

Actions from GISERA Research Advisory Committee Meeting 31 July 2014

Key

| |
|--------------------------|
| Action Open |
| Action Due/overdue |
| Action complete/in train |

| | Item | Action | Owner | Due | Status |
|----|-----------------|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| 1. | 31-07-14 Item 1 | Action 1 : The proponents will ensure regular meetings are made part of the project requirements. If possible, organise the reference group to double as the regular meeting with industry colleagues. | Research Proponent | 4 August 2014 | |
| 2. | 31-07-14 Item 1 | Action 2 : The proponents will adjust the project order document to include a paragraph to explain the broader research design. | Research Proponent | 4 August 2014 | |
| 3. | 31-07-14 Item 1 | Action 3 : The proponents will adjust the description of task 12, to make clear what 'complimentary avenues' are. | Research Proponent | 4 August 2014 | |
| 4. | 31-07-14 Item 1 | Action 4 : The proponents will seek clarification from BREE in writing, how they see where they fit into this project and what their role is. | Research Proponent | 4 August 2014 | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|--|---|----------------|--|
| 5. | 31-07-14 Item 1 | Action 5: The proponents will include more detail in the project scope so that it is clear what it is going to look at and not going to look at. | Research Proponent | 4 August 2014 | |
| 6. | 31-07-14 Item 1 | Action 6: The GISERA Communications Advisor and proponent will ensure messaging in relation property values is made clear with a view to public consumption on this issue. | GISERA Comms Advisor / research proponent | Ongoing | |
| 7. | 31-07-14 Item 2 | Action 7: The proponent will amend/translate the short title into common English. | Research Proponent | 4 August 2014 | |
| 8. | 31-07-14 Item 2 | Action 8: The proponent will include a reference to the benefits from this study. | Research Proponent | 4 August 2014 | |
| 9. | 31-07-14 Item 2 | Action 9: The proponent will expand the summary to provide greater insight into the context. | Research Proponent | 4 August 2014 | |
| 10. | 31-07-14 Item 2 | Action 10: From the Atlas of Living Australia, the proponents will pull together all the distributional data that exists from all of the sources across the country and forward to Member 15 and Member 2. | Research Proponent | 15 August 2014 | |
| 11. | 31-07-14 Item 2 | Action 11: Member 15 to provide research proponent with the name of a representative to be involved during the lifetime of this project. | Member 15 | 15 August 2015 | |
| 12. | 31-07-14 Item 3 | Action 12: The proponent will amend the short title, so that it is not so broad. | Research Proponent | 4 August 2014 | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|---|--------------------|----------------|--|
| 13. | 31-07-14 Item 3 | <u>Action 13:</u> The proponent will incorporate into the project order document, a requirement to have close interaction with appropriate individuals from Origin and QGC. | Research Proponent | 4 August 2014 | |
| 14. | 31-07-14 Item 3 | <u>Action 14:</u> Member 15 to provide research proponent with the name of a representative to be involved during the lifetime of this project. | Member 15 | 15 August 2014 | |
| 15. | 31-07-14 Item 3 | <u>Action 15:</u> Member will send research proponent some of the papers that Rob Lemeck and he wrote on focal species approach. | Member 5 | 6 August 2014 | |

Minutes
GISERA Research Advisory Committee Meeting No. 6
Thursday, 31 July 2014
Via Telephone

OPENING

The meeting of the GISERA Research Advisory Committee was called to order at 10.10 am on Thursday, 31 July 2014 via telephone by Damian Barrett, GISERA Director.

