

Summary of feedback
Future of BAP Seminars
26 February, 4th and 5th March 2009
Draft

1. HOW COULD LBAP PARTNERS GET INVOLVED WITH THE NEW APPROACH TO BAP TO ENSURE IT DELIVERS ON THE GROUND?

LBAP partnerships - role and function (*link to roles and protocols*)

- How will it work for local BAP species that are not reflected in national lists?
- Have a wish list of actions if funding becomes available
- Make input into establishing targets locally
- Partnership meetings – opportunity to network, help recruit people for projects, promote own partner objectives and feedback on projects delivering targets.
- Need right partners on the LBAP – enough people with the right expertise to do the job – opportunity to review membership of LBAPS?
- Review how LBAPs are run – eg: taking a more regional approach to ensure the right people come and reduce pressure in terms of numbers of meetings.
- Cut down range of activities, focus on new priorities.
- LBAPs ability to raise awareness and local interest is important
- Better regional collaboration if this hasn't already been addressed.
- Establish local ecosystem groups
- More collaborative projects
- How do LBAP Partnerships respond to the new structure – could they be split into Ecosystem Groups?
- Maintain good membership of LBAPs at all meetings
- Don't know where LBAP Partners sit?
- Feedback to LBAP Partnership
- Need to make sure LBAPs get information from people on the ground (local knowledge) – can then feed onto BARS
- Update contacts list Re: LBAP meetings and who could/should attend
- Help to write targets that fit in with what partners are doing.

Wales level – role and function (*link to roles and protocols*)

- In Ecosystem groups limited Local Authority representation – need more senior staff / WLGA
- Dual role for CCW as a funding partner and a process partner (need CCW officer involvement in Ecosystem Group).
- Awareness of their ownership of an action – where involved in decision making

Protocols and responsibilities (Arrows on organogram)

- Need to feed back local priorities based on expertise to national groups.
- Setting realistic targets bottom up and top down
- Confirmation of priorities.

- Need more involvement/direct involvement/membership from LBAPS and partners on ecosystem groups eg: regional reps.
- LBAP officer and partnership will decide on the 'national priorities' that can be delivered within their area and feed back to the ecosystem groups what they can deliver that the regional/national organisations aren't delivering.
- National groups NEED to interact with LBAPs (guidance would be valuable) esp. to offer perspective and species/habitats expertise!
- Attendance of Ecosystem group meetings (by LBAPs)
- LBAP Partners given the opportunity to join Wales groups
- Feed up? Question mark over how to achieve. Could volunteers WITHIN the partnership take on a role of carrying info from local to national level where LBAP officers can't.
- Eco System Groups to liaise more with Local Record Centre including local recorders
- Ecosystem Groups to inform Local Record Centre of gaps there are in data groups so these can be filed
- Need good communication between ecosystem groups and LBAPs – face to face.
- Ecosystem groups to provide regular updates to LBAPs who need to ensure good communication between all groups and to allow feedback from LBAPs to the ecosystem groups.
- One LBAP officer per ecosystem group? Contact point to DISCUSS key actions at local level before finalising.
- Gaping chasm between New Wales groups and LBAPs
- Need 1 point of contact in each Ecosystem Group
- Emphasize role of Ecosystem Group to pass info downwards and LBAP passing info upwards – how does this relate to Greater Gwent and Glamorgan Biodiversity groups
- Get LBAP partners on to Ecosystem Groups
- Membership of Ecosystem Group – attendance at meetings / providing feedback
- Forestry local links
- It is clearer what the role of the LBAP is with the new system, therefore: SUPPORT (AND WHERE IT COMES FROM)
COMMUNICATION LINE SHOULD BE CLEARER
- The process is in Wales not through Britain so it makes it easier between groups and the LBAP. It helps so that we know where to go to for help, how to set about things.
- On the groups, maybe as part of a Regional BAP meeting, but then would have to make it clearer what our role is

Legal and Policy support

- Policy actions at a higher level. Can be dealt with on local levels
- The Policy Group working with other groups

Resourcing

- INNS group has been useful, although there is a resource gap eg: 1 year funding need.
- Improve reporting currently limited by resources.

