

Minutes Wales Biodiversity Partnership Steering Group Meeting WBPSG10 10th February 2010, Tredomen Park, Caerphilly

Attendance list

| Name | | Organisation |
|---------|------------|-------------------------------------|
| Nigel | Ajax-Lewis | WTW |
| Adam | Rowe | LRCs Wales |
| Adrian | Jones | Welsh Beaver Assessment Initiative |
| Aethne | Cooke | CCW marine |
| Alison | Jones | Caerphilly CBC Senior Ecologist |
| Chris | Tucker | FCW |
| David | Parker | CCW |
| Diana | Reynolds | WAG/WBP Support Team (Chair) |
| Graham | Oliver | National Museum of Wales |
| Hazel | Drewett | CCW |
| Ivy | Berkshire | Wild meadows |
| Joe | Daggett | National Trust |
| Juliet | Hynes | WBP Support Team |
| Kate | Williamson | Natur Cymru & National Parks |
| Maggie | Iles | Caerphilly CBC Biodiversity Officer |
| Mark | Potter | EAW |
| Richard | May | South Wales LBAP rep |
| Robin | Woodyatt | WLGA |
| Russel | Hobson | Butterfly Conservation |
| Sean | McHugh | WBP Support Team |
| Steve | Moon | ALGE |

Apologies

| Name | | Organisation |
|----------|-----------|--------------|
| Helen | Wilkinson | CCW (paper) |
| Michelle | Bromley | FCW |
| Alan | Storer | WCMP |

| | | |
|----------|-----------------------|--|
| Julia | Korn | CCW/WBP ST (Paper) |
| Emma | Broad | North Wales LBAP rep |
| Glenda | Thomas | FWAG |
| Helen | Buckingham | National Trust |
| David | Bullock | National Trust |
| Mike | Bruford | Cardiff University |
| Stephen | Bladwell | RSPB/WEL |
| Dusi | Thomas | Dwr Cymru |
| Nick | Bialynicki- Birula | EAW |
| Ian | Guildford | CCW / South Wales Police (Paper) |
| Virginia | Prieto Salas | North Western and North Wales Sea Fisheries Committee |
| Deb | Hill | WLG/City & County of Swansea |

Diana Reynolds (Chair) welcomed everyone and introduced the meeting. She gave a special welcome to first time attendees. The update from Wales Coastal & Maritime (WCMP) partnership was scheduled in for later on in the meeting as Steve Moon was delayed.

Feedback from the UK Standing Committee: Diana Reynolds/David Parker

The standing committee had not met since SG9 in November and there was nothing to report at this time.

Minutes & Actions from SG9

A few minor queries to the draft minutes had been reported and will be incorporated into the final minutes. The chair then invited comments from the attendees and none were forthcoming. Diana explained that out of 61 actions only four are outstanding (Actions 2; 5; 15; 55). Action 2 and 5 from SG9 will be rolled forward.

ACTION 1. Nigel-Ajax Lewis & Stephen Bladwell to canvas for interested members of volunteer community to provide representative on the WBP steering group.

ACTION 2. Hazel Drewett to share mapping of BAP habitat against habitat definitions used in BARS with Kevin Austin and Ann Humble at WAG and Chris Tucker at FCW.

Kate Williamson enquired whether the volunteer representatives would be drawn regionally. Diana Reynolds confirmed this was the case. Katie-Jo Luxton enquired about the expectations required of the volunteer representatives. Diana explained that volunteers would bring their enthusiasm, experience, individual interests and would be paid travel and subsistence where appropriate.

Action(s) 15 and 55 from SG9 were with Trevor Dines. It was noted in the meeting that Trevor had recently moved office and was managing a high-workload. The two outstanding actions will be ‘bundled up’ and Diana Reynolds will contact Trevor to this effect. Diana thanked all involved in delivering actions.

ACTION 3. Diana Reynolds to contact Trevor Dines to update on BSBI invite to WEIF and additional taxonomic expertise training needs required for the lichenology training project.