PARTICIPANTS

Damian Barrett: GISERA Director (*CSIRO*)

Graeme Bartrim: Chief Environmental Scientist (*Origin*)

Paul Wright: Manager, CSG Technology Hub Leader (*QGC*)

Nadine Marshall: Senior Social Scientist (*CSIRO*)

Randall Cox: General Manager (*Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment*)

Will Rifkin: Chair in Social Performance (*Centre for Coal Seam Gas and Centre for Social Responsibility in Mining, University of Queensland*)

David Freudenberger: Senior Lecturer (*Fenner School of Environment and Society, Australian National University*)

Jizelle Khoury: GISERA Secretariat (*CSIRO*)

Apologies:

Anne Bridle: Secretary (*Basin Sustainability Alliance*)

Peter Wallbrink: Theme Leader, Integrated Water Resource Management (*CSIRO*)

Jim Grayson: Chief Executive Officer (*Gladstone Area Water Board*)

Steve Raine: Professor of Irrigation and Soil Science in Faculty of Engineering and Surveying (*University of Southern Queensland*)

Steven Finlay: HSE Manager (*Australia Pacific LNG*)

Wayne Newton: Grains President (*AgForce*)

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

The GISERA Director welcomed new members Paul Wright and Nadine Marshall. He noted that Peter Wallbrink is currently overseas and was unable to participate in these discussions.

The GISERA Director advised that the project leaders were lined up to dial in to their respective item to respond to any questions that may be raised by the RAC members.

1 Project Proposal – Measuring economic trends and benefits

The RAC provided the following comments on the ‘Measuring economic trends and benefits’ research proposal:

Member 14

- Noted that Member 13 is the UQ proponent on this proposal. He will be available with the CSIRO proponent, to answer any questions, but he won't be offering an approval for this item.
- Alf Garnett who heads UQ CCSG and Member 14 have received feedback from number of companies that we, as two research agencies operating in the area, needed to combine our research capability and derive benefits from coordinating and collaborating between the two institutions. Alf and Member 14 agreed that this is a necessary action to promote because the benefits gained will be considerably more than if the two groups undertake research independently.
- This proposal is a first attempt at collaboration between UQ CCSG and GISERA.
- The degree of collaboration in this project is significant and the benefit will similarly be significant.
- It is timely to begin to understand the effects of development of CSG, particularly in the Surat, on the economies at a range of scales (local, regional and state).
- It was required that the UQ component of this be run through the Strategy Advisory Board (SAB) overseeing the UQ CCSG. They have considered the proposal and are at an imminent point of approval.
- A scoping study has been requested, that forms part one of the work. That study will feed into this project in terms of defining and evolving the direction of this project.

Member 2

- How do you delineate construction from operation in a temporal sense, given that the three projects are working at different speeds and that we are all moving to a slowly steady operational phase?

Research Proponent

- We are still figuring that one out, particularly at the local scale. More like a faded transition, so when it comes to talking with the local businesses, we will have to work very closely with the companies in that area and make a call on what stage. We should be able to define that and then we will have to classify those businesses still under construction or having already gone to operation on a case by case basis.

Member 15

- Sits on SAB for UQ's CCSG. A few things were brought up that SAB had asked for before endorsing it. They were happy for scoping study to be performed and the kinds of questions they were asking that may be relevant here, were things such as there was a brief study happening and where does this fit into it? Had company technical people been involved with the scope and as the scope is developed, that company technical people are briefed because the relevant companies are already doing some of their own work. SAB want to be sure of how this work will fit in with what companies are already doing.

- Asked have people from APLNG and QGC and other industry stakeholders had much input into this scope yet?

Research Proponent

- In relation to the BREE study, Member 13 has been in contact in with them in a lot of detail. We have also looked at their work in paper to compliment that. They are understaffed and low on capacity. In many ways what we will be doing is helping them by providing materials that they can draw on. Particularly as their focus is looking at the industry and our focus is looking at the region and the localities, so what happens to local businesses in towns in the Surat is not specifically of concern to the BREE study in an overall sense. They are more looking at how industry is affecting at a higher scale, so there is a scale issue and then there is a depth issue. We will be going into a lot more depth in our regional scale and state scale assessment and we will be working with them, so that they can use information subsequently in their own work. We will build into the scoping study phase that we will be meeting with them and also into the broader study as well, so that we can allow them to understand what we are doing and help them with their capacity problem.
- Yes, they have been talking to company people. The first time this project was raised last year, it was not an industry request. It came from APLNG representatives at the time, who said they liked what we were doing but wanted to see more on economics. We have taken that up working particularly recently with Caleb Yeoh and others at QGC. He has put us in touch with a number people who we have also been talking to about how it fits in to the people within the region. We have taken that up as a core part of the design of the project.

