

<h1>Meeting Notes</h1>		Meeting: Bluespaces Governance Group	
Attendees: Emily Baldock, Matt Butcher, Jim Cokill, Fiona Morris, Clemmie Moule (Chair), Rebecca O’Connell, Richard Powell, Patrick Welsh and Sian Whitehead		Date: 01/10/25	Location: MS Teams
Apologies: none		Distribution: Attendees and Apologies	
No.	Agenda Item and Notes		
1	<p>Introduction</p> <p>CM welcomed attendees to the shorter interim meeting to pick up items not discussed at the previous meeting, including the refunding of previously improved kms through Bluespaces. The key questions posed to group members were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Should this fund be available at the same level as newly proposed km for Bluespaces funding? 2) How should this fund be accounted for within internal recordings of projects? 3) Should there be a reduced amount of funding available for these km? 4) What additional criteria needs to be supplied by partners to demonstrate that further funding would deliver significant improvements on top of previous Bluespaces funding? <p>Previous comments from early discussions on this topic were agreed by group members that this funding is an important consideration for partners, but that it should be less of a priority than new projects and new kms.</p>		
2	<p>Discussion</p> <p>Initial Thoughts</p> <p>There needs to be a clear distinction between previous and future work and applicants need to make it clear what the differences and improvements are. The need for significant improvements was emphasised as well as a clear distinction between old and new improvements.</p> <p>There should be caution with partners potentially overhyping and under-delivering, to protect the fund against those partners returning for additional funding in return for a low delivery output. Other local bids for the area should also be considered.</p> <p>Projects that would have a greater outcome and overall achievement if they are doing further improvements to areas already funded could be treated with a higher priority; a blanket rule of lower priority for any projects that are revisiting km already improved should be avoided.</p> <p>Projects shouldn’t be limited from this particular funding by any exclusions.</p> <p>Consideration will need to be taken on projects funding INNS (invasive non-native species).</p>		

	<p>Should re-improved kms be added to internally recorded Bluespaces total of improved kms?</p> <p>It depends on the ultimate aim of the Bluespaces scheme. Is the main goal of internal recording of improved Bluespaces kms to maximise water improvement opportunities or to achieve a total km.</p> <p>A middle-ground between these could be achieved with the right narrative to ensure maximum benefits to the water environment can be achieved e.g. 600 overall improved km with 400 unique standalone km</p> <p>This approach was agreed; improvements to the water environment are essential with no preconceived baselines. The funding would be dependent on project use with deprived neglected areas taking priority.</p> <p>An open and honest perspective from NWG is necessary when recording areas already improved and the Bluespaces team would be relied upon for appropriate judgement on each project.</p> <p>What additional criteria should be requested from partners for this fund?</p> <p>Information should be presented with clarity for judgement by the governance group, but this would largely be a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>It was suggested that it would not be practical to apply a lower level of funding for km that are being ‘re-visited’.</p> <p>A funding breakdown and full information of what is receiving further funding, and basics of the project would be required for consideration by the governance group.</p> <p>The importance of the project’s history would also need to be discussed, to provide an understanding of how any new funding fits into any previous funding already used in the same project area.</p> <p>It was agreed that an extra prompt could be added to the application form and that projects will be treated on a case-by-case basis going forwards.</p> <p>There is a new legal agreement for this AMP, all members of the governance group are welcome to view this on request. Reporting requirements are different for each project and bigger projects need more structured monitoring timelines in the legal agreement.</p> <p>Decision to refund project areas providing they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have added value, improving the water environment for individuals and the community - Are not used for previous undeliverables - The previous track record of bids in that area are taken into account by Bluespaces Delivery Managers and Officers - The Bluespaces team accurately records areas improved more than once
3	<p>ACTION: All Bluespaces Governance Group members to approve the Gaunless and Cut Throat Dene projects over email.</p> <p>ACTION: EB to review Bluespaces project candidate forms and add a note added under ‘Links to Other Projects, Initiatives and Strategies’ in italics prompting partners to provide more information on any previous projects that have been funded in the same project area.</p>