

UK SPAR SCIENTIFIC WORKING GROUP

MEETING 27th JAN 2010

10.30 – 15.30, JNCC, Monkstone House, Peterborough

Approved minutes

Attendees:

Ian Bainbridge – Chair (SNH)	Jeremy Wilson (Scottish Environment Link)
Ed Mountford – Secretariat (JNCC)	Kate Jennings (RSPB)
Andy Musgrove (BTO)	Nigel Buxton (SNH)
Andy Tully (Defra)	Peter Clement (NE)
Ant Maddock (JNCC)	Richard Hearn (WWT)
David Noble (BTO)	Steven Dora (Scottish Government)
David Stroud (JNCC)	

Apologies:

Andrea Graham (NFU)	Miranda Davis (Water UK)
Claire Collyer (CLA)	Phil Alcock (Scottish Government)
Ian Enlander (NIEA)	Sian Whitehead (CCW)
Jim Reid (JNCC)	Simon Hopkinson (Defra)

1. Welcome and apologies

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed members to the meeting. Introductions were given and apologies received (see above). An email had been received from Phil Alcock to explain that he had recently moved work areas to focus on marine renewable development (a direct replacement has yet to be identified). As a result, he would no longer be attending meetings and passed on his best wishes to members. The Chair, on behalf of the SWG, thanked him for his valuable input over the last three years.
- 1.2. The Chair apologised for the late change in meeting venue. In particular, he apologised to the CCW representative (Sian Whitehead) who, as a result, had not been able to attend. This was a result of the Chair having taken a period of time off work due to ill health, a matter which continued to affect his working capacity. It was agreed that David Stroud (JNCC) should act as nominal substitute Chair at future SWG meetings, should the need arise.
- 1.3. BTO had been invited to the meeting having won the research contract in support of a targeted review of the SPA network (see item 7). This invitation would continue so that BTO could provide updates on progress and directly seek the advice of the SWG on technical matters related to the contract work. It was, nevertheless, pointed out that BTO were not taking up full membership of the SWG and may on certain occasions be asked to leave meeting discussions.

2. Minutes of meetings

- 2.1. Draft minutes of the 20th October 2009 SPAR SWG meeting were tabled, including a number of outstanding matters and proposed revisions. The Chair reminded the Group that it operated under Chatham House rules and that the aim of the minutes was to provide a summary of issues discussed, record the decisions taken, and identify points for subsequent action.
- 2.2. The Secretariat apologised that the last version of draft minutes had not been included in the papers circulated before the meeting. The following changes were agreed: (i) item 2.1, amend as per the proposed JNCC alternative text; (ii) items 4.10 and 4.15, remove highlighted text; (iii) footnote page 4, change WWT to WWT Consulting; and (iv) include other highlighted additions. The Secretariat agreed to amend and then publish the minutes via the SPAR SWG webpage.

Action Point 1 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to revise the minutes of the June 2009 SWG meeting and replace current version on the SPAR SWG webpage.

Action Point 2 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to revise the draft minutes of the October 2009 SWG meeting and publish these on the SPAR SWG webpage.

3. Status of ‘qualifying’ species on SPAs

- 3.1. A proposed statement on the status of ‘qualifying’ species on individual SPAs had been developed prior to the meeting by David Stroud (JNCC), as agreed at the last meeting. The aim of the statement is to clarify the definitive list of qualifying interests on those existing classified SPAs where changes made in the 2001 SPA Review have yet to be reflected through revision of relevant SPA citations. Some concerns were raised with the detail and emphasis of the text, as it related to the current approaches adopted by country agencies.
- 3.2. The RSPB noted that Birds Directive requirements apply to all classified species, as well as to any additional features highlighted by the SPA Review. Until and unless sites are reclassified, the legal bottom line is that Birds (and Habitats) Directive provisions must be applied to all species cited on citations and/or in the SPA review, the only exception being those species which are ineligible for SPA classification under the Birds Directive.
- 3.3. A small group was convened to take account of these issues over the lunch break, after which a reworded version was tabled. This was approved by the members present¹ and JNCC agreed to publish this statement on relevant JNCC SPA web pages. The matter should also be included in the 2010 SWG Annual Report.