- Make sure the funding/resources are available
- Better allocation (and more) funding
- Deploy existing funding better via LBAP targets
- More staff time to support BARS only included for biodiversity staff
- Resources issues in terms of local and national input
- CCW need to push councils to accept that national integration is a priority. Need a 'remit letter' that includes targets and actions (as CCW fund posts).
- MONEY, (this isn't going to change)

Management priority and risk

- It is not about targets and actions it is about getting things done
- Target development needs to have a touch of reality when set.
- Forward planning of land use – knowing future allocation for food production etc, but also recognising multiple users e.g. food production and biodiversity, not one or the other
- How do CCW buy-in to this process?
- The new approach will show weaknesses that will enable us to iron out the creases now.

Compatible records and systems

- Provide data on local targets for habitats; check whether they are different to CCW disaggregated targets for each county.
- Problems with BARS and how to avoid double reporting.
- How does BARS fit in with CCW Actions database?

Reporting - quality management

- Problems with monitoring/reporting.
- Problems with BARS and how to avoid double reporting.
- Partners can look at system (BARS) and feedback where they feel there could be issues on data entry
- BARS reporting standing item and supporting LRCs
- Simplify BARS input
- More pressure from WBP / Assembly that partners fit in and report in a standard way.

Power and control issues

- Improve communication – have to make sure local level groups feel connected to BAP – empower and see how it all fits together

Sharing knowledge and experience

- Better use of GIS systems to coordinate geography and delivery
- Better data sharing
- Many people already doing things but not reporting to partnership
- Local recorders don't have IT knowledge/facility need to find a way to put information on BARS (LBAP Officers don't have the capacity) so how do we help local recorders do this?
- Submit data to Local Record Centres as well as SNCO data sets (Group 5)

- Share expertise (but how ground-up feeds back to national organisations/policies/processes?)
- Improved Information exchange
- Capture information from National Companies (e.g. Welsh Water)

Expertise / knowledge gaps and how to full them

- Need more GIS info.
- Better opportunity to provide training to interested parties
- WLGA need to be on the policy group

Stakeholder engagement in BAP - mapping who to involve and how

- Development of ‘effective’ partnerships at all levels – define partnership – is there an element of missed recording
- How involved do partners become? What is the commitment? – partners would consider becoming lead partners.
- Taxa groups at NE Wales level, but not so active in NW Wales.
- Encourage new groups like BSBI
- Partners contributing to action
- Identify partners that can be involved in certain aspects
- Partners we have are already committed so need to look at others who are not yet engaged
- Much of LBAP already goodwill based
- How do you relate to active people on the ground?
- How do we capture what volunteers are doing?
- LRC engagement (short on staff and time) BUT aim to integrate more – involve in priority setting.
- What other ‘non specialist’ groups can get involved – Local and Ecosystems are interconnected e.g. Tidy owns/community groups/ new Welsh Assembly Government initiatives
- Target ‘non specialist’ / Biodiversity Champion list
- People can also just be on the circulation list for Wales groups
- Where is private sector represented e.g. housing associations/construction
- Focus groups within LBAPs discussing particular issues. Need to make sure that not just increasing number of meetings. Tie into existing meetings, produce summaries to show how ties into UK wide to ensure all know what’s going on – progress

General Communication

- Ensure understanding of new approach.
- Communication over detail of individual organisations projects to contribute to landscape scale approach.
- Make partners aware of the new system/approach
- Simplified summary of new system at meetings – newsletter, actions set in context.
- Improve communication with partners – resources
- Increase awareness of WBP etc – total reliance on computers / website may alienate some groups – engagement
- Better communication, UK website is too complicated and too confusing

- Good communication
- WBP Secretariat presence at LBAP meetings – what is happening at local level
- Regular slot at regional level meetings – LBAPs
- Communication

2. **WHAT ARE THE POTENTIAL BARRIERS TO SUCCESS WITH THE NEW SYSTEM? (Red)**

LBAP partnerships - role and function

- On the ground, people identify what opportunities there are and make the most of them – they don't find it practical necessarily to take a spatial approach, or use welsh targets as guide (not target led).
- LBAP should not just be reference.
- Is Local Authority the right body to drive new LBAP Agenda?
- LBAP process and Local Partnerships are well established and do not consider change necessary/appropriate.