Feedback from WCMP: Steve Moon

Steve Moon informed the meeting that the WCMP had not met recently but he is happy to attend WCMP meetings on behalf of WBP. Steve had contacted Alan Storer (WCMP) and informed the group of a WCMP conference event taking place on the 18th March in Cardiff which will focus on the Marine Bill. Diana Reynolds informed the meeting that WCMP will operate as the main stakeholder group in Wales for the provision of Marine Conservation Zones outlined in the Marine Bill.

ACTION 4. All to note WCMP event and attend as appropriate.

Paper to Note A: WBP Species Expert Group (SEG) – Lead Partner Gaps; Stephen Bladwell

Stephen Bladwell was unable to attend the meeting and sent his apologies. Diana Reynolds explained that given the size of the task, some gaps in lead partner coverage were to be expected. Nigel-Ajax Lewis commented that some species e.g. Silky Wave Moth showed a regional distribution pattern and suggested a full listing of species would help us identify suitable leads. Diana Reynolds confirmed that a full list existed and would be circulated to the group to help to fill the gaps.

ACTION 5. Stephen Bladwell to circulate the full species list to WBP to help identify gaps in coverage.

Graham Oliver enquired if criteria existed for potential species lead partners. Graham noted that the Museum of Wales has lichen expertise. Diana Reynolds informed that any group or individual with sufficient knowledge could operate as a species lead partner. David Parker enquired as to whether the ecosystem groups (EG) had provision for accommodating these species. Diana responded that she believed that the EG’s and SEG had accommodated the majority of species and what was outlined represented the ‘left overs’ from this process. Juliet Hynes informed the group that the Universities and Museum could potentially fill some gaps in relation to Fungi. Katie-Jo Luxton remarked that the lead partner species actions plans will be required to inform the process making it difficult to judge resource requirement at this stage. Kate Williamson commented that constraints related to capacity of organisations should be considered e.g. Plantlife. Diana Reynolds confirmed that this was being looked into.

ACTION 6. Graham Oliver to speak with Stephen Bladwell to discuss a potential role as a species lead partner utilising taxonomic expertise at the Museum.

ACTION 7. All to consider and help identify possible leads once the full list has been circulated.

Travel & subsistence (T&S) costs for unpaid volunteers involved in the process can be provided by WBP budget (Point B); SEG to initiate the first steps to lead partner delivery and coordination and review the process in terms of resource allocation. Utilising meeting rooms provided by WAG and other partner organisations will assist in terms of resources, WBP budget can provide volunteer T& S as noted above (Point C).

ACTION 8. SEG to review initial first steps and report back to WBP to guide resource needs

ACTION 9. WBP secretariat to clarify with Stephen Bladwell T&S costs for volunteers.

Paper to Note B: Hymenoptera Monitoring: Stephen Bladwell

Katie-Jo Luxton informed the meeting that the main authors of the paper were CCW & Bumblebee Conservation Trust invertebrate experts. Diana Reynolds thanked all those involved. Diana gave details of the Lichenology Project. The paper suggested that this could be used as a template to raise recording and reporting capacity for other taxonomic groups as it represented a sustainable model. The pilot project was successful and has been continued since initiation. The cost is approximately £500pa (WAG funds) but does involve a commitment of time and resources from participants and employers involved in the project.

ACTION 10. Sean McHugh to scope Hymenoptera project initiation based on Lichenology project model.

A discussion took place on the organisational representation involved in the Lichenology Project and the number of participants involved. Also discussed was the next taxonomic group to be put forward for the next round of taxonomic capacity building and marine and coastal species was mooted as a potential candidate.

ACTION 11. Alan Hale to provide a brief Lichenology Project progress report with a list of participants involved in the project to assist with local contacts

ACTION 12. Marine Ecosystem Group and Coastal Ecosystem Group to scope a joint taxonomic capacity building project along similar lines.

ACTION 13. Sean McHugh to offer expenses for unpaid volunteer time incurred in taxonomic capacity building within WBP budget.

