



**TAYSIDE BIODIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP
MANAGEMENT TEAM MEETING**

Thursday 9th November 2006, 10am

Perth College

MINUTES OF MEETING

Present:

M Price (Chair)	CMS, Perth College
J Milne (Secretary)	CMS, Perth College
S Roberts	Angus Council
D Flint	Perth & Kinross Council
B Harris	Dundee City Council
C Lloyd	Tayside Biodiversity Partnership
C Warwick	Scottish Natural Heritage
S Merone	Perth Quality of Life Trust (Item 1-3 only)
M Strachan	Forestry Commission (Item 1-3 only)

1	APOLOGIES	Action
2	<p>SITA TAYSIDE BIODIVERSITY ACTION FUND – PROJECT ASSESSMENT PANEL</p> <p>Field Studies Council (Kindrogan) Application No. 6363 CW reported that SNH have no record of the £10k grant aid application for this project. Will follow-up on this. MP noted that the application to SNH is for building hides. This qualifies as an educational activity which is eligible for only 10% funding from ENTRUST. TBAF could consider an increase to the ENTRUST application to cover 10% of the cost of building the hides. SM stated that the eligible cost of the hides is £3990 and ENTRUST could meet 10% of this. CW requested that schools are involved in the development of the project from the early stages.</p> <p align="center">Recommendation: Accept. High priority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBAF willing to consider additionally funding 10% of eligible hide costs but need to see the SNH grant aid application first. • Encourage liaison with FC, private landowners and involvement of local schools in project development. <p>Barn owls (SAC) Application No. 6364 CL stated that this is a top up application for an area not covered by a larger BAGS application. SM suggested that the application should be submitted as a 'research project'. SR expressed concern that SAC might be receiving Government money for farm visits already. SNH do not support SAC so no double funding issues.</p> <p align="center">Recommendation: Accept. High priority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure expert advice sought on correct location of boxes. • Require monitoring report. This should include information about how the boxes are being used. <p>TBAF update (SM) The Dundee City Bat Project has been approved by ENTRUST (£9660). The Broughty Ferry Environmental Project's second phase of the "Following the Life of Water" project has also been approved. With these, a total of £129,308 is now committed from Year 1 and 2 of the SITA TBAF funding.</p> <p>Further to the discussion at the previous meeting regarding the inclusion of contact details for</p>	CW

	<p>funded projects on the TBP website, SM reported that a clause in the QLT application form means that applicants agree that their contact details can be used in any way.</p> <p>SM reported that QLT reports could be made available on the website. It was generally agreed that TBP needs to publicise funded projects more, although CL confirmed that a small number of press releases had been prepared by the applicants. DF suggested that projects should be encouraged to publicise on their own websites and link to TBP website. as the Tay Ringing Group's Marsh Harrier Project has done. It was felt that another press release would be a good idea and this should be timed to coincide with the next QLT meeting (5th December). Invite SITA representatives, project people, maybe ask Rhona Brankin to raise profile. Due to lesser biodiversity interest in December it was felt that two press releases would be better: one in December, one in March 2007 (next QLT meeting 6th March). The press release should publicise the total costs of projects and the SITA contribution to this total. Also promote applications for the next round (deadlines for applications: 26th January, 27th April).</p> <p>ACTION: Organise two press releases: December 2006, March 2007. Contact projects to set up a location for March. Promote applications for next funding rounds. ACTION: Publicise funded projects on TBP website</p>	<p>CL</p> <p>CL</p>
3	<p>LOCAL BIODIVERSITY FUNDING</p> <p>CW reported that there had been few applications to SNH for grant aid from TLBAP related biodiversity activities in 2006/7, despite provisionally allocating £10,000 funding for this in the annual budget; this has been reduced to £2000 and is now likely to be re- allocated as time is running out. Need to encourage people to apply to maintain credibility of fund. Can't justify it if it isn't being used. BH suggested that the need to meet 50% of the application was a barrier to application. MS stated that FC can offer 50% start up funding for woodland-related projects so joint FC/SNH funding could meet total costs. MP suggested that people should be encouraged to consider SNH grant for pre-project feasibility funding. DF suggested that TBP should develop simple, web-based, schematic advice on funding biodiversity projects. This could be developed as a flow chart of boxes and arrows with appropriate links. SM suggested that this simple advice could also be sent out with QLT enquiry acknowledgement letters.</p> <p>ACTION: Draft simple advice on funding biodiversity projects for both web delivery and as hard copy. Check draft with Management Team before going public.</p>	<p>CL</p>
4	<p>MINUTES OF LAST MEETING</p> <p>Amendment to Item 10 (ii) – change “Review Day” to “Biodiversity Workshops as part of the Networking Day” (<i>amendment subsequently made – JM</i>)</p> <p>Minutes agreed</p>	<p>JM</p>
5	<p>MATTERS ARISING</p> <p>Item 3 (CW) – clarify that SNH funding for local biodiversity projects comes in two forms.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Promotions budget – 100% ‘seed corn’ funding – small projects only 2. Grants budget – up to 50% match funding of eligible costs <p>Roughly £90K of SNH's Tayside and Clacks grant allocation for next year is under the ‘biodiversity’ theme. However, much of this is already committed, such as supporting ranger services in the area. .</p> <p>Need to encourage TBP sub-groups to identify their long-term funding requirements for projects they want to implement to facilitate planning. Sub-groups should be encouraged to plan ahead</p> <p>MP – Could develop an additional budget proforma to identify proposed sources of funding.</p>	<p>CL</p>

