



PMC Meeting Minutes/Compte-rendu de réunion

Thursday 3rd April – 10.00-13.00, Espace Mathurin Méheut, Roscoff

Chair: Gill Glegg Plymouth University [GG]

Attending /Participants:

Steve Fletcher – Plymouth University [SF]
Manon Le Tual – Plymouth University [MLeT]
Rémi Mongruel – Ifremer [RM]
Karine Dedieu – AAMP [KD]
Diane Vaschalde – AAMP [DV]
Denis Bailly- University of Brest [DP]
Manuelle Phillipe – University of Brest [MP]
Ness Smith – Plymouth University [NS]
Gillian Glegg – Plymouth University [GG]
Alex Potter – Dorset County Council [AP]
Nicola Beaumont– Plymouth Marine Laboratory [NB]
Steve Guilbert- Devon County Council [SG]
Juliette Herry – SIAGM [JH]
Eric Thiebaut- UPMC Roscoff [ET].
Astrid Maline - JTS [AM]

Apologies / Philippa Hoskin – Cornwall Council [PH]

Welcome and actions from previous minutes

- GG welcomed everyone to the meeting, and reported that most actions from the previous minutes were complete. She highlighted two actions; the group nominated to set up a publications protocol had done so at this meeting. GG mentioned the key points of the agreed protocol

Action: everyone to add their own intended publications to the list previously circulated by Wendy Dodds. Deadline; **Friday 9th May.**

- Also queried whether French WP1 workshop had taken place – RM confirmed that this had been held in December '13.

Project Progress

- NS reported that project was running smoothly. She spends a lot of time emailing and coordinating partner actions. She noted that some partners/individuals are not communicating particularly well; this is quite frustrating for the management team as it makes it difficult to get an overview of what is happening. She stressed the importance of keeping the communication channel open, even if the reply is “We don’t know” or “we

can't reply now". She also asked that deadlines are respected to ensure continued smooth running of the project.

- Progress report four is well underway and, along with the financial claim, is on-track to reach the JTS on time. She thanked everyone for their ongoing cooperation and support with the claims process.
- Realization of the deliverables is progressing well, with 20 more to go.
- The management team continues to meet on a twice-monthly basis to monitor the project, plan future events, and discuss/act on issues. NS asked for feedback on how the management of the project could be improved but members of the PMC stated that the management team was doing a great job and had nothing critical to add.

Each partner was asked to briefly report on:

- Actions they have been working on
- Deliverables achieved so far
- Any budget issues (including potential modifications, underspend/overspend, match-funding issues)
- Difficulties encountered (e.g. delays)
- Next Steps

Cornwall Council; have been helping the other work packages to gather the information needed to carry out ESA of the Plymouth Sound to Fowey Case Study, including new research to increase the cultural ecosystem services information relating to the area. Coordinating discussions between the work packages and stakeholder group to agree the scenario process, and helping to deliver the resources needed to support the scenario process. Minor modifications have been agreed with Manon, moving €9550 from the CC staff costs line to Travel & Subsistence (€ 2000), Communication (€ 1000) and Subcontracting (€ 6550). This will provide a small amount to help cover the costs associated with being the Plymouth Sound to Fowey Case Study: organising workshops and contributing to a new piece of Cultural Services research in the Case Study. No difficulties or delays anticipated.

AAMP; stakeholder engagement ongoing, held first workshop in November '13. Working closely with WP1 and attended workshop. Final workshop at GNB end of '14 where they will present ESA and scenario outcomes. PNMI taking modelling approach, working closely with WP2 to produce a data platform to feed model. No deliverables since Oct '13. Budget issue of underspend of €230,000– due to delayed recruitment of staff originally due in Dec '12, but actually in Nov '13 and Feb '14– this includes the 50% ERDF funding. Partners will be able to use this funding if they are able to match fund it. AM stated it would be preferable if this money could be used, as the project is underspending on the whole. Diane Vaschalde has replaced Mahe. AM asked if a summary of each case study site results/work in progress could be made. PMC didn't think this was possible at the meeting, but agreed to provide a short summary. The Powerpoint presentations of the case study sites progress given the day before can also be made available to AM.