Action Point 3 (27/01/10): JNCC to publish agreed statement on the status of ‘qualifying’ species on individual SPAs via the JNCC SPA web pages

4. SPA Review - General update

- 4.1. JNCC (Ant Maddock) provided an update on progress with SPA Review Phase 1 contract. Of the 14 Expressions of Interest received, four were short-listed, though only two of these submitted tenders. The tenders were reviewed in December by an evaluation panel that consisted of Melanie Kershaw and Andy Tully (from Defra), Ant Maddock and Ed

¹ and subsequently by representatives of CCW and NIEA who were not present

Mountford (from JNCC), and Nigel Buxton (standing in for the SWG Chair). BTO won the contract.

- 4.2. The Project Steering Group met the contractor on the 21st January 2010. Those present included Andy Musgrove and Niall Burton (from BTO), Melanie Kershaw (from Defra), and Ant Maddock and Ed Mountford (from JNCC). Ian Bainbridge (on behalf of the SWG) was unable to attend. The main immediate tasks identified from this meeting were: (i) for the contractor to join the January 2010 SWG meeting; (ii) to revise the contract work plan; and (iii) to list the species and sources of species population estimates for approval at the January 2010 SWG meeting.

5. SPA Review - Feedback from Executive Steering Group meeting 20 November

- 5.1. JNCC (David Stroud) reported back on the first meeting of the SPA Review Executive Steering Group, which took place on 20 November 2009. The minutes of this meeting had been circulated beforehand. Attention was drawn to three key items.
- 5.2. ESG had discussed the concerns that had been expressed about the policy-science interface within the current SPA Review. This area had proved problematic for policy advisors in the past and reflected the complex and technical nature of some of the scientific issues involved, and the difficulty of describing these in terms that administrators could understand. ESG advised that when a policy steer was required on specific issues, a structured 'submission' should be prepared, as detailed in the ESG minutes. The Chair remarked that this broadened the brief of the SWG and would help to get potential 'policy' recommendations to ESG to decide on.
- 5.3. The RSPB agreed that this was a welcome step, having previously highlighted the need for the input of legal and policy expertise into the SPA Review process. It could help progress policy matters, such as the issue of cropped habitats, especially because previous requests for such input from government and agency representatives (via the N2KR Steering Committee) have been returned to the SWG without resolution. The RSPB added that the test of this change would be whether the ESG provided an adequate response to recommendations and requests made in submissions.
- 5.4. A paper had been submitted to ESG about the development of a framework to aid the consistent review of SPA suites, with a view to progressing the planning for Phase 2 of the Review. This framework would act as a mechanism to interface between Phases 1 and 2 and might enable implementation of Phase 2 to commence before Phase 1 had been fully completed for all species. ESG had endorsed this general statement, recognising that implementation was a matter for the devolved Government Administrations. This matter was discussed further under a later agenda item (see item 8.1). The Group welcomed this development.
- 5.5. It was also pointed out that further meetings of the ESG would follow SWG meetings by 3-4 weeks or so, if this is deemed necessary by the Chairs of ESG and TAG with advice from JNCC.

Action Point 4 (27/01/10): CHAIR to liaise with ESG Chair about the need for a further SPA Review Executive Steering Group meeting.

