

## **Appendices**

Appendix i: Reference Table of Questions Used in Officers' and Partners' Surveys

OFFICERS	ALGE (Pilot)	PARTNERS
<b>Confidential LBAP Officers' Survey</b>	<b>Opinions on LBAPs - Confidential Questionnaire for ALGE Members outside Wales</b>	<b>LBAP Partners' Survey - x LBAP</b>
(Please relate to your own LBAP and area, unless question implies LBAPs more generally)		(Please relate to x LBAP and area, unless question implies LBAPs more generally)
<b>1. General.</b>	1. General:	<b>1. General.</b>
<b>LBAP/ Council:</b>	LBAP/ Council:	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Name and Job Title:</b>	Name and Job Title:	<b>Name and Job Title:</b>
<b>Time in this Post:</b>	Time in this Post:	<b>Time in this Post:</b>
<b>Time in other LBAP Post (if relevant):</b>		
<b>2. Open-ended:</b>	2. Open-ended:	<b>3. Open-ended:</b>
i) You have £2 million for local Biodiversity work - what would be your first priorities for spending it?		i) You have £2 million for local Biodiversity work - what would be your first priorities for spending it?
ii) If you were Leader and Chief Exec of your Authority, how would you change things for its input to the LBAP process?	You are made Leader and Chief Exec of your Authority. How would you change things for its input to the LBAP process?	
iii) If you were First Minister of the Assembly, what would you do as top priority for LBAPs?		

*(Continued ...)*

<b>OFFICERS</b>	<b>ALGE (Pilot)</b>	<b>PARTNERS</b>
2. iv) If the LBAP and process were abolished, what would be the biggest losses to your area for biodiversity conservation?		3. iii) If the LBAP and process were abolished, what would be the biggest losses to your area for biodiversity conservation?
		ii) Please give an example of how you would change the LBAP document to improve it.
<b>3. Semi-Structured:</b>	3. Semi-Structured:	<b>2. Semi-Structured:</b>
<b>3. i) Partnership</b>		<b>2. i) Partnership</b>
a) The Local Biodiversity Partnership has proved to be a real catalyst for both agreeing and delivering new biodiversity actions and projects.	i) The Local Biodiversity Partnership has proved to be a real catalyst for agreeing and delivering new biodiversity actions and projects.	a) The Local Biodiversity Partnership has proved to be a real catalyst for both agreeing and delivering new biodiversity actions and projects.
b) Factors such as already-busy work commitments and competition for limited funds significantly limit partnership cooperation in practice.	ii) Factors such as already-busy work commitments and competition for limited funds significantly limit partnership cooperation in practice.	b) We would be more open to partnership work, if increased resources were available.
c) The Local Biodiversity Partnership has successfully drawn in a good number of businesses, landowners and community groups.		
		c) Long-term project stability and job security for our organisation have to take priority over commitment to new projects with partners.
	<i>(Continued over ...)</i>	d) New Partnership work takes up valuable time, needs consensus, and if successful usually results in temporary projects and employment.

<b>OFFICERS</b>	<b>ALGE (Pilot)</b>	<b>PARTNERS</b>
<b>3. ii) Council</b>		<b>2. ii) Council</b>
a) The County Council leads on local Biodiversity action by example and is thus a highly credible LBAP leader.		a) The County Council leads on local Biodiversity action by example and is thus a highly credible LBAP leader.
b) Staffing and resources are not a problem issue for Council LBAP input.	iii) Staffing and resources are not a problem issue for Council LBAP input.	
c) LBAP Officers and the LBAP function are well-linked to power and decision-making within the Council.		
d) Prioritisation issues mean that Council work often comes before wider LBAP Partnership work.		
		b) It would be worth investigating whether the LBAP process could be more clearly separated from County Council work.
<b>3. iii) LBAP Document</b>		<b>2. iii) LBAP Document</b>
a) To follow best practice, LBAPs are meant to aim to cover all biodiversity action happening locally.	iv) To follow best practice, LBAPs are meant to aim to cover the sum of biodiversity action happening locally.	
b) Partnership members constantly use the LBAP to inform conservation decision-making in the area.		b) We actively use the LBAP to inform our conservation decision-making in the area.
c) Success in new action implementation often tends to be with things that would have happened anyway.	vi) Many of the actions in the LBAP were things already happening or already agreed	c) Success in new action implementation tends to be with things that we would have done anyway. <i>(Continued ...)</i>

OFFICERS	ALGE (Pilot)	PARTNERS
		2. iii) d) The LBAP is more a reference list of who's doing what than itself setting the agenda for what gets done.
		a) The LBAP is just about the right size and level of detail.
<b>3. iv) LBAP Reporting and Results</b>		<b>2. iv) LBAP Reporting and Results</b>
a) Our Partnership members are reporting on BARS or to the LBAP Officer, thus ensuring that progress on their actions is normally clear.		a) We report on BARS or to the LBAP Officer thus ensuring that progress on our actions is normally clear.
b) Although significant numbers of actions in the LBAP seem to show little or no progress, their inclusion shows what needs to be done, and can help draw in funding.		b) Although significant numbers of actions in the LBAP may show little or no progress, their inclusion shows what needs to be done, and can help draw in funding.
c) The LBAP enthuses and informs many local people.		c) The LBAP enthuses and informs many local people.
d) There is lack of clarity about how LBAP targets and action reporting stand in relation to national HAP and SAP management and steering processes.	v) There is lack of clarity about how LBAP targets and action reporting stand in relation to national HAP and SAP management and steering processes.	d) There is lack of clarity about how LBAP targets and action reporting stand in relation to national HAP and SAP management and steering processes.
e) It would be better to focus more on priority objectives with long-term flexibility for project decision-making, rather than including long lists of detailed actions with variable degrees of backing commitment.	vii) It would be better to focus on priority objectives with long-term flexibility for project decision-making, rather than including long lists of detailed actions with variable degrees of backing commitment.	e) It would be better to focus more on priority objectives with long-term flexibility for project decision-making, rather than including long lists of detailed actions with variable degrees of backing commitment.  <i>(Continued ...)</i>

OFFICERS	ALGE (Pilot)	PARTNERS
<b>3. v) Other</b>		<b>2. v) Other</b>
a) Local Biodiversity action would benefit greatly by focusing more on Climate Change-related projects (such as habitat linking) and mutually-beneficial projects for health and wildlife.	viii) Local Biodiversity action would benefit greatly by focusing more on Climate Change-related projects (such as habitat linking) and mutually-beneficial projects for health and wildlife.	a) Local Biodiversity action would benefit greatly by focusing more on Climate Change-related projects (such as habitat linking) and mutually-beneficial projects for health and wildlife.
b) In formal/official contexts, it is often the 'done thing' to refer only to positive features and results of LBAP action.	ix) Its often the 'done thing' to refer only to positive features and results of LBAP action.	
c) The range of skills and work expected of an LBAP Officer are a great deal to ask of one person.		
		b) For us, most, if not all, important local conservation decisions are made outside the LBAP partnership and process.
<b>4. Do you wish to make any other specific or general comments?</b>	4. Feel free to add other specific or general comments.	<b>4. Do you wish to make any other specific or general comments?</b>

**Appendix ii: Questionnaire for Officers' Survey Pilot (ALGE), with Associated Text Posted on ALGE Discussion Site, 19.4.06.**

Opinions on LBAPs - Confidential Questionnaire for ALGE Members outside Wales

Please could you spare a few minutes to fill in a short questionnaire?

Linked to an LBAP review study, and research project with the University of Wales, Bangor, I'm gathering data on LBAP evaluation from LBAP staff and LA ecologists. It would be very helpful for this if you could spare a little time to answer the questions below. Your identity from personal details will remain confidential; the results of the other questions will be put on the ALGE website, where they should hopefully be useful for stimulating thinking and informing LBAP review processes.

Easy reply: just cut and paste questions, add answers and send to:- [dcxpl@anglesey.gov.uk](mailto:dcxpl@anglesey.gov.uk).

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. General:

LBAP/ Council:

Name and Job Title:

Time in this Post:

2. Open-ended: You are made Leader and Chief Exec of your Authority. How would you change things for its input to the LBAP process?

3. Semi-Structured:

Please answer i) - ix) by making one of the responses below:-

SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, D - Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree, DK - Don't Know, O - Other - e.g. Sometimes.

You have an option for further comment after any answer.

i) The Local Biodiversity Partnership has proved to be a real catalyst for agreeing and delivering new biodiversity actions and projects.

ii) Factors such as already-busy work commitments and competition for limited funds significantly limit partnership cooperation in practice.

iii) Staffing and resources are not a problem issue for Council LBAP input.

iv) To follow best practice, LBAPs are meant to aim to cover the sum of biodiversity action happening locally.

v) There is lack of clarity about how LBAP targets and action reporting stand in relation to national HAP and SAP management and steering processes.

vi) Many of the actions in the LBAP were things already happening or already agreed.

vii) It would be better to focus on priority objectives with long-term flexibility for project decision-making, rather than including long lists of detailed actions with variable degrees of backing commitment.

viii) Local Biodiversity action would benefit greatly by focusing more on Climate Change-related projects (such as habitat linking) and mutually-beneficial projects for health and wildlife.

ix) Its often the 'done thing' to refer only to positive features and results of LBAP action.

4. Feel free to add other specific or general comments.

**Appendix iii: Questionnaire for Officers' Survey (Wales), with Associated E-mails.**

**Accompanying E-mail text, sent to all Welsh LBAP Coordinators 12.5.06** (following phone contact):

LBAP Evaluation - Confidential LBAP Officers' Survey

Hi [*name*]

It would be very helpful if you could spare some time to fill-in and e-mail back the attached confidential survey.

A bit of clarification:-

- Due to likely similarity of issues etc, LBAP review on Anglesey has grown into wider study for LBAP evaluation (Welsh focus), linked to Post-grad. research at University of Wales, Bangor. Your input will help in LBAP evaluation at a broader scale, and help fill a gap in current knowledge.

- This is intended to be a 'grass roots' survey, a chance for you to say how you really feel about the LBAP process in your area, and beyond. Its confidential - reporting and analysis of the information is not going to be linked to your name, so please feel free to say how you feel on the issues raised.

- The survey aims to get feedback from every LBAP Coordinator in Wales; if that happens, there will be a big weight behind the resulting work by way of representation - for future reference for LBAP reviews (and hopefully WAG, CCW, WLGA etc.).

- You'll get a copy of the write-up of the survey for your own use, and I can keep you posted with other elements of the work in time.

- To save time, feel free to cut and paste filled-in questionnaire straight into e-mail text.

Thank you very much for taking part/ diolch yn fawr iawn am gymryd rhan.

Best wishes,  
David

David Cowley  
Biodiversity Officer, Isle of Anglesey CC/ Biodiversity Partnership  
University of Wales, Bangor

***[Questionnaire provided as attachment and also pasted under e-mail text]***

---

**Reminder Text (Sent 25.5.06):**

Hi [*name*]

Quick reminder on the Confidential LBAP Officers' Survey (sent on 12th May, part of University of Wales, Bangor, research project). So far, officers covering a third of Welsh LBAPs have responded, which is very encouraging.

Your own response is eagerly awaited - as a rare chance to provide confidential, independent feedback on LBAP and processes from your experience, I hope you'll be able to find the time to take part. This kind of evaluation work should be of use in helping inform improvement processes in the future.

Two tips:

- This time the questionnaire has been pasted into the text below also; this gives you the option of less steps in replying (can hit reply with text and add answers straight in e-mail text).

- If you find the early open-ended questions (section 2) hard to start with, try doing section 3 first, and coming back to these later.

Looking forward to hearing from you, and thank you again for your input.

Best wishes,  
David

David Cowley  
Isle of Anglesey CC/ Biodiversity Partnership  
University of Wales, Bangor

***[Questionnaire provided again as attachment and also pasted under e-mail text]***

---

## **Questionnaire Text:**

### **Confidential LBAP Officers' Survey**

(Please relate to your own LBAP and area, unless question implies LBAPs more generally)

#### **1. General.**

**LBAP/ Council:**

**Name and Job Title:**

**Time in this Post:**

**Time in other LBAP Post (if relevant):**

#### **2. Open-ended:**

i) You have £2 million for local Biodiversity work - what would be your first priorities for spending it?

ii) If you were Leader and Chief Exec of your Authority, how would you change things for its input to the LBAP process?

iii) If you were First Minister of the Assembly, what would you do as top priority for LBAPs?

iv) If the LBAP and process were abolished, what would be the biggest losses to your area for biodiversity conservation?

### 3. Semi-Structured:

Please answer the following by making one of the responses below:-

**SA (Strongly Agree)**      **A (Agree)**    **D (Disagree)**    **SD (Strongly Disagree)**  
**DK (Don't Know)**      **O (Other - e.g. Sometimes)**

You have an option for further comment after any question.

#### 3.i) Partnership

a) The Local Biodiversity Partnership has proved to be a real catalyst for both agreeing and delivering new biodiversity actions and projects.

b) Factors such as already-busy work commitments and competition for limited funds significantly limit partnership cooperation in practice.

c) The Local Biodiversity Partnership has successfully drawn in a good number of businesses, landowners and community groups.

**3.ii) Council** [*N.B. Clarification was obtained from National Parks at a later date, to confirm that results obtained from questions 3. ii) a) - d) referred to the appropriate National Park Authority, as LBAP Lead and not the local County Council*]

a) The County Council leads on local Biodiversity action by example and is thus a highly credible LBAP leader.

b) Staffing and resources are not a problem issue for Council LBAP input.

c) LBAP Officers and the LBAP function are well-linked to power and decision-making within the Council.

d) Prioritisation issues mean that Council work often comes before wider LBAP Partnership work.

#### 3.iii) LBAP Document

a) To follow best practice, LBAPs are meant to aim to cover all biodiversity action happening locally.

b) Partnership members constantly use the LBAP to inform conservation decision-making in the area.

c) Success in new action implementation often tends to be with things that would have happened anyway.

#### 3.iv) LBAP Reporting and Results

a) Our Partnership members are reporting on BARS or to the LBAP Officer, thus ensuring that progress on their actions is normally clear.

b) Although significant numbers of actions in the LBAP seem to show little or no progress, their inclusion shows what needs to be done, and can help draw in funding.

- c) The LBAP enthuses and informs many local people.
- d) There is lack of clarity about how LBAP targets and action reporting stand in relation to national HAP and SAP management and steering processes.
- e) It would be better to focus more on priority objectives with long-term flexibility for project decision-making, rather than including long lists of detailed actions with variable degrees of backing commitment.

**3.v) Other**

- a) Local Biodiversity action would benefit greatly by focusing more on Climate Change-related projects (such as habitat linking) and mutually-beneficial projects for health and wildlife.
- b) In formal/official contexts, it is often the ‘done thing’ to refer only to positive features and results of LBAP action.
- c) The range of skills and work expected of an LBAP Officer are a great deal to ask of one person.

**4.** Do you wish to make any other specific or general comments?

**Appendix iv: Questionnaire for Officers' Survey (England), with Associated E-mail.**

**Accompanying e-mail text, sent 3.7.06 to selection of English LBAP coordinators (following phone contact):**

LBAP Evaluation - Confidential LBAP Officers' Survey

Hi [name]

I hope you'll be able to find a little time to take part in this confidential, independent survey on feedback on LBAP and processes from your experience.

A bit of clarification:-

- Due to likely similarity of issues etc, LBAP review on Anglesey has grown into wider study for LBAP evaluation, linked to Post-grad. research at University of Wales, Bangor. Your input will help in LBAP evaluation at a broader scale, and help fill a gap in current knowledge.

- This is intended to be a 'grass roots' survey, a chance for you to say how you really feel about the LBAP process in your area, and beyond. Its confidential - reporting and analysis of the information is not going to be linked to your name, so please feel free to say how you feel on the issues raised.

- The part of the survey being run in Wales has had responses from LBAP officers covering 19 out of 24 LBAP areas. Coverage of important areas of England will help make this a more valuable source of information - hopefully to help inform future UK thinking and direction.

- You'll get a copy of the write-up of the survey for your own use, and I can keep you posted with other elements of the work in time.

Two tips:

- As well as being an attachment, the questionnaire has been pasted into the text below also; this gives you the option of less steps in replying (can hit reply with text and add answers straight in e-mail text).

- If you find the early open-ended questions (section 2) hard to start with, try doing section 3 first, and coming back to these later.

Thank you very much for taking part - your input to this important work is much appreciated.

Best wishes,  
David

David Cowley  
Biodiversity Officer, Isle of Anglesey CC/ Biodiversity Partnership  
University of Wales, Bangor  
01248 752470

***[Questionnaire provided as attachment and also pasted under e-mail text]***

---

## Confidential LBAP Officers' Survey

(Please relate to your own LBAP and area, unless question implies LBAPs more generally)

### 1. General.

**LBAP/ Council:**

**Name and Job Title:**

**Time in this Post:**

**Time in other LBAP Post (if relevant):**

### 2. Open-ended:

i) You have £2 million for local Biodiversity work - what would be your first priorities for spending it?

ii) If you were Leader and Chief Exec of your LBAP's lead body (normally Council or Wildlife Trust), how would you change things for its input to the LBAP process?

iii) If you were Environment Minister, what would you do as top priority for LBAPs?

iv) If the LBAP and process were abolished, what would be the biggest losses to your area for biodiversity conservation?

### 3. Semi-Structured:

Please answer the following by making one of the responses below:-

**SA (Strongly Agree)      A (Agree)    D (Disagree)    SD (Strongly Disagree)**  
**DK (Don't Know)      O (Other - e.g. Sometimes )**

You have an option for further comment after any question.

#### 3.i) Partnership

a) The Local Biodiversity Partnership has proved to be a real catalyst for both agreeing and delivering new biodiversity actions and projects.

b) Factors such as already-busy work commitments and competition for limited funds significantly limit partnership cooperation in practice.

c) The Local Biodiversity Partnership has successfully drawn in a good number of businesses, landowners and community groups.

#### 3.ii) Lead Organisation

a) The Lead organisation (Council/ W.T) leads on local Biodiversity action by example and is thus a highly credible LBAP leader.

b) Staffing and resources are not a problem issue for the Lead organisation's LBAP input.

c) LBAP Officers and the LBAP function are well-linked to power and decision-making within the Lead organisation.

d) For the Lead organisation, prioritisation issues mean that other work often comes before wider LBAP Partnership work.

### **3.iii) LBAP Document**

a) To follow best practice, LBAPs are meant to aim to cover all biodiversity action happening locally.

b) Partnership members constantly use the LBAP to inform conservation decision-making in the area.

c) Success in new action implementation often tends to be with things that would have happened anyway.

### **3.iv) LBAP Reporting and Results**

a) Our Partnership members are reporting on BARS or to the LBAP Officer, thus ensuring that progress on their actions is normally clear.

b) Although significant numbers of actions in the LBAP seem to show little or no progress, their inclusion shows what needs to be done, and can help draw in funding.

c) The LBAP enthuses and informs many local people.

d) There is lack of clarity about how LBAP targets and action reporting stand in relation to national HAP and SAP management and steering processes.

e) It would be better to focus more on priority objectives with long-term flexibility for project decision-making, rather than including long lists of detailed actions with variable degrees of backing commitment.