	<p>ACTION: Draft budget proforma to present to Steering Group for approval</p> <p>Item 8 – CL asked FC for money to support sub-groups but was refused on grounds that money only available for projects.</p> <p>Item 10 (iv) – Not implemented. Carry to next Steering Group meeting</p> <p>ACTION: Raise issue of TBP constitution at next Steering Group meeting</p>	CL
6	<p>WORK PROGRAMME/CO-ORDINATOR'S REPORT</p> <p>CL tabled "Update on Work programme – 21st August to 9 November 2006". This is a list of activities that will be incorporated into the next Co-ordinator's Report in January 2007.</p> <p>CL reported that the new Work Programme format was proving helpful. DF suggested that TBP needs to strengthen emphasis on SMART targets especially for Local Authorities. The requirements for Local Authorities for reporting to BARS are unclear. MP suggested that, once the UK and TBP HAP and SAP review processes are completed, SMART targets can be input to BARS. DF suggested removing the term "SMART actions" from the Key Task column header in the Work Programme as some actions lack proper deadlines. MP queried the absence of the task related to the SE Planning Guide. CL said it should be there and will investigate.</p> <p>ACTION: Delete "SMART actions" from column header. ACTION: Make sure SE Planning Guide task included in Work programme</p>	CL CL
7	<p>FINANCES</p> <p>DF tabled financial statement for September 2006. With regard to salaries, the single status has been announced but not yet implemented. The impact of this will be minimal for this year's budget but wondered what the implications of the proposed movement of the post to Dundee would be. BH thought that post would transfer to closest scale point. DF said there were some outstanding items that need to be included in the statement.</p> <p>ACTION: Update and circulate financial statement. (<i>Updated financial statement subsequently circulated – 14/11/2006</i>)</p> <p>MP raised issue of interest on funds received from SITA for TBAF. This money should come to TBP. Need to clarify with SM.</p> <p>ACTION: Email SM to clarify how much interest money is available and what it can be used for.</p>	DF MP
8	<p>LONG TERM PLANNING (NEXT FUNDING APPLICATION FOR CO-ORDINATOR'S POST TO SNH)</p> <p>BH reported that the application went in on time. Have subsequently received a letter requesting clarification on a few points. BH queried whether he should include sub-group plans in response to SNH. CW thought yes if they are received on time.</p> <p>General discussion on terms of employment of Co-ordinator's post as follows.</p> <p>The current presumption is that post will move to Dundee City Council. BH reported that Merrill Smith has not yet put this forward to DCC Management. This Council's no redundancy policy means they would be obliged to offer a similar post within DCC if the current funding for the post was withdrawn.</p> <p>DF – TBP has collective responsibility for the post. MP – need to clarify soon as current contract expires end March 2007. Would it make a difference if TBP was formally constituted?</p>	

	<p>BH – TBP could then determine the terms of employment. SR – TBP would need to register as a company which costs money. MP – already pay money to host Council for administration and auditing costs. DF – rotation of the post among Councils was informally agreed at start of TBP so there is an expectation that this will happen. However there is no binding reason why it should happen. CW – what are the PKC responsibilities when the current contract expires? If Dundee falls through, what is the PKC position? DF – wider question is about where legal responsibility lies within TBP. The application to PKC to host the Co-ordinator's post was made on behalf of TBP. What does that actually mean? MP – the current concordats between Local Authorities and SNH are not legally binding. There are no memoranda of understanding with Local Authorities. SR – require clear legal and employment advice on the various options to inform any decision. MP – Best option for the immediate future is for post to move to Dundee. If this falls through, next option is for post to remain at PKC. Failing this, next option is to constitute partnership legally which would require changing SNH application and finding out pension implications etc. A clear way forward is needed no later than the next Management Team meeting and, if possible, before.</p> <p>ACTION: Try to ensure early decision from DCC.</p> <p>ACTION: Write to Kathryn Chidley and Line Manager to clarify CL's employment rights and the current and future risks and responsibilities of PKC with regard to the Co-ordinator's post.</p>	<p>BH DF</p>
9	<p>AOCB</p> <p>None</p>	
10	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS</p> <p>15th February 2007, 21st May 2007, 3rd August 2007 All at Perth College, 10am</p>	