6. SPA Review - Phase 1 work plan

- 6.1. JNCC (Ant Maddock) provided a briefing on progress with the work plan for Phase 1 of the SPA Review, as charged at the previous SWG meeting. A spreadsheet had been circulated beforehand containing details of the main work areas and component tasks and their relationship to the Terms of Reference and Phase 1 contract. In addition, the spreadsheet showed who was leading on each task and who was likely to be involved, together with a schedule of when tasks were to be progressed and completed. Further planning will be necessary to complete the work plan and additions and updating will be required as Phase 1 progresses.
- 6.2. For those tasks in the Phase 1 contract that the SWG need to advise on closely, the following approach had been taken:
 - (i) based on the contract specification, the contractor in liaison with JNCC would outline the task;
 - (ii) the Project Steering Group (PSG) and SWG would comment and agree on the outline;
 - (iii) the contractor in liaison with JNCC would carry out the work and prepare any draft reports and spreadsheets with supporting information;
 - (iv) the PSG and SWG would comment on the draft reports and spreadsheets;
 - (v) the contractor in liaison with JNCC would finalise the reports and spreadsheets;
 - (vi) the final report would be signed off by the SWG and then the ESG. Through careful planning, such as identifying tasks ahead of time (see 6.1), it is expected that this can be done efficiently.
- 6.3. A demonstration was given as to how the spreadsheet could be used to filter out items for the attention of the SWG and its meetings. The SWG has a considerable amount of work to get through by March 2011. It was suggested that a number of sub-groups ought to be created to progress specific issues and tasks.
- 6.4. Members commented that they were comfortable with the general design and comprehensive coverage of the work plan, though a number of tasks have quite a complicated sign-off process that may cause problems. The work plan would, of course, need to be properly populated and linkage to the SWG communicated: the Secretariat assumed the latter would be his responsibility. Suggestions were made as to how to manage changes and updating of the spreadsheet between meetings. It was proposed that a live version of the work plan could be placed onto a password protected web site, to improve access arrangements. This was seen as a potentially useful step.
- 6.5. There were concerns that the internal priorities and work programmes of the Country Agencies were not reflected in work plan spreadsheet. Exclusion of these considerations meant that there may not be adequate resources available for Phase 2. It was suggested the Agencies and JNCC should meet to discuss this and that a sub-group is formed to deal with planning for Phase 2.
- 6.6. The RSPB sought clarification as to whether or not the ESG had a work programme for delivery of the legal and policy aspects of work required to inform the SPA Review (e.g. review of the implications of all relevant ECJ rulings). The Secretariat advised at their November meeting, the ESG had concluded that the SPA Review Terms of Reference was sufficient in describing the role of the ESG, combined with the Phase 1 work plan that was to be developed by JNCC.

7. SPA Review - Phase 1 contract

- 7.1. Andy Musgrove outlined the contract work to be undertaken in support of the SPA Review, which BTO had recently won. The four main areas of work related to: (i) generating reference population estimates – biogeographic, all-Ireland, GB/UK; (ii) generating site-level data – all UK sites for selected ‘SPA’ species and all Ramsar qualifying and noteworthy species; (iii) production of short reports for ECJ species (Smew, White-tailed Eagle, Montagu’s Harrier, Crane, Kingfisher); and (iv) creating a cropped habitats generic decision tree.
- 7.2. Prior to the meeting, BTO had circulated a spreadsheet showing the list of requirements for the bird species/populations involved. This flagged up a number of species-specific issues for consideration, including regional treatments (Isle of Man), how to deal with seasons and passage totals, and which sub-specific populations, new breeders, scarce migrants, and Category E species should be included. Many of these issues were efficiently dealt with at the meeting. BTO had also circulated a list of principal data sources for the generating reference population estimates and site-level data. They had also identified a number of key questions arising from their examination of data sources:
- are there suggestions for other data sources?
 - what time period should be used?
 - what state of publication should the data be in (published, in press, submitted, grey literature, national databases);
 - what is required for qualifying versus noteworthy species on Ramsar sites?
 - how should population estimates be determined for common species (scaled BBS, distance sampling, or mixture)?
 - what interaction and overlap is involved with the marine SPA process and associated data sets?
 - what are the requirements for cropped habitats and the implications for timetabling work (does the CHIP decision tree need to be in place before network evaluation occurs)?
- 7.3. Members advised that there was a clear order of priority in focusing efforts on the population and site-level data: work related to SPA Review species came first, followed by work related to the Ramsar species, with the remaining APEP species coming last.
- 7.4. Comments were made on how various species/populations should be treated. The Chair pointed out that the SWG had previously considered and taken a view as to how particular species should be treated when considering their SPA requirements. Such information is reported in the SWG Annual Reports. It was agreed that the Secretariat would go through the Annual Reports and alert BTO to relevant sections. In addition, it was agreed that members should pass on any comments about the species list to the contractor and JNCC within the next two weeks.
- 7.5. Mention was made of additional data sources that might prove useful, e.g. goose counts in Scotland, and that some form of assessment of the ‘quality’ of the data source should be made, recognising that a number of factors are involved with this. It was agreed that members should pass on any comments about additional data sources to the contractor and JNCC within the next couple of weeks. The contractor was asked if they needed to request any population/site-level data for their work and they replied that they were considering this. It was recommended that they should consider data from SCARABBS as a priority.
- 7.6. Members advised that (i) any geographic areas and ranges used would need to be defined; (ii) the preferred sequence of time periods depended on the availability of sample dates