Wales level – role and function (*link to roles and protocols*)

- Potential for a long lead in time for new system. Requirement for priority guidance from Ecosystem groups.
- Ecosystem cross over / link to how connectivity will be achieved. Fed into landscape work.

Protocols and responsibilities (Arrows on organogram)

- If partnerships are told what their priorities are they may not be as keen to meet them as if they had chosen their own
- Local BAP officers don't have time to sit on National Groups.
- Insuring the link between LBAP and National groups work
- Can't see communication in the new diagram/communication goals don't seem addressed in the new set up.
- Lack of communication 'upwards' – who do you contact, who do you ask for expert advice re: ecosystem groups/specialists. Needs to be clarified to signpost to relevant officers.
- Lack of clarity about species groups – how will this work in practice?
- How will communication between Ecosystem Groups and LBAPs work – communication will not improve
- Lack of cohesion between so many groups – silo mentality

Legal and Policy support

- Targets are set for areas which are beyond LBAP Partnerships control i.e. Private ownership – all you can do is raise awareness
- Integration with other WAG structures – eg: EA not consulted on TG, Target Axis 2.
- Policy not necessarily at stage of being applied. System relies on current situation without climate change.

- Government support – need costed action and need to target right places.
- Lack of legal framework, guide and enforcement for Section 42 priorities in planning – need far more weight behind NERC Duty
- NERC Duty still not strong enough to protect Section 42 habitats and species
- Required Welsh Assembly Government to listen to policy recommendations e.g. Tir Gofal and agricultural policy
- No penalties/drivers to ensure targets met. Often gets overlooked and others prioritised over.
- Making the Connections – losing staff? Losing local links

Resourcing

- Volume of reporting material and time commitment to report
- WAG don't directly fund Cofnod so TG consultations don't go through Cofnod and opportunities are missed.
- Bigger scale projects – more funding and personnel time.
- Resources.
- Funding! Need a Wales-wide fund – out to consultation?
- Partners may not have the resources to use the new system
- Funding
- Staff
- Resources
- Lack of staff resources
- Lack of finances
- Lack of resources for LBAP Officers to be involved at a higher level.
- Resources – Money and staff, government and private
- Grant lead and priority lead
- Time and resources
- Resources / capacity to implement
- Lack of support / resources to drive the process particularly at a Welsh Assembly Government level
- Lack of investment in the whole Wales |environment Strategy/Ethos/delivery/reporting BARS
- Lack of time for NGOs
- Lack of resources for NGOs
- Lack of incentives for NGOs to participate
- Support / Budgets to enable meetings etc! May seem small but adds up to a barrier to delivering targets/facilitating partnerships
- Focus investment to Ecology teams
- Resources / funding/Basic information on habitat/species inadequate
- Lack of additional funding
- Small pool of people in Wales to draw experts from + membership of all new groups. Lots of work for small number of people.

Management priority and risk

- Danger in the new diagram that there is no box for ACTION.
- Demoralise as targets show that little has been done
- Structure OK but delivery is a problem

- Historic frequency of goal post moving – reluctant to commit in case change again
- Structure still seems complicated
- Too much time on reporting and not enough on delivery
- Many individuals reluctant to engage with BARS
- Lack IT / BARS ability (local level)
- Fear of using BARS – can we get local authority IT support involved?
- BARS being too complex – need for more support
- Phase 1 terrestrial surveys shouldn't be used as out of date
- Perceived lower status of LBAP officers in local authorities can inhibit involvement in national groups.
- The risk isn't high enough to push it up the agenda

Compatible records and systems

- Potential for conflict between BAP process and CCW's Action Database – how people perceive things – clarity on actions database needed.
- Departments with NERC Duty may not feed into BARS. NERC Action Plan could be added

Reporting - quality management

- How do we measure success and share good practice?
- Jane Davidson says all the time that biodiversity is a key indicator but there is a danger we are not monitoring or reporting it.
- Requires BARS to be up and running!!!
- How is data drawn out of BARS? Disaggregating info from other reports – staff/time – stand alone plans – organisational plans.
- Monitoring to establish change.
- Resistance to report on BARS
- A lot of partners are not interested in reporting and many are volunteer
- System (BARS) needs cleaning out of information that shouldn't be in there