### **3.v) Other**

a) Local Biodiversity action would benefit greatly by focusing more on Climate Change-related projects (such as habitat linking) and mutually-beneficial projects for health and wildlife.

b) In formal/official contexts, it is often the 'done thing' to refer only to positive features and results of LBAP action.

c) The range of skills and work expected of an LBAP Officer are a great deal to ask of one person.

## **4. Do you wish to make any other specific or general comments?**

---

*N.B. Further to the above, no specific reminder text was used. Prospective respondents were reminded by phone and the original e-mail and questionnaire attachment resent if requested.*

*(Blank page.)*

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
1R	A	- suspect most partners were happy to list actions of this kind, rather than completely new ideas.
2R	O	
3Re	D	Whilst it's certainly true that we continue with estate management anyway, species-based action tends to be lead by the LBAP. <i>Author's Note: D refers to species rather than habitat work; 'we' implies the LA only, not partners.</i>
1U	O	sometimes <i>Author's Note: Limited agreement</i>
2U	D	
3U	O	(Perhaps, but on a very ad-hoc basis only. The success of new action implementation in x has been to coordinate and bring together volunteers in a variety of projects, especially in hosting a partnership event every other year, which would not happen otherwise, and to carry out participative surveys, e.g. GCN, dormouse, house nesting birds, and practical conservation task days. Maybe these things would have happened anyway, but who would have known or heard about them? Where would the training of new volunteers usually take place and who would get priority. I think the success in the LBAP process is introducing new people to the idea of biodiversity conservation and bringing them all together in one group (even if it is very informal) to establish links and networking opportunities.) <i>Author's Note: O, but position tends to be closer to D than A</i>
4R	A	
5R	SD	– without an LBAP and LBAP officer, very little proactive biodiversity work would happen in x <i>Author's Note: Notes proactive work as being LBAP initiated.</i>
6R	O	– not all the time, but probably mostly! <i>Author's Note: O, but tends to be near to A.</i>
7R		Pilot wording: 'Many of the 'new' actions listed in the LBAP were things already happening or already agreed.' D <i>Author's Note: Pilot wording slightly different; result not counted here in main text</i>
8Re	SA	
9R	D	
10Re	SD	
11R	D	This may be true of some of our Action Plans written in the past. However I believe that Action Planning should provoke innovative projects between partners that would otherwise be unlikely to get together. <i>Author's Note: Implies that D is based on change in new action plan style.</i>
4U	D	
5U	A/D	LBAPs are a means to an end, and sometimes that includes things which would have happened, but also possibly focus attention and resources on habitats (mainly) which can tend to be forgotten. <i>Author's Note: Response has been counted half A, half D. (Continued ...)</i>

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
6Ue	D	
12R	A	
13R	O	- sometimes
7Ue	D	(there are many things that we used to do under the heading 'Nature Conservation', mainly site specific management. The LBAP process has diversified the actions being carried out. <i>Author's Note: 'we' - does this refer to LA only, or the partnership? Statement 3. iii) c) itself refers to the latter.</i>
8U	SA	
14R	O	
9Ue	A	
10U	A	
11U	D	
12Ue	D	but it is often based on chance meetings/conversations or an opportunity and a single minded volunteer.
15R	D	This is <b>sometimes the case</b> , but by no means always.
16R	A	
17R	O	
13U	O	– <b>sometimes</b> but not always
18R	O	<b>Unaware any success</b> in new action implementation driven by my post or the biodiversity since I've been in the post.
19Re	A	although having partnership support makes things more likely to happen.
20R	SD	
14U	A	To date <b>I don't think that the LBAP partnership here has been responsible for initiating a great deal of conservation action directly.</b>
21R	SA	
15U	A	
22R	D	
16U	A	
17U	A	
23Re	A	
18U	A	
19U	D	But, the only actions implemented were those which would have been carried out anyway. <i>Author's Note: Seems close to agreement in effect</i>
24R e	O	Other – <b>in some cases</b>
20U	D	- we are having some existing actions in the x BAP, but there are others that are new and innovative. <i>(Continued ...)</i>

## Appendix vi: Results in Detail (with initial analysis): Officers' Open-ended Questions

Note: **Bold** highlighting of response comments, and the columns 'Author's Notes' and 'Themes' have been added by the present author as part of the analysis process.

## Question:-

i) You have £2 million for local Biodiversity work - what would be your first priorities for spending it?

Comment	Author's Notes	Themes
<b>1R</b> Set up a <b>habitat-linking</b> pilot project, to fund <b>wildlife corridors</b> in 10/20/30 m strips along existing footpaths, bridleways and cycleways, to <b>show how biodiversity, recreation, health, landowners</b> (who would be paid above what they would earn from current grants and production) and <b>climate change adaptation can all benefit.</b>	Need for on-the-ground habitat-linking management action, beneficially linking to other sectors.	Habitat management - links, climate change
<b>2R</b> 1. Ensure favorable condition of x owned land through development of grazing projects particularly facilitate return of Welsh Mountain Ponies	Need for management of authority-owned land.	Habitat management - LA land.
2. Facilitate diversification of farm-businesses to increase quality and marketing potential of the biodiversity resource	Need to help agriculture to diversify to benefit both biodiversity and farmers.	Agricultural diversification - habitat management.
3. "Stock pile" biodiversity resource through <b>integrated landscape scale projects</b> to allow ecosystems to better cope with inevitable <b>climate change</b>	Need for landscape Management for climate change adaptation.	Landscape management for climate change.
<b>3Re no response</b>		
<b>1U</b> Make the Biodiversity Project Assistant who is running our ( <i>grant scheme for biodiversity action</i> ) full-time and permanent.	Need to boost staffing resource.	Staff - boost
Would put more money into our ( <i>grant scheme for biodiversity action</i> ) scheme to continue it beyond June 2008.	Need to support action with biodiversity action scheme - grants to fund projects	Funding - projects/ action  (Continued ...)

Comment	Author's Notes	Themes
Focus on designating a robust wildlife site network for $x$ (i.e. designation of SINC and LNRs) with <b>appropriate resources and staffing</b> to manage them.	Need to resource designation and management staffing for wildlife site network.	Site designation - resources - staff habitat management, (including SINC, LNRs)
<b>2U</b> First pay specialists (preferably local) to <b>survey</b> the entire area for their particular taxa to get proper baseline data.	Need for baseline survey, with appropriate staffing.	Baseline Survey (and survey staff).
Secondly secure appropriate management of important habitats through agreements with landowners.	Need for management of priority sites, by agreements.	Habitat management - agreements
<b>3U</b> Major raising awareness of the importance of local biodiversity – all wildlife – with events on a different theme for every week of the year. Targeting everyone. Employ really famous celebrities to promote $x$ 's local biodiversity. Commission a whole BBC series on native wildlife of Wales, but with a twist, relating it to LBAP work and partner organisations ONLY.	Need for significantly better awareness, specifically focused on the LBAP and LBAP partners.	Awareness
Provide the whole budget for highways and grounds maintenance, so control contract specifications and introduce new sympathetic management for biodiversity, with large highway signs to indicate these “conservation” or “nature reserve” areas.	Need for direct control of highways and grounds maintenance for management purposes.	Habitat management - highways and grounds maintenance
<b>Purchase large swathes of land</b> with development potential to protect corridors, particularly for marsh fringing (therefore benefiting many other marshy grassland species), woodland corridors, hedgerows and riverside habitats.	Need to maintain existing links which might be lost to development otherwise.	Habitat management - links
<b>Maybe even buy up all the local SINC/ Wildlife Sites</b> in the county and actually introduce proper habitat management and carry out restoration works.	Need to safeguard and restore important sites.	Land purchase for habitat management - SINC
Commission an ecological survey of whole of the ( $x$ area) to cover updating habitat survey and species. Provide	Need for survey and recording of data for whole LA area, to inform biodiversity process..	Survey - whole LA

detailed records of all the (x area) and map them for future use.		(Continued ...)
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>4R</b> More staff	Staffing shortfall	Staff - more
Grant aid for conservation projects	General project funding needs.	Projects.
<b>Flagship partnership project</b> to carry out an effective conservation project and raise awareness of importance of x's biodiversity	Need for 'flagship' demonstration project.	Partnership flagship project for awareness.
Training for Council staff	Need for Council training	Training - LA staff
<b>5R</b> -Allocate funds for staff wages and increase staffing levels to employ an assistant biodiversity officer and make the Ecologists post full time.	Staffing shortfall for biodiversity and for ecology function. Pay.	Staff - more - assistant biodiversity officer, full time ecologist, wages
-Allocate funds for strategic habitat projects – such as managing county wildlife sites and linking in with LBAP partner projects/pieces of land.	Need for strategic, funded approach to habitat management, targeted for effectiveness.	Habitat management - strategic projects incl. SINC's, linking with partner projects/ land
-Allocate funds for smaller capital projects and maintenance projects on private landowners land (such as farms and small holdings etc.)	Need to implement smaller-scale habitat work.	Habitat management - small scale
- Allocate funds for community and school based biodiversity projects, including awareness raising projects.	Community and education coverage needs.	Funding - community/schools awareness
<b>6R</b> If this was on top of what we have and do already, then I think funding some sort of biodiversity education officer / an officer to focus more on the awareness raising would be one of my priorities. This would then mean that time and effort and money could be put more effectively into both aspects of the job, which are both important – the conservation work / LBAP actions and also the awareness and education work.	Need for more education and awareness coverage - staffing.	Staff funding - education, awareness (free up time for conservation work)

		<i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>7R</b> (NB Pilot was slightly differently worded: 'You have £2 million for local Biodiversity work - how would you spend it?') I would employ another two Biodiversity Officers to implement the actions in the plans, update the plans, and coordinate and develop the partnership.	Need for more staff for LBAP implementation and partnership administration.	Staff - more, action implementation, partnership
The rest of the money would be put in a pot to fund partnership projects.	Need for partnership project funding.	Partnership projects
<b>8Re</b> I would throw a dice to decide between two priorities: On the ground project to provide revenue funding to manage and safeguard non-statutory wildlife sites,	Need for management of otherwise unprotected priority sites.	Habitat management - SINC's
OR Develop some sort of project that would rope in and change hearts and minds in another LA departments (e.g. roadside verge survey and policy, SUDS policy and implementation, schedule of all Council land and corresponding survey)	Need for better knowledge and attitudes within Council.	LA attitudes, understanding
<b>9R</b> Restoration/re-establishment of BAP Priority habitats in the LBAP area, including ensuring long-term management, in order to link up important habitats.	Need for habitat restoration and linking, managed long-term.	Habitat management - linking
<b>10Re</b> Implementing our LBAP 2007 – 20013 by using it to develop and as a match for European Money for a further implementation Project. Possibly as part of a bid to develop a multi-authority strategic framework project for LBAP implementation	Need for LBAP implementation.  Aware of possibility of match-funding potential.  Open to partnership with other authorities to implement LBAPs	LBAP implementation, match funding,  cross-LBAP joint working
<b>11R</b> - Secure a dedicated planning ecologist post.	Staffing shortfall	Staff - more, ecologist
- Set up a Landscape Scale Biodiversity project with a	Need for landscape-scale biodiversity work, staffed.	Landscape management project, with staff

dedicated officer (x valley to x or x World Heritage Site)		(Continued ...)
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
- Employ an officer / commission a consultant to write Management plans for all Council owned 'Countryside' sites.	Need for management planning for relevant sites in council ownership.	Staff - more for management plans for LA sites
<b>4U</b> Carrying out ecological surveys as required and as actioned in the LBAP;	Survey needs - incl. listed LBAP action survey.	Survey - incl. LBAP action listed
preparation and implementation of management plans following ecological assessments and surveys; establishing and encouraging good practice through appropriate, positive management of sites.	Need for management planning and action, based on survey. Setting good management example for others.	Habitat Management and planning, by example.
<b>5U</b> Yippeee. I'd employ myself as a full time Biodiversity Officer and hire a Biodiversity Assistant.	Need for staffing resources.	Staff - f.t. biodiversity officer and assistant
We would work together to revamp the LBAP and find a way to reinvigorate the LBAP partnership.	Need to renew/ boost LBAP processes.	Revamp LBAP and partnership
With that amount of money we could concentrate on funding long term, and large scale projects, something that's not really possible at the moment.	Lack of/ need for long-term, large-scale projects.	Big project funding for long term.
<b>6Ue</b> Land purchase to ensure habitat protection	Need for habitat management.	Habitat management - land purchase
<b>12R</b> Employ a specialist officer to develop and manage long-term projects to protect a group of habitats i.e. an officer for each habitat (wetland, woodland, marine & built-up areas).	Staffing and resources needed for long-term habitat projects.	Staff - more, for habitat management
<b>13R</b> DK not been here long enough to have prioritized work that needs to be done	(DK = don't know)	-
<b>7Ue</b> It would be split between buying land and providing resources to fund management.	Need for control of habitat management at specific sites.	Habitat management - incl. land purchase
<b>8U</b> 1. Phase 1 survey of x (Council) to provide up - to - date information	Survey needs for update and to inform LDP.	Survey - phase 1, for LDP

on habitats within the county borough and to inform the new LDP.		(Continued ...)
Comment	Author's notes	Themes
2. Establish a ranger service for $x$ (LA) - help with management of existing reserves, LNRs and local community projects, awareness raising, community liaison.	Staffing needs for habitat management on reserves, community work and awareness.	Staff - more, covering habitat management (incl. LNRs), community projects, awareness
3. Employ a SINC project officer for $x$ (LA) - 3 year project	Need for staffing for SINC coverage.	Staff - temp SINC officer (- habitat management)
4. Rhos pasture restoration - landscape scale project	Need for landscape-scale habitat restoration	Habitat management - landscape- scale
5. Wider landscape -scale projects linking habitats including land purchase if necessary (which our new ranger service will help us to manage!)	Need for habitat linking and management, landscape-scale. Need in some cases to buy land to achieve.	Landscape-scale projects - incl. land purchase if needed
6. Designation of more LNRs in the north of the county	Need for LNR designation.	More LNR designation
I think I may have spent it. Generally people are the most valuable thing. That is what limits us most.	Need for staff funding	Staff funding
..... what I meant was that at this stage funding people (i.e. staff) is more valuable than providing project grant aid as there are few people on the ground to spend the money. Funding salaries is difficult.	Clarification note on comment above	
<b>14R</b> A bigger team of staff working on LBAP within the Authority and more of a budget for projects. Particular areas of focus would be on education and schools work ( a big demand from teachers), coordinating, recruiting and training volunteers.	Need for staffing and project funding.  Fulfill education demands. Need for training.	Staff - more Project funding Education Organise volunteers, incl. training
What I would really like to do, but we are not allowed to within the Authority, is purchase land. At the end of the day the only places where we have 'real' influence and control is on our own sites – although that hasn't	Need for habitat management through land purchase.	Habitat management - land purchase.

necessarily been a good thing in the past!!		(Continued ...)
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<p><b>9Ue</b> I would invest to £2 mill and use the interest to employ:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Full time biodiversity officer/ Team</li> <li>- Full time fund raiser</li> <li>- Ranger team for conservation works for all LBAP partners to</li> <li>- Education/ awareness raising team</li> <li>- Develop income generating projects (so not to rely on funding)</li> </ul>	<p>Need for staffing teams to cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biodiversity</li> <li>- Fund raising</li> <li>- Education / Awareness</li> </ul> <p>Income generation.</p>	<p>Staff - more specialists: full time biodiversity officer/ team, full time fund raiser, education/ awareness team. Develop income generating projects</p>
<p><b>10U</b> - Use part of it to secure staff.</p> <p>- The rest working with landowners on biodiversity enhancement on agricultural land.</p>	<p>Need for staffing coverage.</p> <p>Need for relevant agricultural land management.</p>	<p>Secure staff</p> <p>Habitat management - on agricultural land, with landowners</p>
<p><b>11U</b> More staff, as staff time is often a larger limiting factor than money.</p>	<p>Staffing shortfall</p>	<p>Staff - more</p>
<p>I would also earmark a large proportion of the funds to be invested to provide LONG TERM funding of projects/habitats to prevent them failing after their initial grant money runs out.</p>	<p>Need for stability in form of long-term funding for projects, including habitat management</p>	<p>Long-term funding for projects/ habitats (prevent failures from short term funding)</p>
<p><b>12Ue</b> Enhance Pay scale of Biodiversity Officers/Ecologists and put on full time footing and maybe even employ a Biodiversity Community Officer, Business Officer and Wider Countryside Officer etc</p>	<p>Staffing shortfall. Pay</p> <p>Suggested specialist staff coverage for community, business and wider countryside.</p>	<p>Staff - higher pay, on full time; more - community, business wider c'side etc.</p>
<p>Provide a range of small grants with minimum bureaucracy to enable any project benefiting biodiversity e.g. from habitat enhancement to education. Those schemes that have no other funding opportunities elsewhere would be prioritised e.g. ponds and hedgerows.</p>	<p>Need for small-scale project coverage, filling funding gaps, with low application and admin. demands.</p>	<p>Projects - small grants covering funding gaps, with simple processes; incl. habitat management, education</p>
<p><b>15R</b> I would consider:</p>	<p>Need to safeguard management of priority areas.</p>	<p>Land management</p>

Purchasing land in high priority/strategic areas (e.g., areas identified in the county's ecological network map);		through priority land purchase  <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
Commissioning a Phase I habitat survey of the entire county;	Need for broad baseline survey	Survey - Phase 1, all county
<b>Investing the funds and using the annual revenue to:</b> a) support the Biodiversity Co-ordinator's post over the long-term;	Need for long-term funding stability to support: Biodiversity Co-ordinator's post	Staffing - LT funding for coordinator
b) establish a project fund that could be used to support high priority biodiversity actions.	Need for long-term funding stability to support: High priority actions.	Action - LT funding for priorities
<i>1) Open-ended Question 2i (related to the use of £2 million): With hindsight, I would now add a new activity, along the lines of "Strengthen the Biological Records Centre, which is in urgent need of staffing, equipment, software upgrades, and data migration/cleansing." If you are allowing new material to be added at this stage, I'd be grateful if this could be incorporated - but I appreciate that this may be methodologically unacceptable!</i>	<b>Comment as response to circulated initial analysis in Dec. 06. Only included here for reference (not counted in analysis for methodological reasons).</b>	
<b>16R</b> To fund more staff who are able to work with private land owners in the 'wider countryside'	Need for more staff funding for wider c'side work	Staffing - wider countryside work
and provide additional funds for land owners to that which can be accessed through ELS and HLS and EWGS. I.e. FWAG officers	Need for more funds/ support to land owners for management	Management - supporting land owners
<b>17R</b> (a) a full time LBAP coordinator;	Staffing shortfall for LBAP coordination	Staffing - FT LBAP coordinator
(b) finance for specific project officers to take forward elements of the BAP (it's <b>officer time that is always the main constraining factor</b> );	Staffing shortfall for LBAP implementation	Staffing - take forward LBAP
(c) finance for project work, including capital spending	Need for projects, incl. capital spending	Projects (incl. capital spending)
and (d) review of climate change adaptation in the County, and the relevance of the BAP in the light of likely future climate scenarios.	Need to plan for climate change	Planning - LBAP and climate change
<b>13U</b> no ans.		
<b>18R</b> Spend money on proactively targeting the agri-environment schemes	Need for targeting of agri-env. work	Management - targeting of agri.

