



Stakeholder Engagement, Facilitation & Mediation

R K Partnership Ltd
Ellsdone
Torbay Road
Castle Cary
Somerset, BA7 7DW
Tel: 01963 351008

Finding Sanctuary: Process Group

REPORT

Meeting: 9th July 2010

Report: 22nd July 2010

Attendees	2
Agenda	3
Actions from the Last Meeting.....	4
The Process Group.....	4
Review of the Steering Group Meeting.....	4
Process Planning	7
Steering Group Protocol.....	10
Working Groups.....	11
October Steering Group Meeting	13
Next Steps	14
Agreements and Decisions – Summary	15
Actions.....	16

Attendees

Richard White	The Wildlife Trusts
Dave Cuthbert	New Under Tens Fishermen's Association
Jim Masters	Devon Maritime Forum
Dick Appleton	British Ports Association
Rick Parker	Personal Boatmen's Association
Tom Hooper	Finding Sanctuary
Spike Searle	Finding Sanctuary
Louise Lieberknecht	Finding Sanctuary
Rob Angell	RKP



Agenda

09.45	Arrivals & refreshments	<i>Supporting Paper</i>
10.00	Start <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review & Agree Agenda Actions of the last meeting 	<i>PG notes Apr 2010</i>
	The Process Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Membership and make up - replacing the 2 members who have left 	
	Review Steering Group Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A quick look back at the last meeting to reflect on what went well, what needs to change / be done better or differently next time 	<i>SG Meeting Report June 2010</i>
11.30	Break	
	Process Planning To help continue to plan & develop the Project Timeline including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working with “named consultative stakeholders” The Process from the end of the WGs work to draft recommendations and on to the final recommendations Local Group Input 	<i>Process Timeline</i>
13.00	Lunch	
	The Steering Group To review and further develop the Protocol; including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A discussion on the merit and possible development of sanctions for breaking the protocol If this is done, discussion of who in the process becomes the judge on when a breach is made Agree the updated Protocol (with process for disagreeing with PG recommendations) Dealing with new members from now on 	<i>Updated Protocol</i> <i>Mike Bailey Email</i>
	Working Groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review of where they have got to & discussion of what is planned next WGs How the work is shared with the SG IWG membership 	
15.00	Break	
	Steering Group Meeting (October) A first look at priorities for the agenda	
	Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree actions and review all decisions made Items and priorities for the next meeting Next meeting date(s) 	
	Feedback On how the meeting has gone	
17.00	Close	

Actions from the Last Meeting

- **Action:** *“Email SG members to ask for agreement on contacting MCA to offer them either full SG membership or NCS role.”*
This is being chased up nationally
- **Action** *“Double check with JNCC what their expectation for what is and isn’t put in the public domain regarding the 1st iteration of sites. “*
The report and supporting documents for the 1st iteration will be available on the FS website from Monday 12th July. However, the PT has requested that they are not put on the Defra website because of the need to ensure that regional ownership is clear.
- **Action:** *“Offer NCS induction and send them ENG, updated handbook and TOR.”*
All documents have now been updated and sent, but the NCS have not yet had an induction.
- All other actions were completed.

The Process Group

A review of the membership of the Process Group was undertaken due to two members leaving. The details of the old members and the people replacing them are as follows:

- Andy Green has left the BCU and therefore is no longer a member of the SG or PG. Tom asked Rick Parker to replace Andy on the PG to represent recreational interests. A replacement for the SG is currently being recruited.
- Dick Appleton’s role on the SG is coming to an end and he is being replaced on the SG by Sandie Wilson, Tom Hooper asked Dave Cuthbert to replace him on the PG.

Review of the Steering Group Meeting

What went well?

- Feedback from some SG members was that it was the best meeting yet.
- Group dynamics seem more cohesive and the meeting had a good atmosphere.
- The Group’s identity seems really strong, and even during difficult discussions where some people disagreed, people kept their sense of humour. This is also leading to members being more honest with one another
- The Group had a lengthy and difficult discussion over, what some saw as contentious, new members, at the end of which they made a decision. The discussion was necessary because if it hadn’t happened, people may have begun to harbour resentment, which would have been destructive for the group as a whole.
- SG members, who aren’t in a WG and may have been concerned previously, now seem to understand how the WGs are working and the progress they are making.
- Having WG members mixed in on each table worked well because other SG members could ask them questions.
- People were much more focused on the actual work being done rather than on revisiting exhausted points.

