



**TAYSIDE BIODIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP
MANAGEMENT TEAM MEETING**

Monday 12th May, 2008

Perth College

DRAFT MINUTES OF MEETING

Present:

Martin Price (Chair) (MP) CMS, Perth College
 Jin Park (Secretary) (JP) CMS, Perth College
 Stewart Roberts (SR) Angus Council
 Esther Rogers-Nicoll (ERN) Perth & Kinross Council
 Bryan Harris (BH) Dundee City Council
 Carolyn Deasley (CD) SNH
 Catherine Lloyd (CL) Tayside Biodiversity Partnership
 Tim Barratt (LB) Forestry Commission (Item 1-2 only)
 Evelyn Kerr (EK) Perth Quality of Life Trust (Item 1-2 only)
 Douglas Calderwood (DC) Perth Quality of Life Trust (Item 1-2 only)

Apologies:

Pam Couatts Angus Council (SR attended on behalf of AC)

1	<p>APOLOGIES As above</p> <p>Action: Relevant files should be circulated at least one week before a meeting.</p>	Action
2	<p>SITA TAYSIDE BIODIVERSITY ACTION FUND – PROJECT ASSESSMENT PANEL</p> <p>a. Project Assessment Panel</p> <p>8160 – Environmental Arts Development – Baxters Bugs & Birds Project Need more information on project officer (e.g. employer, time allocation), urban rangers' involvement, detailed budget year by year, current status of the site and species. Possibly a good idea linking with <u>Dundee Bb</u> at <u>P</u> projects.</p> <p>Recommendation: Medium Priority. Decision deferred to next <u>management meeting Panel Assessment</u>.</p> <p>8153 – Auchterarder Golf Club – Heathland Mosaic Applicant with a good track record (CD) SR questioned the scope of beneficiaries, club members or the general public. There is public access on site (CL) + it is open to non-member golfers.</p> <p>Recommendation: Accept. High priority for habitat. £2,040 for 1 year</p> <p>8154 - Auchterarder Golf Club – Red Squirrel Project Useful to clarify the types and no. of trees to be removed.</p> <p>Recommendation: Accept. High priority. support 80% (£2440) for 1 year</p> <p>8155 - Auchterarder Golf Club - Pond Project Recommendation: Accept. Medium Priority.</p> <p>Request to Auchterarder Golf Club to provide map(s) showing location of sites for all three projects, and to have annual open days for school/community involvement and planting in surrounding areas.</p>	<p><u>DC</u></p> <p><u>DC</u></p> <p><u>DC</u></p>

	<p>b. Revision of TBAF Application Guidelines These guidelines will be revised before the next meeting. One item to include is the need to provide a map of proposed sites.</p>	DC / CL
3	<p>MINUTES OF MEETING held on 20 February 2008 Agreed</p>	
4	<p>MATTERS ARISING - Digital voice recorder will be purchased. Consult with the council technician.</p>	CL
5 6	<p>TBP/Perth & Kinross Countryside Trust SNH grant funding (funding via Scottish Government) The Perth & Kinross Countryside Trust has expressed interest in hosting the TBP. Funding for both this and biodiversity activities currently provided by SNH will be provided directly to Councils from the Scottish Government. This funding will not be ring fenced for biodiversity at a local authority level. More detail will be available in June (CD). <u>CD not sure if "legacy funding" 2007-10 will continue; this is being discussed by CoSLA.</u> BH & ER recognised the difficulties to ensure that money is available for biodiversity. To secure funding for the TBP in the future, need to check whether Councils would maintain or increase support for TBP.</p> <p>Action: CL will draft a letter to each of the 3 Council chief executives to emphasise their biodiversity duty, TBAP's unique existence and current activities and thus the importance of continued funding. MP will send out the letters.</p>	CL/MP
7	<p>WORK PROGRAMME/CO-ORDINATOR'S REPORT 1.1 CD asked CL to reformat Co-ordinator Work Programme: remove the quarterly days section and replace Comments with Achievements.</p> <p><u>2.1 Promote Awareness – CL had undertaken six presentations in the 4th Quarter and there had been excellent feedback from the various workshops. Press releases and articles continue to be prepared and the website regularly updated.</u></p> <p><u>3. Sub-group management- CL need to keep advice and push further. (Jin – not sure what this means? Could Martin check this?)</u></p> <p>3.12. Farmland projects should aim for funding from the SRDP; <u>as should Upland and Water and Wetland projects.</u></p> <p>3.18 Upland: no recent activities</p> <p>3.26 Urban: <u>very active – ZOOM survey about to be launched; distribution of Community Gardens, Orchards & Allotments booklet going well; Swift survey underway for this year.</u></p> <p>3.35 Woodland: much going on with orchard projects led by the Forestry Commission. Future projects should aim for funding from the SRDP. <u>A reprint of the 2nd issue of the Tayside Red Squirrel Newsletter was undertaken to support the Red Squirrel Householders' Packs being circulated throughout Tayside.</u></p> <p><u>3.41 Education: there had been a very positive response to the publication of the 8-page "From Summit to Sand" Newsletter which features many SITA TBAF projects. A comprehensive "Building Better Biodiversity" Programme has been prepared for 2008. Liaison with Scottish Biodiversity Forum and SNH led to the Perth Biodiversity Street Theatre being included in the Top Ten Scottish Events 2008 leaflet – 40,000 copies.</u></p> <p>4. Promote community involvement in biodiversity projects – <u>CL continues to discuss potential community projects ahead of SITA TBAF applications, and to advise on funding where the TBAF grant is not applicable.</u></p> <p>5. Promote joint working with organisations within and outwith the TBP: Planning Manual, nearly ready (CL). BH asked a possibility of training days with local</p>	<p>← CL</p>

