

Notes from the 28th meeting of the Broads Climate Partnership (formerly Adaptation Panel)

Date: 26th October 2016

Present

Charlie Beardall, (EA), Andy Millar (NE), Jacquie Burgess (chair for meeting), , Sarah Mukherjee, John Packman, Simon Hooton {skh} (notes), Maria Conti (BA),

Guest: Rowena Harris (3KQ)

Apologies:

Kerry Turner (UEA) Rob Wise (NFU), John Sharpe (RSPB) John Ash (BA)

Summary points:

ACTION

1. High Level Review

SKH reported that the HLR had been put onto the web site on Monday 24th and link sent to BF members and guests along with press release (and press discussions) resulting in EDP coverage on 25th.

Invitations to meeting on 3rd had included Broads Forum members, parish and higher tier councils, MPs and BA members. Briefings advising of the material becoming available had been made to Coastal Partnership East. Conversations had been held with GYBC [CEO by JP, Tina Bunn (Exec Support Manager) and Bernard Harris (Coastal officer)] and Norfolk Coast Project and its Forum.

CB reported GYBC were concerned about costs facing them for their flood protection and new technical solutions were being developed that would hopefully drop the costs though they would still be large. Grant in Aid had already been drawn down so further costs for something like a barrier remain an issue.

2. Broads Forum meeting

RH outlined her initial thoughts. These were discussed by the group teasing out the pathways and potential pitfalls. The points highlighted were:

Most of the meeting should be led by RH to foster involvement and show independence.

Helpful to have an early 'big picture' slot that JB would take to draw out that many matters of context were changing (climate, public finance, stakeholder interest) and this was sharing a forward look with a wider audience to ask what were people's views and how should people be involved in the coming years.

RH to set a series of ground rules to help get as many involved as possible noting this, like all Broads Forum meetings, could have public and press present. Tweeting would be allowed though people discouraged from allowing phones to detract from the discussion. (SKH work on hashtag).

Notes would be not personally attributed. Most captured on flip charts for all to see but background notes also taken by Essie Guds.

Opportunity should be taken to get all involved in talking from the start. Seek to have open questions with no specific route to follow. Organisations will primarily be there to listen.

After hopefully highlighting issues and concerns, participants would help identify what things needed to be considered at this stage and help identify what would

SKH

(EG)

<p>be needed over time to give them confidence in the 'governance' of the process.</p> <p>Next steps would be informed by the discussions. It would be important to ensure some discussion took place around whether others needed to be involved (who) and how people could be engaged with, and informed about, the process. (Governance issues). Who would be best placed to guide and drive the necessary process(es) forward?</p> <p>RH would reflect on the discussions and liaise with SKH and MC over a detailed plan and process.</p>	<p>RH, SKH, MC</p>
<p>3. Date of next meeting</p> <p>Matters left open depending on outcome of the meeting on the 3rd Nov.</p>	