- There was much more input from SG members and less time spent by the PT informing the group

What changes would you suggest making?

- Working in small groups is efficient, but time constraints on the day made it difficult for each group to fully understand what the other groups achieved. The PG suggest allowing more time during the meetings to enable this feedback between the different groups so that SG members can get an overall view of how the SG as a whole is progressing.
- The PT need to be more proactive at answering questions posed by SG members that they can answer at the meeting so that these questions don't need to be answered afterwards or forwarded to the SAP.
- It would be beneficial to have more time for the SG to ask questions of the PG about its recommendations, as some SG members felt that the PG had made decisions in some instances rather than recommendations to the SG. The PG recommend placing one PG member within any sub group at the SG as was done with WG members to allow for this.
- There is a recurring problem with substitutes and new members who arrive at SG meetings without being fully briefed. This was most apparent when new members and substitutes diverted discussions onto issues that had already been put to bed by the SG in previous meetings. The PG recommend in these instances that a member of the PG suggests to the substitute that they have not been fully briefed by the SG member, for whom they are covering, and that the issue is question will not be discussed again.
- Where possible SG members should let both the PT and RKP know well in advance that they will not be able to attend a meeting and will be sending a substitute - and commit to briefing their substitute properly. Where this is not possible PT and RKP will help in the briefing of late substitutes.
- In order to ensure that all substitutes are kept up to speed, the PG recommend that all substitutes are added to the SG mailing list so that they receive all relevant documents in case they have to attend a meeting at the last minute.
- So that all possible substitutes receive the emails, the PT will ask ALL SG members who think that they might require a substitute in the future to nominate them by the deadline (within 3 weeks of the PT asking).
- All previous and new substitutes will be added to the mailing list.

Things to do better

- The discussions surrounding the recommendation from the PG for MCS to be invited to join the SG as a full member were contentious. Prior to the meeting SG members were invited to raise any issues with the recommendation in writing. Four SG members did so. However, during the meeting, many SG members stated that they felt that the decision had already been made by the PG, rather than a recommendation.
- The PG felt that this may have been due to PG recommendations being given less time for discussion at the SG meeting. This was done to reduce time spent on PG recommendations in order to allow more time for discussion of the Building Blocks and WGs work.
- It is hoped that the majority of the time, PG recommendations will be agreed by the SG without the need for discussion. But, for what the PG recognises will be contentious recommendations more time needs to be allocated.
- The PG agreed that when there are contentious issues that it cannot agree on, it will make it explicit that SG members who have concerns need to put them in writing, and to highlight that the issue in question was one of contention within the PG.
- PG agreed that, by asking for SG members to submit their concerns in writing gives members the opportunity to state the reasons behind their concern.

- The PG highlighted the difference between voting and a consensus driven approach whereby: a vote only allows participants to give a yes or no answer, but in the FS process, SG members may not necessarily agree with a recommendation, but can include caveats in the decision record.
- This is equally important when referring to site suggestions and network options. If SG members only voted for each site, it might be impossible to reach any agreement. With consensus, each member has the option to recommend several sites and include comments and caveats.
- People are recognizing that the important work is being done by the WGs and SG members would like more feedback on this and less time spent on process issues.
- The PG acknowledged that WG members are only making suggestions to the SG, therefore SG members need to be given the opportunity to ask a lot of questions of the WGs and the WG members given time to fully explain to the SG why they have made the suggestions they have.

Sharing with the SG

The PG felt that very few SG members had read the PG report before the SG meeting. The group discussed measures to ensure that the SG is briefed on the recommendations from the PG meetings:

- Make it more explicit in the email that gets sent to SG members that they really need to read the report. Stress that SG members have a responsibility to make sure they are informed before meetings.
- We said before the last SG meeting that the discussion on the day will be based on the reports supplied.
- The PT agreed to include bullet points in the joining instructions email text of the **key points** all SG members need to know before the meeting. This could include key questions and statements, recommendations and suggestions from the PG.