Power and control issues

- Too top down – Fears of unrealistic targets for LBAPs. Can't have actions for LBAPs which do not have expertise or resources
- Who shouts loudest wins the attention within the partnerships.
- Raise profile of WBP process etc

Sharing knowledge and experience

- Communication – national bodies could actually get involved with specific site target setting – much more useable format.
- No access at moment to CCW satellite mapping information

Expertise / knowledge gaps and how to fill them

- Struggling to get the right experts onto local partnerships
- Finding enough people with relevant expertise to feed into groups, and those with expertise having the freedom to participate (line managers made more aware of how it fits into bigger picture)
- Basic data

- Lack of expertise
- Staff turn over
- Lack of expertise at National level
- Long term security of taxonomic recording

Stakeholder engagement in BAP - mapping who to involve and how

- Seemingly random assignment of actions – people NOT TOLD when made responsible for work/lead partners.
- Rely too much on good will of individuals
- Awareness of importance of councils.
- Scientific communities, universities etc need to feed in to day to day conservation – is LBAP the place? Ecosystem level ‘translated’ for local BAPS.
- Partnership members – reaching members and organisations and involving them in delivering the LBAP
- Lack of involvement from key sectors (outside environment)
- Keeping the momentum going through partners that are not dealing with the BAP process all the time.
- Groups need input from everybody.

General Communication

- Joined up thinking, understanding what big picture is
- Lack of understanding /unfamiliarity.
- Lack of common understanding and application consistency.
- Keeping up with the work of all the groups.
- We need to celebrate good practice.
- Uncertainty about whether to hold fire or crack on with plans.
- Language/jargon.
- Imposing a new system on people / additional paper work – some may not understand new system
- Jargon – Ecosystem means habitats to make the process understandable
- Lack of communication between partners – external and also within large organisations – internal
- Usage of ‘Policy terms’ may alienate members of public etc

3. What works well in the original BAP process? (Amber)

LBAP partnerships - role and function (*link to roles and protocols*)

- Local contacts – local working
- Local emphasis – having local experts on BAP partnerships – needs to happen in all areas.
- Project delivery helped develop and consolidate partnership work
- Good ideas arise all the time
- Collaborative projects
- Keep LBAPs – local focus/local distinctiveness

- Fact that we have Local BAPs as well as overall BAPs (though need to make sure not regarded as a local council process – Independence)
- Good regional networks e.g. Greater Gwent and Glam BAP groups
- Local co-ordinated action has been of great benefit.
- Local based action has been important along with local involvement – should not be lost.
- Gap identification (limited examples).
- Actions are on-going but not necessarily got proper monitoring
- Biodiversity Conservation has moved on hugely at a local level
- Priorities set locally so easier to deliver
- Focused on more deliverable actions
- LBAP originated actions
- Worked out local priorities
- Including locally important species rather than just a list of European Protected Species etc
- Provided a document to get things moving on the ground where no environmental guideline document existed before (LBAP)
- Can bring in a lot of varied and interesting things and can justify, and out of this it brings original and innovative ideas.
-

Wales level – role and function (*link to roles and protocols*)

- Good to have WBP to collate the overall Welsh part of the BAP
- Lead Partners
- Existing SMART Targets
- HAPS and SAPs helped inform mitigation
- Value of having local distinctiveness – all habitats should be covered by 9 Ecosystem Groups
- In theory OK, practice?
- Gives all guidelines to work to

Protocols and responsibilities (Arrows on organogram)

- LBAP Lead/Partner Lead
- Collaboration between local authorities
- LBAPs working together across borders.

Legal and Policy support

- Given biodiversity weight
- Local BAP adopted in the Supplementary Planning Guidance – gives weight
- BAP process contributed to NERC Duty
- Links with local planning via LBAP
- Making the Connections (MtC) haven't even done a SWOT analysis on biodiversity delivery.
- MtC have been a bit dismissive of partner involvement.
- Can be used to make people do things.
- Has been used to introduce policies etc.