Paper to Note C: Update on Wales Environmental Information Forum steering Group (WEIF) Data flow and Data Charter actions: Helen Wilkinson

Helen Wilkinson was unable to attend the meeting and sent apologies. David Parker informed the meeting that Wales was leading the way in sharing environmental data in a systematic way. Six data flow models for various taxa and two sectors (academic & private) were outlined in the paper and a draft data sharing charter was included with the paper. David highlighted that prioritisation of work will be critical in taking the process forward and biodiversity data would be the initial focus followed by other environmental data as the process rolled forward. Two main elements of this approach are 1) A data sharing charter outlining principles for organisations regarding sharing of data 2) Data flow issues observing the ‘capture once use often’ principle.

Adam Rowe explained that data flow work currently focused on building on pre-existing work, agreements and relationships. For example, work with the academic sector was advanced due to good links with Dan Foreman at Swansea University. Adam emphasised prioritisation of work and resources would be required and the core groups outlined in the paper may have to be revisited based on resource constraints. Adam mentioned that data flow would be based on organisational/taxonomic group requirements and that a ‘one size fits all’ model would be unsuitable. In terms of the draft data sharing charter, Adam invited support for the principles contained in the data charter and comments on the charter. Signatories to the data sharing charter would be showing commitment to the process and Adam suggested public sector bodies as initial signatories followed by all organisations holding environmental data. Following sign up to the charter, organisations would then negotiate a more detailed data sharing framework based on their circumstances and requirements.

A discussion then took place regarding the following: data sensitivity; commercial implications; time-scales; resource implications and data custodian implications. The RSPB and CCW (biodiversity data initially) indicated their support in principle for the charter with the RSPB requesting clarification based on the points raised in the discussion.

Decision point 1 could be addressed by using a suitable paragraph contained in the recent WAG Cabinet written statement on the WAG website outlining the Natural Environment Framework (NER) approach.

Decision point 2 & 3 – the Data Charter principles were accepted subject to creation of a clarification note on some of the terminology. A consultation framework was agreed based on a 12 week consultation period.

Decision point 4- the data charter principles were endorsed.

Decision point 5- the data flow groups outlined in the paper was endorsed while accepting the need for prioritisation. Small NGO’s/recorder groups to be offered funds from WBP SG taxonomic fund reserved for SG10 to assist with the data flow initialisation processes.

On a related theme, Adam Rowe mentioned that the LRC training days funded by WBP had been very successful and expressed interest in their continuation. Sean

McHugh informed the meeting that the training days would be included in the WBP 2010/2011 draft budget.

ACTION 14. WEIF to use paragraph from NER statement to introduce the data sharing charter document.

ACTION 15. WEIF to supply a brief clarification note to the data charter providing meanings of terminology such as 'sharing with single custodian' and 'timeliness'.

ACTION 16. Diana Reynolds to confirm data charter consultation arrangements with WAG colleagues.

ACTION 17. WEIF to adopt the core groups identified for data flow action and prioritise as appropriate.

ACTION 18. WEIF to contact Sean McHugh regarding financial assistance to small NGO's/Groups involved with the data flow process.

Paper to Note D: WBP Planning: Sean McHugh

Diana Reynolds explained that the WAG Minister for Environment, Sustainability & Housing will be attending the WBP conference and is keen to outreach to other sectors. There had been an offer from WAG colleagues in the Sustainable Development Branch to help deliver the conference and this may have a bearing on the conference date. It was agreed that the dates and general location (ie North Wales) would remain the same if possible (Bangor; 15th & 16th September). Bearing in mind the limit on delegate numbers is 125 at the proposed venue and the importance of 2010; alternative venues in Bangor may be required. Ideas to bottom out the conference theme (Action 1) and suggestions for speakers and suitable topics (Action 3) were invited and it was suggested the workshop activities following the morning proceedings would help in this respect.