The PG **AGREED**:

- That any issues that are felt to be contentious for and by the PG be highlighted to SG members, and SG members asked to put in writing any comments or concerns on the issue before SG meetings.
- To send a covering email with the notes of this meeting to remind SG members of the importance of continuity of attendees and that all substitutes must be fully briefed.
- The PT will include key bullet point and a couple of key questions based on the WG reports in the joining instruction email for the next SG meeting

The PG **RECOMMENDS** that:

- Those SG members who would like to name a substitute to do so now.
- All named substitutes be added to the mailing list for SG documents.
- More time at SG meetings is allowed for feedback between sub groups if possible.
- A PG and WG member to be present within each subgroup to aid discussions and answer questions regarding their work.

Process Planning

The Group discussed the current Project Timeline including future Steering Group and Working Group meetings:

- The February 2011 SG meeting is scheduled to coincide with the 3rd progress report and SAP submission. The PG understands that by this point the majority of the work towards the final recommendation will have been completed by the WGs.
- SG meeting 6 is currently pencilled in for the end of March 2011, however the PG does not feel that this would give sufficient time to receive feedback from the SAP on the third progress report. The PG recommend replacing SG meeting 6 in March with a set of WG meetings once the SAP feedback had been returned to allow for recommendations to be tweaked.
- Because there will not be another opportunity to gain feedback from the SAP on the recommendations after the third progress report submission in February 2011, the PG acknowledge that the bulk of the WGs work needs to have been completed in time for the third progress report.
- The PG would prefer the majority of the work to be submitted in the second progress report so that, at SG meeting 5 on the 11th February, the SG only needs to finalise their recommendations for the third submission to prevent it being done last minute.
- The PG noted that the SG will also be asked for organisational sign off of the third progress report at the 5th SG meeting on the 11th February, increasing the work load for the meeting further.
- As the PG is unsure of the amount of time needed at the meeting until the October SG meeting has been held, it was suggested that the PG highlight the importance of SG meeting 5 to the SG and discuss the length of the meeting nearer the time.
- The PG recommended for the PT to bring together the WGs work in time for SG meeting 5 on the 11th February 2011 as there might be some overlap in around the 12 nm limit.
- The PT has agreed to collate this work and present it to the SG as a whole at SG meeting 5.
- The PG recommends having a final SG meeting at the end of April 2011 in order to sign off the final recommendation following the SAP feedback and March WG meetings.

Having discussed the timing of meetings and the need for most of the SGs work to be completed in time for the third progress report, it was acknowledged that some of the SG members would not be able to sign off the recommendations without organisational sign off. The process of gaining organisational sign off was then discussed:

- Organisational sign off will take time to receive and will need to have already been reached before the final recommendations are made.
- Therefore the PG recommend asking SG members at the 7th October 2010 SG meeting (meeting 4) to find out if they will require organisational sign off.
- The PG acknowledged that SG members need to see the format of the final recommendation document before they can ask for organisational sign off.
- Therefore the PG suggest that the PT send out a draft of the cover note and the format of the final output and it's layout to SG members prior to the October SG meeting (mtg 4), and allow time for discussion of the format at the meeting. SG members will then be able to go back to their organisations with the draft format and bring their comments to the 11th February SG meeting (mtg 5).