(HLS and ELS). We cannot acquire land, e.g. for nature reserves, to achieve targets - particularly in the South East of England. We need to work with existing landowners.		env. work (pro-active)  (Continued ...)
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
Second priority would be urban greenspace - improving the wildlife value and helping people to use it.	Need for urban greenspace wildlife enhancement work (incl. for peoples' use)	Management - urban greenspace enhancement (incl. for peoples' use)
<b>19Re</b> Land acquisition and demonstrating good practice.	Need for land purchase and good practice management	Management - land purchase/ good practice
<b>20R</b> Assess current status of BAP priority habitats with recommendation for improvement	Need for priority habitat status assessment and improvement recommendations	Survey - Priority habitat assessment - incl. recommend improvements
<b>14U</b> I would reference the 'business and communications' plan which prioritises the work of my LBAP over the period 03/2006 -03/2009 and use some of the money, where appropriate, to facilitate actions listed in this plan under each of the DEFRA core services.	Need to fund existing LBAP priority actions	Funding for LBAP priority actions
Most urgently in my area I need to strengthen and broaden the partnership (core service 1) and I would use some money in projects and events aimed at building a strong, broad and sustainable partnership.	Need for partnership building - events and projects	Partnership building - projects and events
In an urban area like mine it would be very valuable to have a BAP 'out-reach' officer who could go into the community – schools, businesses etc. – and concentrate solely on building and maintaining the partnership.	Need for staff support for partnership in the community, building and maintaining of	Staffing - For Partnership support, in the community
The delivery of the BAP (core service 2) would be greatly facilitated by building and maintaining various action groups.	LBAP delivery - need for action groups - building and maintaining of	LBAP delivery - through support for action groups
With £2 million to play with I would also consider creating a post for someone to do just that. I would consider employing a full-time fund-raiser – perhaps in partnership	Need for future funding - fundraising post	Staffing - fundraising post

with other LBAPs in my region - to secure future funding for the LBAP.		
<b>21R</b> - Set up funding for a LBAP Officer for 5 years	Need for LT/ MT LBAP Officer funding	Staffing - LBAP Officer (Continued ...)
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
- Fund the Local Records Centre who are vital for monitoring and recording and telling us how we are doing	Need for LRC funding support (feedback monitoring and recording)	Support LRC
- Use it to <b>lever match funding</b> and buy some key sites	Buy key sites for management	Management - key site purchase
<b>15U</b> Some process work - we've had no funds for the whole co-ordination and process and this has been a struggle and could be done much better.	Need for process funding - e.g. coordination	Funding - coordination/ process
Following that probably look at our records centre.	Support/ funding for LRC	Support LRC
<b>22R</b> Work on the ground! <b>Match fund</b> with other funding sources to increase benefit. Employ a[n x L]BAP project officer as well as a partnership coordinator.	Need for staff - LBAP Project Officer and Partnership Coordinator	Staffing - LBAP Project Officer, Partnership Coordinator
Work on the ground - priorities: County wide hedgerow survey to establish baseline and target protection / restoration	Survey - hedgerows countrywide - baseline and action targeting	Survey - baseline of hedgerows countywide
Wood pasture site assessment for management / restoration to include solitary bees & wasps.	Wood pasture site assessment for management/ restoration	Assessment - Wood pasture sites for management/ restoration
Assist in the process of enabling sustainable management of heathlands through grazing - fencing, stock, publicity for consultation etc.  Could go on.....	Support sustainable management of heathlands	Management - support for sustainable heathland management
<b>16U</b> Creation of a new local nature reserve and environmental education centre, built to showcase sustainable buildings and act as a point of outreach for environmental education across x.	New LNR and environmental education centre	New LNR - management Env. Education Centre - education and awareness
Create wildlife areas in parks and squares,	Need for urban wildlife areas	New urban Wildlife areas

running wildlife events for families, working with schools	Family events Education and awareness etc. - schools	Events - family Work with schools
and a cross-section of community groups.	Community group work	Work with community groups

**Question:**

ii) If you were Leader and Chief Exec of your Authority, how would you change things for its input to the LBAP process?

N.B. Slightly different wording in England, to reflect the fact that Lead bodies would not always be local/ national park authorities (unlike the Welsh situation): **If you were Leader and Chief Exec of your LBAP's lead body (normally Council or Wildlife Trust), how would you change things for its input to the LBAP process?**

Comment	Author's notes	Themes
<b>1R</b> Make a Biodiversity Team with: 1. Coordinator for Partnership, 2. Ecologist for Council (planning and Council projects), 3. Coordinator for Council LBAP actions. 4. Education and awareness Officer. 5. Technical Support/ Admin. assistant.	Staffing shortfall in various areas: Coordination, Ecology function, Council action, Education/ awareness, Admin.	Staff - more; coordinator ecologist, education/ awareness, tech. support/ admin.
Team leader to have monthly meetings with Department Head and elected Portfolio Holder (for Environment), to help progress action through all departments.	Need for linking to power and decision-making, for integration.	LA status and integration
Define position of Biodiversity as high priority and secure Exec. backing. Provide a budget for the team, enabling proactive, new projects to be undertaken e.g. by enhancing and restoring biodiversity on Council smallholdings and other property to be showcase examples of good practice.	Need for local political support and standing. Need for proactive action on the ground, with financial support. Need to set example in good practice.	LA status for action, with funding - LA land, habitat management, set examples in good practice
<b>2R</b> 1. Mainstream biodiversity into other LA functions	Need to raise profile across LA remit areas.	LA integration
2. More staff and resources	Staffing and other resource shortfalls.	Staff - more, and more resources
<b>3Re</b> Protect and increase the budget,	Need to safeguard and boost funding base.	Budget - protect and raise
re-appoint the External Funding Manager,	Need for support to secure external funding.	Staff - re-appoint External Funding Manager
set staff objectives to get $x$ LA-owned	LA land management	LA land

land into good condition and backed up with funds and expertise; spin-off other services provided around well managed x LA -owned land.	shortfalls, Need to cover planning, funding and specialised staff input. (wider benefits from good management)	management - incl. funding and expertise; connections  (Continued ...)
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>1U</b> More staff resources to deliver biodiversity, i.e. full-time ecologist, biodiversity project assistant, environmental education officer and ranger service to manage wildlife sites.	Lack of staff resource: needs in key areas of ecological function, projects, education and ranger work.	Staff more - ecologist, biodiversity project assistant, environmental education officer, and ranger service for wildlife site management
Ensure that biodiversity is full integrated into all key service areas of the Authority.	Lack of cross-authority integration.	LA integration
<b>2U</b> Ensure the authority as a whole is aware of the LBAP, their part in it and how it can help them to fulfill their objectives. Also strengthen links between departments e.g. LBAP coordinators and Parks and Highways (inappropriate (for biodiversity) road verge cutting a common issue in local authorities). The most important linkage, however, is obviously with Development Control, giving them the knowledge and skills to balance development with conservation.	Need for cross-authority awareness of LBAP, and relevant between-service links.  Planning service deemed to be the most important link area for conservation.	LA awareness of LBAP, linkage/ integration, incl. development control
<b>3U</b> Ensure that the Council Approved LBAP was actually promoted internally in all departments and that staff are required to attend workshops on how they can do their bit to implement the plan.	Lack of internal promotion and awareness; lack of implementation of LBAP across departments.	LA internal promotion of LBAP, incl. training for implementation
Commission/employ a Biodiversity Officer for a year to run these training days	Need for staff resource to run staff training workshops (addressing last issue noted above).	Staff - new temp. training officer
and expand the Ecology/Biodiversity team to 4 people to ensure adequate resources to provide advice to all departments as well as ecological responses to planning applications, property consultations, nesting bird complaints, etc. etc.	Lack of staff resource to fully cover ecological advice.	Staff - more, to make team of 4, for cross-authority advice coverage
Or locate a Biodiversity Officer in each	As above - alternative	..... or

Directorate to deal with specific issues and policies relating to different service requirements, other than planning and countryside, e.g. Education, Property, Housing, Social Services, Grounds Maintenance.	suggestion to cover same needs.	biodiversity officer in each directorate, specialising in as appropriate <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>4R</b> Not just rely on the conservation section to implement BAP work - raise awareness that all council staff have responsibilities towards biodiversity action.	Lack of awareness of biodiversity responsibilities outside conservation section - overcome compartmentalised working.	LA awareness for BAP implementation
Better training for Members	Need for knowledge amongst elected members.	LA members' training
<b>5R</b> - ensure continuity of funding for both staff and capital projects	Need for long-term, rather than short-term funding for staff and projects.	Funding continuity for staff and capital projects
ensure that the LBAP is more highly promoted throughout all sections of the council, not just within the countryside section.	Need for cross-authority promotion (outside countryside section).	LA - cross-authority promotion
<b>6R</b> I would definitely put it higher up the agenda than it is now – I think we are a bit forgotten here and certainly not viewed as an essential part of the council and x as a whole.	Low standing and low position in priorities.	Status - too low in LA and county as a whole
I would want to make the LBAP and what we do for biodiversity integral to the authority and essential to how it operates.	Lack of biodiversity integration in authority.	LA - LBAP make integral to, essential for operation of
I would firstly ensure that the Biodiversity Officer's role was permanent and at a suitable payment scale so that it is a valued position in the authority that is likely to attract a good calibre of staff that will stay put for a number of years. Ideally I would also like to see at least one other officer (really if the sky's the limit a whole team to deal with the different aspects of the role but I will try and stay realistic!)	Need for resources to encourage stability and quality staff.  Need for more staff coverage.	Staff - b. officer permanent, better pay to gain quality and stability in post  Staff - more; at least one new, better whole team
I would then incorporate the idea of biodiversity, the LBAP and our responsibility to it into the authority as a whole. Encouraging awareness raising for staff, incorporating it more fully into planning, highways, grounds maintenance	(detail on integration areas, cross-authority)	LA - comprehensive integration of biodiversity and LBAP into

and education – raising its profile and making it essential for everyone, but specifically these departments, to incorporate biodiversity and the LBAPs aims, actions and targets into what they do on a day to day basis.		running of; incl. awareness  <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
I would also try to set the authority up as a biodiversity champion and role model for other authorities and businesses, by ensuring that our policies and actions on things like all grounds maintenance and road verges were perfect, that some budget was specifically targeted to fulfilling LBAP actions in all the different areas possible.	Desirability of being an example practitioner (cross-authority, funded).	LA - champion and role-model; policies, actions, funding for authority-relevant LBAP actions
I would also try and encourage local businesses in the area to become biodiversity champions, possibly setting up a scheme to reward them.	Need to encourage involvement by businesses e.g. with reward scheme	Businesses - encourage championing by e.g. rewards scheme
<b>7R</b> There would be a Biodiversity Section within the LA, with biodiversity representation at a section management level.	<b>Need for better status and linking to decision making. More staff</b>	<b>LA - new b. section, raise management representation</b>
<b>8Re</b> Hack the Highways Division, so instead of retention of staff being dependent on half-baked Assembly schemes, they would be re-deployed into proactive (e.g. biodiversity project officers) and reactive (e.g. wildlife enforcement, planning & hedgerow compliance officers) conservation issues.	Need to boost both proactive and reactive biodiversity-related work, rediverting Highways funding specifically.	LA internal resource diversion for e.g. biodiversity project officers, wildlife enforcement, planning & hedgerow compliance officers
<b>9R</b> I feel the Authority already has good input into the LBAP process. Perhaps this could be improved by employing an environmental education officer in the Authority to work with LBAP officers	Praise - 'Good input'.  Education named as only area where improvements could be made.	Praise  Staff - new education officer
<b>10Re</b> De-marginalize it ?? Not sure how	Biodiversity is marginalised (NB contrasts with above statement on same authority.)	Status - raise
<b>11R</b> Seek that robust performance indicators be put in place to ensure implementation of the LBAP across departments.	P.I. s seen as way of remedying cross-authority LBAP implementation shortfalls.	LA implementation driven by P.I.s

Ensure that there are enough dedicated officers to make achieving goals realistic.	Staffing shortfall	Staff - more, to achieve goals
<b>4U</b> I would commit funding resources – both revenue and capital in order that the LBAP can be properly implemented and that sufficient staff resources were in place in order to do so.	Need for funding for implementation and need to address staffing shortfall.	Funding for LBAP implementation, incl. more staff. (Continued ...)
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>5U</b> Try to integrate the LBAP with the Community Strategy, essential if it is to move forward with a community lead approach.	Need for LBAP community element progress through integration with Community Strategy.	Community Strategy - integration of LBAP with, for community lead approach
<b>6Ue</b> More internal awareness raising about the LBAP and the importance of complying with wildlife legislation and statutory duties.	Need for better awareness of LBAP within authority, and statutory compliance.	LA awareness of LBAP, and compliance in legal and statutory duty areas
<b>12R</b> Ensure that all departments are fully aware of their responsibility towards protecting biodiversity.	Need for better awareness of responsibilities within authority.	LA - awareness to protect b.
<b>13R</b> Greater emphasis on biodiversity in the day-to-day work of the Authority (reinforcing stipulation in NERC Act to pay due regard to biodiversity-perhaps by making this a corporate objective?).	Need for higher profile, suggested corporate objective to help comply with legislation.	LA - raise emphasis in work of, incl. NERC compliance
Awareness raising.	Need for better awareness.	LA awareness
Incorporate LBAP actions and targets into management of LA land/sites wherever possible.	Need for integration of LA land management with LBAP.	LA integration of LBAP for sites owned by
In relation to planning/development issues: employment of a planning ecologist (should be mandatory for every LA!),	Need for staffing resources for planning development cases.	Staff - new ecologist
YES DEFINITELY, BUT ALSO FOR LBAP OFFICERS NOT TO SPEND A LOT OF THEIR TIME DEALING WITH PLANNING APPLICATION QUERIES IF THEY ARE NOT THE PLANNING ECOLOGIST. WE HAVE NO ECOLOGIST IN POST AND I AM DELIBERATELY NOT BASED WITHIN THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT BUT I STILL GET ASKED TO DEAL WITH APPLICATIONS THAT IDEALLY REQUIRE A SITE VISIT TO ENABLE ACCURATE COMMENT. THIS IS NOT SOMETHING I HAVE (OR SHOULD BE EXPECTED TO HAVE) THE TIME FOR, NEITHER DO I HAVE THE BUDGET TO HIRE A CONSULTANT TO REPORT ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL!	Additional note to above in response to interpretation. i.e. employment of ecologist needed also to free biodiversity officer time	
a policy to recognise and give due	Need for fair planning	Protection - of

consideration to 'non-designated' LBAP habitats in the planning process	coverage of habitats in LBAP which are otherwise not protected	LBAP listed 'non-designated' habitats in planning
7Ue I would recognise the value of x's countryside section and amend salaries upwards,	Need to boost salaries to reflect worth of work.	Staff - raise pay <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
sign up to the ALGE Vision document	Formally adopt best practice biodiversity/ ecological guidelines for LAs (Association of Local Government Ecologists).	LA best practice, adoption of
and properly resource the service.	Need for more resources.	Resources - more for biodiversity service
8U A genuine corporate commitment to biodiversity conservation.	Lack of high-level status for biodiversity conservation.	LA - corporate commitment to b. conservation
A recognition of the importance of biodiversity not just in a fluffy way, but as an important element in the regeneration of x (LA area) and its contribution to the health and social well being of the community and in the outside perception of the x LA area.	Need for recognition of status for positive links to various key theme areas.	LA recognition of b. importance incl. for wider benefits e.g. for health, community;
I would ensure that its true value was reflected in decisions that are made when conflicts of interest arise.	Need to balance fairly with other interest areas.	Fair value weighting where conflicts of interest
14R The main thing the Authority could do would be to make sure that all it's own activities were carried out with due regard to Biodiversity and incorporating enhancement features where possible, e.g. proactive features for birds and bats on our buildings, wildlife friendly management of our woodlands and grounds.	Need to demonstrate good practice in authority's functions. Integration	LA good practice, due regard, integration, enhancement, land management
Reversing the 'no-purchase' policy of the Authority would allow us to really influence more land management.	Need to be able to buy land to be able to have real land management effects.	LA Land management - scrap no-purchase policy
9Ue Include sustainable and meaningful biodiversity protection, conservation and consideration into following plans and	Need for thorough integration with some key policies and processes.	High-level plan/ policy integration for b. with:

<p>policies, supported by appropriate and ongoing funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community Plan</li> <li>- Planning &amp; Building policy (and ensuring mitigation and enforcement where carried out)</li> <li>- Sustainable Development Policies</li> <li>- Corporate Priorities</li> </ul>		<p>Community Plan, planning, SD, corporate priorities</p> <p><i>(Continued ...)</i></p>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>10U</b> - Roll out training to all departments on biodiversity for all LA staff	Need for staff training at all levels and for all services.	LA - training all departments and staff
•Secure funding to ensure ecological team is properly resourced	Lack of funding for ecological team.	Funding - ecological team, proper resourcing of
•Ensure the council promotes biodiversity as part of the sustainable development agenda	Need for integration with authority's SD agenda.	LA - promote b. as part of SD
- Act as a champion for biodiversity, ensure that its incorporated into council policy	Need to set example and for policy coverage.	LA - act as b. champion, incorporate in policy
<b>11U</b> Create a post of Biodiversity Officer in each department that has the potential to affect biodiversity e.g. Highways, Parks Dev[elopment] Control. Said officer would be responsible for ensuring the councils NERC duty is met and that enhancements for biodiversity are made whenever possible.	Need for more staffing resource to comply with NERC legislation, and for enhancements	Staff - more; new officer for each relevant department, conform to NERC, enhance biodiversity.
<b>12Ue</b> Enhance Pay scale of Biodiversity Officers/Ecologists and put on full time footing.	Boost existing staff status and time resource.	Staff - raise pay, give full time status
Make it a requirement that the LBAP is a truly corporate document/process so that all projects take such issues into account at the earliest possible stage rather than as an "add on".	Need for early consideration of biodiversity issues (result of solid corporate backing).	LA status - make LBAP document and process truly corporate
<b>15R</b> I would appoint a dedicated biodiversity officer within the planning team;	Need for integration - biodiversity officer in planning	Integration - biodiversity officer in planning team
(Dec. 06): <i>'The point I was trying to make here was not so much about staffing per se as about the need to make biodiversity a cross-cutting issue that is more fully integrated into all aspects of the County Council's work.'</i>	Clarification note on the above, sent in response to initial analysis, which named this as a staff issue.	