Conference themes and ideas discussed following the workshop activities: Resourcing biodiversity came up as a key issue in the workshop activities and has potential to be developed into a conference theme. Biodiversity levy/offsets examples from England, the Netherlands and a potential scheme from the Vale Council based on S106 agreements were cited as good practice examples which could be incorporated into the conference. Political buy in and support for the conference aspirations was raised as an important element and Wales Environment Link could help with advocacy work in this respect. On this basis, a theme based on resourcing biodiversity will be provisionally adopted.

The UK BAP Conference dates and location were announced. The conference will take place in Stirling on 23rd & 24th November.

ACTION 19. All to note provisional conference date and location of WBP Conference (15th & 16th Sept, Bangor). Details confirming the date & location will be sent as soon as they are available.

ACTION 20. All send suggestions of suitable conference projects/speakers/workshops based on the 'Resourcing Biodiversity' theme to Sean McHugh.

ACTION 21. All to note UK conference date and location (23rd & 24th Nov, Stirling).

Diana Reynolds reminded everyone that 2010 was a significant year for biodiversity and events would be held throughout the year to mark Wales' contribution to the International Year of Biodiversity (IYB) which includes the International Biodiversity Day on 22nd May and Wales Biodiversity Week 5th -13th June. Forums to promote IYB activities in addition to Wales Biodiversity Week events were highlighted including: the National Eisteddfod in Blaenau Gwent; International Biodiversity Day event at the Museum in Cardiff (20th, 21st & 22nd May); Institute of Ecology & Environmental Management event proposed for Autumn; Potential for a Senedd event (poster session) to draw in cross-party Welsh AM support for biodiversity (would require catering costs).

ACTION 22. All to offer to host Wales Biodiversity Week (5th -13th June) events and send event details to Sean McHugh (s.mchugh@welshwildlife.org).

ACTION 23. All to contact Catrin Mears (catrin.mears@museumwales.ac.uk) to get involved with the National Museum Wales partnership activities and events to mark IYB.

ACTION 24. All to send Sean McHugh (s.mchugh@welshwildlife.org) and Catrin Mears (catrin.mears@museumwales.ac.uk) events to mark IYB for publication on the WBP and Museum events database.

ACTION 25. Catrin Mears (catrin.mears@museumwales.ac.uk) to investigate and circulate a possible format for holding a Senedd event to raise the profile of biodiversity.

Paper to Note E: 2008 Wales BAP interpretation of data: Julia Korn

Julia Korn was not able to attend the meeting. The paper requested volunteers to participate in a task & finish group to interpret the UK 2008 BAP report at a Wales level. The CCW Biodiversity Network are involved with the process and Diana Reynolds invited volunteers from other organisations to assist. Nick Birula (EA) was suggested by his colleague (Mark Potter) and Nigel-Ajax Lewis (Wildlife Trusts Wales/WEL) volunteered to join Jan Sherry, Aethne Cook and Julia Korn on the group. LBAPs were invited to find a representative to participate in the task & finish group. A draft report from Wales was included with the paper and comments were encouraged via CCW. Circulation and comment from the Ecosystem Groups, Species Expert Groups and Policy Group was considered advisable. It was noted that the UK 2008 Reporting Round Report was not released. CCW commented that it did not

foresee any issues releasing the Welsh interpretation. Approval for continuation of the process was agreed.

ACTION 26. Richard May and Maggie Isles to contact LBAP officers to seek volunteers for inclusion on task & finish group

ACTION 27. All to send Aethne Cooke (a.cooke@ccw.gov.uk) comments on the draft 2008 Wales reporting interpretation document.

ACTION 28. Aethne Cooke to circulate 2008 Wales reporting interpretation document to relevant WBP working groups for comment.

ACTION 29. Diana Reynolds/David Parker to update WBP on status of UK 2008 Report following UK Standing Committee meeting in May.

Paper to Note F: Wildlife Crime Update: Ian Guildford

Ian was unable to attend the meeting and sent his apologies. A thematic inspection of wildlife crime in Wales is currently being carried out by Pete Charleston and a report will hopefully be ready in the spring.