- Suggested moving 'Agree what / who needs organisational sign off' to SG meeting 5 from SG meeting 6, which will allow enough time for those who need it to get it in time for the third progress report.
- NE and JNCC have given themselves 5 months (June - October 2011) to get internal sign off on their commentary on how well the proposals meet the ENG, then it will go to Defra.
- There was some concern that the internal sign off by these bodies will open up the SG recommendations to alteration, resulting in the proposals that reach Defra possibly being different from the ones the RPs have submitted.
- NE have said that this won't happen, although they may have to recommend additional sites if the SG are unable to meet all of the ENG. This should not be confused with alteration of sites.
- Whilst presenting the first progress report to the SAP, the PT were given a very positive response to the work the SG have done so far.
- Many SG members feel that it would be impossible to achieve organisational sign off as they represent a more disparate sector rather than one overarching organisation.
- The PG acknowledge that the formal consultation held by Defra will enable those stakeholders who have objections and comments to log them and confirmed that this is the appropriate avenue for them to use.
- It was asked how the PT is planning on communicating the recommendations and caveats that may accompany some of the sites. The PT have discussed this and each SG member will have the opportunity to put their name and signature next to a site to say, for example : 'yes it was included in the project recommendation to meet the ENG, however, I did not support it for the following reasons:'
- The PG stressed that the accuracy of SG member's comments was of the utmost importance: once they have been recorded, they will be on record past the end of the project to the consultation and designation stages.
- The PG highlighted that what SG members are actually signing off is support of the project and the work that the WGs and SG have done, for which both sectorial and organisational representatives have taken part.

The PG suggested the following wording to be included on a cover note accompanying the final recommendation:

- **"This report is a fair representation of the work undertaken by the Finding Sanctuary Steering Group, the undersigned, and contains within it the agreements, objections and caveats regarding the sites recommended within."**
- **"I am aware that the organisation I represent may not support this view."**

The PG suggests that each SG member also notes whose views they represent when signing the final recommendation.

The PG discussed how comments from LGs would be included in the final comments that will accompany the final recommendation:

- It was discussed if LG member's comments should be included in the final report. However it was pointed out that each LG has a representative on the SG who will include any comments and caveats on their behalf.
- It was also highlighted that the outputs from LG meetings are fed to the WGs who are using them to help guide their discussions of the Building Blocks.
- Each LG report logs LG member's comments regarding the Building Blocks, the records of which will be available as appendices to the final report.

Amendments to the Project Timeline are as follows:

- **Inputs to the process** - “2nd iteration feedback from the SAP by 15th needs to move to November box from the October box.
- **SG activity** - Remove SG meeting 6 from the end of March and replace with further WG meetings. Change SG mtg 7 in May for SG mtg 6.
- **Output from SG/WG** - move “Agree what / who needs organisational sign off” to February to co-inside with SG mtg 5.

The PG **AGREED** to:

- Send the draft format for the final recommendation and accompanying covering letter to the SG before the October SG meeting.
- Ask SG members at the October SG meeting (meeting 4) to find out if they will require organisational sign off.

The PG **RECOMMENDS** that:

- SG meeting 6 is removed from the end of March and replaced with further WG meetings.
- SG mtg 7 in May is changed to SG mtg 6.
- The PT to combine the work from the WGs and present it to the SG at the SG 5 in February 2011.

Steering Group Protocol

Agreeing the Updated Protocol

The Group reviewed the latest proposed changes and suggested amendments to the SG Protocol, and recommend the following amendments be made to:

- Section 3.1. Basis of steering group make up e.ii: “SG members will be asked to express any strong concerns and objections by email in advance of the SG meeting.”
- 3.1. Substitutes point a: “They must inform the project team of that person’s name by the closing date.”
- 3.1 Substitutes b - Substitutes will be added to the mailing list
- 4.1.d - remove “...at a venue accessible by public transport.” to leave only “Meetings will be held in Exeter.”
- 4.2.b - leave as is

It should be noted that the document will remain as a ‘Draft’ copy due to its evolving nature.

Sanctions

Following a discussion at the June SG meeting during which the issue of sanctions for SG members who break the SG protocol was raised, the Group discussed the merit and possible sanctions for any SG member who breaks the SG Protocol:

- The PG agreed that there is no point in pre-empting what this might be or when it might occur.
- RKP quoted the following passage from the Balanced Seas Regional Steering Group Terms of Reference relating to sanctions:

Abiding within this working agreement is considered an act of respect to other members of the group. Seriously breaching the agreement is considered to be a withdrawal of commitment and an act of disrespect. Should this occur, the RSG will consider whether a task group should be set up to determine, with the facilitators and project team, whether any action is needed.

- The above paragraph was discussed by PG members who agreed that it used the right level of wording without being too specific.
- PG members recommend adding a section 1.6 to the SG protocol titled “working within the SG protocol”. This will included the exact same wording under the heading as above.

