Management Committee Meeting 23 Minutes

Date: Thursday 28 September 2017   **Time:** 10:30am to 3:30pm

Location: Leo Zussino Building, CQ University Gladstone Campus

Attendees

Name	Position	Organisation
Community		
Mr Paul Birch (Chair)	CEO	Fitzroy Basin Association
Mr Peter Brady	Management Committee Representative	Gladstone Region Environmental Advisory Network
Mr Gerry Graham	Proxy Representative	Gladstone Region Environmental Advisory Network
Government		
Ms Angela Stokes	Proxy for Ms Rachel Parry	Department of Environment
Ms Rachel D'Arcy	Proxy for Ms Kristin Kenyon	Great Barrier Reef
Industry		
Mr Patrick Hastings	CEO	Gladstone Industry Leadership Group
Mr Andrew Tapsall	Marine Advisor	Shell/QGC
ISP Members		
Dr John Rolfe	Chair	GHHP Independent Science Panel
Staff		
Ms Crystal McGregor	Media and Communication Team (Phone in for Report Card Format)	Amarna Consulting
Mrs Lyndal Hansen	Media and Communication Team	Amarna Consulting
Ms Amy-Lee Pople	Secretariat	GHHP
Dr Uthpala Pinto	Science Team	GHHP
Dr Mark Schultz	Science Team	GHHP

Absent:

Prof. Owen Nevin	Associate Vice-Chancellor	Central Queensland University
Councillor Desley O'Grady	Councillor	Gladstone Regional Council
Ms Kristin Kenyon		
Mr Gordon Dwane		Gladstone Ports Corporation

Meeting Started: 10:35am

Agenda Item 3 – Reports

The Chair introduced Ms Rachel D'Arcy from the Great Barrier Reef and paid respect to the traditional land holders.

MC Did not require a private discussion.

3.1 Previous Minutes and Actions

Previous minutes confirmed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

Action items addressed.

3.2 GHHP Science Program Report

The ISP Chair reported on all current projects and their status.

Social, cultural, and economic indicators:
ISP Chair confirmed that there was a poor response rate (15%) from the website survey for the social indicator. ISP chair confirmed that the telephone survey is the most effective way to reach people as they now have access to a mobile phone number database and this will be utilised solely moving forward.
ISP Chair noted that there were more sites surveyed for Cultural indicators than previous years and that the scores have changed from last year due to the extra sites.
ISP Chair identified that at the previous meeting it was noted that there was a gap in payment for the indigenous elders to be paid to do the assessments but confirmed that money has now been paid for the assessments and as a result there was improved engagement and training for new indigenous assessors.
It was noted that last year the statistical analysis was done at zone level but this year, there was a score for each site and the scores were then aggregated for each site.

MC Comments/Questions
- It was questioned if there is intention to grow the Indigenous Cultural Heritage scope? ISP Chai confirmed that Terra Rosa have proposed to change the methodology of scoring but the ISP have requested no changes to methodology until a review has been conducted and decided on later.
- Confirmed there will be no changes to this report card.

Mud crabs:
ISP Chair elaborated on the findings and recommendations from the project contractor.
Overall the contractor has received very good data and it is a robust indicator that is recommended to be included in the 2017 GHHP Report Card.
Current mud crab indicators are:
- size sex ratio
- rust spot elisions
- catch per unit effort (abundance)
- biomass (body condition index)- there was not enough data for this to be included due to lack of historical data
ISP has proposed that the contractors quote for the coming year (2 quotes: 1x bare bones project scope, 1x additional inclusion project scope) that will then be presented to the MC.

MC Comments/Questions

- Will there be a score for mud crabs in the 2017 report card?
  ISP highly recommend the inclusion of the mud crab indicator in the 2017 Report Card.
- It was questioned why mud crabs were selected as an indicator?
  ISP Chair confirmed that some of the reasoning for the inclusion is that they are a major commercial and recreational species, indicator species for top of the food change, 2011 Community Consultation identified that mud crabs and fish health are the two main indicators the community wants to know about.
- Asked what historical research is available on mud crabs?
  ISP Chair answered that Leonie Anderson has done some research but in terms of the report card indicator there is no relevant historical data.