Resourcing

- Funding initiatives
- Continuity of staff and budget on sites
- Giving communities, the public and interest groups access to expertise, funding and information
- LBAP Officers – big push for local authorities / Parks

Sharing knowledge and experience

- Local expertise and enthusiasm should be harnessed – there are mistakes nationally. Local adaptability.
- Expertise and enthusiasm at a national level

Expertise / knowledge gaps and how to full them

- Local recorders

Stakeholder engagement in BAP - mapping who to involve and how

- Getting local organisations, some not even conservation orientated, together within the partnership has been beneficial.
- Unusual partnerships i.e. the police and the fire service (LBAPs)
- Original BAP process was driver to form initial partnerships
- Involvement of partners has been good. It would be good to build on it even more. (LBAPs)
- LBAPs great for restoring and developing partnerships on the ground
- Partnership approach, on the ground can work well
- Establishment of partnerships (LBAPs)
- Can also enhance use of volunteers (LBAPs) as gives volunteers support
- Good at getting people together.
- Easier to achieve actions and therefore encourages Partnership and can see achievements (LBAPs)
- Communication between officers at the level of partners (thinking before the BAP)

General Communication

- Good motivation at the beginning
- It was seen as something new
- Awareness raising/public engagement a key strength of LBAP system.
- Good liaison/collaboration between county officers.
- Networking/communication – broader regional approach.
- Awareness – defined obligations better.
- Engagement – LBAP documents went into libraries, easy to engage with people.
- Been good to meet other councils/groups etc – networking
- Mechanism to raise awareness within council
- Public engagement with high local profile species
- Opening lines of communication, sharing information and exchanging data
- Original identification of priority species and habitats – awareness raising
- Raised public awareness / profile – volunteer networks / community strategies
- Has kick started a lot of awareness work

4. What do you think will be good about the proposed new approach? (Green)

LBAP partnerships - role and function (*link to roles and protocols*)

- Helps partners identify local priorities in a national context
- Empowers local groups and set meaningful actions with guidance
- Help review of LBAPs and prioritisation
- Should enable effort to be focussed where it's needed
- Helps those on the ground out in field
- Gets linkages re: Ecologists/Planners
- Renew enthusiasm for the LBAP process.
- Help to review LBAPs.
- Review actions to “SMART” objectives.

Wales level – role and function (*link to roles and protocols*)

- Priority recommendations from Ecosystem groups will be valuable guidance for LBAPs.
- Integration of species into habitats is positive.
- Identifying urgent action and targeted resource (*this could equally be in LBAP Partnerships role and function*)
- Integration of habitats and species into ecosystems esp. in light of climate change.
- A lot more potential for delivering action on marine biodiversity.
- Looking at the overview is good as it stops crossing over of actions or missing areas
- Will help to be given targets rather than coming up with them – can adapt
- Above is true with actions, can take parts relevant to LBAP
- Actions are more specific
- Simplifies – better habitat based targets/actions helpful for LBAPs that groups are at a Wales not a UK level
- Needs to be habitat/landscape lead not by species
- Genuine link between UK and local.
- Specific interest groups will hopefully be more committed
- Having Ecosystem and Species groups will help identify gaps – hope to cover all areas.
- Should save LBAPs work
- Provide good structure
- Should to be more efficient and avoid duplication
- Should encourage more regional working
- Ecosystem Groups rather than habitat groups
- More visibility of Ecosystem groups and Lead Partners
- More direct approach to habitats
- Ecosystem base – rather than looking at individual parts
- Emphasis on connectivity increased
- Better chance of getting national level information together.
- Provides expertise to help with local action plans.
- It is actually happening
- Raise the profile of marine and coastal biodiversity issues.

Protocols and responsibilities (Arrows on organogram)

- More efficient use of specialist time – feed up local info into national groups.
- Those giving advice (ESG and Species groups) will help where a lack of knowledge in a small area. Collating advice for somewhere even if not as specific to local level.
- Less complex than England's system
- Having a Wales input – understanding the local area, with Wales steer
- Feedback from Ecosystem group to LBAP – joined up thinking
- Choice of accessing information
- Clarity of communication and support
- National to Wales – know the players; who to go to.