Member 14

- The water related projects and methane seeps project have benefited from close interaction with our industry colleagues e.g. the Methane Seeps project is running monthly meetings with a key group of technical people from all of the companies in the Surat. The exchange of information and the insight that are generated is valuable for the project and would like to see a regular meeting arranged between industry colleagues in the relevant areas and the researchers.

Research Proponent

- Will ensure the meetings are made part of the project requirements.

Member 13

- We have already put in to the proposal to have an industry reference group.
- That will involve people nominated from each company. That request was raised at a SAB meeting and the previous technical advisory group meeting for each company to nominate someone.

Member 14

- From the GISERA side, we do not need any extra oversight given the mechanisms we have in place, but if it is possible to organise the reference group in such a way that it could double as the regular meeting with industry colleagues then that's fine. Conscious of duplicating structures that add to burden, but equally conscious of the need to promote the industry research links in all of the projects.

Member 17

- Asked for history of the sorts of research and research momentum the research proponent has already established in the region.

Research Proponent

- This study is building on an aspect of earlier work we have been doing. We have been looking at social impacts. The border between social and economic is a little blurry. We have already been looking at income effects and employment effects, as basic economic indicators, but of very strong social significance.
- What has come out of that is an important study design issue, so one of the things that this study did, is distinguish between the areas affected by CSG and a controlled group of comparable areas, which means we can really isolate the effect of the industry in terms of saying well these are the changes we can really associate with that industry.
- What we would like to do in this project is extend that to a more comprehensive economic assessment looking at other variables, productivity and the size of the local economy.
- To show that we are not repeating earlier work with a few more variables, what we would also like to do in this study, is look at the areas already in production with CSG, the control group and then build into that a third group which would be new areas where already some part of exploration is happening in other parts of the country, so there is an initial effect and we would like to look at that as well.
- One of the advantages will be that this project can indicate for those new regions, what they might expect in terms of economic impacts if they proceed a few years down the track. We think that will be an important contribution and part of what GISERA is trying to do in terms of knowledge legacy.

Member 13

- Across the UQ and CSIRO projects, we have a whole range of time series data from different areas and can show some correlations over time, of changes and certain factors for what the economic modelling is here in Australia and the timeframe with a vehicle to distinguish which of those effects are due to the CSG development.

Member 17

- Likes the outputs identified for each of the aims.

Member 5

- Likes the verbal description given of broader research design, but it did not seem to come through in the documentation and it is an important strength of this research is that it has this design in looking at areas that are not involved in CSG exploration and development.

Research Proponent

- Will adjust the project order to include a paragraph earlier in the document to explain the broader research design.

Member 5

- Essentially taking two approaches to better understanding local economic impacts. One is a qualitative (interviewing SME's) and the other is a quantitative econometric approach using hard data. It was not clear how you were going to

bring the two together. How is the qualitative going to compliment the quantitative?

Research Proponent

- Part of this is a scale issue and these scales are interacting with each other, so what is happening at the very local level in terms of new businesses starting up, changing, closing up, expanding etc. are going to be having regional impacts. We will be putting these two lines of inquiry alongside and trying to get a better understanding of what is happening in an integrated way. In terms of the formal mechanism for how do we do that, the project team are going to have an ongoing series of discussions and we have particularly planned that so it is not one stream handled by CSIRO and the other by UQ. We have planned it so that we have cross institutional collaboration for each stream. We have structured a series of interactions early in the project and towards the end of project to bring these things together and draw out the commonalities.