Coral:
Fourth indicator; Percentage of coral cover change (amount of coral that has grown or declined in the year) has been added this year as previous year there was no baseline for the inclusions.

MC Comments/Questions

- The Chair questioned if the fourth Coral indicator had been approved and signed off by MC?
  ISP confirm that the proposal of the fourth indicator was included in the Coral indicator proposal three years ago as an inclusion but there had been no data baseline available until now.
- Questioned if the map on the coral fact sheet is correct?
  Confirmed that the fact sheet map is showing a different boundary (port) and is different to the report card map.
- Coral fact sheet needs to read "Being monitored in 2 zones" not six.
- Questioned if the inclusion of the fourth Coral indicator caused a decline or improvement in the score?
  ISP Chair confirmed it made an improvement (overall grade went up).

Actions:

- Change the fact sheet maps to show the same boundaries as the report card
- Edit the statement on the coral fact sheet to read "Being monitored in 2 zones" not six.

Fish health:
GHHP to contribute $200,00 to FRDC and keep reserve funds of $100,00 for follow up work. There have been five responses to the SOW tender, and a teleconference is scheduled to decide on the preferred tenderer. All Proposals had different approaches (veterinarian approach- cutting up fish, biological- counting; catch per unit-weight size etc, better monitoring network- photographs added to visual monitoring systems to produce visuals (out of the box approach)). ISP Chair said there would be a discussion around the option of awarding a large tender and then allocate a small portion of funding to one of the computerised tenders to explore a new model but remain within budget ($300,000).

Mangroves:
No progress has been made with this indicator as the ISP are waiting on EHMP data (GPC initiative with Norm Duke from James Cook university) to be released.
ISP Chair highlighted that there could be a challenge with the mangrove indicator as it doesn't tend to be a very sensitive indicator due to its frequency of change. ISP Chair suggested that

mangroves could possibly be a background indicator or an indicator that is only report every 5 years due to sensitivity of data.

MC Comments/Questions

- Asked what the indicators will be for mangroves?
  ISP Chair said until the data is made available from GPC it is difficult to determine, but confirmed that satellite data, aerial photography and some site assessment is what Norm Duke is currently doing for GPC.
- Can mud crabs and mangrove health be combined?
  ISP Chair said it is possible report trends over time within an indicator or look at interactions between indicators potential over time as more data becomes available. ISP will put forward some suggestions that are promising moving forward.

Action:

- Patrick Hastings to follow up the mangrove data from GPC

Other:

MC Comments/Questions

- It was questioned if the previous process for the release of study findings be followed or altered to allow findings to be released earlier.
  All agreed to follow the previous process to ensure transparency of data.
- Questioned why coral coring was conducted outside harbour zones?
  Confirmed that it is to see if what happens in the harbour does or does not have an affect out of the harbour.
- If Coral coring data is not in the report card, where will the information be used?
  If it can prove the historical background of post development, how does this get out to community?
  ISP Chair said the report will be available on the website and that AIMS is producing a video that will also be made available.
  Suggested that it doesn't have to be included on the report card but could be referred and for more information go to the website as it draws community interest.
  It was also suggested to be an inclusion of the education resources.
- Will the code for Indigenous sense of place be available publicly and can other report cards use it?
  ISP Chair elaborated that R codes are quite dense and not user friendly. The code is not currently made available but the ISP Chair has no problem with making them public.
  Noted that at the back of the 2015 technical report that the R scripts are available.

Action:

- ISP to work with communications team to communicate coral coring findings.

3.3 GHHP Chair Report

Reporting the Environmental Indicator:
ISP Chair passed on the recommendation of the ISP is that the overall score to still provide an environmental grade, but have a score for the three segments. Reasons for this is to leave as many things unchanged as possible. More emphasis on the 3 components but still reporting in the middle the overall grade. Further discussion and decision agenda item 4.3.

Names for the Environmental indicator groups:

ISP chair, on behalf of the ISP debated that it was too soon to make changes in the names as reef 2050 is still under consultation, ecosystems is too broad of a term and biodiversity means everything but GHHP aren't measuring everything.