Legal and Policy support

- Good that there is a Policy Group that can influence future planning policy etc. WAG official involvement lends weight to this group.
- Separation of policy and delivery.
- Easier to pull together at a National/Policy level
- Better input into national policy approach
- System to deal with policy issues
- Policy Group linked to Welsh Assembly Government – should enable legislation to be changed / adjusted where required

Resourcing

- Strong push to external funding – BAP plans help secure money
- Should identify who pays

Compatible records and systems

- Potential to link into other databases i.e. Welsh Local Government Data Unit new database
- Could be good – should collate data/improve data exchange / highlight priorities/ show gaps and improve data flow
- The LRCs will be involved.

Reporting - quality management

- Communication through BARS
- Constant updating rather than 4 year reporting round
- BARS reporting /information
- Review of LBAPs/company BAPs will help report on BARS
- Easier to get information/data out of the system (BARS)

Power and control issues

- Transparency – hopefully
- Having Wales control

Sharing knowledge and experience

- Learning from what worked well in original BAP
- Prioritising targets more appropriately

Expertise / knowledge gaps and how to full them

- Engagement of Welsh Assembly Government in marine group if it can bring in the experts and key players.
- Expert knowledge more accessible
- Better access to expertise across groups

Stakeholder engagement in BAP - mapping who to involve and how

- How do new people get involved in process at LBAP or Wales level – the LBAP can invite people who contact the Ecology team? More support from Ecosystem Groups as they operate at a Wales level

General Communication

- Hope to be able to contact these groups with issues.
- Help to improve communication and advice. Easier to identify contacts and expertise
- Opportunity for more information coming to LBAPs
- Support and advice underpinning the process
- Could be good to ensure web links on other key sites
- Efficient use and linking of websites / online information

KEY MESSAGES FROM THE 3 FUTURE OF BAP REGIONAL WORKSHOPS

February 26 and March 4th and 5th 2009

Question .5. What key messages or support needs do you have for the Future of BAP Task and Finish group when developing the mechanism for local delivery?

I have allocated each message to one or more group or as a cross cutting theme
(In brackets are other groups identified for addressing specified issue)

Role of Wales Specialist groups (WSGs)

Ecosystem Groups/ Species Expert Group / Lead Partners

- A request to Ecosystem groups to deliver co-ordinated guidance on priority actions. How/when it will be delivered.
- Supporting local BAPs with provision of expertise is a positive.
- A lot more potential for actual delivery for marine biodiversity. **(PG)**
- Importance of involving local experts/local partnerships in national groups. **(LBAP)**
- Realistic and accurate audit of priority habitats
- Avoid prescription
- Consult widely
- How do we differentiate between upland habitat and others i.e. the Valleys?
- How will Ecological connectivity work going to fit in with this process? **(LBAP)**
- Important to get the right people on the groups
- Prioritise actions early
- Improve linkage with Farming Unions – get them more involved with the process
- Ensure actions follow findings **(LBAP/PG)**
- Advice rather than instructions as a local BAP won't have exact the some priorities as the Welsh BAP
- Consultation with LBAP Partnerships before targets and actions finalised at a Wales level **(LBAP)**
- Ecosystem contact person key to LBAP involvement **(LBAP)**
- Species signposting – good idea, don't know how it will work out – needs to be reviewed.

Role of Policy group

- Tir Gofal.
- Integration – how does it fit in with other spatial planning at government level?
- Proper liaison within local authorities to ensure appropriate 'status' of biodiversity work/legislation as lack of political clout within authorities. **(WBP)**
- Ensuring expert skills for the long term.
- A lot more potential for actual delivery for marine biodiversity. **(WSGs)**
- Strengthen existing legislation and enhancement particularly in relation to Section 42

- Clear communication and direction from Welsh Assembly Government to local authorities (TAN 5 would help) **(WBP)**
- Lack of expertise
- Monitor outputs and outcomes ensuring right monitoring – better data from Agri- Environment schemes – WAG
- Making the links between the natural environment and local communities at a Wales level.
- Health and well-being making relevant to people – make it relevant politically
- Address problem of securing of long term taxonomic skills
- Ensure actions follow findings **(WSGs/LBAP)**

