

Finding Sanctuary Process Group

Report to the meeting of the Finding Sanctuary Steering Group, 24.11.09

The process group met for the first time on 15.10.09.

Attendees

Andy Green	Recreation
Richard White	Conservation
Dick Appleton	Commercial
Louise Lieberknecht	Project Team
David Murphy	Project Team (LG)
Tom Hooper	Project Team

1 Work Programme

A start was made on the consideration of a programme of work and key milestones needed to be achieved by the project. A list of tasks was created as a first step towards producing a process plan which will need further consideration by the PG at the next meeting in January. The programme for publication of the Ecological network Guidance should be noted.

2 Process Governance

Process governance was considered and the following recommendations are brought to the steering group for their agreement:

- i. that the PG should be formally delegated by the SG to decide on process matters
- ii. that in order to get work done (when its needed) there should be well planned and managed:
 - Task focused **work sessions** (i.e. ad-hoc or one off) meetings set up to do a particular piece of work

And / or

 - **Task Groups** (i.e. a standing group that meets more than once & has a named membership) to do a particular strand of work.
- iii. that the above groupings/ work sessions should have the following “ground rules”:
 - At least two sectors must be present at the session (the spirit is that the bigger the mix the better)
 - RKP facilitator attends
 - Any work done, options developed or suggestions agreed from these sessions are then fed into the SG for consideration
 - The work is commissioned by the SG

3 Steering Group Terms of Reference

The terms of reference for the SG were considered in the light of the significant increase in the size of that group and it was agreed to submit a revised draft to the SG for their agreement. It was also clear from the developing nature of the project that these should be kept under continuous review by the PG . The PG agreed that the document should be renamed as the SG Protocol.

4 Steering Group Membership

New applications for SG membership were considered and the following decisions made

- SWRDA should be admitted to provide overview of economic inputs.
- BASC should be invited to engage via members of that organisation who are already on the SG in other capacities.
- Marinet should not be admitted as the conservation sector is adequately represented.

5 Local Groups

The role in which local groups (LG) could contribute most constructively to the overall project was discussed. It was agreed that they were essential for feeding information from their locality up to the regional SG and also for providing comment on proposals that subsequently emerge from the SG, particularly with respect to the possible socio economic effects of these proposals.

It was felt that it should not be their principle role to make specific proposals for MCZs as this would be likely to add further to the workload of the project by imposing an additional assessment need. However, subsequent to the PG meeting it was explained by the Project Team how disempowering changing the role of the Local Groups will be because the groups have been recruited on the basis of their existing role and remit and a change would mean undoing what's already in place.

In light of this the PG has agreed that the remit of the LGs remain as they were.

6 Summary of principal recommendations

- That the SG be open to the idea of setting up smaller groups as necessary to do detailed work on behalf of the whole SG.
- That the SG can commission work to be done via both Standing Work Groups, and also one-off Work Sessions.
- That the PG takes on a role of helping the process consultants (RKP) and the project team in setting the agenda for SG meetings.
- That it takes on the role of deciding on membership of the SG when requests to join are received.
- That the SG adopt the latest draft of the terms of reference, now renamed the SG Protocol.