

# Your Tidal Thames Strategy Group Meeting 27<sup>th</sup> June 2012, UCL

## Final Report

### Report Introduction

This is a direct record of the meeting to complement the background information provided in the document 'Introduction to Your Tidal Thames – A pilot project in 2012' and 'Tidal Thames Catchment-based Pilot Project' sent round to the attendees prior to the meeting and the presentations given during the meeting which can be accessed on the [TEP](#) and [Thames21](#) websites. The question and answer sessions after each presentation have been grouped together under the relevant headings of the agenda made available on the day.

This report was written by Thames21 and Thames Estuary Partnership

### Table of contents

Context and introduction to Your Tidal Thames.....	1
What we know about the tidal Thames.....	3
Taking a catchment based approach.....	5
Setting up a Strategy Group – presentation and discussion.....	7
Suggestions of other organisation that might be part of the Strategy Group.....	11

### Context and introduction to Your Tidal Thames

*Presentation was given on the project and the national context, progress to date and an overview of the process of developing a catchment plan for the tidal Thames, followed by questions and discussion.*

Q: Clarify the relationship between Defra and EA with the catchment based approach – is Defra responsible for taking it forward with the EU?

A: Defra provided funding for the pilot projects and the EA is piloting 10 of the projects. The EA is the competent authority for delivering WFD actions.

Q: EA classed the tidal Thames as 'moderate'. What is the status of the other tidal rivers/ports in the EU compared to the tidal Thames?

A: We do not know the current status of other EU rivers but can find this out. **ACTION:** Alice Wilson EA

***Post meeting note: Since the meeting we have investigated the current status of other EU rivers. The European Commission holds assessment data for all the different water bodies across Europe and this information is due for release towards the end of 2012. At the moment there is no publically available summary of water body statuses across Europe. The EU WFD navigation task group and The Clearing the Water guidance both provide useful information with regard to WFD but they do not give details of the statuses of EU water bodies. As soon as this information is available we will share it with the group.***

Stakeholder comment: EU learned from habitats directive that each EU member state should not use different approaches to deliver directive targets. WFD is a powerful directive to inter-calibrate different approaches, so even if EU member states are not using exactly the same approach they should be at least parallel approaches and therefore similar.

Q: Is the tidal Thames 'pretend' catchment unique in the UK? Most people understand a catchment to be a whole catchment but this isn't one in the traditional sense.

A: This is the only pilot focussed on a tidal river so it is unique in that sense but there are other tidal rivers in the country which will have a catchment based approach to management in the long term.

Q: What about the Humber, the Exe or the Severn? Surely they are being taken into account in their relevant catchments?

A: There are no pilot projects underway in these rivers at the moment but they will have to go through the process at some stage. There is no set process as yet hence the pilot project.

Q: What happens to this contribution in 2013 – will we have to go through it again?

A: We don't want to waste people's time and we have put this question to Defra and await their response. We think the catchment plan could go into the formal EA consultation next year and thoughts that come out of this plan will be taken into account. Jill Goddard is a member of the River Basin Liaison Panel which can only strengthen the case for taking the catchment plan forward.

Q: Is there a more formal way that this pilot ties into other initiatives such as Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs) and Nature Improvement Areas (NIAs)?

A: Yes – TEP is the contracting body for an NIA in the Greater Thames Marshes which is biodiversity led and supports WFD criteria and targets. We are also being kept in the loop about MCZs and can make sure that where possible links with MCZs are taken into account.

Q: Right now there is good coordination between all these different initiatives but there will be concern should a change of personnel later on result in a lack of coordination and loss of information.

A: Jill Goddard (TEP) and Debbie Leach (Thames21) are not going anywhere, the charities themselves have been around for years and have strong links with the organisations involved with these initiatives. The link between projects is written into the contractual funding agreements. We could set up a more formal linkage between the various initiatives written into the structure of each one so that if personnel changed it wouldn't matter, it would be a remit of each of those projects to make sure they take each other into account. **ACTION:** JG to send round more information on the Greater Thames Marshes NIA - the most recent information summary on the greater Thames Marshes Nature Improvement Area project is included on the e-mail with this meeting summary.

Stakeholder comment: It would be good to set up a system whereby information that captures all the relevant information for each initiative can be found in one place.

Q: What benefits can we hope to get out of participating in this process – money?

A: There is a Catchment Restoration Fund through which Defra is trying to direct funds into the landscape scale type processes.