ISP Chair Proposes that GHHP remain with the current names but make mention in the technical report how/where it relates to reef 2050.

MC Comments/ Questions:

- Chair confirmed that this topic requires a decision and is to be added to the agenda as item 4.5 and to be further discussed later.

ISP Chair also reported on Indigenous Cultural Health, the internal review of the GHHP Report Card as per agenda paper 3.3.1 and proposed a boat trip around Gladstone Harbour followed by dinner on November 1st (next MC meeting 2nd November) and has invited the MC to join the ISP members.

MC Comments/ Questions:

- Indigenous Cultural Health review: postponed until discussions about GIDARJIL. Chair suggests not doing any additional work without including GIDARJIl due to current relationship issues with Terra Rosa (agenda item 5.1).
- Chair suggested that a meeting be held with Kerry Blackman (GIDARJIL) to get approval for the review of Indigenous Cultural Heritage.

Actions:

- Chair to arrange a discussion with Kerry Blackman(GIDARJIL) and ISP chair regarding the proposed Indigenous Cultural Heritage changes and current indicators.
- Communications team to liaise with Science team to follow up the invitation for the harbour cruise.

3.4 GHHP Communications Report

Communications team reported on all current projects with special mention and introduction of the GHHP Fact sheets and explanation of the Stewardship storybook idea.

Communications team requested partners to provide their story to be included in the book.

MC Comments/ Questions:

- It was asked that the website activity show the regions that the downloads took place?

Action:

- Communications team to find out if the regions can be detected for the website download activity and if so, have this included in the next report.

3.6 GHHP Citizen Science Projects Report

Communications team gave an update on all Citizen Science Projects and identified some of the new potential citizen science projects.

Communications team noted that Conservation Volunteers Australia have submitted an article about the Gladstone Myco Restoration Project (funding by GHHP Citizen Science project) to Wetlands Australia for their 30th edition scheduled to be released in February 2018.

3.5 Finance Report

Chair reported on GHHP's financials and there were no questions.

Agenda Item 4 – Items requiring decision

4.1 2016/17 Annual Financial Statements

Chair presented to the Management Committee the Annual Financial Statements.

MC Comments/ Questions:

- Asked if there is estimate of the project forecast for next year (2018)?
  Chair confirmed that it is estimated to be $1.2 million including PCIMP contribution.

Motion: All MC members accepted the Annual Financial statements as a true and accurate record.

4.2. Governance Charter

Patrick Hastings gave an outline of what the full review contractor ($25,000) will undertake and the value of having an external review.

Patrick is seeking approval from the MC to award the project and continue forward with the review.

MC Comments/ Questions

- Questioned what is the danger of not doing the external governance review?
  Confirmed that by conducting the review it ensures continual improvement.
  The review is to make sure everything is operating to its potential and the risk of not having it would not be too detrimental in the immediate time but in the future the operating style will become outdated.
  Chair explained that the interim arrangements of hosting have now gone 5 years and the process has not been evaluated, it is overdue for the proposed evaluation to be conducted.

Motion: Patrick and Chair to continue go forward and award the contract to the external reviewer and commence the Governance review- *all agreed, motion carried.*

4.3 2017 Report Card Layout

Communications team presented the proposed report card layout.

Actions/Layout Changes:

- Increase the size of the table title to allow it to stand out further.
- Darken the boundary between each section.
- Increase the size of the grading system at the bottom of the map page.
- Mention the fact sheets are available on request or at www.ghp.com.au.
- Rearrange the back page to have larger acknowledgement logos.
- Put the grades in the pie charts on the map.
- Make the overall grade slightly bigger.
- Title page: Enlarge the report card heading.
- Healthy Harbour, Healthy Future to be more prominent.
- Remove the waves from the header.

Motion: Report card front cover: fifth option of Port, LNG & Spinikar park- *all agree, motion carried.*

4.4 Air Quality

Marilyn Steel gave an update from the Air Quality community focus group she previously spoke to the GHHP partners about and the progression since that time.