<p>Action; all case study sites to produce a brief summary of results/work in progress and send to NS who will incorporate them into the final progress report. Deadline; Wednesday 30th April</p>

SIAGM; have a strong partnership with UBO who help with technical aspects at case study. Took part in WP1 workshop, and organised a workshop with ecologists from UPMC on seagrass. Designed and implemented choice experiment – over 600 surveys with GdM

residents. Also interviews and workshops with multiple stakeholders. All data collation will be fed into the Zostera platform designed by UBO. Completed case study brochure with DCC, used for stakeholder engagement. As WP3 leads delivered the final scenario guidelines in January '13, which are available on Basecamp and the VALMER website. This was a deliverable. Conducted interviews, backed up with questionnaires, with case study coordinators to feed into scenario synthesis document. Looking to combine the knowledge exchange event with a PEGASEAS workshop to maximise attendance.

Dorset County Council; mainly been disseminating the ESA results at conferences, workshops, stakeholder meetings etc. Following this up with taking some of the actions forward. Completed WP4 stakeholder questionnaires. Recently reviewed finances, and have a budget underspend of £20-25,000, which will allow for a staff extension for AP to August/Sept '14. There will be resource for further meetings and workshops, including scenario work if it is conducted. Written many articles for publications, strategies etc. Minor budget modification might be needed to carry out scenarios under WP3. Alex Potter will be leaving the project at the end of August, and Ken Buchan will be carrying any other actions forward to the end of the project.

Ifremer; essentially involved with WP1, feeding into case studies, also work with WP2 on data. WP1 Guidelines have been completed for internal dissemination only. A WP1 workshop was organised in France to present the guidelines and triage methods to ensure people working at case study sites were confident to implement them. Operational assessments have begun at GNB and PNMI, and will be completed over the summer. Two new people have been employed; Jean-Christophe Martin (GNB) and Anahita Marzin (PNMI). Ifremer will be organising a second WP1 workshop with PML to prepare the WP1.2 lessons learned document – probably in November 2014. Several peer-review journal articles are in production and WP1 are thinking of producing a book. A minor budget modification will be requested to transfer budget from travel to subcontracting for a survey for the GNB site and for designing publications. AM asked the difference between the guidelines, and the synthesis report; RM said the guidelines were currently an internal document that would be enhanced with examples from the case studies for the final output, which will be publically available. The synthesis report will focus on more lessons learned from the case studies. Both will be completed for March 2015.

PML; Primary work is focused on the three UK case study sites. A triage paper has been submitted to MEPS, and PML has contributed to the VALMER publications list. Many meetings have been attended, with the MBA (WP2), case study sites and environmental scientists at PML. They are also planning (with Ifremer) for the WP1 workshop to be held in November. No budget issues were reported and everything is going to plan. Work will continue carrying out ESAs at the case study sites.

Plymouth University; PU has two roles, as lead partners (project management) and as lead researchers for WP4 – all overseen by GG and SF. Also involved with WP3, working on the scenario guidelines and supporting the UK case studies in developing their scenario processes; particularly WD. Work on WP4 deliverables is now building, and commitment to WP3 will decrease accordingly. WP4 have developed a clear framework for evaluating how the ESA can influence policy. PU has been conducting interviews with stakeholders and site managers to fulfil this. WP4 were concerned that the case studies would not be completed on time for them to make their assessments, but are very pleased with the positive response to the '12-month' challenge. PU staff will be presenting at various events this year, including the MarCoPol forum. There are no budget issues, but some minor modifications may be requested. AM asked about progress on the experience exchange and e-learning platform

(Action 4.2) DB stated that UBO were responsible for these deliverables and would report on these later.