Q: NIA will give that but what does this process add?

A: Defra has stated that funds will be directed to projects that are WFD focussed and that joined up with other initiatives e.g. NIA which ties into TE2100 and WFD. Therefore, habitat creation through the NIA will also deliver WFD objectives. Organisations have been tasked with delivering the aims of WFD, therefore added value for other initiatives such as the NIA is that projects coming out of this process can be designed to complement the NIA or help to tease out any issues that are not fully understood right now.

Thames21: In addition, the ambition for the catchment plan we will produce is that we end up with a workable plan that we can then go out to fundraise for project delivery.

Q: Will actions be costed within the catchment plan?

A: That depends on how far we get by December. Until then it is a working document but we hope there will be some projects that are progressed far enough to have rough delivery costs included. This is not however a requirement of the pilot Catchment Plan.

Q: The catchment plan must take into account the non-tidal rivers feeding into the tidal Thames and the non-tidal Thames itself. It would be useful to spell out whether there's a competent body for the tidal tributaries as well.

A: There are other pilot catchment projects on some of the Thames tributaries with EA coordinators and host organisations. **ACTION:** Alice Wilson (EA) to find out which tributaries have pilots currently underway and which organisations are leading on them to compile a handy list for dissemination.

***Post meeting note: A list detailing all pilot projects and their coordinator contacts will be made available along with a map shortly and this will be forwarded to the group and uploaded to our respective websites***

Stakeholder comment: This approach is not just about added value and initiative linkages but the synergies going on. If tidal habitats are created under the WFD research already done can be referred to and the multiple benefits of different habitats can be promoted e.g. saltmarsh is essential for fish nurseries and shelter, carbon sequestration, waste assimilation etc.

## **What we know about the tidal Thames**

*Presentation by Alice Wilson, EA, sharing what the project team has gathered so far about the state of the river, existing projects and activities to improve it followed by questions and discussion of the current status and identified issues including any additional information and perspectives on the evidence, priorities and activities.*

Q: What is dissolved inorganic nitrogen?

A: Nitrates that have dissolved in the water column which leads to estuarine eutrophication. It mainly comes from farming, diffuse pollution further upstream and road run off. Eutrophication in estuaries is generally a serious problem since they are the depository of many other rivers and the pollution the water brings with it.

Q: Heavily Modified Water Body – what does this mean in terms of standards? Do we have to meet the full WFD criteria or not?

A: It means that we can be a bit more fluid in how we tackle it e.g. when looking at flood defence we may have to look at options of how we mitigate for it or whether we can mitigate it at all taking into account disproportionate costs and complimentary measures such as terracing. In some areas it may not be feasible to physically change the river due to economic or defence reasons. The tidal Thames cannot achieve the near pristine conditions of Good Ecological Status but we can improve the water quality to achieve Good Ecological Potential. **ACTION:** A definition/briefing note that explains how Heavily Modified Water Bodies have been classified as such and what this means in terms of WFD delivery can be found on the Environment Agency's website: [http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Research/River\\_basin\\_management\\_guide\\_to\\_hydromorphology\\_no.1.pdf](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Research/River_basin_management_guide_to_hydromorphology_no.1.pdf)

Q: Have organic and inorganic nitrogen been separated out because they need different management strategies to tackle them?

A: Management strategies are unknown as yet but they are different chemical elements which is why they have been separated. Further investigations into the cause of failure these and other chemical elements are underway.

Q: Are you using the traditional definitions to explain the difference between organic and inorganic chemical elements?

A: More facts and information will be put onto TEP's and Thames21's websites as they become available

Q: What is the current status of TE2100 and how does this tie in with WFD?

A: Defra has the current TE2100 plan and there are a lot of discussions going ahead to put together packages of work over 5year/10year periods. Very soon announcements will be made about how the plan will go ahead and what actions will be going forward. Until Defra has approved the plan it cannot go out publically. TE2100 and WFD are happening in parallel and TEP are working on both, trying to link them up and streamline projects.

*The project team gave a presentation on their plans to supplement this existing picture with additional views and data from the public and stakeholders followed by questions and discussion of these plans.*

Q: How does the Thames Tunnel fit into this process?

A: TEP and Thames21 are fully engaged with Thames Tunnel plan which will address a lot of the problems on the tidal Thames. There will be significant investment over the next 15 years and plans will be integrated into this Catchment Plan.