Role of LBAP partnerships

- The local action/ community involvement element should not be lost. The ‘local flavour’ of priorities/action.
- Reviewing LBAP membership – importance of involving local experts.
- Consistency in coordination of LBAPs
- Importance of involving local experts/local partnerships in national groups. **(WSGs)**
- Find ways of identifying sources of funding for community partnerships
- Links to local access forums as Farmers are involved
- How will Ecological connectivity work going to fit in with this process? **(WSGs)**
- Greater LBAP role for LBAP Officers – they can’t be the planning ecologist as well **(WBP)**
- More training for planning officers (**WBP**)
- Community awareness raising
- Monitoring (local delivery)
- Ensure actions follow findings **(WSGs/PG)**
- Communication between LBAPs and Ecosystem groups is a 2 way process **(WSGs)**
- Improve communication – 2 way! **(WSGs)**

Role of WBP

- Organisational sign up needs to be clarified – roles and accountability need to be clarified.
- Responsibility needs to be spread throughout an organisation. NERC.
- Proper liaison within local authorities to ensure appropriate ‘status’ of biodiversity work/legislation as lack of political clout within authorities. **(WBP)**
- Openness of positives and negatives of developing the process.
- Continual feedback plus honest appraisal, with data.
- Importance of co-ordinated communication and good use of WBP website.
- Need to be able to report on what we’ve done – Jane Davidson saying its so important - we need to back it up. *(coordinated and supported by WBP)*
- Have a way of sharing information of good projects for actions e.g. how to get funding etc; to other local BAPs. Possibly on BARS or maybe on WBP Partnership?

- Clear communication and direction from Welsh Assembly Government to local authorities (TAN 5 would help) **(WBP)**
- Ensure WBP or WAG do actually hold people/groups accountable for their agreed contributions – adopt this role.
- Don't expect too much from the LBAPs
- Greater LBAP role for LBAP Officers – they can't be the planning ecologist as well **(LBAP)**
- Lack of representation of biodiversity at a higher level in the local authority
- More meeting like this
- More training for planning officers **(LBAP)**
- Understanding of issues at local level and identify constraints of delivering actions through LBAP partnerships
- Help with awareness raising for biodiversity message across the board.
- Engaging organisations e.g. Forestry Commission people who are delivering
- Accountability for action delivery and action reporting – not reliant on goodwill.
- More publicity of our successes – figures
- What priority is this to be given alongside economy/social issues in the current economic climate – in Welsh Assembly Government and Parliament
- Make the LBAP process wider than just the LBAP Officers, partnerships and need resources to support other departments – clarify the role
- Organisations approach to BAP differ – there needs to be some commonality of approach and commitment
- Ecosystem Approach needs to be understood and promoted to big agencies both inside and outside biodiversity partnership. We need to promote our approaches
- What ultimate power/clout will the process have – will it make it stronger
- Incorporate targets/ actions into job descriptions
- Better communication / feedback
- Support recording on going and future – not just volunteer but professional/national surveys
- The stick in the system (penalty) if people don't deliver and a political focus
- Prioritisation – Pros & Cons.

CROSS CUTTING THEMES

(Making sure these happen / are supported is largely the responsibility of WBP)

Use of BARS

- Better communication from national and regional organisations on local activity – ie: what is going on within your patch – suggest BARS.
- Have a way of sharing information of good projects for actions e.g. how to get funding etc; to other local BAPs. Possibly on BARS or maybe on WBP Partnership?
- Consistency of reporting – national organisations at a local level e.g. Forestry Commission are not disaggregating actions and targets – others are
- Streamlining of BARS to ease reporting capacity to deliver
- Simplify BARS making sure there is sufficient support
- Push BARS, change the negative perceptions of BARS

Securing resources

- Strategic funding from ecosystem groups.
- Ensure appropriate resourcing.
- Can higher Wales groups get funding for actions that need to be covered by a number of LBAP partnerships?
- Simple and specific funding
- Sorting out funding programmes (deadlines)
- Financial support
- Staff support
- Resources
- Find simple funding mechanisms
- Resources for implementation
- Where are the resources ££/advice/support/guidance?
- Resources / focussing
- Funding for baseline monitoring linked with long term taxonomic skills
- Strategic organisation of funding needs by the Ecosystem Groups
- Lack of additional funding that has been allocated to enable delivery.

Draft V2 31/03/09