Management Committee Meeting 15 Minutes

Date: Monday 14 September 2015   **Time:** 9:00am to 10:00am
Location: TELECONFERENCE

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 Peter Brockhurst		Gidarjil Development Corporation
Government		
Ms Claire Andersen	Director – Strategic Policy Services	Department of Environment and Heritage Protection
Ms Angela Stokes	Proxy for Ms Peta Lane	Department of Environment
Councillor Col Chapman	Councillor	Gladstone Regional Council
Industry		
Mr Kurt Heidecker	CEO	Gladstone Industry Leadership Group
Mr Garry Scanlan	Gladstone Regional Manager	GLNG
Ms Megan Ellis	Proxy for Mr John Sherriff	Gladstone Ports Corporation
Other Attendees		
Dr Ian Poiner	Chair	GHHP Independent Science Panel
Dr John Kirkwood	GHHP Science Convenor	Fitzroy Basin Association
Ms Crystal McGregor	Media and Communication Team	Amarna Consulting
Ms Maddy Willey	Media and Communication Team	Amarna Consulting

Apologies:

Name	Position	Organisation
Mr John Sherriff	General Manager, Safety Environment & Risk	Gladstone Ports Corporation
Dr Liz O'Brien	Associate Director of Research	Griffith University

Agenda Item 1 – Science Update

Dr Ian Poiner provided Science Update and advised:

- The science program in continuing, as planned
- An Appendix is attached to the Science Report including an update on all projects and indicators that will be used in the 2015 and future report cards
- That a discussion was had at the last ISP meeting covering issues identified from the 2014 Pilot Report Card

1.1 Aggregation Method
- The ISP had reviewed aggregation methods and had made a decision to so with the bootstrapping method.

- The Bootstrapping method was questioned in relation to the implications if it's different from last year, with the response provided:
  - No implications – no comparison to be made due to different suite of indicators
  - Environmental indicators are not comparable
- Is the bootstrapping method the same as SEQ uses?
  - Unsure – used in a number of other report cards
  - Issues of consistency between report cards and aggregation methods
  - Mackay – looking at SEQ and AIMS methodology – recommended using AIMS method (bootstrapping)
  - Claire and Ian to talk offline to ensure ISP's are making similar recommendations

1.2 Baselines
- The ISP wanted a standardised approach to setting baselines and to setting the threshold for "satisfactory" when comparing indicator results to the baseline.
- It was discussed that some indicators such as Water Quality had Queensland Government guidelines to support baselines, however others, such as Seagrass did not.
- The ISP considered ways baselines and thresholds could be set and decided the best approach was to accept the expert opinion of the project teams as to where baselines and thresholds should be placed but conditional on a 'satisfactory' grade meant the same for each measure even though its position relative to the baseline may differ between measures. This means a grade of C will be a 'pass' for each indicator.
- A question was raised regarding the consistency of baselines across all report cards, with the response:
  - We are making sure there is consistency when determining baselines and thresholds

1.3 Mudcrabs
- Following concerns about the quality of the Queensland Government mud crab fishery commercial catch and effort data the ISP commissioned a review of the use of the mud crab fishery catch statistics to generate a mud crab indicator for the Report Card.
- The review determined that the existing data was not deemed suitable for GHHP Report Card, with fundamental issues with data – Don't know whether the catch recorded for that day came from 50 pots or several hundred – very hard to standardise catch, as well as issues around what is being recorded and if it accurate/consistent
- Dr. Brown who did the review has provided suggestions to look at in the future.
- The mud crab indicator has been removed from the 2015 Report Card.
- Questions were raised by the Management Committee in regards to:
  - What were the recommendations?
    - Identify a subset of fishes that you know have a long history in the fishery – develop a program with them
    - Have a fishery independent assessment – do it yourself, go out and measure the abundance of mudcrabs – great difficulties in doing this because of nature of mudcrab life history and fishery
    - Dr. Brown recommended the former, rather than the latter response
  - There being no record of the catch and release of females
    - Can make some standardisations with relation to male to female ratios

1.4 PAH Indicator
- Large number of PH measures under PAH indicator – will use the total PAH indicator
- 2015 PAH sediment data were recently provided to the ISP for review and most measures are below detection level and where there are values they are well within guidelines.

- The ISP decided to use the total PAH values. Where total PAH is the sum of the 18 individual PAHs that were measured by PCIMP. This approach is consistent with national guidelines.

1.5 Report Card
- The ISP finalised indicator list for the 2015 Report Card is at Appendix 2 of the Science Report.
- A discussion occurred regarding the indicators in 2015 Report Card, including points regarding:
  - Some potential indicators identified will not be used but plotted as trend lines – with no guidelines available
  - Indicators scheduled for 2016 Report Card – some of the existing data not suitable or not available for this year
  - Some indicators scheduled for 2017 or later – case studies in 2016 to then be developed into an indicator for 2017
  - Some indicators have been omitted