Stakeholder comment: This is an example of a mitigation measure that if it is not put in place could argue that the WFD status has not been achieved.

Stakeholder comment: It's probably fair to say that everyone in this room supports the Thames Tunnel. But it's important to remember that it's not just the tunnel that will improve the water quality of the Thames. It is crucial that work being carried out on all other amenities e.g. Crossness Pumping Station, Abbey Mills, etc must be carried through as well.

Stakeholder comment: Draw attention to the fact that the EA has expertise in freshwater and coastal processes and engagement but not many within the agency have developed these skills for estuaries. Put together the expertise we do have with initiatives such as the Thames Tunnel together with the great stakeholder engagement already in existence through groups such as TEPs Dredging Liaison Group and others which could be argued as precursors to this process. There is an opportunity here to get a European wide best practice example in stakeholder engagement for WFD for future use.

## **Taking a catchment based approach**

*Presenting more detail on the catchment based approach, what a catchment plan is and how Your Tidal Thames intends to develop a catchment plan followed by questions and discussion of this and how your organisations might get involved.*

Q: What are 'pop-up workshops'?

A: On the whole these are five minute, structured workshops which are being held at the start/finish of foreshore activity to encourage small group discussion and comment. We are also running these workshops at other community fairs/festivals and events that both TEP and Thames21 are attending. These workshops give people an opportunity to come and speak to a project coordinator about the project, give their views on the tidal Thames which will be incorporated into the catchment plan or take away a copy of the plan to fill out later. We're in the initial stages but so far people have been enthusiastic and interested. Many people hadn't been engaged before in these processes and came along for a different reason but were happy to be engaged in this way.

Q: People who attend Thames21 events are already interested in water quality and riparian habitats. How are you planning to get people who are not already interested involved?

A: Presentations at group meetings, other events across London that are not necessarily on the river. We have to be mindful of how much engagement we can do in the time allowed.

Q: How do you intend to engage industry?

A: One on one meetings mainly. We have the details of the river operators on the TEP database and have had a good response so far from the mail-out we did in May. It's important to remember that we're not going to be able to speak to every single person with an interest in the Thames in the time we have but we'll do our best.

Stakeholder comment: We must recognise that this engagement must be carried on. Too often in the past engagement has been started but then goes cold while decisions are being made. We must find ways to fund the engagement, including more foreshore events, as there is nothing more powerful than seeing what is in the river. 10-15 years ago the EA did fish surveys and boat trips for interest and school groups which were invaluable. It'd be great to get something like that in operation again. The Olympics would have been a great opportunity to do this.

Q: Is Boris Johnson on board with this? He could reinforce some of these messages.

A: City Hall must be involved. Transport for London has shown an interest already.

Project team statement: Two part time posts cannot possible engage with everyone, so both TEP and Thames21 take these messages to every meeting, open day and event that occurs thus widening the scope of the engagement. By the end of the year we should have a snapshot of what we want to achieve in the long run.

Q: If we don't provide you with details of people to talk to would you be seeking your own avenues in which to do that? If so, it would be useful to know when you're going and to take information about other initiatives with you such as the NIA in North Kent. So that stakeholders don't get confused and recognise the link between the different projects but also I can make you aware of what else those stakeholders are involved in.

A: Yes but it would be great to have your help to explore those avenues if you didn't wish to directly give us contacts. Of course, we would engage in collaboration with you so as not to confuse the local stakeholders. It's a very good idea to swap engagement plans to help all involved effectively engage and would demonstrate collaborative working within the pilot.

Stakeholder comment: This is a good point. Another example is in Lambeth where there is a wharf that needs safeguarding for industry which local people may not like or want it altered in some way. It's important to know all the issues before engaging with people so as not to confuse those who may have to implement actions. Forward thinking and planning is essential.

Q: If we send the plan out to our individual databases and ask people to respond, what are the logistics of collating information and making it useful for the catchment plan when you may have 2000 people per database replying to you?

A: Good point. TEP has access to students who are keen to help with data collation and research. Thames21 can take on interns if we end up being victims of our own success.

Q: If you want us to send it out to individuals on our databases it may be more useful to put the questions into a survey form rather than open-ended questions.

A: We're also in the process of developing an online version of the form in addition to the paper version we currently have.