Member 5

- In task 12 'conduct whole of project workshop' there is mention of 'complimentary avenues', but it was not clear what the complimentary avenues were. Suggested more detail is included there.

Member 14

- The risks are comprehensively listed as are the means of mitigating those risks. In relation to staff availability, there have been a lot of changes in CSIRO in last few months. Are any of the staff allocated to this project potentially impacted?

Research Proponent

- Recent restructuring and staff changes have not impacted staff on this project. At present, there is no elevated risk.

Member 17

- It looks like good value for money and looking forward to the outcome.

Member 14

- This project is timely and happy to support it. The results that will come out of this will be of interest internationally. The demand for information on these sorts of topics is increasing all the time.

Member 15

- Could we have some clarification from BREE about how they see where they fit into it and what their role is. It would be good to have something in writing.
- Some of the statements in the project scope are fairly broad and he wanted to be clear on what is in and what is out. E.g. heard earlier comments about land value assessments but cannot see this in the scope. There are some general statements and wanted to be clear on what it is going to look at and not going to look at.

Research Proponent

- Will add more specification in terms of those variables and factors member 15 has mentioned. We can include that in a revised version of the proposal and also taking on board member 5's comments on clarification on history and methodological design.

- In terms of clarification with BREE, we are intending to talk with them already in terms of the scoping study, so we can easily approach them for these details.

Members 2, 5 and 17

- Endorsed project subject to clarification as discussed and that they are completed to GISERA Director's satisfaction.

Member 11

- Endorsed the project and commented that in relation to the point made about property values, it is important for those messages to be clear if that is what the data is telling us, with a view to the public consumption of this. It is hoped the project will be keeping a view to the important conclusions for communities out there.

Member 14

- One of things we are focusing on is increasing our visibility in relation to communications and will take that on board in relation to messaging.

Member 11

- It has been the view that property values go down whenever CSG comes to town. We have a contrary view put forward by some of the advanced land holders who are looking to increase the value of the properties through this sort of development and if there is data showing progression rather than anecdotal views shown by people, it would make a very strong message to send to the community.

Member 15

- Agreed with other members, but sought clarification on whether the RAC would see the revised proposal before it went to the Management Committee.

Member 14

- We can state in the actions, that the revised project order will be sent to the RAC for endorsement. Endorsement will be sought via email rather than convening another meeting.

Member 5

- He will be on leave for 5 weeks and is happy to approve the project, subject to GISERA Director's satisfaction.

Outcome: The Research Advisory Committee agreed that following further clarification and revision of the project order document, endorsement of the RAC would be sought via email, before proceeding to the Management Committee for final approval.

Following the above discussion, it was resolved that:

Action 1: The proponents will ensure regular meetings are made part of the project requirements. If possible, organise the reference group to double as the regular meeting with industry colleagues.

Action 2: The proponents will adjust the project order document to include a paragraph to explain the broader research design.

Action 3: The proponents will adjust the description of task 12, to make clear what 'complimentary avenues' are.

Action 4: The proponents will seek clarification from BREE in writing, how they see where they fit into this project and what their role is.

Action 5: The proponents will include more detail in the project scope so that it is clear what it is going to look at and not going to look at.

Action 6: The GISERA Communications Advisor and proponent will ensure messaging in relation property values is made clear with a view to public consumption on this issue.

2 Project Proposal – Translocation research project for *Rutidosia lanata*

The RAC provided the following comments on the 'Translocation research project for *Rutidosia lanata*':