Overall the incidence of wildlife crime has increased balanced against increases in levels of compliance. All wildlife crime are recorded including CITES incidents. In Wales, there is a comprehensive network of specialist wildlife crime officers and 16 new wildlife crime officers have recently been appointed in South Wales. North Wales has good coverage. The thematic inspection report will raise the profile among chief officers in Wales of the importance of tackling wildlife crime which often occurs in connection with other criminal activities.

ACTION 30. WBP to express their thanks to the Wales Wildlife Crime Partnership for their efforts to date.

Katie-Jo Luxton commented that EIA cross-compliance breaches were not listed as prosecutions in the wildlife crime analysis but this does happen in England. Diana Reynolds informed the meeting that she met with WAG EIA agricultural colleagues and was impressed with the work they are doing to secure compliance.

ACTION 31. Katie-Jo to send the link to the England EIA cross-compliance breaches so that Diana Reynolds can raise with WAG colleagues.

Paper to Note G: Cultural Olympics: Meinir Wigley

The paper was not received; WBP will revisit the theme as appropriate.

ACTION 32. WBP Support team to contact Meinir Wigley.

Presentation: Welsh Beaver Assessment Initiative – beaver reintroduction to Wales: Adrian Lloyd Jones

Adrian is based at North Wales Wildlife Trust and represents the Wildlife Trusts Wales (WTW) in the initiative. WTW are leading on the beaver reintroduction initiative in partnership with statutory agencies including the Forestry Commission and CCW.

Historically, the European beaver range has contracted largely due to hunting pressures and is now extinct from many of its Western European strongholds. The beaver occurred naturally in mainland Britain but not Ireland. Successful reintroductions have taken place in continental Europe (90 reintroductions in 24 countries) and this study scopes the feasibility of reintroduction in Wales. A recent reintroduction initiative took place in south west Scotland and this will be monitored closely to assess success.

Reasons for reintroduction include environmental benefits (habitat management; water flow & quality; increased fish stocks – up to 800% increase) and socio-economic factors (tourism & fisheries). The beaver is a ‘key stone’ species and its presence in an ecosystem can confer many benefits to other species and the habitat in general. Beavers tend to stay close to the water side, typically ranging 20m from the river bank. Beaver activities include, tree coppicing; dam construction and burrowing of river banks. These activities bring the beavers in contact with human activities where conflicts can occur. Trees can be protected by chicken wire but it should also be noted that beavers often coppice trees which re-grow and they do not generally decimate whole areas of standing trees. Dam construction can induce flooding and blocking of culverts but simple low-cost measures can be enacted to mitigate for this. Sensitive river banks can be protected from burrowing though this can be expensive. Beavers may also feed in adjacent agricultural crops but their damage is typically minimal and electric fences can be used to protect crops. Trapping and transposition of beavers can also be employed if necessary. Active public engagement is necessary to discuss the pros and cons of beaver reintroduction with farmers, landowners and the general public.

The Welsh Beaver Assessment Initiative is currently conducting a reintroduction feasibility study in Wales (which includes a stakeholder analysis, management plan, site assessment, costings etc) and a draft report will be available for consultation soon. Six pilot areas in Wales have been assessed and a potential reintroduction might occur in one of these areas or elsewhere subject to findings of the feasibility study and further collaborations. The project group have worked with the beaver expert Dr Duncan Halley and visited an introduction program in Bavaria.

Discussion

Reintroduction Programmes: European reintroduction programs have been successful and help to avoid the dangers of illegal releases. An agreed framework and program of release (if adopted) is important.

Cost: Estimated at approximately £350k with 10-20k annual maintenance for an initial small scale reintroduction in Wales. Funds would need to be drawn from new

initiatives not from existing projects but might be regarded as cost effective as beavers carry out habitat works and may be of tourism interest. The Beavers for Business Report covering some of these details will be appended to the feasibility study.

Site section for release: Catchments identified are large-scale so there would need to be further work to identify and/or assess local sites. CCW offered assistance in site selection.