Q: More specific questions may be better for groups of people who don't have technical backgrounds as open-ended questions may not garner useful responses. But also, TEP and Thames21 already have a huge amount of data from surveys and past consultations on the Thames which should be used.

A: We're well aware that we're going to get a wide variety of responses which we will have to sift through to tease out the workable suggestions. We won't discard those that aren't directly WFD related and we'll put them in an appendix to pick up on at a later date. We will also integrate the information we already have.

*The facilitator asked what attendees liked and had concerns about with regards the engagement plan.*

Like	Concerns
Pilot – we can learn from what we've done; what we couldn't manage and didn't work	Job taken on is huge and whether this can be made into a meaningful plan.
Better way of engaging with the public – people who wouldn't normally be involved in consultations, are being included.	Critical that take into consideration the projects that are already in existence – avoid duplication of work and future plans.
Outputs and outcomes from the stakeholders – small measurable milestones that local communities can see for themselves will give them a sense of progress so that they feel it was worth it. We must think hard about this – plan must have some of these ideas and suggestions of projects on this small scale.	Coordination of communications; confusion between projects and boundaries with people on the ground who have built up relationships with certain organisations – must make sure that local organisations are aware of pilot communications planned in their area and local organisations are mentioned in pilot communications to those stakeholders.
	These types of consultations tend to get a lot of feedback from those who traditionally get involved. Lack of understanding in projects and/or panic within in e.g. industry which can result in representation being unbalanced – be aware of gaps in sector response and make an effort to gain the balance back, make it possible for them to respond.
	Consultation fatigue – try to get MCZ information, don't do it again!
	Misconceptions that this will be a definitive management plan – this plan must have credibility and be something that is carried forward.

## Setting up a Strategy Group – presentation and discussion

*Reminder of the proposed role and activities of a Strategy Group followed by discussion on this idea, how it might work and who might want to be involved.*

Q: The term strategy is about the high level, not a decision making body or a steering group so what would our responsibilities be?

A: That is up for discussion today but our initial thoughts are that we'd need a group to complete a second sift of the information coming in once we've done the first lot of data collation. We won't expect you to go through each individual response. Helping to prioritise the issues, projects and what goes into the appendix. We'd need to be clear that projects in the appendix may be just as valid but may not be a priority or directly linked to WFD and can be worked on later.

Q: Do you have a process in mind for prioritising issues and projects? E.g. Severn Estuary Strategy to identify issues within the estuary worked well and could be a good case study. UCL helped the group headed up by Dr Peter Jones and his team lead the Stakeholder decision analysis. They engaged everyone in the group and there was a defined process that auditable as to how we'd arrived at the decisions and prioritised issues.

A: Our initial thoughts about this were that we didn't want more than two or three meetings with the group if we go for face to face meetings. We wanted to be able to do a collation and email you with the issues we want answers on. It's difficult because we don't know as yet what the response from the engagement will be and so we may have to wait and see what sort of information we get back and how much. If you say today that you are up for two or three meetings then we can start to put dates in diaries or you may want it all by email. We're also going to put on our two websites the collated plan as we go along so that everyone can see that what they said is at least up there, even if it's in the appendix or just a record that they contributed. As we go along we can refine it.

Q: You want the group to go on after the pilot ends – how will you do this and what will it mean? Would the group liaise with Defra/EA independently of your two organisations?

A: TEP and Thames21 are very good at fundraising and once we get funding for a project we can match it to double it up. We've already started looking for funding for three months after end the project because we know Defra will go away with all 25 pilot project reports and discuss them. We don't want this discussion process to last forever because then the project will 'go cold' and we'll lose the momentum that we will have managed to achieve. So for those three months we want to keep the dialogue going, work up the projects that we will have identified and look to fundraise for further work. Bidding for the Catchment Restoration Fund has started. We feel that however much we have achieved by the end of the year it will just be the start.

*The facilitator asked the attendees whether there was anyone there who already knew that they or their organisation would definitely want to be part of such a group or would definitely not want to be part of such a group. Approximately five people stated that they would and none stated that they wouldn't.*

The attendees were asked what they would need to know before making a decision.

A: We would need to know the level of organisation that was expected or desired on the group particularly umbrella organisations that represent the views of other organisations. E.g. prior to the meeting I was getting confused about the scale of representation in my local area. I didn't know whether my organisation would be expected to be a 'gatekeeper' to other similar organisations such as local authorities in my area or whether each individual organisation should have an opportunity to be involved. Really it's a question to TEP and Thames21 as to how you want these organisations to be represented. If you were thinking the individual organisations would come then I wouldn't and vice versa.