UPMC Roscoff; Four people are working on VALMER from UPMC. Jennifer Schoenn has returned, and will work from March '14-February '15. UPMC are experts in ecosystem functions and pressures, working mainly on WP1; looking at kelp in the PNMI and contributing to ecological data for the ESA at GNB. Contributed to the seagrass workshop in December (with SIAGM) and the WP1 workshop in December. There are no problems with the budget and confident that they will complete the habitats and functions matrix in good time. Have prepared two publications, on seagrass and the GNB.

UBO; work on all WPs, particularly focused on methods within WP3&4, and implementation at the GdM. WP1 – helped with December workshop, and designed the seagrass survey with SIAGM. WP2 – collecting ecological data for GdM to feed into the data knowledge platform (Zostera). WP3 – helped to produce the scenario guidelines with PU, DeCC and SIAGM. Also helping at an implementation level with analysing seagrass systems, common culture workshop, focus groups (2 complete, four to go) and the seagrass workshop, and preparation for scenario work. WP4 - have undertaken governance analysis, surveys and interviews. DB described work on experience exchange and e-learning package; 50-60 people have already exchanged through planned workshops – a strong link between the 'science clusters' at Brittany and SW UK has been built, with further promise of lasting collaboration – possibly establishment of a Memorandum of Understanding. Challenging to get local managers/stakeholders to travel – time cost; therefore WP3&4 taking advantage of opportunities for exchange rather than a more formal process. For example – the GdM seagrass event will be open to interested UK stakeholders, and final conference will be a great opportunity for exchange. There is an interest from the French marine park managers to visit UK conservation people at the case study sites – this will be followed up. E-learning package will contain outputs from WP1, including handbook. The multi-media exhibition will also play an important educational role – will make sure we cross-reference. There are now extra resources for this from AAMP's budget. WP5 – UBO is a member of the communications group, helping with ideas and translation. Also dissemination of results – attending IMCC Glasgow, and MarCoPol forum in Plymouth. Budget is fine, would like to move money from translation to staff costs (more efficient to translate 'in-house' due to technical language) and from sub-contracting and depreciation to travel. AM asked if the Zostera platform was available on-line. MP replied that it was only internal at the moment, used in focus groups, but would be made publically available at the end of the project – thinking of transferring it to the SIAGM website, or e-learning platform. DB stressed the need to design a repository of all VALMER material for after the project.

Devon County Council; AW has been working on the WP3 scenario guidelines, but has had an extended absence due to an operation. SG has been coordinating the N. Devon case study site, including organising stakeholder workshops and case study team meetings. Also disseminating results at networking events. Significant budget issues, beyond DeCC's control; two core-funders have withdrawn money – RWE and the Environment Agency. DeCC have worked hard to minimise the impact of this on communications outputs, which will be discussed later.

MBA; has five people working on the project; four on WP2, and one on WP3 scenarios at the N. Devon case study site. Mainly involved in Plymouth-Fowey and N. Devon, providing geospatial data (collation for scenarios) and working closely with WP1 (PML) by providing data for ESA. Also created socio-economic questionnaires, which is also a good test for action 2.3, and mapping for scenarios. Olivia Langmead is working on N. Devon scenario process, and MBA are providing data for socio-ecological modelling part of this. Have been attending

many meetings for case studies, workshops and conducting data validation with stakeholders. Working closely with French colleagues to produce the data repository, based on MEDIN and SEXTANTE. No budgetary issues.

Finance

- Payment claim three was accepted by the Managing Authority and the ERDF funding was transferred to PU in December, and onto partners in February. There were few issues; PML and DeCC still not able to claim overheads, so the JTS will work with partners to ensure they can claim the money.
- A few partners had a payment reduction of 25% on some procurement claims, due to lack of procedural evidence.
- Payment claim four is going well so far – nine partners have already started entering information on Presage, seven have sent supporting documentation to lead partner. Claims will be finalised in April, and go to the FLC for May – on target to reach JTS on-time in June.
- Overall project spend up to and including payment claim three is €456,000 – about 20% of the ERDF grant. We were forecast to have spent 32% by this stage. Mainly due to the exchange rate, rejected overheads and AAMP underspend. Claim four is also significantly under – only €600,000 so far, 50% less than forecast. However two partners are left to enter and both usually have large claims.
- AM reiterated that we must try to spend the full €800,000 we have forecast to ensure there is no decommitment to the programme, which could result in partners not being paid full ERDF funding in 2015. AM asked if the next payment claim could be moved back a few months – perhaps to September – to allow partners to claim more.