and how recently these were made – primacy should be given to the most contemporary data sources, primarily from 2003-7; and (iii) as regards the preferred state of publication for source data, primacy should be given to published sources and particularly if the data was to be used to generate population estimates. It was pointed out that related standards had already been set for the 2001 Review and by APEP2, and the contractor should refer to these.

- 7.7. The RSPB highlighted the need for determination of 1% thresholds for all species in APEP and welcomed the plan to include all species in the APEP review, as it will be important to arrive at the population estimates and 1% thresholds for all Annex I and regularly occurring migratory species, including those such as Little Gull for which no such figures have been derived to date. The RSPB also highlighted the need for consistency in how 1% thresholds are derived – currently a range of approaches are used from direct calculation based on an absolute population estimate, to the use, variously, of figures based on the minimum, mean, and maximum of population range estimates (e.g. 8000 – 10000 pairs). JNCC noted that protocols for this had been established by the 2001 SPA Review and that the default position should be use of those.
- 7.8. SNH questioned the significance of reviewing the Ramsar ‘Noteworthy Species’. The Chair suggested that a sub-group should be formed headed by JNCC to consider and advise on this matter, although this was not seen as an immediate priority.
- 7.9. The Group recommended that the question regarding the use of scaled BBS versus distance sampling should be referred to APEP. It was also agreed that David Stroud (JNCC) would bring the APEP Steering Group up to speed with the contract work. Nonetheless, the presumption was that any methods used in the contract will have been peer-reviewed and published, or will be a development of such methods.
- 7.10. The Group also advised the contractor to discuss the marine SPA timetable and issue of overlapping sites and datasets with the JNCC team in Aberdeen. JNCC was asked to facilitate this liaison.
- 7.11. JNCC asked if the completion of the work on the cropped habitats generic decision tree was necessary in order to undertake a consideration of the SPA suites for the species involved in the SPA Review. The Chair advised that this was not necessarily the case, but there was still an urgency to firm up the requirements for this work and delivery via the contract. It is likely to generate a lot of debate and discussion and should be taken forward promptly.
- 7.12. The RSPB expressed concern regarding the limited spatial data output requirements in the contract, given that such data will be essential in later phases of the Review. JNCC said they had considered this in developing the contract. It was decided that the best approach would be for the contractor to simply cross-reference any relevant spatial information (GIS polygons) attached to the site-level counts that are collated. BTO confirmed that they had agreed to do this and provide additional salient information on the ownership and availability of this information.
- 7.13. BTO had also circulated a document outlining a phased delivery of population and site-level data, as requested by the Project Steering Group. Six steps were proposed with estimated delivery dates (see over page). Effectively this prioritised the work related to SPA Review, and then the Ramsar related work. This proposal was accepted. BTO were asked to consider adding a seabird to Step 1.
 - Step 1. Provide population and site-level data for a limited number of species covering a range of dataset types – including the Crane (RBBP), Nightjar (SCARABBS), Bar-

tailed Godwit (WeBS) – to enable onward methods to be developed whilst further data are being prepared [estimate for delivery = end Feb 2010].