A: Would need to know who within my organisation would be the best person to attend as there is a WFD specialist within my organisation but I have wider knowledge of the area and use of the Thames. Anyone interested in the future of the river should be involved but how, when and why. I believe this is a very good project but it's not clear yet as to where the project is going.

A: We could pilot the group for the next six months and then review the strategy in early 2013 as to how we go forward. It would be good to schedule a review point for the pilot so that if it becomes clear that members do not want to continue with the group it can be disbanded.

Project team comment: We understand how much we're asking of people and suggested that attendees could sign up to a draft Strategy Group. Meanwhile we will send the meeting notes round and a summary of what information we've received in from stakeholders so far. Until we have an example of the kind of information, issues and volume we'll have we won't know what kind of level of work we'll need.

Stakeholder comment: Anglers as a group are a bit fragmented. There are several outlets for engagement e.g. Southend Angling forum, K&E IFCA and the national Angling Trust. Many of the anglers from the Essex area fish the Thames.

*The facilitator reiterated the proposed roles of the group and asked whether they felt this was the best way to achieve the tasks needed or whether there were suggestions of alternative ways*

A: Strategy Group is a good idea and could be a conduit for a sub groups or a 'task and finish' groups to solve local issues which can be reported back to the Strategy Group. E.g. Balanced Seas MCZ Project for the South East had an overarching Regional Stakeholder Group; three Local Groups that met to resolve local issues and specific site meetings where people outside of those overarching groups could be brought into the discussion.

A: Use existing networks and workshops e.g. TEP. One of the most useful tools will be when a project is suggested local organisations can link it up with other initiatives in the same area.

*Discussions round each table about what needs to be agreed before the Strategy Group could be set up. Each table then took turns to state one outstanding point that needs agreement from their list, in plenary.*

#### Building an agenda for the Strategy Group

- Must have people on the river looking outwards not just those on land looking in i.e. effective stakeholder representation
- Sign off of the draft plan – what are people agreeing to when they sign off
- Terms of Reference must clearly set out what the group is expected to do i.e. a clear remit
- How much can be prepared by the two project hosts before the next meeting
  - One attendee suggested that the process could be short circuited as having a Strategy Group whether meeting physically or working via email will take a long time to complete the tasks needed. With the expertise and experience of TEP and Thames21, all the working groups TEP currently convene e.g. Dredging Liaison Group combined with the work that Thames Landscape Strategy and Thames Strategy Kew to Chelsea, it could be an option for Jill Goddard and Debbie to draft a plan and present it at the next Strategy Group meeting for

everyone to discuss. To carry on with the consultation at this stage, going out to talk to all the councils and community groups etc would take too long.

- Build on EA projects suggested already
- How do you prioritise work to be done? Criteria and the process by which you do this needs to be agreed – clear and transparent
- How these Strategy Group issues get agreed! – if we meet again would like to get straight into work and not get into housekeeping, so the project team must work on solving these issues and send round suggestions for a prioritisation process and TOR for the group to agree in advance of the next meeting
- Severn Estuary – use case studies on how criteria and decisions have been made before
- Dates of meetings that Strategy Group would like to attend
- In addition – would like to see a timeline detailing how the project will be completed
- More support for a draft plan up front which is consulted on by the group and wider stakeholders
  - Project team: not an either/or situation – we should do widespread engagement to involve local communities and can also come up with a draft plan if that's the group wants.
- Major concerns about communicating with such a large range of stakeholders in such a short period of time especially when consulting on a 'catchment plan' as even some attendees do not understand what this means. It is very hard to communicate with your own stakeholders – e.g. getting information to the officers of recreation clubs and then getting the same information out to their members which can range in the thousands plus getting them to understand the information they are being given is extremely difficult
  - Project team: Public consultations do take time but we must do it as part of the pilot. It is happening now and will continue. Use of the term 'catchment plan' is not language chosen by the project but requested that we use by Defra for the pilot. This will be good to feed back to them to make it clear that this language is not helping particularly since the tidal Thames is only part of a catchment.
  - It is important to remember that this is a pilot project where we will be able to highlight the problems as well as the successes. We realise that it is impossible to communicate with everyone within the Thames community within the timescale of the project but we will reach a sample.
  - In addition, we can look at involving some students from UCL to help us collate and summarise some of the information we already hold within the two host organisations and see if we can start to put together a draft plan for discussion.
  - Beware of 'samples' – may think that a sector has been engaged and when it comes to announcing management some sectors suddenly come out of woodwork as not being engaged
- Consistency of representation – good selection of stakeholders e.g. county wide or borough wide and making sure that sectors have been adequately represented
- TOR must be clear as to how representatives on the group are expected to liaise with their sectors to satisfy their needs and views and how they were chosen to be representatives of a given sector - as long as decisions are transparent then it should be achievable in the short period of time.
- Open questions are awkward as you don't get clear answers – have some sort of structure first and then ask people to comment