The PG **RECOMMENDS** that:

- The PT need to add a section 1.6 to the SG protocol titled “working within the Steering Group protocol.” to contain the same wording as used in the Balanced Sea Terms of Reference.

Dealing with new members from now on

Following an email from Mike Bailey, Recreational Sea Angling member of the SG, who expressed concern about admitting any more new members to the full SG in the future, the group discussed the protocol for any new submissions and agreed that:

- The PT and the SG cannot close the doors to any new membership applications.
- However, in the unlikely event that any new applications are made to join, the applicant would have to make a very strong case for why they are not already represented on the SG by another member before being considered further.

Working Groups

Membership

Richard Stride has contact the PG to ask if Paul Trebilcock could join the IWG in order to contribute greater knowledge of inshore fisheries. His email was then discussed by the PG and suggestions made:

- At present the PT are looking to address this gap in knowledge by facilitating a meeting of fishing industry representatives from the SG, LG and other guest attendees to help validate the Fisherman data. The attendees of this meeting (to be held on July 20th) will also have the opportunity to enlighten and share with each other local knowledge of their area of the south west.
- In order to ensure that good ecological knowledge for the entire region is available to members of the OWG, a separate meeting of members of the conservation NGOs has already been held with the conservation representative on the OWG and support from the PT.
- Following this, the PG recommends that the PT offer this same opportunity to all SG members who are not part of the WGs, to ensure that all important knowledge is available to the WGs.
- RKP reminded the PG that when the WGs were set up, the SG agreed the criteria for setting up the WGs. One of these states a maximum number of available seats and that this number has already been reached on the IWG.
- There was reluctance to change the composition or number of members of the IWG at this stage due to the number of meetings already completed by the IWG. The PT believes that there is a good group dynamic and working relationship within the IWG, which the group would not want to undermine. However, if a member felt they were the wrong person for the job and would like to suggest swapping for another SG member, this is an option.
- The Group discussed the option of swapping an existing fishing member of the IWG for Paul, but decided that this would lose the experience gained by all WG members if a new member was brought in.
- Members of the PG queried if it would be possible for a member of the SG who is not a WG member join the meeting for the day if they could provide important information. Provided that the IWG agree, there is no reason why this could not be an option.
- The Group acknowledged that at the last OWG meeting John Butterwith, a fishing representative on the SG with very good local knowledge, was missing and this hindered the Group's progress.
- The CFPO have agreed to supply their data to the FS PT today (Friday 9th July), which when combined with the outputs from the fishermen's meeting on Tuesday 20th July, should fill in many of the gaps.
- The PG recommends that the IWG be asked to consider if it wants to co-opt Paul Trebilcock onto the September meeting of the IWG at the next IWG meeting (July 2010).

The PG **RECOMMENDS** that:

- The PT makes a onetime offer to the SG members not on the WGs, for a meeting with the PT and their particular WG representative to ensure that the WG representatives have the information they need.
- That the IWG be asked to consider if it wants to co-opt Paul Trebilcock onto the September meeting of the IWG at the next IWG meeting (July 2010)

Input to the WGs from the SG

Due to the lack of time between the last SG and the following WGs, it was apparent that there was insufficient time between meetings to process the feedback from the SG to a format that was easy to use, as it then ended up being time consuming during the meeting to sift through.

- The PG agreed that the PT need to ensure that specific feedback for the WGs from the SG meeting is extracted and dealt with separately and not just part of the report.
- During meetings the PT need to make sure the SG understand how their feedback is going to be used, and the questions asked made more specific to prevent ambiguity of answers.
- If people are better prepared for the meeting and have already read the WG reports, then they are less likely to go off on tangents and to supply constructive feedback. This issue is being addressed.
- The PG noted that prior to the last SG meeting, the WGs were discussing more general points, and therefore feedback to the SG was more general. As the WGs progress their work should become more detailed and therefore the questions we ask of the SG will become more focused.

The PG **AGREED** that:

- The PT need to ensure that specific feedback for the WGs from the SG meeting is extracted and dealt with separately and not just part of the report
- The PT need to make sure that the SG understand how their feedback is going to be used, and the questions asked made more specific.