- Step 2. Provide biogeographic, all-Ireland, GB and UK population estimates for SPA Review species covered in column 2 of Appendix A of the contract specification [estimate for delivery = end Apr 2010].
- Step 3. Provide site-level data for SPA Review species covered in column 2 of Appendix A of the spec, to allow evaluation of the SPA suite for these species and for ECJ reports to be prepared [estimate for delivery = end Jul 2010].
- Step 4. Provide biogeographic, all-Ireland, GB and UK population estimates to allow updating of Ramsar Information Sheets [estimate for delivery = end Sep 2010]
- Step 5. Provide site-level data to allow for updating of Ramsar Information Sheets [estimate for delivery = end Nov 2010]
- Step 6. Provide GB and UK population estimates for all remaining species to enable subsequent production of APEP3 [estimate for delivery = end Jan 2011].

Action Point 5 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to go through the SWG Annual Reports and alert BTO to sections that consider the treatment of particular species in relation to their SPA requirements.

Action Point 6 (27/01/10): ALL MEMBERS to send comments to Andy Musgrove (BTO) and Ant Maddock (JNCC) on the following: (i) the list of species requirements (spreadsheet); and (ii) the principal data sources and methods (paper) (as circulated before the meeting) (deadline = by end of 12 February).

Action Point 7 (27/01/10): JNCC (David Stroud) to form a sub-group to consider and advise on the proposed review of the Ramsar noteworthy species.

Action Point 8 (27/01/10): JNCC (David Stroud) to bring the APEP Steering Group up to speed with regard to the SPA Review contract work.

Action Point 9 (27/01/10): JNCC (Ant Maddock) to facilitate liaison between BTO contractor and JNCC Aberdeen team to discuss the marine SPA timetable and issue of overlapping sites and datasets.

8. SPA Review - Framework to review SPA suites

- 8.1. JNCC (David Stroud) introduced a paper about the development of a framework to aid the consistent review of SPA suites, which had been circulated beforehand. ESG had advised that the SWG should progress this framework to facilitate the implementation of information generated from Phase 1 of the current SPA Review (see item 5.3). It was agreed that a sub-group should be formed to develop this framework, with a view to producing a further draft for consideration at the next SWG meeting. The following members volunteered to join this sub-group: David Stroud, Kate Jennings, Nigel Buxton, Ian Bainbridge, and Ant Maddock. David Stroud agreed to lead on the work and invited members to send comments within a month.

Action Point 10 (27/01/10): JNCC (David Stroud) to lead a sub-group to progress the ‘Framework to aid the consistent review of SPA suites’ and produce a further draft for consideration at the next SWG meeting.

Action Point 11 (27/01/10): ALL MEMBERS to send comments on the framework to review SPA suites to David Stroud (deadline = end of February).

9. SPA Review - Site Provision Index

- 9.1. JNCC (David Stroud) gave an update on-going work to complete the Site Provision Index (SPI). The link to the planned questionnaire is almost ready to circulate. Members were encouraged to complete the questionnaire and forward it to other interested individuals. The aim is to complete the work on the SPI by the next SWG meeting and certainly in advance of the end of July when BTO should have compiled the agreed population and site-level data.

Action Point 12 (27/01/10): JNCC (David Stroud) to circulate the Site Provision Index questionnaire web link to members (deadline = by 5th February).

Action Point 13 (27/01/10): JNCC (David Stroud) to complete work on the Site Provision Index and report back at the next SWG meeting.

10. CHAINSPAN

- 10.1. BTO (David Noble) gave an overview of the recently started, CHAINSPAN project. This is a Defra funded project examining the resilience of the SPA network in the light of climate change. It is due to conclude at the end March 2011. The aims of the project are to:

- collate and analyse appropriate data in relation to past climate impacts on designated features;
- develop predictive models;
- use models to quantify how designated features and SPA status are likely to change under different scenarios of climate change;
- ensure linkage with other related Defra projects;
- produce a visual web-based GIS tool to illustrate future changes in bird distributions and abundances and the location of potential protected areas;
- provide recommendations with respect to targeting appropriate land management
- provide an end of project report, detailing the methods, policy relevance, results conclusions and recommendations;
- implement a communications plan early in the project.

An overview of the datasets involved and approach to the climate envelope modelling was given. The project will generate a number of decision-making tools for targeting land management to aid resilience and adaptation. It intends to produce likely scenarios for individual species and possible responses to these, identifying where additional measures and where habitat restoration/creation might be required, and provide an overall policy note.