Member 14

- This is a project looking at factors of success associated with translocation of a daisy species *Rutidosia lanata*. The project originally came out of an interaction between Origin Energy and CSIRO looking at what are the genetic and ecological factors that come to bare on the success of plantings, revegetation and offsets associated with this particular species. The project will contribute to planning and conducting plantation and replanting vegetation of this species in areas that are affected by clearing. The value associated with this is around improving efficiency and effectiveness of the reestablishment of these populations.
- This reestablishment is necessary to meet regulatory requirements associated with vegetation clearing in Queensland and to meet Queensland Government offsets policy.
- The work exists at two scales and there are two components of the work. There is a genetic analysis component and an ecological analysis component. Both of these components aim to generate a general and synthesis understanding of the limitations that may occur in terms of viability of populations for reestablishment. The issues associated with the species itself, due to its reproductive system and genetics is limited success or viability associated with establishment of seedlings. This may flow through to the offset and restoration plantings, so the objective of the project is to provide those guidelines based on best available science.
- One component is looking at the genetic structure, the chromosome number which affects the ability of these plants to generate viable seeds. There are constraints to breeding amongst plants via self pollination.
- The project will work closely with Origin Energy staff. It requires field collection, delivery of plant material for growth, then collection of seeds and then plantings to assess success rates, as well as laboratory related work associated with genetics.

- One of the key risks is obtaining sufficient flowering plants associated with the study at the time when it is needed. Moving into spring period is the appropriate time for this work to occur and that should largely mitigate that risk.

Research Proponent

- We know that these two issues within the daisies are very real in terms of restoration work. We have worked on restoration projects for other daisies and for other Rutidosis species and know that two of the key limits are if there is any chromosomal variation and if there is that distribution because if you mix different chromosome numbers you end up with sterile offspring and that is something you cannot undo.
- A little bit of evidence, just from morphology in talking to the Origin Energy collaborators, they do see some different forms and those different forms can often be underpinned by different chromosome numbers. It is a sensible thing to make sure they get a good result and that we understand that bit about the biology. The second is the breeding system. Again we know that anecdotally they have seen low seed set in some of the populations they have looked at. That could be because of low genetic diversity at this incompatibility gene system. We have worked on other values and it is an issue for translocations that you need to get as much diversity captured as possible. These two things trade off against each other because to get a lot of diversity you want a sample from a wide range, but if there is chromosomal variation you do not want to mix that up, so looking at these two things together to come up with the best strategy in terms of sourcing the material that is not going to mix up chromosome numbers, but will maximise the variation of the incompatibility gene system.

Member 2

- This is of great interest to us because we are finding as the project develops, that we need to have areas with many thousands of these daisies on them, so we want to get it right. In the meantime, we are working to delist the species again, that this research will still fit nicely with some of our offset requirements.

Member 14

- From a GISERA perspective, it goes to developing and providing the best available scientific advice to underpin actions that are undertaken to meet regulatory requirements. Communities are well attuned to that sort of message and it is very much of community interest matter and so from that perspective, it fits under the GISERA umbrella.

Member 5

- Congratulations on addressing this important subject in partnership with Origin Energy. As a restoration ecologist, it has been of concern that there is an assumption that offsets are technically feasible and that is an untested assumption. This particular daisy is a classic example that grabbing a bunch of seeds and throwing it on the ground is not necessarily going to create a genuine offset.
- The short title for a public document needs to be translated into common English. It does not indicate it has anything to do with CSG. Suggested 'Ensuring biodiversity offset success: the right kind of seed for a rare daisy (Rutidosis lanata)'. Titles are important for public documents and websites.

Member 14

- All these documents are transparent and visible on the web and regularly visited and having that communication in clear English in the short title and heading for this work is very useful.

Member 13

- Some reference to the benefits from this study would be really useful for the public representation of the project.

Research Proponent

- We can use that to flesh out a little bit more about what we might do in the workshop that is foreshadowed around how we can use this as a specific example, but talk about what it tells us about the generality of the genetic and ecological issues that we need to think about. It is a good model to highlight the practical reasons for doing this, but agree that if it comes across as being a species specific solution, then it has not done all it could.

Member 5

- Fully endorsed that.

Member 17

- Suggested that the summary could be expanded more to provide greater insight into the context. Is this a single species that will be dealt with or is a basis for future research on other species? Do we look at many species in the future or are we committed to this one? Is this the long end to research or the beginning of more?