I would accord high priority to the implementation of the biodiversity action plan for the County Council's estate, and ask officers for regular progress reports;	Lack of priority for CC estate BAP actions.	Implementation - priority for CC estate actions
I would take steps to ensure that the LBAP co-ordinator's position had long-term financial security.	Lack of long-term financial security for LBAP coordinator	Staff - Coordinator funding - LT security ( <i>Cont'd ...</i> )
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>16R</b> County Council – Ensure that the countryside service has more of a biodiversity focus rather than having to concentrate on rights of way.	Lack of focus on biodiversity compared to RoW.	Status - relative to RoW
<b>17R</b> Host a full-time LBAP Officer.	Lack of staff coverage for LBAP.	Staff - need for FT Officer
<b>13U</b> no response		
<b>18R</b> I don't think the wildlife trust should be the lead partner. Mainly because it allows the county councils to abnegate responsibility. So, I guess I would stand down and insist that the county councils pick it up.	WT lead effectively means councils washes hands of responsibility . Need for councils to take over.	Change lead partner from WT to the relevant county councils.
<b>19Re</b> I wish! For starters I would engage in debate with the BAP Steering Group to better understand their roles and functions.	Need for clarity on BAP Steering Group roles and functions.	Clarification - BAP Steering Group roles and functions.
<b>20R</b> Allow staff to dedicate at least 10% of the working time to AP implementation	Lack of time for crosscutting AP implementation.	Allow time for crosscutting AP implementation.
<b>14U</b> Actually I would be more concerned with <b>taking the current LBAP process and bringing into the centre of more wide-ranging policy areas.</b> For example as Chief Executive of a council I would make it clear that UDPs, Local Area Agreements etc. <b>have an obligation</b> to consult with LBAP partnerships and ensure that their outputs are not only consistent with the LBAP but, where possible, actually contribute to its targets.	Need for integration of LBAP with other relevant strategies and processes.	LBAP - crosscutting integration with policy.
The Chief Executive of a Trust doesn't wield the same sort of power, but could	Need for WT to raise LBAP status within WT, and	LBAP status - in WT (and more

signal the importance of the LBAP to the local community and policy makers by <b>positioning it at the forefront of their conservation mission</b> and <b>using it more as the conduit through which they aim to achieve many of their targets and objectives.</b>	thereby encouraging other to do the same.	widely indirectly)  <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>21R</b> Make sure regular training of biodiversity issues for Local Authority Planners	Need for biodiversity training for LA Planners	Training - LA Planners
Put Biodiversity in key partners job descriptions otherwise they are never going to spend enough time working on biodiversity. We ensure buy-in from the whole organization then.	Need to ensure commitment in relevant crosscutting areas, to enable integration. (‘Key partners = those within the ‘whole organisation’)	Integration - Add to job descriptions to ensure crosscutting commitment
<b>15U</b> Don't know - neither have any spare funds in x	Doubt about financial limitations	Don't know (lack of spare funds)
<b>22R</b> Link all project work through the LBAP process to strengthen partnership,	Need to integrate relevant project with LBAP to strengthen partnership	Integration - to strengthen partnership
increase profile of x [area L]BAP	Need to raise status.	Status - strengthen
and promote knowledge sharing, best practice etc. e.g. wildlife sites, large area projects	Need for better knowledge and information sharing	Knowledge and information sharing
<b>16U</b> I would launch the LBAP,	Need to launch LBAP	Launch LBAP
help in the promotion of the BAP and, in particular, calling on all council departments to contribute and businesses across the city to do their bit.	Need for promotion, particularly aimed at council departments and businesses	LBAP Promotion - within council and to businesses
<b>17U</b> x [Council] does quite well really, the intention is there,	Council praised	Praise for council
but some more money to spend would not hurt.	Would welcome more funding	Funding- would welcome more
<b>23Re</b> I would employ an LBAP officer to promote BAP work within the district	Need for LBAP officer coverage	Staff - LBAP Officer
and provide a biodiversity budget.	Need for biodiversity budget.	Funding -

		biodiversity budget.
<b>18U</b> Usual - adequate staff resources	Need for adequate staffing	Staff - adequate s. resources
and budget,	Need for adequate budget	<b>Funding</b> - adequate budget
stronger planning enforcement/links,	Need to strengthen planning enforcement / better links	Integration - Strengthen Planning enforcement <i>Cont</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
commitment in Community Strategy,	Need CS commitment	Community Strategy commitment
business links etc.	Need to build business links	Business links
<b>19U</b> The Biodiversity Action Plan process would not be a priority until there was adequate <b>funding</b> for:	Need for adequate funding to make LBAP priority	Status - and effectiveness by funding (named themes)
- Habitat and species survey work.	Need for survey funding	Funding - survey
- Site management of council sites.	Need for council site management funding	Funding - council site management
- Defending sites against unjustified development.	Need for site defence funding (from development)	Funding - site defence from development
Only with these basics in place could a LBAP process be useful.	(refers to above points) N.B. Respondent's comments counted as four points: - status (1) and funding (3)	
<b>24Re</b> - Stimulate more 'buy in' from some departments who generally support the concept but don't incorporate the principles within their service plans.	Need to make cross-departmental support more effective	Integration - across departments in service plans
- Ensure that activities on the ground have actually translated the biodiversity principles and concepts that are in a loose sense supported. Show and lead by example.	Need to translate loosely supported theory to on the ground working practice, leading by example	Get results - translate theory into practice, setting example
- Celebrate our involvement.		Publicity - celebrate involvement
<b>20U</b> Ensure <b>compliance with the targets and outputs</b> of the BAP and process, through regular structured <b>reviews</b> of progress, commissioning of 5	Need for effective monitoring and evaluation	Monitoring and evaluation - comprehensive

yearly <b>audits</b> and <b>evaluations</b> of BAP and outputs,		
and integrate BAP with existing maintenance contracts and policies on development or regeneration	Need for integration - maintenance, and development/ regeneration policies	Integration - with maintenance contracts, dvpt/ regen. policies
<b>25Re</b> Give stronger corporate backing to the initiative including more resourcing.	Need for more corporate backing, incl. resources. <i>(Continued ...)</i>	Status - general corporate, incl. more resourcing
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>26R</b> Ensure that Biodiversity/ Environment was a <b>key theme of the Corporate Plan</b> which in turn would make it more of a <b>priority for Members and ensure its inclusion in other plans and strategies</b> . Too much emphasis given on Economic Development throughout the Council and this is not balanced with environmental issues and hence considered (by me) to be unsustainable. The LBAP process would then be the framework through which it would meet biodiversity objectives and targets. By having <b>Performance Indicators</b> (or other measures) in place this would also make this work more of a priority to ensure that <b>adequate resources and funding</b> is in place to achieve them. (could probably waffle on and sound off loads here, but won't!)	Need to boost LBAP status by including in Corp. Plan, with PIs. Would lead to more resources and funding.	Status - boost corporately, leading to more resources/ funding
<b>27Re</b> (No answer)		
<b>21U</b> 1. allocate resources to recruit BAP project officer or equivalent	Need for project officer	Staff - Project Officer
2. Increase resources to nature conservation team as a whole, allocate budget for projects	Need for resources for conservation team, incl. project budget	Resources - for cons. team, incl. project budget.
3. Raise profile of biodiversity among public, politicians and senior management	Need to boost biodiversity profile.	Status - boost public, politicians senior management
<b>28Re</b> Elevate conservation of the natural environment to a <b>strategic priority</b> vital to other aspects such as economic development. At present	Boost status	Status - boost priority

environment is waste and roads as these are the two "environment" issues that government pay close attention to via corporate performance assessment.		
---	--	--

**Question:****iii) If you were First Minister of the Assembly, what would you do as top priority for LBAPs?**

N.B. In England, question read: If you were Environment Minister, what would you do as top priority for LBAPs? (not included on ALGE Pilot).

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>1R</b> Boost effectiveness by:- 1) Clarifying LBAP remit roles to ensure WAG departments/ bodies funded by WAG have top-level commitment to the process, including adequate resources to play their parts at local level (with reporting of progress on their actions).	Need for more effectiveness. Lack of clarity of remit roles and lack of top level commitment from WAG departments and WAG-funded bodies. Lack of resources for same for local-level input.	Effectiveness - clarify LBAP remit; full WAG commitment; resources - need adequate for WAG local input
2) Allocating significant funds to each LBAP Partnership to spend on key project work.	Lack of funding, need for more results on the ground in implementation. Give partnerships something solid to work with.	Funding - each LBAP, for key project work
<b>2R</b> 1. Ensure commitment to and integration with LBAP process by government bodies particularly CCW, FCW, EAW and WAG agriculture dept.	Lack of commitment and lack of integration of named bodies with LBAP process.	Government organisations - LBAP commitment and integration
<b>2Re</b> Ensure that every LPA has at least one full time, permanent ecologist and at least one full time, permanent LBAP officer.	Staffing shortfalls	Staff - min for LPAs = full time permanent: ecologist and LBAP officer
<b>1U</b> Ring fence funding for a permanent LBAP officer in each local authority to implement the LBAP and county ecologist to advise on planning and policy consultations. Both roles need to be clearly defined.	Need to set defined levels for staffing resources. Ring fencing implies defence against reallocation of monies to other priorities. Lack of clarity between the two roles at present.	Funding - ring fenced, for LBAP officer and ecologist in each LA (clearly defined roles)

Establish a major biodiversity grant scheme for Wales to help implement targets within the LBAP as in England and Scotland.	Need for significant funding to achieve LBAP targets; equality with England and Scotland.	Funding, major, for LBAP implementation
More central government funding for ecological surveying and monitoring and better resourcing of Local Record Centres in the long-term to improve knowledge base of biodiversity.	Need for survey and monitoring, and LRC funding.	Ecological survey and monitoring; LRC resourcing  <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
Set up a BARS Development Team in Wales who will be responsible for maintaining BARS in Wales, collecting info. from LBAP partnerships and providing training/support. I'm not convinced that relying on already overstretched LBAP officers and partnerships to maintain complex I.T systems is the most efficient use of resources.	Need for LBAP officers' servicing etc. of BARS - perceived as a significant resource issue, which should be covered by a Welsh BARS team.	BARS for Wales - new team to support (as LBAP officers overstretched)
Establish a network of 'ecological parks' in urban areas to promote community involvement and awareness of biodiversity.	Lack of wild spaces in urban areas; need to boost actual involvement of communities, as well as awareness in urban areas.	Urban Ecological Parks network for community involvement, b. awareness
More funding to CCW to set up a Local Nature Reserve grant scheme like in England (Wildspace grant). This to include staff posts.	Need for more funding for LNR support (including staff posts). Desire to be on par with England;	CCW funding for LNR management/ processes. Incl. staff posts.
Funding for local authorities to establish and manage green infrastructure within their areas including robust networks of designated wildlife sites.	Need for proactive designation, management and enhancement of sites. 'Robust networks' imply links.	Green site management by LAs, incl. SINC network
<b>2U</b> Insist that each authority has a permanent, core funded member of staff responsible for implementing the LBAP.	Need for LBAP implementation staff stability - permanent staff on solid funding base.	Staff - LBAP officer for implementation - insist on min. for each LA.
<b>3U</b> Lobby for a change in UK legislation, or introduce Welsh legislation to strengthen the protection afforded to species and habitats in Wales, especially in light of the Dormouse case which was lost on the doubt cast over the wording of the legislation (i.e.	Clear up legal loopholes for species protection.	Legislation - clear up loopholes

<p>“place of shelter”). Ensure that all individual species requirements are covered in the legislation – especially for European Protected Species, as all have different behaviour and therefore different habitat/shelter requirements, which are not explained well enough in legislation, and therefore provide loop holes.</p>		<p>(Continued ...)</p>
Comment	Author's notes	Themes
<p><b>4R</b> Increase staffing levels – ensure each LA had a Bio[diversity] Officer and a Planning Ecologist</p>	<p>Need for these two posts in each LA. (to cover LBAP coordination and Council planning remit matters)</p>	<p>Staff - min biodiversity officer and ecologist in each LA.</p>
<p><b>5R</b> - ensure continuity of funding for both staff and capital projects, the current sporadic nature of funding severely limits LBAP action.</p>	<p>Need for stable resource-base - ‘severely limits’ means major perceived barriers to LBAP action.</p>	<p>LBAP funding continuity for staff and projects</p>
<p>- give further promotion/backing to the NERC bill to ensure that it is carried out within local authorities.</p>	<p>Need for support from WAG to comply with new legislation.</p>	<p>Ensure NERC carried out in LAs</p>
<p><b>6R</b> Give the LBAP more legal weighting than it has now, make it essential for all areas to have one and to employ officers to facilitate it and essential that it is incorporated into day to day running of local authorities and businesses and support that through provision of funding.</p>	<p>Need for stronger status for LBAPs; Need for WAG funding support for integration of LBAPs to LA work and businesses.</p>	<p>LBAP legal status - raise; funding of LA and business integration</p>
<p>I would ensure that all aspects of the Assembly incorporated biodiversity and LBAP principles into their running and therefore setting a good example.</p>	<p>Need for Assembly to be seen to be embracing biodiversity in integrated manner.</p>	<p>Ensure WAG integration and exemplary practice.</p>
<p><b>7R</b> (Note: <i>Pilot wording was slightly different: If you were made First Minister of the Assembly, what would you do for LBAPs?</i>) I would put money aside to provide an annual budget for biodiversity projects.</p>	<p>Lack of WAG biodiversity project funding.</p>	<p>Funding - b. projects</p>
<p>I would commission and implement a Biodiversity Strategy for Wales, and ask all LAs to report back on progress every three years.</p>	<p>Need for a formal strategy, with LA feedback.</p>	<p>Welsh B. Strategy, with LA reporting on</p>

<b>8Re</b> Spend no more time on guidance etc. for BAPs and LBAPs, but critically review all guidance to other sectors (e.g. commercial, highways depts., trunk roads etc.) so it is 'biodiversity compliant' and that this filters down to LBAP level. I suppose I am suggesting a real implementation of S40 NERC.	Based on review of guidance in relevant sectors, rather than LBAP guidance, need for integration of biodiversity across WAG and LA remit areas;	Multi-sectoral integration of BAPs/ LBAPs; NERC compliance  <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>9R</b> Ensure each Authority across Wales has AT LEAST 1 biodiversity officer and 1 ecologist	Need for basic staffing resource base in LAs.	Staff - ensure min. of biodiversity officer and ecologist in each LA
<b>10Re</b> Raise their Profile	Need for higher status (very likely to imply more resources).	Status - raise
<b>11R</b> Encourage joint working; landscape scale projects and Action Planning on a larger scale e.g. all Wales or South/North Wales.	Need for cooperation to cover the 'bigger picture' within Wales	Landscape-scale projects and action planning, Wales-wide etc.
<b>4U</b> Make LBAP implementation statutory and provide the necessary resources to implement, monitor and review.	Present legal standing not solid enough; resources shortfall for named essential elements of the process.	Make LBAP implementation statutory; provide resources to implement, monitor, review
<b>5U</b> More funding for the LBAP process and for back-up services.	Current lack of funding for process and back-up.	Funding - for LBAP process and back-up services
Policy integration with emerging strategies.	Emerging strategies need to be integrated with LBAP.	Policy integration of LBAP with emerging strategies.
<b>6Ue</b> Ensure permanency of biodiversity staff. Ensure that there are multiple permanent staff to implement LBAPs as this is can be a huge undertaking.	Need for staffing stability. Shortfalls in staffing coverage for LBAP implementation.	Staff - permanency; numbers - multiple permanent staff for implementation
<b>12R</b> Ring fence money for each LA to employ a minimum of 1 ecologist, 1 biodiversity implementation officer, 1 biodiversity education officer & 1 biodiversity LBAP administrator.	Present staffing level insufficiency - a team needed for each LA, with specified WAG funding.	Staff - ring-fenced funding for: ecologist, b. implementation officer, b. education, LBAP admin.
<b>13R</b> DK – not been here long	(DK = Don't know)	Funding - need for

enough to have identified the biggest holes apart from the obvious need for more easily accessible funding.	Despite short time in post, funding needs clearly perceived.	more easily accessible
<b>7Ue</b> Remove the 50% matching rule	Need to be able to fund work by grants which do not require money to be match-funded; (would save time and effort and remove a barrier to some funding streams).	Funding facilitation (remove 50% matching rule) <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
and provide more ring-fenced money direct to local authorities to provide the service.	Need for secure, guaranteed WAG funding for LA biodiversity input.	More ring-fenced funding for LA biodiversity work
<b>8U</b> I would stop kidding myself that local biodiversity action will be delivered by volunteers and the 'community'. I don't expect them to deliver their own health service or their children's education so I won't expect them to deliver a healthy environment for Wales.	Perception that expectations of decisive voluntary and 'community' input are unrealistic. (See next row below.)	LBAP delivery - facing limitations of community volunteers for
Make a genuine commitment to biodiversity conservation in Wales (i.e. stump up some cash).	Resource issues - need for funding - present lack of which makes WAG's commitment to biodiversity conservation questionable	Funding - need genuine WAG commitment to
Resource CCW properly.	Lack of resources for CCW	Resources for CCW
Examine large scale land purchase as possibly the only way of meeting targets in some cases.	Need to meet targets by control of management of important sites for biodiversity.	Habitat management - large-scale land purchase
Further development of agri-environment schemes. The majority of most of our LBAP areas are farmland and the habitat we need to protect/conserves/ enhance, and opportunities for recreation, are mostly on private farmland.	Another tool for helping achieve the point noted in last box above: agri-environment schemes	Habitat management- more development of agri-environment schemes for conservation, enhancement and recreation links
<b>14R</b> More strategic influence and power. LBAPs are seen too much by other departments and those working at larger scales as 'tinkering with' and 'playing at' conservation. We need to be taken seriously, both internally and externally.	Self-explanatory; LBAPs are not taken seriously enough - need for Assembly input to address at various levels	Status - raise
<b>9Ue</b> Raise profile of and awareness of the importance of protecting the nature environment through LBAP	Need for higher status, awareness through LBAP	Profile and awareness - raise

<p>implementation to ensure sustainable development throughout Wales.</p> <p>Also to make recognition and raise awareness of the contribution the natural environment makes to support Wales' economy, health and well being.</p>	<p>implementation, as part of SD agenda.</p> <p>Need to acknowledge links to economy, health and well-being and publicise.</p> <p><i>(Continued ...)</i></p>	<p>through LBAP implementation, which is part of SD</p> <p>Cross-sector links to economy, health, well-being; acknowledgment and awareness of</p>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>10U</b> - Ensure local authorities are making their contribution to Section 74, sustainable development and the UK BAP	<p>Shortfalls in these areas.</p> <p>Note: Sect 74 - now backed by NERC; Biodiversity is a key theme of sustainable development (S.D.). LA contribution to UK BAP is through LBAPs</p>	Ensure LAs' input to: Sect 74 list, SD, and UK BAP
- Increase resources available for biodiversity action. In keeping with funding available for economic regeneration	Resources shortfall. Need to fund for action in line with (politically higher-priority) economic regeneration agenda.	More resources for b. action; funding on par with economic regeneration
<b>11U</b> Provide funding for at least two LBAP officers per council (and more in those such as <i>x</i> and <i>y</i> ( <i>counties</i> ) which cover large areas).	Staff shortfall in coverage issue once more. Realisation that larger areas need more resources	Staff - fund LBAP officers proportionate to area (min 2/ council)
Provide guidance notes for LBAP Structure/linking with BARS to provide a template for LBAP review	Need for guidance as to how to deal with BARS issues in LBAP review.	LBAP guidance for BARS and LBAP review
<b>12Ue</b> Ensure adequate resources.	Lack of current resources.	Ensure adequate resources.
Set targets for public organisations e.g. L.As to force them to take the issue seriously. This could be number of projects that take biodiversity into account from the outset plus number of enhancement schemes etc.	Need for set targets to raise biodiversity status in public organisations.	Set targets for public organisations to force to take b. seriously.
<b>15R</b> - Explore the feasibility/desirability of making the implementation of biodiversity action plans a statutory responsibility;	Need for legal underpinning for BAPs and LBAPs.	Consider legal underpinning for implementation