Local Groups

The Group discussed when and how it is possible for the Local Groups to feed in to the process:

- LG coordinators have been asked to have their group meetings within the windows leading up to IWG meetings, the dates for which the PT will pass on to them.
- At present WGs are only scheduled until November, therefore there are no windows after this. However, if LGs feel they need a meeting in the New Year, this is possible, but there is no guarantee that this will feed into the WGs.
- LGs may be given the opportunity to comment on the third progress report to feed into the March/April WG meetings.
- LGs have asked to be arranged so that they can feed in to the process at the most effective time. In the case of the Scillies, they are awaiting the SAP feedback.
- The PG noted that the more often the LGs meet, the more chance there is for them to feed into the process, but that it is important to find the balance for the best use of people's time.
- The next block of LG meetings will take into account the work of the WGs, which could result in some BBs being altered.
- The LGs need to know when the latest they can input into the project is. At present this appears to be some time in the lead up to the final WG meetings in March for final comments. However, the last opportunity to feed into the third progress report will be the November WG meetings.
- Hence, unless there are more WG meetings in January, there is no other opportunity for the LGs to feed into the third progress report.
- Many of the Local Groups would like to continue their work beyond the end of the project. The PG noted that this was a positive example of how well they are now working.
- A final point is that Sam Davis (the Cornwall Local MCZ Group Coordinator) does not think she will be able to make one of the SG meetings. She is currently looking for a substitute to cover and will let the PT know when she has one to name.

October Steering Group Meeting

Priorities for the Agenda

The Group discussed ideas for the next Steering Group meeting Agenda:

- Time needs to be allocated to discussion surrounding the format of the final report and the SG need to be presented with a draft of the final recommendation.
- The SG need to be given the feedback from the SAP regarding the 1st iteration.
- Peter Ryder, chairman of the Science Advisory Panel (SAP), has offered to attend a SG/WG meeting in person. PT and RKP recommended it would be most beneficial for him to attend the SG meeting in October.
- The PG agreed that by October the SG will have progressed away from the first progress report and will be focusing on preparing the second one. Therefore it is not worth Peter explaining the SAP first progress report feedback to the SG. Hence the PT suggests getting the WGs to put questions to Peter and the SAP prior to the SG meeting for him to answer on the day. If this is not deemed appropriate, Peter can observe the meeting, which the PG feel might also be beneficial for him and the SAP when trying to understand the contents of the second progress report.
- There are still quite a few national datasets outstanding:
 - The EUNIS Level 3Habitat map is still awaiting a final update
 - The Compatibility Matrices - if these are released after the WGs meet, this could have a knock on effect at the SG meeting.
- All four RPs have insisted that they need the Compatibility Matrices by September as the other 3 RPs have SG meetings in September and will need them.
- The PG agreed that at the next SG meeting there will be a lot of things to discuss on the day and that it is very important that enough time is allowed for each task.
- PG members also agreed that meetings are better when there are less agenda headings / items and subjects to discuss, thus enabling the SG to get into more depth and make more progress on the day. It allows momentum of tasks to grow and not be cut short.

The PG felt that the next SG meeting should be longer to allow for the important task and large work load that the SG will be expected to complete during the meeting. Options for the meeting were discussed:

- An extended SG meeting should be put in the context of: 'The PG appreciates that the SG need sufficient time to get to grips with WG work'.
 1. Offer lunch on 1st day of SG meeting for those that want it and then starting meeting at 2pm, continuing the next day until the early evening.
 2. Start the meeting earlier and finishing later into the evening: e.g. starting at 9am and finishing at 7pm.
 3. Have two meetings one week apart: the first to sort all administrative issues and PG recommendations; the second to discuss the WGs recommendations
- The PG stressed that having a longer meeting did not mean that more agenda items could be squeezed in to fill up the extra time, but that there should be fewer agenda items, each one given more time to allow momentum to build.