Member 2

- We have a few offset obligations. One of which is to offset this Rutidosis and we are acutely aware that we are kind of on the edge of science with these things, but we need to sort out and optimise our work with Rutidosis, but what I think what we get out of this is going to help set expectations for future offset work.

Research Proponent

- In terms of our collaboration, this is the first step to see if we can effectively do the science for this area of work with Origin and see if we can produce the kind of results that we need to make a practical outcome on the ground. It is also a segue for more generic exploration of what those issues are and then if this goes well, at CSIRO, we see this as the potential beginning of a longer and broader collaboration.

Member 15

- Where does this occur naturally? Is this a Surat Basin species?

Member 2

- It is in the gas field's area. Origin seem to have more than most, but QGC will have it on their tenures as well.

Research Proponent

- Can send the distributions from the Atlas of Living Australia. It will pull together all the distributional data that exists at the moment from all of the sources across the country.

Member 15

- We may be able to supplement that with some of the internal information we have and would be happy to share that.

Member 14

- There is going to be interaction between Origin and the research proponent's group on this. Perhaps we could ensure that a QGC individual is involved during the lifetime of this project.

Member 15

- Will put forward a relevant person from QGC.

Member 2

- We have been talking to people at QGC and Santos about their records on this species.

All RAC members

- Approved project with the GISERA Director's oversight on recommended changes.

Outcome: The Research Advisory Committee endorsed the project, subject to the GISERA Director's satisfaction that comments raised will be addressed.

Following the above discussion, it was resolved that:

Action 7: The proponents will amend/translate the short title into common English.

Action 8: The proponents will include a reference to the benefits from this study.

Action 9: The proponents will expand the summary to provide greater insight into the context.

Action 10: From the Atlas of Living Australia, the proponents will pull together all the distributional data that exists from all of the sources across the country and forward to Member 15 and Member 2.

Action 11: Member 15 to provide research proponent with the name of a representative to be involved during the lifetime of this project.

3 Project Proposal – Threatened Species Ecology

The RAC provided the following comments on the 'Threatened Species Ecology' research proposal:

Member 2

- This project was agreed at the outset when GISERA was getting started. We had difficulty finding someone who could carry the research forward.

Member 14

- We have been through the RAC and Management Committee approvals on this. At the time though, it was for the recruitment of a PhD student to undertake the work. PhD students move at a different pace in terms of the requirements of their PhD and also have different goals and different requirements in order to gain their degree.
- The other issue was finding an individual with the right base skills to take on the project and bring it to fruition over a period of 3 years as a PhD graduate.
- The research proponent is able to meet the original requirements of the proposal, but as a professional scientist, he is able to do to that in a much quicker timeframe.
- This project has come back to the RAC because under the original proposal, there was a desire to have a PhD student involved in this. That has different aims and goals compared to undertaking the research work on its own and he wanted to ensure that the RAC was satisfied that this proposal go ahead as part of a research project rather than a teaching project.
- Project is looking at issues around conversation of the golden-tailed gecko and the glossy black-cockatoo which exists across the range of tenements and leases in the CSG development region in southern Queensland.
- The work that will be undertaken will look to develop a set of guidelines and prescriptions for assisting with the management and maintenance of habitat types that are required for viability of both the golden-tailed gecko and the glossy black-cockatoo. This will be based on activities that will include field assessments and field work that will be undertaken this year. Then a set of work on analysis and understanding of prior information, as well as the information coming out of the field assessment and then a set of guidelines and management prescriptions will be generated.

Research Proponent

- One of the key aspects of the project is that within the area that GISERA is involved with, there is about 100 threatened species. This project is an attempt to pick species that operate on vastly different spatial scales, so the gecko which has small home ranges and is quite fixed, where as the cockatoo has distinct feeding and nesting habitat and uses the landscape in a different way. It is an attempt to try and get two of the extremes in terms of space usage and using those two types of species as flagship in terms of conservation and developing really sound management prescriptions for them.