- Ensure that there is long-term funding available through DEFRA/ Natural England to support LBAP delivery across the country;	Need for long-term delivery funding for LBAPs	Funding - Long Term delivery
- Institute a national policy and programme to deliver an ecological network (as has been done in the Netherlands).	Need for national ecological network	Strategic Policy and Delivery - British/ English Ecological Network (Continued ...)
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>16R</b> More money from DEFRA and Natural England to fund LBAPs locally – to contribute towards LBAP coordination, record centres and capital work.	Need for more LBAP local funding - for coordination, record centres and capital work.	Funding - coordination, record centres and capital work.
<b>17R</b> Financially support full-time LBAP Coordinators.	Need for LBAP coordination support	Staff funding - coordinators
<b>13U - no response</b>		
<b>18R</b> - Link all kinds of environmental funding to the LBAP, e.g. agri environment schemes, so people have to consult and get the approval of the LBAP before they get funded.	Need to strengthen LBAP - consultation and approval from LBAP an essential funding approval step.	Status - integrate to environmental funding approval processes.
Ensure each Local authorities had an ecologist who was given independent powers to intervene.	Need for independent ecologists within LAs.	Staff - LA Ecologists (with independent powers)
Ask the ODPM to PROVE that HAP targets can be achieved with the massive housing expansion currently planned for the south east of England. Is there space for all these houses and HAP expansion as well? Do we actually have enough water?	Issue of impacts of SE England house building programme on Habitat AP targets - is mutual expansion possible?	Govt. Policy - can both housing and habitat expansion be compatible in SE England?
<b>19Re</b> More funding but targeted funding to achieve results on the ground.	Need for funding for results on the ground	Funding - implementation on the ground
<b>20R</b> Secure funding for all LBAP Coordinators	Need for LBAP coordinator funding	Staff - LBAP coordinators
and set aside a fund for BAP projects	Need for project funding	Funding - projects

<b>14U</b> I would look to formally recognize the role of LBAP coordinators/ managers and secure continuity of funding for the foreseeable future.	Need for formal recognition and long term funding for LBAP coordinators/ managers	Staff - status and funding for coordinators/ managers
I would look at ways of influencing planning policy so that LBAPs and the UK BAP were much more central in the entire planning process.	Need for central roles in planning for LBAPs and UK BAP	Status - make LBAP (and UK BAP) central to planning process <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>21R</b> Decide what habitats/ species are important in the next 25 yrs and provide some long term vision and funding.	Prioritisation for habitats and species, with L.T. vision and funding	Habitat and Species Prioritisation with L.T. vision and funding.
<b>15U</b> Again <b>not sure</b> - some resources for coordination and records centres would be good.	Not sure; notes resources for coordination and records centres	Resources - coordination and records centres
<b>22R</b> Resource their work so they can prioritise, not go where the funding is!	Need for resources for LBAPs, to allow priority-driven action	Resources - funding to allow LBAP priority-driven action
<b>16U</b> Make action to enhance biodiversity a statutory obligation for LPAs.	Need for statutory obligation for LPAs to enhance biodiversity	Legal - LPA obligation to enhance biodiversity

**Question:**

**iv) If the LBAP and process were abolished, what would be the biggest losses to your area for biodiversity conservation?**

N.B. i) Question was not included in ALGE Pilot.

ii) The second column **'What Comment Implies'** for this question results in positive implications (mainly) for LBAPs' effects (in contrast to questions i) to iii)).

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>1R</b> Networking and information sharing. Having a document which gives a decent overview of what's going on, why; also listing of what else - at least to some degree - needs to be done.	Networking and info. sharing benefits. Information.  Listing of conservation needs.	Networking, information Overview of current action  Listing of needs
<b>2R</b> 1. The biodiversity resource!	LBAP gives general, broad	B. itself

	status.	
<b>2Re</b> Lack of cooperation, lack of a framework to fulfill legal commitments in NERC Act, lack of process by which conservation philosophy can evolve.	Cooperation. Framework for NERC fulfillment. Framework for conservation philosophy development.	Cooperation, NERC legal framework, philosophy
Yes, what I mean is that by losing the LBAP, cooperation would break down, we'd find it harder to identify how to fulfill legal commitments and our philosophy would founder.	(Clarification note for previous statement, to avoid possible misinterpretation.)	<i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>1U</b> Loss of and damage to biodiversity from development and inappropriate management	Defence against development and mismanagement.	Protection - from development and poor management
Loss of funding for biodiversity projects and events to promote public awareness and involvement in biodiversity conservation.	Funding lever for projects and promotion/ awareness.	Funding - b. projects; public awareness and involvement events
<b>2U</b> In terms of policy, the local authority ecologists would have less to call on to forward their cases in may areas.	Defence in development cases.	Protection - planning cases
Local conservation groups would go back to being more stand alone and would lose the support of an overarching group.	Linking and support benefits.	Local links, overarching support
The influences on land owners to manage with biodiversity in mind would decrease.	Positive management influence.	Influence on landowners
It would be difficult to justify the expense of 2 ecologists within the local authority.	Backing-up staff resource.	Staffing - harder to justify 2 posts in LA
Coordinated survey efforts would diminish so our knowledge of what biodiversity we have would become out of date.	Fosters survey - data gathering to quantify resource.	Survey - less, less coordination > less b. knowledge
<b>3U</b> Loss of networking opportunities to meet like-minded individuals and volunteers.	Fosters networking.	Networking
Loss of officer posts,	Supports staff posts	Staffing - loss of officer posts
loss of funding,	Supports funding/ is reason for funding	Funding - loss
loss of proactive conservation work including co-ordinated surveys,	Fosters proactive work, incl. coordinated survey.	Proactive work,

		incl. coordinated surveys
and a central contact point for all biodiversity issues.	Provides overall contact point.	Central contact point for b.
Mainly loss of co-ordination and identification of priorities for survey and projects by partner organisations.	Provides coordination and prioritisation for survey and projects.	Coordination and identification of survey and project priorities
<b>4R</b> Loss of partnership and the network that LBAP started	Partnership and networking benefits. <i>(Continued ...)</i>	Partnership, networking
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
Focus for biodiversity species and habitat conservation	'Focus' - heightened coverage of conservation.	Species and habitat conservation focus
Loss of mechanism to raise awareness about biodiversity	Awareness raising benefits.	Awareness raising mechanism
LBAP is a visible way that council has signed up to biodiversity action – a carrot and a stick!	Signifies council commitment positively. Also can be resorted to as a reminder of that commitment when needed.	Shows LA commitment
<b>5R</b> - Majority, if not all proactive biodiversity conservation work would cease.	Implies is essential for much - even all - proactive conservation work.	Driver for proactive work
-Involvement of the local communities with their local wildlife/conservation would be severely damaged.	Supports local community wildlife involvement.	Much less community involvement
- Projects with local landowners would cease.	Essential for projects with landowners.	End of projects with landowners
<b>6R</b> I think whilst a lot of the conservation and awareness raising work would still go on	Much of the work would still happen without LBAP (NB)	Continuity - would be for lot of conservation and awareness raising work
I think a vital contribution would be lost and particularly in the providing [of] support and connections to other organisations.	'Vital' contributions provided include support and link benefits.	Support, links to other organisations
I think the LBAP process through the partnership provides a good focal point for organising work that addresses actions within the LBAP and for bringing different players together to work jointly on them.	Provides work focus for actions by joint-working.	Focus, work cooperation
I also think it has provided a mechanism for drawing down funds	Mechanism for gaining funding and giving projects status	Funding - drawing down;

and providing weighting to projects which would be a big loss.		project weighting
In particular, work for UK priority species and habitats would still happen, but what would definitely be less of a focus and therefore a big loss would be the work that goes on with more local species and habitats, that don't have the protection through law and are not the focus of the bigger agencies such as CCW and EAW, but are still important, particularly to the local community.	Positive focus on species and habitats which have been identified as important locally, but which are not a focus for UK BAP action.	Locally important species work and focus  <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
Also the awareness raising and work with schools and communities is a big aspect that would suffer.	Benefits from awareness, educational and community work.	Awareness, schools, community work
<b>7R</b> (Note: Pilot asked: 'If the LBAP and process were abolished, what would be the biggest single loss to your area for biodiversity conservation?' i.e. slightly different wording.) The potential to plan and implement habitat networks/wildlife corridors and all the associated benefits of these to local species.	<b>Benefits from habitat linking.</b>	<b>Habitat management - linking</b>
<b>8Re</b> 1. Undoubtedly the networking and information sharing (and possibly joint working) between different local agencies, NGOs and volunteers	Networking and information benefits at various levels; 'possibly' essential to joint working.	Networking, info. sharing, (poss. joint working)
2. Significant potential to draw down project funding	Benefit of funding <i>potential</i> - i.e. gives hope	Funding lever potential
<b>9R</b> The loss of awareness raising work in the LBAP area	Awareness benefits.	Local awareness
Less partnership working and sharing of information between different organisations	Joint working and information sharing benefits.	Partnership working, information sharing
<b>10Re</b> Work would become reactive once again rather than proactive as things are now	Is reason for present proactive work.	Proactive work
<b>11R</b> The LBAP is a useful tool for the underpinning applications for grants for projects as well as a lever for partner organisations to undertake conservation work.	Helps in gaining funding.  Aids/ helps ensure work gets done.	Funding lever - projects and partners' work
Biodiversity officers are employed to lead the LBAP process but invariably	Staff provide benefits in related areas.	Staff loss - affecting

end up doing planning and other work. If the LBAP process were abolished these officers would probably be lost having a knock on affect to other services and projects.		planning and other areas
<b>4U</b> The involvement and interest of local, regional and national organizations and particularly the loss of local interested volunteers who have been fundamental in helping to implement LBAP actions – and who would be greatly disheartened by the abolition of the LBAP process.	Supports connections with various organisations. Supports connections with local volunteers who help implementation; these latter value the existence of the process.	Organisations' and individuals' input  <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>5U</b> The Biodiversity officer post would be a loss, as it would almost certainly not be replaced by the council.	Staff post benefit.	Staff - post lost
It forms a link between the council, the public and the local wildlife groups, a conduit for information and for helping to coordinate biodiversity efforts.	Wide-ranging linking and networking benefits.	Networking, coordination effort
<b>6Ue</b> We wouldn't have a process for protecting / enhancing habitats outside of protected sites. If the LBAP was abolished the communication between volunteers, recorders and organizations would be lost and biodiversity conservation would be a lot less coordinated.	Coordination benefits.	Process for non-statutory protection  Communication, coordination.
<b>12R</b> The networking links that have been developed between conservation organizations.	Networking/ linkage benefits.	Organisational networking links
<b>13R</b> DK – not been here long enough to answer this but I assume a lack of recognised targets would make it even harder to secure funding and effectiveness of and support for partnerships would falter.	Taken that targets help gain funding, and LBAP supports partnership.	Funding for meeting targets, support for partnership
I suspect that some LAs would be a lot less inclined to incorporate biodiversity into their work without someone to push for it.	Staff have significant influence through backing LA biodiversity integration.	Loss of staff = less LA b. work
<b>7Ue</b> The LBAP has been a real force for change in terms of relationships	Fosters relationships with other areas of council.	Positive

with other departments and directorates, has been a way of drawing in more financial resources, and has generated a voluntary partnership which still meets, talks and joins in project work.	Has led to rise in finance resource. Has led to results from 'generated' voluntary partnership.	within-LA awareness  Funding - draws in Partnership generation
Losing the LBAP and its process would return the enthusiasts among us to the 'tree-hugging' perception.	Has raised credibility of biodiversity as a serious work area.	Raised credibility
<b>8U</b> One full time member of staff	Staffing benefits	Staff - one full time ( <i>Continued ...</i> )
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
Communication between partners	Communication	Between-partner communication
<b>14R</b> The lack of a focal point for networking and information that we have provided for partner organizations and the public as coordinators of the LBAP.	Focus for networking and information.	Focus for networking and information
<b>9Ue</b> Personally I don't know if it would make any difference, many partners remit is conservation which would exist without the LBAP.	Questions whether there would be any losses.	Don't know - much conservation work without LBAP.
<b>10U</b> - Partnership working	Partnership working.	Partnership work
• Loss of a key driver for change	Is a key driver for change.	Key driver for change
• Loss of the LBAP would remove the local value conservation actions	Local action specialisation benefits.	Local value conservation actions
• Loss of important supplementary planning guidance	LBAP as SPG benefits.	SPG
- Loss of in-house ecological expertise	Staffing benefits.	Staffing - ecological expertise
<b>11U</b> Inter-organisation communication	Communication benefits.	Communication, inter-organisation
<b>12Ue</b> Loss of the LBAP Partnership/Steering Group Meetings –they stop me from feeling like I'm on a flat earth and about to go over the edge!!	Meetings can give moral support/ hearten those involved.	Moral support from meetings

15R - There would be less information sharing and communications,	Info. sharing, communication.	Networking
leading to a loss of coordination, partnership working and synergy;	Partnership working, synergy	Partnership working, synergy
- There would be less funding available for biodiversity (e.g., the County Council currently channels £20,000 into the Biodiversity Partnership's Project Fund – this is additional to the support provided for the Coordinator's post).	Funding for biodiversity	Funding - loss of
- Biodiversity would have a lower profile;	Biodiversity profile	Status - loss of (Continued ...)
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
- Targets and priorities would be less clear, leading to a possible loss of direction.	LBAP targets and priorities give clear direction	Possible loss of direction
16R The partnership which has developed and is still developing between organizations and local groups	Partnership development	Partnership development
and the need for organizations to report on what they been doing for wildlife.	Reporting need/ incentive	Reporting
17R ? Perhaps less partnership working (especially business),	(Possibly) partnership working, especially businesses	(Perhaps) Partnership working, esp. businesses (partly lost)
less cooperative use of financial resources,	Financial cooperation	Financial cooperation (partly lost)
less easy to lever funding from other sources (LBAPs are an excellent mechanism for this),	Lever for funding	Funding lever (partly lost)
perhaps a less focused approach in terms of priorities.	(Perhaps) Focused approach to priorities	Priorities focus (partly lost)
However, all of these would still continue to some extent.	Loss of the above would not be total	
13U (no answer given)		
18R Coordination I guess - we would go back to people scrabbling around getting funding for project and reinventing the wheel.	Coordination	Coordination
19Re Don't know. I think we would still continue with a BAP partnership	Don't know. Partnership 'has proved to be a profitable forum	Discussion forum

because this has proved to be a profitable forum for discussion on a wide range of biodiversity issues.	for discussion on a wide range of biodiversity issues'	
<b>20R</b> Links with local planning policy	Links with local planning policy	Planning links
<b>14U</b> As things stand in my area, the impact would be less than in many others because the LBAP process is not yet fulfilling its potential here. Nevertheless I think that there <b>would be a sense amongst the partners that we had lost something in terms of working in concert towards common goals.</b>	Working in concert towards common goals.	Working in concert  <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
Even though the LBAP here does lack in terms of the breadth of partnership and integration with existing conservation efforts, I think it does <b>have a kind of subliminal presence that people would miss</b> – like a child misses his comfort blanket when he leaves home without it!	A kind of subliminal presence - moral support for local conservation direction	<b>Subliminal support from LBAP</b>
<b>21R</b> Sadly nothing. Currently <b>we are no more than the sum of the parts.</b>	Nothing	Nothing
<b>15U</b> Probably there wouldn't be any - I suspect we'd have done much of the conservation works any way. We'd have probably reviewed x's nature conservation strategy and used that instead. Some of the bigger, more exciting projects have been done on a larger than local scale - we're <b>currently looking at working subregionally</b> rather than locally when we review our LBAP.	Probably none	Probably none
<b>21R</b> Reduced communication therefore duplication of work / effort. No joined up thinking, no county wide knowledge of conservation action.	Communication helps efficiency, joined up thinking and countywide action knowledge	Communication - e.g. helps joined up thinking
<b>16U</b> Partnership approach to nature conservation.	Partnership approach	Partnership approach

## Question:

## 4. Do you wish to make any other specific or general comments?

Comment	Notes/ Implications	Themes
<b>1R</b> There is <b>great potential for action, but lack of resources to do justice to the need.</b>	Lack of resources.	Resources shortfall
<b>2R</b> Note on funding/resources: <b>If a project with the wide range of partners, actions, community/business involvement and scope of the LBAP was a Social Services, Community or Education project delivered by a Local Authority, it would likely have c.4 staff and a large budget!</b>	LBAP has a low standing in relation to certain other sectors.	LBAP under-resourced in staff and funding - reflects relative lack of standing.
Note on commitment from LAs <b>If LAs fail to deliver core services such as Education, libraries etc. they are brought to task by WAG – why not when failing to conserve biodiversity?</b>	Similar comment on another aspect of low standing.	Desirability of WAG policing on b. conservation delivery
General Note: The next 10-20 years will see massive changes in the structure of farming. <b>Farming practices are the principle factor in biodiversity conservation. Farming and biodiversity must not be seen as mutually exclusive, nor long term biodiversity losses sustained in order to provide easy transition over the short term.</b>	Need for joined-up approach with agriculture.	B. work - importance of integration with farming

<b>Most Local Authorities and WAG still do not seem to have grasped the fundamental value of the biodiversity resource in providing essential ecosystem services and its role in coping with climate change.</b>	Lack of understanding of biodiversity in government in Wales	Understanding value of b. resource for: - ecosystem services, climate change adaptation
<b>1U LBAPs are extremely useful tools in terms of raising awareness about biodiversity and translating national targets into local actions on the ground.</b>	Praise for LBAP awareness and local action.	Praise - LBAP awareness, local action  <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
However, <b>I do not believe that by themselves they are enough to halt biodiversity loss - in my experience, there are too many actions to achieve and actions delivered are too piecemeal and small scale to have major benefits.</b>	Complexity of plans criticised	Problem with LBAP complexity - number of actions; too piecemeal to have major benefits
Also, the <b>emphasis is usually placed on the overstretched LBAP officer to lead on the delivery of most of the actions.</b>	Too much expectation on LBAP officers for delivery	Staff - LBAP officer overstretched
<b>I think the way forward is large scale collaborative projects (i.e. habitat restoration/creation and major events) between LBAPs, maybe operating at more of a regional level</b> leaving small scale projects, awareness and advice to be provided at more of a local level.	Suggests action at regional scale, in collaboration.	Scales of working for LBAPs - more regional focus for habitat work; give awareness and advice locally
I would also like to see a <b>biodiversity strategy produced for Wales led by WAG</b> . This has happened in England and Scotland securing considerable resources and funding. <b>The strategy should be more of a working document that we can all sign up to containing spatial plans for the whole of Wales mapping out biodiversity assets within each Local authority area and opportunities for habitat restoration/creation for each priority habitat.</b>	Suggestion for all-Wales plan, with baseline information and a focus on habitat restoration and creation.	Need for Welsh Biodiversity Strategy (WAG led; following Eng. and Scot. well-resourced precedents), working document, incl. mapping for habitat management opportunities
<b>3U The LBAP process has brought new edge to the conservation of habitats and species, mainly through the</b>	LBAP process praised for networking and dedication of LA staff	Praise - LBAP 'new edge' to conservation,