Next Steps

The next PG meeting dates are at present **September 2nd (TBC) and 9th December 2010.**

- It was highlighted that the SG need enough time to take ownership of the work of the WGs before they will be able to agree to anything.
- That an early September (Thursday 2nd) PG meeting is pencilled in and Tom Hooper to email all PG members 2 weeks before to confirm whether meeting will go ahead or not.

The PG **AGREED** that:

- Tom Hooper will email PG members two weeks prior to the next PG scheduled meeting to confirm or cancel it depending on necessity.

Reflection and Evaluation

The Group reflected on how the meeting had gone:

- We're now solving problems more quickly and everyone feels more comfortable making recommendations.
- Dick Appleton's input will be missed.
-

Agreements and Decisions - Summary

The PG **AGREED**:

- That any issues that are felt to be contentious for and by the PG be highlighted to SG members, and SG members asked to put in writing any comments or concerns on the issue before SG meetings.
- To send a covering email with the notes of this meeting to remind SG members of the importance of continuity of attendees and that all substitutes must be fully briefed.

The PG **RECOMMENDS** that:

- Those SG members who would like to name a substitute to do so now.
- All named substitutes be added to the mailing list for SG documents.
- More time at SG meetings is allowed for feedback between tables/groups.
- A PG and WG member to be present within each subgroup to aid discussions and answer questions regarding their work.

The PG **AGREED** to:

- Send the draft format for the final recommendation and accompanying covering letter to the SG before the October SG meeting.
- Ask SG members at the October SG meeting (meeting 4) to find out if they will require organisational sign off.

The PG **RECOMMENDS** that:

- SG meeting 6 is removed from the end of March and replaced with further WG meetings.
- SG mtg 7 in May is changed to SG mtg 6.
- The PT to combine the work from the WGs and present it to the SG at the SG 5 in February 2011.

The PG **RECOMMENDS** that:

- The PT need to add a section 1.6 to the SG protocol titled “working within the Steering Group protocol.” to contain the same wording as used in the Balanced Sea Terms of Reference.

The PG **RECOMMENDS** that:

- The PT make a onetime offer to the SG members not on the WGs, for a meeting with the PT and their particular WG representative to ensure that the WG representatives have the information they need.
- That the IWG be asked to consider if it wants to co-opt Paul Trebilcock onto the September meeting of the IWG at the next IWG meeting (July 2010)

The PG **AGREED** that:

- The PT will include key bullet point and a couple of key questions based on the WG reports in the joining instruction email for the next SG meeting.

The PG **AGREED** that:

- The PT need to ensure that specific feedback for the WGs from the SG meeting is extracted and dealt with separately and not just part of the report
- The PT need to make sure that the SG understand how their feedback is going to be used, and the questions asked made more specific.

The PG **AGREED** that:

- Tom Hooper will email PG members two weeks prior to the next scheduled meeting to confirm or cancel it depending on necessity.

Actions

Action	Who	By When
Double check that Dick Appleton has received a copy of the first progress report	Tom	12 th July
Send briefing for NCS people on what they can expect (process)	Rob/Tom	16 th July
When there is a contentious issue within the PG, any communications sent to the SG need to make this explicit and ask for any concerns to be voiced in writing	Rob	Ongoing
Request all SG who want to have a substitute to name them and supply an email address within 3 weeks	Tom	16 th July
Ask SG at the October meeting if they will need organizational sign off and how long it will take them to get it. SG members need to respond in writing before the Feb SG meeting	Rob/Tom	At October 7 th SG meeting
Pass on windows of opportunity for LG meetings until the end of the year to coordinators	Tom	16 th July
Update the Project Timeline	Rob	29 th July
To add section 1.6 to SG Protocol and to use the wording from the Balanced Sea TOR	Rob	29 th July
To respond to Mike Bailey's email.	Tom	16 th July
To respond to Richard Stride's email	Tom	16 th July
PT to make a onetime offer to the SG members not on the WGs, for a meeting with the PT and their particular WG representative to ensure that the WG representatives have the information they need when making suggestions.	Tom	23 rd July
To explore with SG members via email whether or not they would be happy extending the October SG meeting.	Tom	16 th July
To send a draft PG report to Rob	Sarah	14 th July
Send PG report to PG	Rob	22 nd July