- Communications plans that keeps people up to date with progress of the plan which will help to advise group members on key times to go out and liaise with their sector
- Expectations of what happens when timelines slip so that everyone can meet each other's and project expectations e.g. everyone has responsibilities at work which will mean they may not be able to respond by the deadlines we request
- Expectations of people's time to contribute between meetings
- Draft plan would be helpful to try to understand who would be better placed within their organisation or whether the organisation itself is the right one – levels of expertise and technicality required in order to help with the prioritisation process
- The key aims and objectives of WFD within the plan - understanding that nothing will really change until the Tideway Tunnel is built in 12 years' time and then we'll have a very different river
- Whether the group is purely strategic or needs a level of expertise
- Revise the list of membership - a list of additional members as suggested at the meeting can be found below – Thames21 and TEP will engage with these organisations to see if they would like to be on the Strategy Group
  - NIA project is running at the same time which is engaging with coastal farmers and landowners and is a good link with WFD
- Would like a generic presentation to be able to use and send out to respective networks including a timeline (Action team)

Project Team agreed to take this away and provide clearer guidance on what we need from the group but we have a lot of discussion and report writing to do in order to get this clearer guidance to you and we feel that we'll need to leave the finalisation of the draft plan right up to the wire – do you feel this is the right approach?

- Depends on the level of consultation you expect us to have with our sectors. To get detailed response leaving it right up the wire may be too much to ask. However, if you just want us to provide a feel for it then it would probably be fine.
- A draft plan for us to discuss at the next meeting would be best so that we don't get bogged down in going over what we've discussed today

***Post meeting note: Clearer guidance has been provided to the Strategy Group in the document 'Answers to Strategy Group Questions and Suggested Workplan' and a draft TOR.***

## **Suggestions of other organisation that might be part of the Strategy Group**

*These organisations listed below were suggested by individuals at the meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> June:*

- GLA – London Plan
- ZSL – European Eel project
- Institute of Civil Engineering – water and waste panels
- Marine Conservation Society
- DP World (London Gateway Port)
- London Container Terminals
- Waterman's Hall

- Unitary Councils
- Other water companies
- City of London
- Cross River Partnership
- English Heritage
- Natural England
- Landowners – especially rural
- NFU
- Peel Ports
- Essex Coastal Wardens

<b>Action</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>When</b>	<b>What's happening</b>
Find out status of other EU tidal rivers and ports for comparison with tidal Thames	Alice Wilson with liaison with PLA	3 weeks	The request has been put to the national team and will be passed on to the group once an answer is received.
More info on NIA to be sent round	Jill G	2 weeks	Attached to email sent round with meeting report
Info on pilots happening on Thames tributaries and upstream – who's coordinating them etc – collate and send round	AW and project team	2 weeks	<a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/131506.aspx">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/131506.aspx</a>
FAQ for what some of the pressures actually are e.g. dissolved inorganic nitrogen	AW	2 weeks	Being developed – updates from the EA have been received and will be put into the FAQ which will be made available online.
Briefing note on what HMWB means for meeting WFD criteria	AW	2 weeks	See links in meeting report
Briefing note on TE2100 to be included in the meeting report	JG		Jill is discussing this with EA contact
Generic presentation to be made for dissemination to attendees for use in engagement work	Project team		TEP suggest the presentation be re-worked after team meeting on 24 <sup>th</sup> July due to suggested changes to work plan – TBC
Project team to consider how the Strategy Group would work and who would be involved – come back with proposal building on existing experience and a TOR	Project Team		Project Team has discussed the questions raised at the Strategy Group meeting and has sent suggested responses to send back to the group – see Answers to Strategy Group Questions and Suggested Work Plan