<p><b>networking and bringing together of like-minded individuals, and through the hard work of local authority LBAP/Ecology staff and other partner organisations.</b></p>	<p>and staff from other organisations.</p>	<p>mainly due to networking success and staff involved</p>
<p>However, I have been in post for 5 years now and we are fast approaching the 2010 halt the loss of biodiversity deadline set by the UK BAP. The majority of work is still on survey, monitoring and raising awareness initiatives, which although desperately required and bringing about positive benefits, <b>much more on-the-ground habitat management and restoration work is needed.</b></p>	<p>Highlights urgent need for habitat management and restoration.</p>	<p>Habitat management and restoration - much more needed, most work now being on survey, monitoring and awareness.</p> <p><i>(Continued ...)</i></p>
<p><b>Comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's notes</b></p>	<p><b>Themes</b></p>
<p>Even <b>more work is still required to get planners and developers on board</b> with biodiversity enhancements, even where mitigation work is <u>not</u> required. It seems to me that these things will only happen if there is a <b>top-down approach to making the senior officers or politicians see the real benefits of biodiversity conservation – its links to quality of life, health, well being, economic gains, etc.</b> etc., all of which are related to Sustainable Development, Community Strategies and the Wales Environment Strategy, WAG Trunk Road Estate BAP, etc., etc. <b>But where are the links to LBAPs and the partnerships working so hard at the local level, often without adequate budgets?</b> Wouldn't it be great if there was some kind of policy which stated that all new residential developments had to include biodiversity enhancements – nest boxes for birds, access points for bats, native tree and hedgerow planting, pond creation, wildflower seed mixes on roadsides, green roofs and bridges, sympathetic river and woodland corridor buffer zones, retention of mature trees and hedgerows, solar panels, water recycling and compost bins, etc. across the board???! Innovative design and integration of biodiversity features. . . . . . a lot could be done in terms of linking habitats through the planning and DC process.</p>	<p>Need for more, non-enforceable, enhancement in planning cases.</p> <p>Underlines need for top-down management and political commitment, linking biodiversity with quality of life, health, well being, economic gains and other fields. Asks where such links are now to LBAPs, noting lack of funding.</p> <p>Examples of positive biodiversity gains which could accompany development.</p>	<p>Planners and developers, need for b. element in work, as appropriate; to happen, need for connection to power and decision-making, based on links to quality of life, health, well being, economic gains, etc., and also SD and various WAG strategies; asks where are the links between these and LBAPs;</p> <p>backs with policy -related practical examples of ideas for small-scale biodiversity gain features in planning</p>

<b>4R Every local authority DEFINITELY need a LBAP Officer and a PLANNING ECOLOGIST – as a minimum.</b>	Staffing shortfalls	Staff - need for at least LBAP officer and planning ecologist
<b>5R</b> No (mainly due to time restriction!!)		
<b>6R</b> I think the <b>LBAP and the LBAP process has a lot going for it</b> and I think there is a lot of good work coming out of it, specifically on a local level.	Praise for LBAP results at local level.	Praise - LBAP and process at local level  <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
However, I do think that there is also a lot of scope for improvement. I think it <b>would be very useful to have more of a structure to the process, but that needs to be looked at very carefully and determined by the people actually doing the work and should be very flexible and not too restrictive</b> because part of the beauty of the LBAP process is that it allows all sorts of different projects to happen, not just those relating to UK priorities but local issues as well, <b>it needs the freedom that it has currently</b> as each LBAP officers / area interpret things slightly differently which often results in some great projects and ideas that others would not have thought of. <b>The partnership approach is a strong one and needs to be reinforced</b> not lost.	Suggestions for improvement:- Need for more structure to process, determined by practitioners; need to keep element of flexibility which allows for positive innovations etc.  Strengthen partnership approach.	LBAP - need for more structure to process, practitioner-driven, whilst keeping benefits of local flexibility and variety; partnership approach is strong and needs reinforcing
<b>But most of all, there needs to be more resources</b> , most counties just have one person trying to do it all with virtually no budget – not an easy task! And better incentives to stay in the job, wages are not great and most contracts are not permanent. Whilst I don't think anyone that cares about doing a job like this is in it for the money, everyone needs to live! <b>We need people that are going to stay in the job for a decent length of time</b> as there are so many aspects to it and people and organisations to develop relationships with that it takes time to learn how to do it all effectively and build up the relationships needed.	Need for more resources -more staffing, better wages, permanent contracts.  Need for stability in coordinators' posts to foster effective work.	Greatest need for more resources; incl. staff - wages and permanency for stability.

<b>7R</b> (Note: Pilot asked: Do you wish to make any other specific or general comments?) Sorry too much to do!!!!		
<b>10Re</b> I don't feel we are very representative at the moment as we are going through a bit of (temporary) rosy period with lots of staff and funding - I don't feel qualified to answer a lot of these question as I steer well Clear of Bars and leave it all to Biodiversity Officer	Acknowledges relatively favourable resources situation in x LBAP, which is seen as temporary and not very representative. Not confident about much of the questionnaire due to being further removed from the LBAP process.	Feeling that x LA is not representative, as LBAP funding is temporarily relatively high here  (Continued ...)
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<b>4U</b> I think that the <b>LBAP process has provided an important vehicle for bringing together many local interested persons and groups</b> , who previously may have been disparate organizations with no real links to each other.	Praise for LBAP - for linking players at different scales.	Praise - LBAP has linked various players
The most active members of the LBAP partnership tend to be individuals and local or regional organizations and it is vital that we maintain their interest, support and enthusiasm.	In contrast to involvement from individuals, local and regional organisations, (continued below)	<b>Local player activity praised</b>
<b>I find it disappointing that some of the larger and or national organizations have shown little commitment to local biodiversity action and promoting, monitoring and implementing the LBAP in a consistent manner.</b>	... some larger or national players are disappointing.	Lack of bigger and nat. organisation commitment to LBAP disappointing
I also consider that <b>without a tangible increase in particularly Local Authority (but also Governmental) support for LBAP implementation, we are in danger of losing some of our most effective and active members of the LBAP partnership</b> , due to the <b>consistent and frustrating lack of funding and support, which prevents positive action and progress.</b>	Need for more LA and government support, without which partnership is in danger. 'consistent and frustrating lack of funding and support, which prevents positive action and progress'	Need for more LA and government support, without which partnership is in danger; lack of funding and support is barrier

<p><b>12R</b> After 3 years of trying to balance the job of a biodiversity officer I was ready to give it all up, until I stood my ground &amp; explained that <b>what I was expected to do</b> (often my own expectations, as I'm so passionate about my work) <b>was the work of more than one person.</b> My working group has listened to this and reassessed our priorities, given that I can't do everything.</p>	<p>Lack of staffing; Coordinator spread very thinly - outlines how prioritisation decisions were made to alleviate this for day-to-day work programme.</p>	<p>Staff - prioritisation of work, given the excessive remit, (agreed with working group)</p> <p><i>(Continued ...)</i></p>
Comment	Author's notes	Themes
<p>We have decided that the following work is reasonable for a biodiversity officer to deliver.</p> <p>Coordinating the delivery of specific projects.</p> <p>Maintaining websites.</p> <p>Production and distribution of the newsletter.</p> <p>Planning and running events, talks, shows.</p> <p>General enquiries.</p> <p>Coordinate general communication within the biodiversity sector.</p> <p>The work below won't be carried out by the biodiversity officer until further notice.</p> <p>Prioritizing which actions to implement. (this will be the responsibility of the whole partnership).</p> <p>Writing SAPs &amp; HAPs.</p> <p>Reporting on HAPs &amp; SAPs</p> <p>Collating data and inputting data onto BARS.</p> <p>Representing the x Biodiversity Partnership at all meetings (several meetings will be delegated to other members of the PBP).</p>	<p>One local working group's agreed list of priorities for LBAP Coordinator.</p> <p>LBAP Coordinator - work areas no longer carried out for time being</p>	<p>B. officer priorities: specific projects, information and communication;</p> <p>no longer doing: action prioritisation, HAP and SAP writing and reporting (incl. BARS work), b. partnership rep at all meetings</p>
<p><b>7Ue</b> No, thanks for asking.</p>		
<p><b>8U</b> I think I've said enough!</p>		
<p><b>9Ue</b> During the 1992 Earth Summit <b>Biodiversity was one of the key themes for counties to consider when talking taking forward the idea of Sustainable</b></p>	<p>Perception of loss in status for biodiversity due to no longer featuring as a key area in</p>	<p>Need for b. to have key role in SD</p>

<p><b>Development.</b> However since then I feel it has dropped off the agenda and become a separate issue from the mainstream SD issues and not discussed as a key concern. This can be seen at the global talks level right the way down to the LA level where biodiversity is just not seen as a[n] SD issue at all. I feel <b>the balance needs to be readdressed and biodiversity brought back as an underpinning theme.</b></p>	<p>the SD agenda at local through to international levels.</p>	<p>(Continued ...)</p>
Comment	Author's notes	Themes
<p><b>10U</b> The <b>LBAP is a useful driver for change in the Local Authority, however resources are not available to properly implement the plan and is still regarded as a periphery activity.</b></p>	<p>LBAP worth noted for change within LA, but proper implementation not possible.</p>	<p>Resources for implementation and status, lack of</p>
<p><b>11U</b> No</p>		
<p><b>15R</b> - Even though the <b>challenges faced by many LBAPs appear to be broadly similar, communication among different LBAP officers remains weak and there appears to be a tendency to reinvent the wheel in each county.</b></p>	<p>Despite common issues, lack of communication between LBAP officers - reinventing the wheel</p>	<p>Benefits of better between LBAP officer communication e.g. to address common issues</p>
<p>- I am concerned that there are <b>too many Species Action Plans at the county level</b>, making the BAP process unwieldy. My own sense is that <b>it would be more effective to focus on Habitat Action Plans</b>, but to ensure that species' requirements are built into these.</p>	<p>Too many county SAPs - better to focus on HAPs.</p>	<p>More focus on HAPs, less separate county SAPs.</p>
<p><b>16R</b> - (none)</p>		
<p><b>17R</b> - (none)</p>		
<p><b>13U</b> - (none)</p>		
<p><b>18R</b> It would be good if this survey also looked at the average length of stay in post for an officer (i.e. looked back into the history of the partnership and their rates of pay). <b>In my role there have been 5 officers in 6 years - difficult to build partnership in those circumstances!</b> Partnership has been going 10 years. <b>Pay for officers has been pretty poor which may have something to do with it.</b></p>	<p>Instability of posts - high staff turnover. Poor pay.  (N.B. Questionnaire included a question on time in post, which will be used in later analysis. Temp. nature of posts likely to be a big factor too.)</p>	<p>High staff turnover/ poor pay.</p>
<p><b>19Re</b> - (none)</p>		

<p><b>20R</b> The overall nature of LBAPs partnerships are one of <b>not-incorporated organisations</b> (basically nebulous entities without any legal base) and <b>this can have a negative impact to their function</b> i.e. <b>lack of partner organisation commitment to implementation, high turnover of members</b>, etc. The only solution is to <b>consolidate Partnerships</b> by adopting some basic MoU and ToRs for all partners to sign up to. The UK BAP should at least consider Partnership building as an essential element of BAP implementation and thus should be providing clear guidance.</p>	<p>Lack of legal standing for individual LBAP partnerships, which are loose entities, compromising their functional effectiveness. Suggests formalising situation. Need Partnership building guidance (N.B. Partnership building was covered in original LBAP Guidance documents, though now somewhat dated.)</p>	<p>LBAP partnerships - lack of legal status limits effectiveness. Need to formalise. Need Partnership building guidance  (Continued ...)</p>
Comment	Author's notes	Themes
<p><b>14U</b> The answers to my questions reflect what I perceive to be the position in my area at the moment and not what I believe <i>should</i> be the situation. For example, although I disagreed with statement 3. i. a, I want to move our local partnership forward to a point where I can agree or even strongly agree with it!</p>	<p>(Aiming to improve situation)</p>	<p>Wants to improve LBAP effectiveness.</p>
<p><b>21R</b> (none)</p>		
<p><b>15U</b> No</p>		
<p><b>22R</b> No time!!!!</p>		
<p><b>16U</b> (none)</p>		
<p><b>17U</b> LBAP - has helped me to get out and do things 'on' the ground, which otherwise might not of been considered part of my role. I am only one person in an LA and have limited resources, but the LBAP process has helped us to get the ball rolling.</p>	<p>LBAP has helped work on the ground and helped make biodiversity progress in the LA, despite limited resources.</p>	<p>Positive effects of LBAP - ground work and general progress, despite limited LA resources.</p>
<p><b>23Re</b> (none)</p>		
<p><b>18U</b> Sorry - lots I could say but haven't time!!</p>		
<p><b>19U</b> The problem with nature conservation strategies, Biodiversity Action Plans and other strategic initiatives is that <b>documents are easy to produce but implementing them is impossible. Practical implementation in this area is severely restricted by lack of resources and short term funding.</b></p>	<p>Fundamental problems with implementation: - Lack of resources - Short term funding</p>	<p>Implementation problem - lack of resources and S.T. funding.</p>
<p>- The <b>Local Biodiversity Action Plan Partnership</b> has largely failed to</p>	<p>Partnership specifically limited by:-</p>	<p>Partnership limitations -</p>

<p><b>implement the Biodiversity Action Plan due to lack of funding, the lack of capacity to implement actions in the plans and an ineffective project officer.</b> Most members of the <b>steering group have large workloads and are reluctant to commit too much time to a process which requires a lot of time and effort</b> to sort out.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lack of funding</li> <li>- lack of capacity</li> <li>- ineffective project officer</li> <li>- Steering group already busy, reluctant to commit much to this demanding process.</li> </ul>	<p>funding, capacity, project officer, already busy.</p>
<p>- Biodiversity Action Plans are recovery plans for defined species and habitats and this partnership has <b>no means of measuring their effectiveness one way or another since detailed ecological data</b> is usually absent.</p>	<p>- Lack of data to measure action plan effectiveness.</p>	<p>Lack of ecological data to measure effectiveness.</p> <p><i>(Continued ...)</i></p>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<p>- It is <b>questionable whether the Local Biodiversity Action Plan has given rise to much action which would not have been carried out anyway.</b></p>	<p>- Amount of new work resulting from LBAPs is questionable.</p>	<p>New work from LBAP - questionable how much</p>
<p>- The <b>Biodiversity Action Plan has been used to resist damaging development affecting priority habitats and species.</b></p>	<p>- LBAP positively used to resist damaging development.</p>	<p>Positive use of LBAP to resist development</p>
<p>In conclusion. <b>Biodiversity Action Plans may work well if there are resources for their implementation.</b> In this area there are not and <b>my increasingly limited time cannot be spent effectively in trying to prop up a failed process.</b> There are <b>more effective ways my limited resources can contribute to nature conservation in my borough.</b></p>	<p>Plans may work well if there are resources for their implementation. At present, is a failed process; are more effective ways to further conservation locally.</p>	<p>Need for resources, as at present is a failed process and are more effective ways to further conservation.</p>
24Re <i>(none)</i>		
20U <i>(none)</i>		
25Re <i>(none)</i>		
26R <i>(none)</i>		
27Re None		
21U <i>(none)</i>		
<p><b>28Re</b> Presently attempting to compile a funding strategy which has involved stripping out many of the actions from the action list to <b>focus on those things which aren't happening and which really should.</b> Tempting for this to form the basis for the next review of the BAP coming as soon as the national picture</p>	<p>Favourable to idea that current action prioritisation exercise could lead to much more streamlined LBAP.</p>	<p>Favours action prioritisation for much more streamlined LBAP.</p>

becomes clear - <b>a much more streamlined document</b> but does take some actions for granted.		
Need to report on progress towards targets via BARS. Biodiversity Action Reporting tends not to answer the questions people have about progress.	BARS reporting not fulfilling local progress needs.	BARS not fulfilling local needs.
BAP deals badly with generic issues like the need for an adequate County wildlife Site system or xRC [LRC, Local Records Centre] or interpretation/ public involvement which get repeated endlessly in every BAP. It's a struggle to have a BAP and avoid the paperchase that some factions seem to want.	Problems with generic issues: SINCs, LRC, interpretation/ public involvement; the latter can lead to repetition in many action plans.	Problem:- generic issues and action plans: SINCs, LRC; Interpretation/ public involvement; much repetition <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author's notes</b>	<b>Themes</b>
<p><i>Yes, when I put BRC I meant biological record centre or LRC. All other interpretations seem correct. Having read "Working with the grain of nature-taking it forward" and had various discussions with our BAP officer and BAP partnership my picture of the place of an LBAP in the local scene is evolving. I might now have answered some of your questions differently. Plans for specific habitats and species now seem to be a part of a much bigger picture rather than a LBAP being all encompassing. We have mechanisms such as local and national site systems, data management and advisory services and issues such as public engagement and development planning which are being dealt with separately. The action plans with their specific targets inform these mechanisms and the habitats and species (hopefully) benefit from all the activity. Working with the grain of nature is a strategy and perhaps if you need something overarching in the local area a strategy fills the bill better than an LBAP. Our BAP coordinator is working to a spec. that came from English Nature and she and I are perhaps more focused on pushing forward a nature conservation or biodiversity strategy, an element of which are the habitat and species action plans. Does that make any kind of sense? Is that what others are doing?</i></p> <p><i>I still have tremendous problems with BARS as it doesn't as yet tell me much that i want to know, though the BAP officer is convinced that, if the detail is properly worked out and the users are sufficiently disciplined it could be very valuable. How much of our limited resource of manpower do</i></p>		

<i>we want to devote to reporting and how much to actual survey and conservation of biodiversity?</i>		
---	--	--

**Appendix vii: Questionnaire for Partners' Survey, with Associated E-mails.**

**E-mail Sent to Anglesey Partners, 24.5.06 (N.B. partners were not phoned beforehand):**

Subject: LBAP Review - Have your Say, in confidence!

Hi *[name]*

A confidential survey of those involved in Anglesey's LBAP is being run as an important part of our LBAP Review process. The survey will also form part of a wider evaluation of LBAPs in Wales - as research with University of Wales, Bangor.

Here is an opportunity to give valuable feedback on your own experience. Such feedback is very important to help enable improvements to be formulated for the future. Please spare some time to have your say by filling in the questionnaire pasted below (also attached).

A few points about the work:

- Confidentiality - responses and comments won't be linked to your name or organisation in the reporting and analysis of the data. Its therefore a chance to say how you really feel on the issues raised; (Please feel free about implying/ making criticism of, for example, myself; it will all help in considerations on improvement.)
- You'll get a full report on the results of this part of the work.
- The questionnaire is pasted below; for ease of reply feel free to paste filled-in version into e-mail text. (Document also attached.)

Your participation in this process is much appreciated.

Diolch yn fawr,

David

David Cowley  
Biodiversity Officer/ Swyddog Bioamrywiaeth  
Isle of Anglesey CC/ Biodiversity Partnership  
CS Ynys Mon/ Partneriaeth Bioamrywiaeth  
University of Wales/ Prifysgol Cymru, Bangor.  
01248 752470

***[Questionnaire provided as attachment and also pasted under e-mail text]***

---

**Text sent to Coordinators in LBAP Areas, Sent 28.6.06 (Cardiff, Snowdonia, Swansea, Pembrokeshire, Brecon Beacons), and 13.9.06 (Ceredigion); resent 14.9.06 to Cardiff:**

Subject: Important Survey for your LBAP

Dear Partnership member/ rep

Confidential surveys of those involved in a number of LBAPs are being run for part of an evaluation study of LBAPs in Wales - as research with University of Wales, Bangor. With the support of the Council's LBAP team, [*named LBAP area*] has been chosen for a Partnership feedback survey for this work.

Here is an opportunity to give valuable feedback on your own experience. Such feedback is very important to help enable improvements to be formulated for the future. Please spare some time to have your say by filling in the questionnaire pasted below (also attached).