Action; MLeT to look at possibility of moving next payment claim date, and implications to partners.

- To take advantage of the AAMP underspend, AM confirmed that we can introduce new money to the project (though this will require a major modification) and also transfer budget from AAMP to all other partners. DB said that UBO can find match funding from existing commitments. DB also stated that despite their underspend, AAMP had done the work they were committed to for the project.

Action: ALL PARTNERS to send NS and MLeT their interest in using AAMP underspend – how much, on what, and when? Deadline; **Friday 9th May.**

Action: MLeT to recirculate the rules about match-funding

Action: MLeT to prepare a report/prediction of how much we will spend for the rest of the project and distribute to partners.

Post-meeting clarification from AM::

“Taking in account what has been paid in PC 1 to 3 + expenses in Presage for PC 4 (= 1 489 481€):

- 31,74% of the total budget has been used
- you achieved 56,20% of your financial objectives for claim 1 to claim 4 - that is to say in other words that the underspending is actually 43,8%.
- in order to respect your financial objectives till end of 2014 (addition of claim 1 to claim 5), you should spend in total 2,6 millions € in claim 4 and 5.

Regarding modification, it will only be a major one (ie submitted to Programme Steering Committee's approval) if the total amount transferred between budget lines is > to 10% of the total budget. Keep in mind that you must take in account the previous modifications: you had one modification with 44 194,26€ transferred (= 0,96% of the total budget), so if the amount transferred in modification #2 is more than 424 068,39€, it will be a major modification.

The extra match funding and the modification of partners budget are minor modifications (if the total ERDF is not changed).”

- JH asked a question about spending and claiming towards the end of the project – with regards to sub-contracting. AM clarified that the action being paid for must be completed by the end of March 2015, but payment can be made until the end of June 2015. However, we need to allow enough time for payments to be processed, included in last payment claim and audited by First Level Controller – audit of the last payment claim also has to be over by end of June 2015.
- Budget modifications were delayed because some partners were not ready. MLeT emphasised that these must be done before the next payment claim as delaying it further could result in partners not being able to claim some of their expenses. – it is a collective and lengthy process for JTS and MLeT, so it is important that each partner takes time to consider what they need and respect the deadlines. This would need to be done by the end of May *if* we stick with the original payment schedule.

Action; MLeT to send schedule for budget modifications to all partners.
--

Communication

- GG reported on the withdrawal of funding from RWE and the Environment Agency (EA) to Devon Maritime Forum. When the project was set up, DeCC took on the communications role, with a generous budget. EA has faced many challenges – cut in government funding with the loss of 500 jobs, and tackling the storms in January and February this year, but this doesn't excuse their behaviour, having committed to pay £13,000 for 2013/14 and 2014/15. RWE are no longer building an offshore windfarm in N. Devon, so have withdrawn their £5,000 commitment for 2014/15.
- When match funding taken into account, this results in a £62,000 decrease in DeCC's budget. DeCC and the management team have gone through communications outputs and identified the important deliverables, and can still produce all of them within the reduced budget, with modifications;
 - Brochures – deliverables stated x4. Actual delivery will be 3.
 - Brochure 1 (the generic brochure) has been produced and had a second print-run
 - Brochure 2 (site-specific case-study brochure) has been produced for GdM. Some case study sites (Plymouth-Fowey and Poole Harbour) do not need this brochure, others wanted to have them at specific points in the process. DeCC will support case study coordinators in production and design of these brochures, but partner organisations leading the case studies are asked to organise and pay for printing these brochures. KD said that GNB will be producing their own A4 'final results' brochure.
 - Brochure 3 – decided not necessary
 - Brochure 4 (now 3!) will be a summary of all results from the project and will need to be a larger format than brochure 1.