Formatted Table

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Font: Arial, 10 pt

Formatted: Font: Arial, 10 pt

	<p>authorities and was told that no funding was available for it. would be interesting to share feedback from PKC' planning seminar (CD).</p> <p>7. BARS Monitoring: RH will do this once she has been trained. * Please see the attached file below for recent e-mail responses between LBAP Officers in Scotland on the subject of the forthcoming BARS Reporting Round.</p> <p>Overall comments on Co-ordinator Work Programme: the Management Team is generally happy and the programme well reflects past activities.</p> <p>Actions: CL to revise Annual Report to incorporate information on time was used and how this relates to the allocations in the original 2007-8 work programme.</p>	CL
8	<p>Support to TBAP See item 5/6</p>	CL
9	<p>TBP Website A presentation by CL showed that there has been good revision and update, but still need more work. Action: CL will get the web manager to make it more user-friendly, regularly update, add links to funders & comprehensive information (e.g. maps), etc. CL will circulate user names and password for Partners Login.</p>	CL
10	<p>FINANCES</p> <p>No major issues (apart from the expected delay by Dundee City Council due to the finance officer's being off). Report will be provided to go out with the minutes.</p>	
11	<p>AOCB</p>	
12	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS 22/08/08, 11/11/08 at Perth College</p>	

<p>*BARS REPORTING ISSUES - general comments from LBAP Partnerships</p>	
<p>Dumfries and Galloway</p>	<p>The next BARS reporting round is intending to rely to a large extent on local information put onto BARS. We have very little on BARS, primarily because many of actions were written pre-BARS and are not compatible. We're working on this for our LBAP revision, but I doubt we'll be able to contribute much to the next UK BAP reporting round.</p>
<p>Falkirk</p>	<p>We're in a similar (if not worse) position than D&G. We don't have actions on BARS as our initial actions weren't compatible. We will endeavour to put something on BARS once we have reviewed the LBAP, however our reviewed action plans are likely to be very project focused and largely based on broad habitats. I suspect it may be difficult to identify exactly which actions impact on which UK BAP species or habitats and to what extent.</p> <p>I'm not sure this reporting round is going to get much from Falkirk via BARS, unfortunately.</p>
<p>Cairngorms</p>	<p>The Cairngorms LBAP does not have any actions - just very general targets for each habitat type. These do not fit into BARS at all (I tried once 18 months ago and gave up).</p> <p>We've reviewed the LBAP and decided not to write another document but stick with the original one as the general targets and issues we identified in 2001/02 are all still relevant and we would continue with the habitat approach. Having very general targets/ issues gives us lots of flexibility to develop projects and take advantage of opportunities as they arise, and we do not need to keep worrying about individual actions, who's doing them, status, resourcing etc. The downside is that we have no monitoring mechanism so we cannot measure how effective we are, or where we are failing to achieve etc.</p> <p>What I am planning to do for BARS is use the Cairngorms National Park Plan targets for biodiversity, which have actions and mile stones, outcomes etc. all nicely set out in several linked tables (all done by CNPA staff). As most of these targets came from the LBAP this will be a means of reporting in BARS and monitoring what we are achieving.</p>
<p>Mid Lothian</p>	<p>Midlothian's LBAP is only just getting put on BARS. I am getting the Lothian Wildlife Information Centre to put the LBAP on BARS and we have already hit a couple of issues with our LBAP not being compatible with the BARS reporting format. I am now taking a bit of comfort from the fact I am not alone.</p>
<p>West Dunbarton</p>	<p>Still awaiting training, so has not even considered BARS input yet.</p>
<p>Clackmannanshire</p>	<p>I encountered this problem in the last reporting round in 2005 when working in Bromley. At the time the LBAP was not entered into BARS but we had done works that warranted reporting. The way we got around it was that if we had something we wanted to report relating to UK priority species or habitats we simply entered an action that related to it. We were fortunate that the LBAP contained many actions that were acceptable to BARS or adaptable enough to be entered in some format. However there were a few things we wanted to report that were not in the LBAP in an acceptable format and so I entered in</p>

	a few specific actions (that were maybe not in the LBAP) into BARS that reflected the work we had done for UK priorities. I think it's more important that the lead partners know what has been achieved, whether or not it fits with the actions of the LBAP and if they are only going to accept info within BARS then this is one way of getting round the problem.
Highland	The Highland LBAPs haven't (yet) tackled many priority habitats and species through local projects. Most of our local projects have tackled non-priority habitats or species and so don't really have a place on BARS even though they are positive actions for biodiversity. Something to discuss at the Argyll meeting - how to make BARS more useful for us?
Argyll	BARS is a great idea but came too late for us. I muddled thro' the last round but will be smarter about it when the LBAP review is completed. In hindsight, BARS should have been developed at the same time as generation 1 LBAP.

DRAFT