A few points about the work:

- Confidentiality - responses and comments won't be linked to your name or organisation in the reporting and analysis of the data. Its therefore a chance to say how you really feel on the issues raised; (Please feel free about implying/making criticism of, for example, LBAP Officers; it will all help them in considerations on improvement.)
- You'll get a full report on the results of this part of the work.
- The questionnaire is pasted below; for ease of reply feel free to paste filled-in version into e-mail text. (Document also attached.)

Please return replies to [dcxpl@anglesey.gov.uk](mailto:dcxpl@anglesey.gov.uk).  
Your participation in this process is much appreciated.

Diolch yn fawr,  
(cei di ateb yn Gymraeg os ti moyn)

David

David Cowley  
Biodiversity Officer/ Swyddog Bioamrywiaeth  
Isle of Anglesey CC/ Biodiversity Partnership  
CS Ynys Mon/ Partneriaeth Bioamrywiaeth  
University of Wales/ Prifysgol Cymru, Bangor.  
01248 752470

***[Questionnaire provided as attachment and also pasted under e-mail text]***

**N.B.** Coordinators used the above information to request their partnership members to participate in the survey. Although invited to use the text above, coordinators had flexibility to contact their partnership through media of their choice and in their own words, and also to send reminders as they may have considered appropriate. Snowdonia provided a list of partnership members, which the author then contacted directly by e-mail.

**LBAP Partners' Survey - [named area] LBAP**

(Please relate to [name] LBAP and area, unless question implies LBAPs more generally)

**1. General.**

**Organisation:**

**Name and Job Title:**

**Time in this Post:**

**2. Semi-Structured:**

Please answer the following by indicating one of the responses below each statement:-

You have an option for further comment after any question.

**2.i) Partnership**

a) The Local Biodiversity Partnership has proved to be a real catalyst for both agreeing and delivering new biodiversity actions and projects.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Don't Know

Other

b) We would be more open to partnership work, if increased resources were available.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Don't Know

Other

c) Long-term project stability and job security for our organisation have to take priority over commitment to new projects with partners.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Don't Know

Other

d) New Partnership work takes up valuable time, needs consensus, and if successful usually results in temporary projects and employment.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Don't Know

Other

**2.ii) Council**

a) The County Council leads on local Biodiversity action by example and is thus a highly credible LBAP leader.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- Other

b) It would be worth investigating whether the LBAP process could be more clearly separated from County Council work.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- Other

**2.iii) LBAP Document**

a) The LBAP is just about the right size and level of detail.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- Other

b) We actively use the LBAP to inform our conservation decision-making in the area.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- Other

c) Success in new action implementation tends to be with things that we would have done anyway.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- Other

d) The LBAP is more a reference list of who's doing what than itself setting the agenda for what gets done.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree

Strongly Disagree  
Don't Know  
Other

**2.iv) LBAP Reporting and Results**

a) We report on BARS or to the LBAP Officer thus ensuring that progress on our actions is normally clear.

Strongly Agree  
Agree  
Disagree  
Strongly Disagree  
Don't Know  
Other

b) Although significant numbers of actions in the LBAP may show little or no progress, their inclusion shows what needs to be done, and can help draw in funding.

Strongly Agree  
Agree  
Disagree  
Strongly Disagree  
Don't Know  
Other

c) The LBAP enthuses and informs many local people.

Strongly Agree  
Agree  
Disagree  
Strongly Disagree  
Don't Know  
Other

d) There is lack of clarity about how LBAP targets and action reporting stand in relation to national HAP and SAP management and steering processes.

Strongly Agree  
Agree  
Disagree  
Strongly Disagree  
Don't Know  
Other

e) It would be better to focus more on priority objectives with long-term flexibility for project decision-making, rather than including long lists of detailed actions with variable degrees of backing commitment.

Strongly Agree  
Agree  
Disagree  
Strongly Disagree  
Don't Know  
Other

**2.v) Other**

a) Local Biodiversity action would benefit greatly by focusing more on Climate Change-related projects (such as habitat linking) and mutually-beneficial projects for health and wildlife.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Don't Know

Other

b) For us, most, if not all, important local conservation decisions are made outside the LBAP partnership and process.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Don't Know

Other

**3. Open-ended:**

i) You have £2 million for local Biodiversity work - what would be your first priorities for spending it?

ii) Please give an example of how you would change the LBAP document to improve it.

iii) If the LBAP and process were abolished, what would be the biggest losses to your area for biodiversity conservation?

**4. Do you wish to make any other specific or general comments?**

---

**Text of E-mail reminder (Anglesey Partners), Sent 22.6.06:**

Hi *[name]*

Just a quick reminder about the Anglesey LBAP Partners' Survey sent 24th May; I hope you'll agree that it is important to get feedback from partners on how the LBAP process is going here - this should then help enable production of a better LBAP and process itself for the future. So it would be very helpful if you could spare a few minutes to fill in the form, which will be used confidentially for assessment/ review here, and also as part of a wider study with other parts of Wales (research with University of Wales, Bangor).

You can either reply on the attachment, or write straight onto an e-mail text, pasted below.

I look forward to getting your reply for this important work.

Diolch yn fawr/ thank you very much,

David

David Cowley

University of Wales, Bangor/ Prifysgol Cymru, Bangor

Biodiversity Officer, Isle of Anglesey CC and Biodiversity Partnership

Swyddog Bioamrywiaeth, CS Ynys Mon a Phartneriaeth Bioamrywiaeth

01248 752470

***[Questionnaire provided again as attachment and also pasted under e-mail text]***

## Appendix viii: Results in Detail (with initial analysis): LBAP Partners' Questions

## Summary of all Semi-structured Responses (Question 2).

Rst	2. i) Partnership				2. ii) Council		2. iii) LBAP Document				2. iv) LBAP Reporting and Results					2. v) Other	
	a)	b)	c)	d)	a)	b)	a)	b)	c)	d)	a)	b)	c)	d)	e)	a)	b)
<b>Ang</b>																	
N1	O	Dk	A	O	D	Dk	D	A	A	A	A	A	Dk	D	O	O	A
N2v	Dk	Dk	O	O	Dk	O	A	Dk	Dk	D	O	A	SD	Dk	O	A	A
N3	A	SA	SA	Dk	D	A	A	Dk	Dk	A	Dk	Dk	D	A	SA	Dk	A
N4	A	SA	A	D	A	SA	A	A	D	D	D	A	SD	D	SA	D	A
N5	A	SA	A	SD	O	Dk	D	A	A	D	O	A	A	SA	SD	A	A
N6	SA	SA	O	O	A	D	A	A	D	D	Dk	SA	O	A	A	O	A
N7	D	O	D	D	O	SD	A	A	A	O	A	SA	Dk	A	A	A	A/D
N8v	A	A	D	A	D	A	A	A		D	D	D	SD	A	A	D	A
N9	A	SA	A	D	A	Dk	D	A	A	D	D	A	SA	Dk	SA	D	SA
N10	Dk	A	O	D	SA	A	Dk	A	D	Dk	SD	A	Dk	Dk	A	A	A
N11	SA	SA	A	A	O	D	A	A	D	SD	SA	SA	SA	A	D	SD	SD
N12	A	D	SA	A	A	D	A	SD	Dk	A	O	A	A	A	SA	Dk	A
N13	A	A	O	A	D	SA	D	SD	A	A	O	SA	SD	A	A	A	SA
G1	A	A	D	A	Dk	A	A	O	A	A	Dk	D	D	Dk	SA	D	Dk
G2	A	SA	SA	D	SA	SD	A	A	Dk	D	Dk	SA	A	A	Dk	A	SD
G3	A	A	A	SA	A	D	A	D	A	A	O	A	Dk	A	A	A	A
G4	A	A	SA	A	SA	A	A	D	A	A	A	A	Dk	Dk	D	D	A
G5	SA	SA	D	A	A	A	A	SA	D	D	D	SA	A	A	A	D	D
G6	D	A	A	D	D	A	D	D	A	A	A	A	D	D	A	SA	SA
G7	D	Dk	A	D	D	D	A	D	SA	A	A	SA	A	A	O	A	SA
<b>BB</b>																	
bN1	A	SA	SD	SA	A	SD	SA	D	SD	D	SD	A	SD	D	SD	SD	SD
bG1	A	A	A	A	A	D	A	A	D	D	D	A	A	A	A	Dk	O
<b>Car</b>																	
cN1 v	SA	SA	SA	A	SA	A	D	A	A	A	D	A	D	D	SA	A	SA
<b>Cer</b>																	
dN1	A	SA	SA	Dk	SD	A	A	A	Dk	SA	D	A	A	A	Dk	D	Dk
dN2	A	A	A	SA	A	SA	SA	D	A	A	A	A	D	SA	A	SA	D
dN3	A	SA	A	A	Dk	A	Dk	Dk	D	A	Dk	SA	D	A	A	SA	Dk
<b>Pmb</b>																	
eN1	Dk	A	O	A	Dk	D	D	D	SA	O	O	A	Dk	A	O	D	A
eN2	Dk	A	D	A	D	A	A	A	D	A	D	A	SD	A	A	A	Dk
eN3	A	A	D	A	SD	A	Dk	A	D	Dk	Dk	A	A	Dk	D	A	A
eG1	O	SA	SA	A	Dk	Dk	SD	SD	SA	A	Dk	A	Dk	Dk	A	D	SA
eG2	A	SD	A	D	Dk	D	A	A/Dk	Dk	Dk	D	Dk	Dk	Dk	Dk	Dk	Dk
eG3	D	O	D	O	D	A	O	D	A	A	D	A	D	A	Dk	O	A
eG4	D	D	A	D	SD	A	D	D	A	A	D	D	D	A	A	A	A

Rst	i) a)	b)	c)	d)	ii) a)	b)	iii) a)	b)	c)	d)	iv) a)	b)	c)	d)	e)	v) a)	b)
<b>SNP</b>																	
fN1	SA	O	O	SA	A	D	D	D	SA	A	O	SA	SA	A	A	O	O
fN2	O	A	O	A	A	D	D	D	SA	O	A	A	Dk	A	O	D	A
fN3	A	SA	SA	A	A	A	SA	A	A	SA	Dk	SA	D	Dk	A	A	A
fG1	A	A	D	A	SD	Dk	Dk	SD	A	A	SD	Dk	Dk	Dk	A	D	SA
fG2	SA	SA	D	A	A	D	A	A	D	D	SA	A	A	D	A	A	D
<b>Sw</b>																	
gN1	A	A	SA	SA	A	A	Dk	A	Dk	D	D	SA	A	Dk	SA	D	Dk
gN2	A	A	A	A	A	SD	A	SA	D	D	A	SA	A	D	D	O	D
gG1	A	A	A	A	A	A	D	A	D	D	A	SA	A	A	A	A	A

### Key

**Rst** = Respondents (listed by code)

**Ang** - Anglesey Partnership

**BB** - Brecon Beacons (National Park) Partnership

**Car** - Cardiff Partnership

**Cer** - Ceredigion Partnership

**Pmb** - Pembrokeshire Partnership

**SNP** - Snowdonia National Park Partnership

**Sw** - Swansea Partnership

SA - Strongly Agree

A - Agree

D - Disagree

SD - Strongly Disagree

DK - Don't Know

### Results in Detail:

Notes: In Open-ended statement response (question 2) tables, **Bold** highlighting of some response comments and *Author's Note(s)*, in italics, have been added by the author as part of the analysis process.

#### 2.i) Partnership

**a) The Local Biodiversity Partnership has proved to be a real catalyst for both agreeing and delivering new biodiversity actions and projects.**

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N1	O	Limited agreement – it has in some areas <i>Author's Note: Partial agreement</i>
N2v	DK	
N3	A	It is a good opportunity for organizations to get together to discuss issues etc.
N4	A	
N5	A	
N6	SA	

(Continued ...)

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N7	D	The water vole project started because of the BAP process but perhaps not the LBAP as the preparatory work for both were being undertaken at the same time. All the other projects administered by <i>x</i> ( <i>organisation</i> ) were already running and these were therefore not started as a direct result of the LBAP. However, it may well have been a catalyst for other organizations/ projects.
N8v	A	
N9	A	
N10	DK	
N11	SA	
N12	A	
N13	A	
G1	A	
G2	A	
G3	A	
G4	A	
G5	SA	
G6	D	
G7	D	Existing partnerships (wetlands, heathlands, ARSP etc) predate the LBAP and have delivered conservation projects. <b>LBAP has served to confirm these arrangements.</b>
bN1	A	
bG1	A	
cN1v	SA	
dN1	A	
dN2	A	
dN3	A	
eN1	DK	
eN2	DK	
eN3	A	
eG1	O	In the case of marine biodiversity actions I do not believe that it has as <b>we deliver management actions independently of the group discussions.</b> I do not believe that the group has the relevant or level of knowledge to assist us.
eG2	A	
eG3	D	
eG4	D	Partner organizations continue to carry out their own work programmes (which is understandable), <b>very few initiatives have resulted from the existence of the LBAP partnership</b>
fN1	SA	
fN2	O	Not in my experience in the time I have been involved Authors query:- Should the response here be 'our' experience, as the questionnaire was a joint one? The 'my' extends to both <i>x</i> and I for the last one. <i>Author's Notes: i) Tends to disagree. ii) Reworded with agreement: Not in our experience in the time we have been involved (Continued ...)</i>

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
fN3	A	
fG1	A	
fG2	SA	EAW have found working with partners the best way to deliver action on the ground. The <b>Partners and Agency BAP documents</b> provide a framework for delivery and leverage for funds. <i>Author's Note: Ref. to EA BAP</i>
gN1	A	
gN2	A	
gG1	A	

**b) We would be more open to partnership work, if increased resources were available.**

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N1	DK	what would the resources be for? <i>Author's Note: Statement had intended LBAP implementation through partnership to be understood</i>
N2v	DK	can only be answered by staff of x <i>Author's Note:</i>
N3	SA	- Although, it is often the case that if organizations weren't so busy with their own work that it is possible that the LBAP could be more efficient. For example, if organizations worked more closely together sharing the resources that already exist. <i>Author's Note: Adds reasoning for boosting partnership work using present resources.</i>
N4	SA	
N5	SA	
N6	SA	
N7	O	(A and D) We're very open to partnership working now and would be happy to cooperate with other organisations on specific projects. However, the work we do is constrained by the funding criteria that are placed upon us and therefore it is not always possible for us to take up new projects when working within the constraints of a specific pot of money. It would very much depend therefore on the type of partnership work in question – we would not be able to spend money on specific works outside the remit of our current funding criteria but maybe able to give staff time to work on a new project or find sources of funding. However, if resources were available it would obviously facilitate things! <i>Author's Note: Explains why x organisation is limited in its degree of partnership work in practice; seems, in light of the last sentence to be close to agreeing with the statement.</i>
N8v	A	
N9	SA	
N10	A	
N11	SA	

N12	D	(Continued ...)
Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N13	A	
G1	A	
G2	SA	
G3	A	
G4	A	
G5	SA	
G6	A	
G7	DK	- not clear that resources encourages partnership work as such, though partnerships do encourage resources – fully funded projects are less inclined to seek partners – underfunded projects tend to pass the begging bowl around! <i>Author's Note: Gives viewpoint which might be more applicable to individual projects than the much broader LBAP.</i>
bN1	SA	
bG1	A	
cN1v	SA	
dN1	SA	
dN2	A	
dN3	SA	
eN1	A	
eN2	A	FROM 4: Although I have agreed to this statement I would like to point out that partnership working is inextricably linked to all the projects we are developing. Also good partnership working is pivotal to securing funding. Therefore we are always seeking to increase the number of partners we work with.
eN3	A	
eG1	SA	We simply <b>do not have the man-hours to attend meetings or often even engage fully</b> with the partnership. <i>Author's Note: Lack of resources for engagement</i>
eG2	SD	
eG3	O	(would appear that resources may not be the key factor limiting partnership working)
eG4	D	I don't think we are not open to partnership work, we're very open to it. I don't think lack of resources have a bearing on the willingness or otherwise for organizations to work in partnership
fN1	O	Strongly agree if not too difficult to apply for or report on <i>Author's Note: Note agreement in right conditions</i>
fN2	A	
fN3	SA	
fG1	A	
fG2	SA	EAW has had a policy of partnership funding rather than 100% funding. If we had more funds we would make a greater contribution.
gN1	A	
gN2	A	

gG1	A	
-----	---	--

**c) Long-term project stability and job security for our organisation have to take priority over commitment to new projects with partners.**

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N1	A	
N2v	O	- No comment
N3	SA	Again, improved communication could have a great influence on this lack of confidence in new projects. <i>Author's Note: Suggests improving communication.</i>
N4	A	
N5	A	
N6	O	Not always. Sometimes commitment to new projects with partners can enhance project stability and can lead to additional job security. <i>Author's Note: Points out that the assumption (see rationale) is 'not always' true; though presumably agreed that it sometimes is.</i>
N7	D	Long-term project stability and job security are obviously very important and under some circumstances have to take priority; without the staff, working on new projects with partners is impossible! However, $x$ is always open to new projects with partners. Indeed, in many cases this can have the very positive impact of creating new jobs and opportunities. <i>Author's Note: Similar to the above. Seems to imply some agreement with the statement.</i>
N8v	D	
N9	A	Note – as an organization which is over 100 years old and is tasked with the “preservation of lands in perpetuity” this long term approach is fundamental to the organization.
N10	O	- Probably <i>Author's Note: Near to agreement</i>
N11	A	
N12	SA	
N13	O	- Although sustainability of our business is a primary concern, often having new projects can provide important new work. As we are not in the game of standing still, we are always open to new projects but will assess each on their merits.
G1	D	
G2	SA	
G3	A	
G4	SA	
G5	D	
G6	A	
G7	A	It is not really about project stability or job security – it is about Corporate objectives and targets. These are set elsewhere (WAG). Partnerships are a means to an end, not the end itself (I hope!).