Marilyn bought forward that the community believes that GHHP is a superior reporting model and believe it is the model they would like to follow or be a part of and requested the discussion of what participation or involvement GHHP would like to have in this movement e.g. support role, membership etc.

MC Comments/Questions

- ISP chair discussed that the ISP currently have no air quality skills and the preference would be only water quality rather than air quality.
- Suggested that the learnings and processes from the ISP could pass on to air quality as they are more of a citizen science focus group. Not drawing on ISP resources but more so for advice on techniques that work.
- ISP Chair noted that the ISP are in the process of publishing a journal paper that elaborates on the processes used and believes this would meet the air quality request for assistance/guidance.
- Chair questioned how does the MC define health of the harbour? Is it just water? Is it land, air etc and confirmed that there Is no mention of air or water in the current governance. Hence the question of what is the health of the harbour to the MC.
- It was stated not to include air with water strictly on a communication point of view. There is already enough of the community not fully understanding the current report for water. There is a requirement for Air Quality but it doesn't sit with GHHP (with EHP) but GHHP can play a role of advising.
- Chair confirmed that GHHP wants to assist in some way but it is maintained that it is kept very separate.

Action:

- Marilyn to send an email to GHHP to request their involvement.

4.5 Names of Environmental Indicator Groups

ISP Chair proposed that the environmental indicator group names remain the same as previous years and do not get changed.

Motion: All Environmental Indicator Group names remain the same as previous years. - *all agree, motion carried.*

Agenda Item 5 – Items for noting

5.1 GIDARJIL Correspondence

Chair gave background on the relationship with GIDARJIL and the current situation. Noted that Kerry (GIDARJIL) has requested to present at the December Partners meeting.

MC Comments/ Questions

- ISP Chair noted that considering everything that is going on and to reduce inflaming the situation it is suggested that the ISP does not go any further with anything regarding Cultural Heritage unless it is in conjunction with GIDARJIL.

5.2 Gladstone Harbour Model

ISP Chair gave an update on the Gladstone Harbour Model and confirmed the model is now available through the website. The model is currently in the maintenance stage and the ISP Chair request the input of the MC of how GHHP would like to share this model outward.

ISP Chair Options:

- a broader audience for the annual workshop (inclusion of technical staff).
- Adopting other models- potential to run models for university scenarios, partner scenarios etc.

MC Comments/ Questions

- Questioned how much it costs to run the model?
  ISP Chair confirmed that it is $30,000 for an annual maintenance fee but this will decrease in future years and allows for approx. ten standard scenarios to be run (extra fees for more complex scenarios).
- ISP Chair- suggests an option could be to; keep it within the GHHP, extend to the science people within the partnership or go even wider and make it available to the public, universities etc but be able to manage expectations and interpretation of results.
- Risk raised regarding people seeing the outcomes and questioned if there was value in going broader than the technical partners?
- The idea of the model was to put in scenarios to help make decisions for the MC to see the impacts of inclusions to the report card or the effects of bad weather to the report card. Interpretation is key.
- All MC felt very uncomfortable with releasing it to the public.
- ISP Chair questions how should the model be promoted to increase use, how to determine scenarios that are relevant etc?
- Chair confirmed that it should be controlled by chair of the ISP.
  Based on ten runs being available: 5 runs should be reserved for the ISP and 5 runs reserved for partners scenarios to be run through the ISP.
  If there are requests for any more than ten per year it requires approval from the MC for funding.
- If GHHP is approached to run a scenario for an external facility (Uni) then it must be passed by the MC.
- For all scenarios run, the results must be reported back to the MC.
- Beth runs a yearly workshop at a partner level for the model and the ISP Chair proposes the inclusion of technical reps along with the MC at the workshop.

