficient funds within MCCIP to contribute financially to the encyclopaedia development, and it was up to individual partners to

consider funding this separately if they wished. However, MCCIP and SAHFOS developments were complementary to each other and should not be viewed as competing initiatives particularly when they are offered to funding partners.

- 11.3 SAHFOS had approached MCCIP for advice on how to take the encyclopaedia forward, and a collective agreement on the MCCIP response was sought. It was agreed that the MCCIP Secretariat would communicate to SAHFOS that MCCIP could not and would not provide funding at this stage since the focus of MCCIP was the ARC card. MCCIP should provide the one stop shop for links to the latest quality science and the SAHFOS encyclopaedia helps towards this goal. Reciprocal web links should be established to make it clear to the general public and funders that these are not 'alternatives' but complementary. There should be early discussion on peer reviewing processes.

12 AOB

- 12.1 How MCCIP should interact with the Surface Ocean Acidification Group, which has formed university forum in PML was discussed, and it was agreed that a reference to the user group would be included in MCCIP bimonthly updates.
- 12.2 Progress with the Water Framework Directive process was reported – the EU were planning a launch in Bonn on climate change in water, and there would be a chapter on marine impacts – further details would emerge over the coming months.

13 DONM

Tuesday 5 September 2006 in York.

Post meeting note – York may be very difficult now and costly and so it is suggested that London may be a much better location, so a room at Defra offices for this date will be sought.

*K Francis
MCCIP Secretariat
03 July 2006*