Member 2

- This business is starting to change now, but it has been quite a reactive one, so we have been focused on short term and the immediate as a business. This was seen as one way on getting us to think about the longer term with a view to maintaining species presence. This study compliments the regional biodiversity threatened mitigation study that is already underway. So we have one that is more generic looking at the region and what can be done about biodiversity and this is looking at detail into species. I think they would dovetail nicely.

Member 5

- Endorsed the project.

- Thinks that the short title too broad and suggested 'habitat requirements of threatened species at two scales: local and regional'

Member 2

- Similar to the Rutidosis project, this project was developed a long time ago and we are happy to engage with the other proponents in the same way.

Member 14

- We will include in the project order a similar entry that indicates there will be close interaction with the Origin and QGC relevant individuals.
- Member 15 to provide name of suitable person at QGC.

Member 13

- How are you studying the baseline against which to gauge the impacts?

Research Proponent

- It is too late to be collecting baseline information. In terms of the golden-tailed gecko in particular, we are going to try to characterise its use of the environment in terms of fragment size and edge effects. In effect, we are going to go in there and look at how they respond and use that to look at how they respond if the environment was suffering a particular type of disturbance.
- We are fortunate in that there is a glossy-black conservancy that is doing some work, so there is a fair bit of baseline data which should help fast track this project.

Member 17

- Referred back to the research proponent's introductory comment about 100 threatened species. Australia's record for extinctions is one of the worst in the world, yet this project comes across as a little isolated. Is there some way of refocussing those management guidelines to have some sort of precautionary or to have some sort of consideration of those other 98 species that do not have the luxury of this research on them. Is there some way of connecting back or are we meaning to see these as isolated individual species?

Research Proponent

- The two species that have been chosen work because they are at two different spatial scales, but also because their GISERA area is important for their conservation. They are endemic species and a lot of their range is within the GISERA area. In terms of the other species to try and connect, to some degree some of them will be covered by the project work, but it is not easy to pick out two species that will cover 100. Some of them will get picked up by this work.

Member 14

- One of the risks noted was around unexpected departure and redundancy of staff. Has reorganisation impacts had effects on this project that would be of concern in terms of capability and availability of skills?

Research Proponent

- The redundancy process is ongoing. It may potentially impact some staff involved in this project, but there are no immediate threats to delivery.

Member 5

- In relation to member 17's point, will send the research proponent some of the papers that Rob Lemeck and he wrote on focal species approach which is trying to get around the issue that there are hundreds of threatened species out there and can you find and identify those species that are most limited by certain threatening processes at multiple scales.

Member 14

- Wants to ensure that the RAC is happy for this to move from a PhD project to a professional researcher achieving similar results in a shorter time period.

All RAC members

- Fully endorsed this project.

Outcome: The Research Advisory Committee endorsed the project being undertaken by a professional researcher.

Following the above discussion, it was resolved that:

Action 12: The proponents will amend the short title, so that it is not so broad.

Action 13: The proponents will incorporate into the project order document, a requirement to have close interaction with appropriate individuals from Origin and OGC.

Action 14: Member 15 to provide the research proponent with the name of a representative to be involved during the lifetime of this project.

Action 15: Member 5 will send the research proponent some of the papers that Rob Lemeck and he wrote on focal species approach.

4 Current Research Investment

Member 14 provided an outline of GISERA's current research investment commitment. There were no issues raised.

5 Progress of GISERA's Research Portfolio

Member 14 provided a summary of portfolio progress, engagements provided and communication opportunities moving forward with the focus on increasing GISERA's visibility.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Research Advisory Committee is yet to be scheduled. It is anticipated that a meeting will occur once further proposals are established.

ADJOURNMENT

The GISERA Director adjourned the meeting at 12.05 pm.

Minutes submitted by: **The GISERA Secretariat**

Minutes approved by: **The GISERA Director**