- 10.2. The Group expressed their interest and support for this timely project, and asked to be kept informed of progress and outputs.

Action Point 14 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to maintain contact with CHAINSPAN project manager at BTO to ensure that the SWG is updated on progress and outputs.

11. Outstanding actions from last meeting/other matters

- 11.1. Progress with and follow-up to the agreed Action Points (20/10/09) from the previous meeting was reviewed. Action Points 1-5 and 8-11 had been completed. Action Point 6 was progressing as agreed. Action Point 7 would be completed when the revised minutes

of the last SWG meeting were uploaded onto the SPAR SWG web page. Action Points 3, 5, 8 and 9 were covered by items on the meeting agenda.

12. Membership

- 12.1. Further to Action Point 3 (20/10/09), the Secretariat and Chair had received suggestions from SHN and Scottish Executive about additional members to consider inviting onto the SWG. These included Forestry Commission Scotland, Scottish Renewables Forum, Crown Estate, Crofters Commission, SEPA and the Scottish Water Authorities, as well as ensuring that certain London-based stakeholders e.g. NFU, still recognised their role in representing their Scottish/Welsh counterparts, e.g. NFUS. There was some discussion about how best to accommodate these, recognising the scientific remit of the SWG. It was agreed that the Chair would contract the Chair of the N2KR Steering Committee, to discuss the best way forward and report back at the next meeting.

Action Point 15 (27/01/10): CHAIR to contact the Chair of the N2KR Steering Committee to discuss the best way of accommodating suggestions about additional members for the SWG and report back at the next meeting.

13. SWG work plan

- 13.1. There was a short discussion about items on the SWG work plan outside of the SPA Review. These included the 2008-9 SWG Report. The Secretariat had started to draft this and hoped to prepare a finalised draft version before the next SWG meeting for comment and subsequent approval. The Chair and Secretariat agreed to look at the other items and consider how these might be dealt with. Scottish Environment Link asked if clarification could be given as to what marine SPA work needs to be considered by the SWG.

Action Point 16 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to progress 2008-9 SWG Report for consideration at next SWG meeting.

Action Point 17 (27/01/10): CHAIR and SECRETARIAT to look at SWG work items outside of the SPA Review and consider how to deal with these, including clarification on marine SPA work.

14. Feedback on Natura 2000 & Ramsar meetings

- 14.1. Defra advised that the only relevant, substantive issue raised at the N2KR Forum (10 November 2009) and Steering Committee (8 December 2009) meetings came from RSPB, and related to progression of Phases 2 and 3 of the SPA Review. A request was made for the minutes of these meetings to be circulated. The next meetings of the Forum and the Steering Committee have been scheduled for September and October 2010 respectively.

Action Point 18 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to circulate minutes of N2KR meetings (subject to permission from Defra).

15. Updating of Birds Directive

- 15.1. JNCC (David Stroud) provided an update on the process to consolidate the EC Birds Directive. This is an EU process to tidy-up and put into plain English older bits of EU legislation, such as the 1979 text of the Birds Directive. This Directive has been repeatedly amended over the years as the EU has expanded, with a series of Directives amending the Annexes at each accession round. The current 'codification' process brings

all these amendments together and will legally repeal the 1979 text, replacing it with a replacement legal instrument, with the preamble written in more accessible language, and with a degree of structural reformatting. The codification does not result in any new or changed policy implications, but will, in due course, mean that references to “EC/79/409 as amended” will be inaccurate and once in force, legal or policy references to the Birds Directive will need to refer to the new instrument. It was agreed that the Secretariat would circulate an information note about this matter.

Action Point 19 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to circulate information note about process to consolidate the EC Birds Directive.

- 15.2. SNH enquired about activities related to the next reporting round for the Birds Directive. They were concerned that current activity does not properly involve those working on the ground in this area and all devolved parts of the UK. JNCC advised that their staff were members of the ad hoc Committee involved with this work² and gave a brief update on the rationale and general aims. The objective was to move Birds Directive reporting from the existing, largely process-based, reporting to a more outcome based process. This work was being undertaken in the context of a broader package of work looking at the scope and timing of reporting under both nature Directives. It was noted that Birds Directive reporting should be included as an item in the SWG work plan.