Agenda Item 6 – General/Recurring Business

Next meeting: Thursday 2nd November 2017

Meeting closed: 3:00pm

Meeting Actions Register: GHHP and MC

(Once actions have been endorsed as complete in the meeting outcomes, they will be deleted from the list)

Action Number	Action	Who is responsible?	When it is due?	Status	Notes
MC Meeting 16					
MC 16.5	Renegotiation of PCIMP contract				
MC 16.6	Negotiate data sharing agreement with GPC				
MC Meeting 17					
MC 17.2	Col Chapman, Patrick Hastings and John Sherriff to work together to outline requirements for hosting	Col Chapman, Patrick Hastings and John Sherriff		**Ongoing**	
MC 17.3	Paul Birch, John Sherriff and Andrew Tapsall to provide guidance as to the nature and form of the proposed GHHP science review – teleconference within next 14 days.	Paul Birch, John Sherriff and Andrew Tapsall	Teleconference 15/2/16	**Ongoing**	
MC Meeting 18					
MC 18.2	Partnership meeting to be included in Science timeline. ISP Chair to update and circulate.	ISP Chair			
MC 18.6	Paul Birch, Patrick Hastings and State and Federal Government Representatives to form a working group to progress further enter discussions with the Fitzroy Partnership and to determine level of involvement and future recommendation to MC.	GHHP Chair, Patrick Hastings, Federal and State Government representatives			
MC Meeting 19					
MC 19.2	ISP0021 report to be amended that discussions will take place with PCIMP not GPC	Science Team			
MC Meeting 20					
MC 20.1	Communications Team to revise GHHP Roadshow proposal to stay within the Gladstone region and bring back to MC.	Communications Team			
MC 20.2	Science Team to circulate 'R' Script papers to MC for comment	Science Team and MC			
MC Meeting 22					

Action Number	Action	Who is responsible?	When it is due?	Status	Notes
MC 22.1	Chair to meet with Central Queensland Traditional Owners Leadership Group to get further information on the involvement of GIDARJIL and other traditional owners in the partnership	Chair	30/05/17	**Completed**	Discussion regarding current situation between GIDARJIL and Terra Rosa in Agenda item 5.1.
MC 22.2	Send out Myco-Restoration speaker Dr Sandra Tuszynska's details to MC	Communications			
MC 22.3	Department of Environment to confirm there will be no title changes made to the Reef 2050 Vision in the review process.	Angela Stokes	Outstanding		
MC 22.4	Obtain quotes for an internal governance review and present quote to MC for a motion to be carried next meeting.	Patrick Hastings	Completed		Motion carried in agenda item 4.2.
MC 22.5	All Management Committee members must complete and submit their Governance Health Check to the Secretariat.	All MC	Completed		
MC 22.6	Secretariat to collate all Governance Health Checks.	Secretariat	Cancelled		
MC 22.7	Chair to provide FBA submissions for DEHP GBR Discharge Policy	Chair			
MC Meeting 23					
MC 23.1	Change the fact sheet maps to show the same boundaries as the report card	Communications Team & Science Team			
MC 23.2	Edit the statement on the coral fact sheet to read "Being monitored in 2 zones" not six.	Communications Team			
MC 23.3	Follow up the mangrove data from GPC	Patrick Hastings			
MC 23.4	Science Team to work with communications team to communicate coral coring findings.	Communications Team & Science Team			
MC 23.5	Chair to arrange a discussion with Kerry (GIDARJIL) and ISP chair regarding the proposed Indigenous Cultural Heritage changes and current indicators.	Chair			
MC 23.6	Communications team to liaise with Science team to follow up the invitation for the harbour cruise.	Communications Team & Science Team			

Action Number	Action	Who is responsible?	When it is due?	Status	Notes
MC 23.7	Communications team to find out if the regions can be detected for the website download activity and if so, have this included in the next report.	Communications Team			
MC 23.8	**Report Card Layout Changes:** • Increase the size of the table title to allow it to stand out further. • Darken the boundary between each section • Increase the size of the grading system at the bottom of the map page. • Mention the fact sheets are available on request or at….. • Rearrange the back page to have larger acknowledgement logos • Put the grades in the pie charts on the map • Make the overall grade slightly bigger • Title page: Enlarge the report card heading • Healthy Harbour, Healthy Future to be more prominent • Remove the waves from the header	Communications Team			
MC 23.9	Marilyn to send an email to GHHP to request their involvement in Air Quality monitoring.	Marilyn Steel			