- A discussion was held regarding the use of trends in the 2015 Report Card. Ian Pointer explained that it was inappropriate to use a trend line on the environmental component
- Social and economic trend lines may be suitable
- It was suggested that we need to be transparent about differences in trend lines and look at trends in water quality compared to last year
- It was questioned if confidence in trend be included with trend lines
  - Advice of ISP is that it is not appropriate
- Public will be sceptical – what is the reason for no confidence in trend lines
  - Water quality – will be able to make comparisons across some PCIMP date from last year
  - More data coming in that may cause scores to fall
- Why can't we explain a trend from last year
  - Will be done in technical report
- There is a higher confidence in this year's figure for water quality than in last year's figure
  - It's about the confidence in comparing – last year small amount of measures used so it can't be a direct comparison
  - Result that comes out this year has increased confidence when it comes to water quality – better information and data being used for this year's results
- The Comms Team explained that there is more room for text in this year's report card – so that these trends can be explained, without the need for the trend arrow symbol
- It was advised that the component can be broken down to talk about trends within each
- It was questioned if caveats could be included around the fact that there are a broader number of indicators used this year and still include a trend line, with the response:
  - Nobody is suggesting that comparisons won't be made – it is inappropriate to have a trend line at a component level
  - ISP say that technically having a trend line at a component level would not be an accurate comparison – ISP would not have confidence in comparison
    - If you detail 'no confidence' you will have to explain why – use text to explain
- Trend information should be available in report card about trends in water quality
  - Adding to analytical task – decision needs to be made promptly

The Chair proposed a motion that: no environmental component score trend arrow be included on report card
Management Committee members voted: eight (8) for, one (1) against
It was noted by four management committee members that no trend line was required as long as there is text around the trend for water quality changes from the 2014 Pilot Report Card.

- A discussion was held regarding confidence levels and the recommendation from the ISP to use a three level rating.
- Claire Andersen to send through confidence rating matrix on 5 level scale to Ian Poiner
- Comms and Science to discuss wording of confidence levels
- Inappropriate to say that confidence levels are not a complicated task – statistical process needed
- Some indicators difficult to interpret – explanation of confidence level needed (technical report or key messages)

The Chair proposed motion: to have a 3 level rating for confidence
Management Committee members voted: six (6) for, three (3) against

The Chair proposed motion to have a 3 level rating for confidence for 2015 Report Card and a 5 level rating for confidence in 2016 Report Card
Management Committee members unanimously agreed

Agenda Item 2 – Read and Release of children's book

Communications team announced that the story 'Gladstone Harbour: Barry & Jenny's Expedition' was finalised and printed. An invitation to attend the Read and Release of the book has been forwarded to all members of the MC as well as partners. The Read and Release is being held on Thursday 17 September from 4:00pm – 5:00pm at East Shores. Any MC members wanting multiple copies of the book to advice the Comms team, who will send out.

Management Committee Comments/Questions on children's book:
- Comms team to send a hard copy to all management committee members and staff
- Will book go to flow centre up in Rockhampton?
  - Books will go wherever they are requested

Agenda Item 3 – Membership Update

- Most membership fees paid – some still chasing
  - Boyne Smelters, CQG Consulting, Rio Tinto, University of QLD, Dhou Woolkoom
- Department of Environment in Canberra signed 2 year contract
- Environmental Heritage Protection – contract signed, cheque coming

Agenda Item 5 - General / Recurring Business

- Cultural Heritage Project progressing well – Ian Poiner acknowledged Peter Brockhurst for his work on project

Next Meeting: MC meeting 28/29 October 2015 – dinner function that night
- ISP meeting 27 – 28 October
- Joint MC/ISP from 2pm (28/10)
- MC meeting on 29 October 9am
- Dinner function to be organised for 29 October
- Secretariat to fix diary entries

Meeting closed at 10:03am

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 7					
MC7.5	Discuss with Science Team about the integration of the Stewardship work with the Report Card.	Science Team and GHHP Secretariat	ASAP	**Ongoing**	
MC Meeting 9					
MC9.3	Circulate GHHP Columns and GHHP media releases to the MC following the Chair's approval.	GHHP Secretariat (RS)	ASAP	**Ongoing**	
MC9.6	Circulate updated Communications Plan to the Management Committee.	GHHP Comms Contractor	ASAP	**Ongoing**	Communications Plan is being addressed regularly through updates on activities, such as the GHHP Community Engagement Strategy, and Report Card Feedback Process.
MC Meeting 12					
MC 12.3	Investigation of policies and procedures to monitor and set up a GHHP Facebook Group	GHHP Comms Contractor		**Underway**	Comms team to discuss with Claire Andersen policies used for Reef Facts Facebook page.
MC Meeting 13					
MC 13.1	Do recruits have more vulnerability than adult fish?	Chair, ISP		**Completed**	Contact John Gunn (Mackay)
MC 13.2	Table detailing line item costs since inception	Chair, GHHP			
MC 13.3	Release ISP 007 Connectivity report	Chair, GHHP			comments from John Sherriff Connectivity Report (ISP007) before approval
MC Meeting 14					
MC 14.1	Schedule of meetings for the rest of the year to be sent to Management Committee and Partners	GHHP Secretariat		**Completed**	
MC 14.2	Reporting of Stewardship and Citizen Science projects in Technical Report	Chair, Comms Contractor			
MC 14.3	Stewardship recommendation/report to be distributed to Management Committee (once received from consultants)	Claire Anderson			
MC 14.4	Comparison of website analytics to those of other healthy water ways projects (SEQ, FBA, etc.)	Comms Contractor			
MC 14.5	Discussion of contract agreements with CVA – to be reported back to Chair	Comms Contractor			
MC 14.6	Generate "Gladstone Healthy Harbour Partnership" Social Media Policy	Comms Contractor			

Action Number	Action	Who is responsible?	When it is due?	Status	Notes
MC Meeting 15					
MC 15.1	Management Committee members and staff to receive a hard copy of GHHP Storybook	Comms team/Secretariat			