16. Other matters

- 16.1. The Chair thanked Peter Clement on behalf of the SWG as he was due to retire from Natural England within a few months. His input, knowledge and awareness of issues in England had proved invaluable. Members wished him well in his retirement.
- 16.2. The Secretariat agreed to circulate the immediate action points from the meeting within a few days.
- 16.3. The dates for the next two SWG meetings were scheduled for Wednesday 19th May 2010 in Edinburgh, and Wednesday 8 September 2010.

Action Point 20 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to circulate immediate action points from the meeting.

Action Point 21 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to advise members of dates and make arrangements for the next SWG meetings.

² further information is available at http://circa.europa.eu/Public/irc/env/monnat/library?l=/expert_reporting/work-package_reporting&vm=detailed&sb=Title

UK SPAR SCIENTIFIC WORKING GROUP

ACTION POINTS – MEETING 27th JAN 2010

Action Point 1 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to revise the minutes of the June 2009 SWG meeting and replace current version on the SPAR SWG webpage.

Action Point 2 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to revise the draft minutes of the October 2009 SWG meeting and publish these on the SPAR SWG webpage.

Action Point 3 (27/01/10): JNCC to publish agreed statement on the status of ‘qualifying’ species on individual SPAs via the JNCC SPA web pages

Action Point 4 (27/01/10): CHAIR to liaise with ESG Chair about the need for a further SPA Review Executive Steering Group meeting.

Action Point 5 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to go through the SWG Annual Reports and alert BTO to sections that consider the treatment of particular species in relation to their SPA requirements.

Action Point 6 (27/01/10): ALL MEMBERS to send comments to Andy Musgrove (BTO) and Ant Maddock (JNCC) on the following: (i) the list of species requirements (spreadsheet); and (ii) the principal data sources and methods (paper) (as circulated before the meeting) (deadline = by end of 12 February).

Action Point 7 (27/01/10): JNCC (David Stroud) to form a sub-group to consider and advise on the proposed review of the Ramsar noteworthy species.

Action Point 8 (27/01/10): JNCC (David Stroud) to bring the APEP Steering Group up to speed with regard to the SPA Review contract work.

Action Point 9 (27/01/10): JNCC (Ant Maddock) to facilitate liaison between BTO contractor and JNCC Aberdeen team to discuss the marine SPA timetable and issue of overlapping sites and datasets.

Action Point 10 (27/01/10): JNCC (David Stroud) to lead a sub-group to progress the ‘Framework to aid the consistent review of SPA suites’ and produce a further draft for consideration at the next SWG meeting.

Action Point 11 (27/01/10): ALL MEMBERS to send comments on the framework to review SPA suites to David Stroud (deadline = end of February).

Action Point 12 (27/01/10): JNCC (David Stroud) to circulate the Site Provision Index questionnaire web link to members (deadline = by 5th February).

Action Point 13 (27/01/10): JNCC (David Stroud) to complete work on the Site Provision Index and report back at the next SWG meeting.

Action Point 14 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to maintain contact with CHAINSPAN project manager at BTO to ensure that the SWG is updated on progress and outputs.

p.t.o.

Action Point 15 (27/01/10): CHAIR to contact the Chair of the N2KR Steering Committee to discuss the best way of accommodating suggestions about additional members for the SWG and report back at the next meeting.

Action Point 16 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to progress 2008-9 SWG Report for consideration at next SWG meeting.

Action Point 17 (27/01/10): CHAIR and SECRETARIAT to look at SWG work items outside of the SPA Review and consider how to deal with these, including clarification on marine SPA work.

Action Point 18 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to circulate minutes of N2KR meetings (subject to permission from Defra).

Action Point 19 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to circulate information note about process to consolidate the EC Birds Directive.

Action Point 20 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to circulate immediate action points from the meeting.

Action Point 21 (27/01/10): SECRETARIAT to advise members of dates and make arrangements for the next SWG meetings.