Stakeholder Consultation: Scope, timing and geographical scale of consultation needs to be considered carefully. A communications plan has been drawn up and will be appended to the report. There is also a website available: www.beaverinfo.org.

Openness and transparency in the process will be key to informing decisions.

Licensing issues: A WAG license is required for beaver release as well as any necessary assessments under the Habs Regs.

Ecology: Lack of top-tier predators in reintroduction areas is not a critical factor as beaver habitat requirements are the main limiting factor on populations. There is no evidence to suggest that beavers are vectors of TB to cattle.

The next stage will be for Welsh Beaver Assessment Project Team to provide a draft report and other details (communication plan etc) to WAG for consideration.

ACTION 33. Adrian Lloyd Jones to ensure that a programme of local consultations takes place before or alongside publication of the report

ACTION 34. Diana Reynolds to check with WAG colleagues regarding consultation process and period for the publication of the report

ACTION 35. Adrian Lloyd Jones to provide WBP secretariat (Juliet Hynes j.hynes@welshwildlife.org) with the beaver reintroduction communication plan for circulation to WBP.

ACTION 36. Welsh Beaver Assessment Project Team to investigate offer from CCW to assist with site selection.

Workshop Activity: The 2010 targets: what has prevented us from achieving them? What do we need to do differently to succeed?

Diana Reynolds outlined the framework of the workshop which involved two presentations and two interactive sessions to distil a number of actions that WAG and WBP could take forward together. Workshop participants were given copies of the BAP reporting update; constraints and threats relating to BAP habitats and Species; presentation slides and the outputs from the Policy Group workshop that was held in December.

Presentation 1: Reporting update - Juliet Hynes

Biodiversity reporting is in terms the EU or the Convention on Biological Diversity target:

1. Have we halted biodiversity loss (i.e. are habitats and species stable)?

2. Have we reversed the declines (i.e. are habitats and species increasing)?
And is measured by the status and trends of habitats and species.

The 2008 BAP reporting round was based on the original BAP list in order to make it comparable with the previous reporting rounds.

About 45% of BAP habitat in Wales is considered stable, probably stable or increasing. While 24% is still declining. The UK is in a similar state, but note the numbers of unknown and the proportions that were reported as “probably...”.

Comparison of status and trends of 2005 vs 2008 BAP habitats: Similar % of habitats are stable or increasing but we seem less sure of the state as a greater proportion are recorded as “probably” stable etc. in 2008. Also a greater proportion recorded as declining accelerating.

Species status and trends, Wales vs. UK 2008 reporting. Wales has only just over ¼ of species stable or increasing in some form. 41% are reported as of unknown status. In the UK as a whole nearly ½ are considered to be stable or increasing and fewer are unknown.

All of the above demonstrates that our state of knowledge is not adequate.

Wales species status and trends, 2005 vs. 2008 reporting: these are quite similar but again the data shows the deficit in our reporting information.

The tables showing habitat trends broken down into terrestrial, marine and freshwater BAP habitats demonstrates how much of our knowledge is “best guess”. While best guess by a specialist may be close to, if not, correct. We still require the evidence to back it up. This is where BARS, LRCs and NBN can help to collect and collate the evidence for quantitative BAP targets and status and trends and where the data charter will help us move forward.

Threats to, and constraints to achievement of targets for, habitats and species (as reported by BAP lead partners) indicated that agriculture practice, infrastructure development and state of knowledge were considered to be major problems.

Interactive session 1

Attendees were split into pairs and asked to reflect on the workshop presentation and their own experiences to suggest 3 key areas of focus for biodiversity action in Wales. The outputs will be analysed with the afternoon interactive exercise and presented to WAG.