- Videos – deliverable =1. Discussed having 3, but unable to do this with reduced budget, therefore back to one; more on video later.
- Newsletters/topic papers - deliverable = 5. These will not be printed, but PDF only. Will be on website and part of the multi-media kit discussed in the communications session earlier in the day. NS commented that the schedule SG outlined in the same session was not workable, SG agreed and would amend accordingly.
- Schools event – not a deliverable and therefore not happening.
- Other DeCC costs which will have to be reduced are for translation and T&S for the final conference; with several partners predicting underspend **it was agreed** that these costs could be found/shared by some partners and that other amendments to the project’s communications deliverables were acceptable.
- DeCC have been through a procurement process and selected Back to the Planet to produce the VALMER video, which will focus on explaining ES to a general audience. The script is in production, but will feature TV marine biologist Maya Plass. It has been a challenge to get everyone in the same place for filming, but 29th April has been suggested. Essential that we have French involvement in the film, but it is proving difficult for French colleagues to get to the UK for this date. ET said he was in Plymouth for 20th/21st May and was willing to take part if the dates could be changed. NB confirmed she could make the 21st May too.

Action: SG to contact Back to the Planet to see if filming can be arranged for 21st May 2015. NS comment – this has now been done, filming confirmed on this date.

- GG added that if partners have spare budget to contribute towards any communication outputs, this would be very welcome.

Final Conference

- NS explained that the dates for the conference were constrained by results being available and having to achieve the action before the end of March 2015. The date originally chosen, w/c 9th March 2015, had unreliable ferry services (ran in 2013, but not 2014). The management team felt the best option was to push the date back by a week to w/c 16th March (exact days TBC). **All agreed** that this was a sensible decision.
- NS met with Gerald Mannaerts, PANACHE project manager, to discuss budgets, venues and number of potential delegates:
 - VALMER has approximately €23,000 and PANACHE €30,000 to spend on the conference. AAMP (lead partners) are also hoping to provide filming/video coverage of the conference similar to that at IMPAC3.
 - Both projects think they will have approximately 100 delegates each, so a rough estimate would be 250 delegates. PU has an excellent events management team who can organise much of the conference at a reasonable fee.
 - To cover both projects, the conference will need to take place over two days, with a third day or half-day for workshops/best-practise exchange/forum events. Exact format to be confirmed later.
- Conference facilities at PU are limited as the date is within term-time. PU is waiting to hear if they can book the semi-permanent marquee located on campus. Other options could be considered, but these have cost and/or travel considerations.
- AM confirmed that we do not need to ask the JTS for permission to invite (and pay T&S costs for) external experts from outside the EU attending the conference. We should list the attendees in the final report.

Action: NS to set up an organising committee for the final conference and start planning the event in more detail as soon as possible

Action: NS to let AM know the location and date of the event asap so it can go on the programme website

JTS feedback

- AM was pleased with overall progress on the project. She encouraged partners to complete all actions and to spend as much of their budgets as they could, particularly to take advantage of the AAMP underspend on offer. She stressed the importance of recording all the time we spend on the project in order to claim staff costs, which represent a substantial part of our budget.
- She reiterated the importance of communications actions, but said we seemed to be on top of this now. Really liked the inspiration we had taken from the Marinexus project, and the aspiration to have the multi-media display on the Roscoff-Plymouth Brittany Ferry; she will look into the possibility of using the Marinexus bus.
- The JTS will continue to work with partners to ensure overheads can be claimed.

Action: AM to ask about the Marinexus bus and feedback to NS

AOB

- DB pointed out that the next partners' meeting is the same date as the 3rd Symposium on ICZM in Turkey (14th-16th October 2014). There is also a public event on in Brest that week. He asked if perhaps we could move the date of the meeting by two weeks either side, or maybe host it in Brest.

Action: NS & MLeT to look at implications of moving date or location of next partners meeting, and doodle for alternative dates if necessary.