Presentation 2: WAG Response to 2010 biodiversity targets shortfall – Diana Reynolds

The presentation began with a slide confirming the existing 2026 biodiversity target contained in the Wales Environment Strategy. WAG has recently launched a process to develop a successor to the Environment Strategy -Natural Environment Framework (NEF) - biodiversity outcomes will be encapsulated in this new approach and the NEF

will define how biodiversity outcomes will be achieved under the central organising principle of sustainable development. The NEF will draw on principles contained in the Wales Biodiversity Framework, the ecosystems services approach and the forthcoming ecosystems statement (which Policy Group are currently developing) and aims to add context to existing programmes and policies. Diana Reynolds will project manage for development of the NEF with Matthew Quinn as Senior responsible Officer. A steering group will be drawn from WAG ESH and RA and drafting will involve groups from all WAG sectors. The aim is to produce a draft NEF by the summer and go out to consultation followed by a ministerial launch in the Autumn. Links with WBP policy group, ecosystems & species groups will feed into the process and Wales Environment Link (WEL) input is also welcomed.

ACTION 37. WBP secretariat to circulate WAG Cabinet Written Statement on NEF to WBP with the Actions for All
(<http://new.wales.gov.uk/about/cabinet/cabinetstatements/2010/100118bio/?skip=1&lang=en>).

According to the outcomes of the Policy Group workshop our reasons for failure to meet the 2010 biodiversity target centre largely on continued unsustainable activities. Potential resources suggestions included: Biodiversity levies, offsets and bonds which could potentially be managed by conservation credit unions; increased use of S106 agreements; resource gain from large infrastructure projects and resources derived from Strategic Master Planning linked, for example to wind farms projects. Potential actions to secure biodiversity gain included agri-environment schemes and wider strategies affecting land management and food security; spatial plan and green infrastructure projects; iconic species used to secure wider biodiversity gain; increased monitoring and surveillance to improve access to biodiversity information; linking in with cultural and historical themes and better embedding WBP ecosystem group outputs into WAG policy.

Interactive session 2

Participants were split into 3 groups – 2 terrestrials and 1 marine/freshwater group. Each group was tasked with producing 2 recommendations that WAG and/or WBP could take forward. The outputs from the workshop will be written up and shared with WAG colleagues and the headline messages will go to the WAG ESH minister. Diana Reynolds remarked that a ‘shared sovereignty’ approach to confronting the issues and maximising resources will be critical.

ACTION 38. WBP Support Team to share the collated outputs of the workshop with WBP

AOB

Wildlife & Countryside Act Schedules 5 and 8 is out for consultation until 20th April.

ACTION 39. All to note and respond to consultation event as appropriate.
(<http://www.defra.gov.uk/corporate/consult/wildlife-act/index.htm>)

WAG Scrutiny Committee Guidance on Biodiversity is being worked up by contractors and a draft version will be available in due course. The guidance will have connections with IEEM, ALGE and 1APP work. A paper will go to SG11 to take the guidance forward.

ACTION 40. WBP Support Team to ask Tim Peppin/Craig Mitchell to provide a paper on scrutiny committee guidance to next WBP SG.

The Wales Biodiversity Framework is currently under revision and the finalised version will feed in the Natural Environment Framework. A link from the WBP website to the finished document will be circulated.

ACTION 41. WBP Support Team (Julia Korn) to circulate biodiversity framework link.

Katie-Jo Luxton highlighted an e-petition lodged with the National Assembly for Wales to draw attention to biodiversity loss in Wales. The petition is sitting with the Chair of the petitions committee for evaluation and individuals can write to express their views.

Diana Reynolds and Juliet Hynes explained the current risk with JH being the only person currently working on the strategic use of BARS in Wales. It was suggested that, as BARS will help to provide the evidence base for future BAP reporting, the LRCs and WAG TSD could become more involved and could forwards representatives to be trained by JH.

ACTION 42. Adam Rowe to take forward BARS capacity building exercise with LRC colleagues.

ACTION 43. Diana Reynolds to speak with TSD colleagues regarding BARS use.

Date of Next Meeting:

SG11 14th Jul 2010, WAG Office, Aberystwyth. Venue to be confirmed
SG12 11th Nov 2010, North Wales. Venue to be confirmed.

Diana thanked everyone for their ongoing and substantial contributions.

Meeting ends