		<i>Author's Note: These comments taken to be based on governmental body working - and would not apply to NGOs.</i>
bN1	SD	(Continued ...)
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
bG1	A	
cN1v	SA	
dN1	SA	We find core costs much harder to cover than project costs so this is a constant issue
dN2	A	
dN3	A	
eN1	O	<b>Job security for our staff allows us to engage more effectively with the LBAP process</b> and provides the resources (staff time and ££) to commit to new partnership projects. It is not mutually exclusive!
eN2	D	
eN3	D	
eG1	SA	
eG2	A	
eG3	D	
eG4	A	
fN1	O	Funders require new projects so have to apply for them to secure funding to retain posts and therefore expertise. <b>Difficulty is getting long-term core funding to enable project development and delivery</b>
fN2	O	<b>Job security for our staff allows us to engage more effectively with the LBAP process</b> and provides the resources (staff time and ££) to commit to new partnership projects. It is not mutually exclusive!
fN3	SA	
fG1	D	I disagree on the job security bit not the second bit <i>Author's Note: Should read 'not the first bit'? Count as O?</i>
fG2	D	<b>Although long term project stability is essential it need not take priority over commitment to new projects</b> as new opportunities should not be missed when they arise. Especially if the new project can attract additional funding from new sources (such as European funding).
gN1	SA	
gN2	A	
gG1	A	

**d) New Partnership work takes up valuable time, needs consensus, and if successful usually results in temporary projects and employment.**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
N1	O	mixture of A/D <i>Author's Note: Mixed answer likely to reflect broad experience.</i>
N2v	O	– No comment

N3	DK	but surely if the end result is worthwhile, partnership work is worth doing on a more regular and devoted basis.
N4	D	(Continued ...)
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
N5	SD	
N6	O	New partnership work does take up a lot of time and needs consensus, but projects and employment resulting from it need not always be of a temporary nature. <i>Author's Note: Points out statement not always true</i>
N7	D	I agree with this statement to some extent. However, the problem is not the partnership work but the funding. It is always very difficult to find sources of long-term funding for any new projects and posts. Time working in partnership is usually time well spent as it can have more holistic and worthwhile outcomes and with long term planning can result in long-term projects and employment. <i>Author's Note: Partial agreement. Highlights long-term funding as the problem.</i>
N8v	A	
N9	D	
N10	D	
N11	A	
N12	A	
N13	A	
G1	A	
G2	D	
G3	SA	
G4	A	
G5	A	
G6	D	
G7	D	Partnership work earns brownie points with internal and external funding sources so there is already a strong incentive to create relevant partnerships. <i>Author's Note: Comment does not back up response to the statement as such.</i>
bN1	SA	
bG1	A	
cN1v	A	
dN1	DK	<b>I sort of agree</b> with this <b>but do not necessarily consider it a negative thing as implied</b> - especially temporary projects; they can be valuable <i>Author's Note: Avoids responding 'agree', as statement is seen to be negative.</i>
dN2	SA	
dN3	A	
eN1	A	- in the current framework FROM 4: 2.i) d) New partnership work does take time and needs consensus but these are positive aspects <b>what is missing is the</b>

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
		<b>link to long-term projects with implementation at the appropriate scale</b> , whether that be local (farm) subregional (landscape) or regional. <i>(Continued ...)</i>
eN2	A	
eN3	A	
eG1	A	
eG2	D	
eG3	O	<b>Yes it takes up time, but the word ‘valuable’ implies that this would be better spent elsewhere – not necessarily the case.</b> Yes it needs consensus, but again this can be seen as a positive. Yes projects and employment may be temporary, but again, <b>is the implication that this is a negative thing?</b> <i>Author’s Note: Basic agreement, but seems put off by way the statement is made.</i>
eG4	D	– not always the case but there’s always the danger of that being the case
fN1	SA	That’s the funding environment we are in
fN2	A	in the current framework FROM 4: New partnership work does take time and needs consensus but these are positive aspects <b>what is missing is the link to long-term projects</b> with implementation at the appropriate scale, whether that be local (farm) subregional (landscape) or regional.
fN3	A	
fG1	A	but this is often the nature of limited funding and is not always a bad thing. Some projects e.g. capital works are by nature temporary
fG2	A	Although I agree with this statement - <b>temporary projects and employment may still be able to achieve good results</b> within the constraints of time and resources.
gN1	SA	
gN2	A	
gG1	A	

## 2.ii) Council

a) **The County Council leads on local Biodiversity action by example and is thus a highly credible LBAP leader.**

N.B. Brecon Beacons and Snowdonia respondents answered in reference to ‘The National Park leads on local Biodiversity action ....’

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N1	D	because it undertakes a limited range of actions

N2v	DK	but unless they are prepared to commit funds cannot be said to be “highly credible” <i>Author’s Note: Comment tends to favour ‘disagree’</i> <i>(Continued ...)</i>
Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N3	D	although <b>I believe the council have the power and influence to lead in a much more effective way.</b> Biodiversity is not an important enough issue for the County Council at present, this is highlighted in at least the sense that so few resources are available for the biodiversity team. The county council do not at present lead by example, and one of the most striking examples of this is the obvious lack of communication between various council departments – although, again the probable root of the problem here is the lack of resources. At present, it is outside organizations that take the lead on biodiversity action. <i>Author’s Note: NB - significant comments to back response.</i>
N4	A	
N5	O	Certainly the lead on LBAPs, definitely a credible and honest standard bearer, but I’m not sure that IACC ‘lead by example’ on biodiversity, <b>simply because of limited resources.</b> The phrase ‘lead by example’ gives the impression of pioneering and almost unilateral, and I think IACC fulfill a function that would be better described as fostering examples and thus facilitating projects e.g. IACC are a catalyst for Biodiversity Action. <i>Author’s Note: Notes resource shortage issue.</i>
N6	A	
N7	O	A and D The Council certainly leads on some major aspects of the LBAP however; <b>I feel that the LBAP should be allocated more resources and should employ a team of people</b> to deal with various aspects of the plan. <b>There is far too much work involved for one person.</b> With a team it would be possible to share out responsibilities in terms of planning, raising awareness and involving the public, initiating new projects and partnerships, supporting other organizations. reporting, fund raising etc. <i>Author’s Note: Notes resource shortage issue.</i>
N8v	D	
N9	A	
N10	SA	
N11	O	- <b>In terms of specific LBAP Action it is not clear to see the council’s achievements</b> however work on the coordination of and writing of the LBAP and awareness work by the local biodiversity officer, Anglesey Coastal Path, Country Parks such as Breakwater, several local projects funded through the AONB Sustainable Development Fund, events such as Anglesey Walking Festival and the work of Menter Mon are providing direct benefits to biodiversity. <b>It would be good to see more direct interest taken by county councilors in the LBAP and LBAP action carried out.</b>

N12	A	
N13	D	
G1	DK	
G2	SA	(Continued ...)
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
G3	A	
G4	SA	
G5	A	
G6	D	
G7	D	I <b>think things are improving</b> – IACC support for the Dingle project for instance, some progress on school nature reserves and dealing with bats in DC – but failure to address the biodiversity on smallholdings remains a glaring omission.
bN1	A	<i>Author's Note: Confirmed BBNP meant</i>
bG1	A	adds: Other Varies from one Council to another <i>Author's Notes: Confirmed BBNP meant</i> <i>Has used 'other' to add a comment.</i>
cN1v	SA	
dN1	SD	The relevant department of the county council is <b>woefully under funded and under staffed</b> for the job they need (and want) to do
dN2	A	
dN3	DK	
eN1	DK	
eN2	D	FROM 4: Many people are distrustful of Pembrokeshire County Council and do not see them as an organisation which consults with people over decision making. Indeed I would go as far as to say that <b>they do not understand the consultation process at all.</b> This criticism of PCC as a whole is by no means a criticism of the Biodiversity Officer who is accessible, accommodating and supportive.
eN3	SD	
eG1	DK	
eG2	DK	
eG3	D	
eG4	SD	- The <b>County Council does not lead on biodiversity action at all</b> , rarely getting involved in anything other than carrying out statutory planning functions. The National Park Authority, CCW, National Trust, EA are the main organizations in Pembs actively delivering biodiversity projects
fN1	A	In Snowdonia's case this might be correct but very viable around Wales and viable by taxa or habitat. <i>Author's Note: Confirmed SNP meant</i>
fN2	A	<i>Author's Note: Confirmed SNP meant</i>
fN3	A	<i>Author's Note: Confirmed SNP meant</i>

fG1	SD	Dealings with SNP LBAP staff have been very positive, but I cannot say the same for Gwynedd Council <i>Author's Note: Confirmed SNP meant</i>  <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
fG2	A	<b>The whole principle of thinking globally acting locally is exemplified by the LBAP process.</b> Having an agreed Local Authority based LBAP ties that Authority into delivering action and addressing biodiversity needs within the planning process. The value of Biodiversity (habitats and species) is core to the whole ethics of a living and working National Park and heavily promoted in tourist literature as one of the reasons of visiting the area. The SNPA can provide valuable resources to safeguard the future of its biodiversity interest. The LBAP process helps focus those scarce resources to where they are most needed. <i>Author's Note: Confirmed SNP meant</i>
gN1	A	
gN2	A	
gG1	A	

**b) It would be worth investigating whether the LBAP process could be more clearly separated from County Council work.**

N.B. Brecon Beacons and Snowdonia respondents answered in reference to '... National Park work.'

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N1	DK	
N2v	O	(no response, counted as other)
N3	A	
N4	SA	
N5	DK	- I have no real opinion on this.
N6	D	Don't think there is a need for this.
N7	SD	Biodiversity issues should be an integral part of the County Council's work. <i>Author's Note: Statement refers to 'the LBAP process', rather than 'biodiversity issues'.</i>
N8v	A	
N9	DK	
N10	A	
N11	D	- It is important that the County Council are aware of biodiversity and that all departments are working together to protect Anglesey's natural heritage.
N12	D	
N13	SA	LBAPs as independent entities can work well, but if this is just a way of the council shedding their responsibility it won't work.

		<i>Author's Note: Positive note on independent LBAP, but not favoured as part of a lessening of council responsibility.</i>
G1	A	
G2	SD	
G3	D	<i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
G4	A	
G5	A	
G6	A	
G7	D	The IACC needs to own the LBAP process and to have that coordinating and democratic role. The involvement and understanding of Members is important.
bN1	SD	Added Jan 2007: The reason being that the National Park is the leading light, well clued up and keen on biodiversity work. When it was worded as a Council, I feel the LBAP should be taken away from the Council and given to a body with a strong will to do something i.e. the National Park, who have 'to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park ' as one of their two statutory purposes. <i>Author's Note: Confirmed response for BBNP was SD (Agreed for Gwynedd Council)</i>
bG1	D	adds: Other Surely it is important that it forms an integral part of the Council's responsibilities. <i>Author's Note: Confirmed BBNP meant Has used 'other' to add a comment.</i>
cN1v	A	
dN1	A	Doing so might in reality allow greater achievement in certain areas, <b>BUT I think it is very important that the county council continue to lead, as biodiversity work should be a necessary part of statutory delivery</b> and not a bolt-on you can opt out of. I would probably resolve this by having additional dedicated staff who are hosted by other organizations but work closely with the lead officer in the county council. <i>Author's Note: Wants council to lead still</i>
dN2	SA	
dN3	A	
eN1	D	Pembs LBAP already enjoys a degree of autonomy from the council
eN2	A	
eN3	A	
eG1	DK	
eG2	D	
eG3	A	Although the cross-over is currently necessary to raise standards within the Council's work.
eG4	A	
fN1	D	LBAP's need all the political support they can get. I suspect if County Council's not required to commit they wouldn't bother.

		(Adds Jan 2007: one could say that with section 40 of NERC act councils now have a legal duty but that's along with all the other broad spectrum of duties across the social, education, etc sectors so on balance probably still useful LBAPs are embedded in to councils/NPs as one mechanism whereby they can deliver that duty.) <i>Author's Note: Confirmed SNP meant (Continued ...)</i>
Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
fN2	D	FROM Q. 4: <b>If actions are removed from the local authority / council there is a danger</b> that an already marginalized sector of local authority responsibility is completely devolved and <b>unsustainable economic / social development runs unchecked</b> . There <b>needs to be more integration with mainstream council operations / remits</b> . <i>Author's Note: Confirmed SNP meant Calls for greater council integration</i>
fN3	A	<i>Author's Note: Confirmed SNP meant</i>
fG1	DK	<i>Author's Note: Confirmed SNP meant</i>
fG2	D	<b>Biodiversity interests need to be at the heart of National Park working</b> (especially planning) rather than bolted on as an after thought. The LBAP should be able to provide a framework for targeting scarce resources and for setting priorities for restoration work. Within the various functions and sections of the National Park an awareness of the importance of maintaining and enhancing biodiversity is easier to achieve where there is an internal voice than from outside. <i>Author's Note: Confirmed SNP meant</i>
gN1	A	
gN2	SD	
gG1	A	<b>But there is the danger that the LBAP will become lost and forgotten</b> without the force of the local authority behind it.

### 2.iii) LBAP Document

#### a) The LBAP is just about the right size and level of detail.

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N1	D	
N2v	A	so long as there are individual documents for the individual species and habitats setting out the plans <i>Author's Note: Wants species and habitats individually</i>
N3	A	although surely the LBAP should be allowed to expand, incorporating case studies from other local authorities, and best practice notes. <i>Author's Note: Argument for possible expansion.</i>
N4	A	

N5	D	I think that <b>more detail is required</b> with an onus upon partners to provide the information. <i>Author's Note: Wants more detail</i>
N6	A	It is accessible to most people in its current format. Just a cosmetic point, but I'd like to see <b>more species photos</b> in it. <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
N7	A	The level of detail is ok however; I feel that it would be useful to <b>add more species/habitats</b> in the future <b>or temporarily delete (put on hold) plans that may not be currently relevant</b> . I feel it <b>should be a dynamic document</b> rather than something that it written once and then set it stone. It is an important document and the more habitats and species that are included within it the more chance there is that these species/habitats will receive some protection/recognition and <b>it certainly helps with drawing in funding to undertake works</b> . Also the <b>list of targets and actions should be constantly being reviewed</b> to make sure that they are current.
N8v	A	
N9	D	
N10	DK	
N11	A	
N12	A	
N13	D	LBAPs tend to become 'on the shelf' documents and Anglesey's is no exception. I feel they <b>need to be made more user-friendly</b> , possibly lighter and more interactive, especially if they are to become better understood by the general public.
G1	A	
G2	A	
G3	A	
G4	A	
G5	A	
G6	D	
G7	A	Any more detail would be unduly prescriptive and beyond the authority of the LBAP. It is up to individuals and partners to determine the detail in the light of their powers and resources. <i>Author's Note: Wants no more detail</i>
bN1	SA	
bG1	A	
cN1v	D	
dN1	A	
dN2	SA	
dN3	DK	
eN1	D	
eN2	A	
eN3	DK	

eG1	SD	
eG2	A	
eG3	O	The evolved format – with a ‘public’ front end and a more technical ‘action plan’ is perhaps the right level, but this hasn’t yet been fully adopted. <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
eG4	D	– the LBAP has failed to engage with any individuals or organizations. It is <b>barely relevant to the day to day work of any of the people working in nature conservation</b> . It needs to be radically reviewed as does the national guidance for LBAPs, which is where it originated from in the first place. LBAPs generally are not useful and are <b>not read and understood by most people, particularly the people making the decisions at national and local government levels</b> .
fN1	D	
fN2	D	
fN3	SA	
fG1	DK	As LBAP is not a statutory ‘designation’ & without any proper legal standing, for example protected species, <b>we tend now not to consider it when consulted</b> .
fG2	A	The initial LBAP sets out a series of actions pertinent to each habitat and priority species. There is always room for improvement and review of what is included, the actions and the targets. <b>SMART targets should be formulated</b> to assist the review of the Actions and future monitoring of the LBAP. <b>Opportunities for developing new actions as information becomes available should be part of the review process</b> .
gN1	DK	
gN2	A	
gG1	D	I <b>think the Swansea LBAP is too big</b> to be honest. It is superbly inspiring and captures all sorts of related issues but I think the species could be combined in some instances and some of the repetition taken out. <i>Author’s Note: LBAP is too big</i>

**b) We actively use the LBAP to inform our conservation decision-making in the area.**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
N1	A	
N2v	DK	– as I am not involved with x decision making on conservation issues.
N3	DK	I am not personally included in most decision-making processes. Although I <b>would imagine that the LBAP is secondary</b> to primary scientific research in informing the decisions of the decision makers.
N4	A	

N5	A	
N6	A	
N7	A	Much of our work directly relates to the targets set out in the LBAP.
N8v	A	
N9	A	e.g. grazing animal project on coastal heaths. <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
N10	A	
N11	A	
N12	SD	
N13	SD	
G1	O	useful document for “kick-off” point when enthusing farmers
G2	A	
G3	D	
G4	D	
G5	SA	
G6	D	Most of our targets nationally are derived from national HAPs and SAPs. <i>Author’s Note: NB Respondent helped set some LBAP habitat targets.</i>
G7	D	Our objectives and targets are generated by WAG, UK BAP, HD, SSSI guidelines etc. <b>We frequently see LBAP used to support, or justify, actions which a body was going to undertake anyway.</b> <i>Author’s Note: NB Respondent helped set many LBAP targets.</i>
bN1	D	
bG1	A	
cN1v	A	
dN1	A	
dN2	D	
dN3	DK	
eN1	D	
eN2	A	
eN3	A	
eG1	SD	
eG2	A DK	<b>A - as an individual, for own duties</b> DK - AS AN Agency <i>Author’s Note: Different answers; count as DK as statement uses ‘we’.</i>
eG3	D	
eG4	D	– The LBAP is used to set the context of local nature conservation action with international and national legislation and policies. <b>It provides us with a framework only, it isn’t actively used to generate work programmes or project programmes</b>
fN1	D	As a lead partner decision-making based on UK BAP first then Wales priorities (not just S74)
fN2	D	
fN3	A	
fG1	SD	
fG2	A	

gN1	A	
gN2	SA	
gG1	A	<b>We do use it but we have recently reduced our role in supporting the LBAP where planning casework is concerned</b> – this has happened because of CCW guidelines on responding to casework. <i>(Continued ...)</i>

c) Success in new action implementation tends to be with things that we would have done anyway.

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N1	A	
N2v	DK	
N3	DK	But I can imagine that in some, if not most cases yes. At present the organization would not take on board a project simply because it was on the LBAP, it would have to be relevant to other projects in which the organization were involved.
N4	D	
N5	A	But the <b>LBAP has been a useful supporting document.</b>
N6	D	
N7	A	Although in the future, should resources become available, the LBAP actions may become a catalyst for new projects.
N8v		
N9	A	- however it does help to prioritise resources and helps in getting projects underway.
N10	D	
N11	D	
N12	DK	
N13	A	
G1	A	
G2	DK	
G3	A	
G4	A	
G5	D	
G6	A	
G7	SA	– in contrast, I suspect the more radical actions recommended in the HAPs and SAPs largely remain unimplemented.
bN1	SD	
bG1	D	LBAP is important in justifying expenditure
cN1v	A	
dN1	DK	<b>In some cases yes</b> , because by definition internal policy and LBAP priorities are working towards some of the same priorities, <b>but LBAP has also opened up some funding we could not have replaced by other means</b>
dN2	A	
dN3	D	
eN1	SA	

eN2	D	
eN3	D	
eG1	SA	
eG2	DK	
eG3	A	
eG4	A	(Continued ...)
Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
fN1	SA	
fN2	SA	
fN3	A	
fG1	A	
fG2	D	The <b>LBAP has helped x (organisation) plan its work programme and raise resources</b> for meeting the targets and actions within the plan.
gN1	DK	
gN2	D	
gG1	D	No, I think the LBAP acts as a trigger and adds further reasons for doing the work.

d) The LBAP is more a reference list of who's doing what than itself setting the agenda for what gets done.

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N1	A	
N2v	D	– for wildflower rich road verges an agenda has been set and if it can be followed biodiversity will benefit
N3	A	but at present this is probably best because <b>the LBAP does not necessarily reflect what the priorities are. The LBAP should be drawn up in the first place to really look at what needs to be done to conserve local species that are in trouble and highlight local issues.</b> For example, <b>song thrushes are not in trouble on Anglesey, but have been included</b> more so to attract the public's attention. <b>Surely, the LBAP should be used as a tool to increase public awareness and make them aware that other species and local habitats really are endangered.</b> <i>Author's Note: Criticism of LBAP on issue of priority species and habitats; also need for awareness raising.</i> <i>N.B. Song Thrush was included in LBAP because of being a UK priority.</i>
N4	D	
N5	D	
N6	D	
N7	O	- A and D. I agree with this statement to some extent – <b>it is extremely valuable to have a reference list of who's doing what locally but I also think it has the potential to set the agenda for what gets done</b> – this is probably especially true with new projects that have started post production of the LBAP

		document as the preexisting projects probably fed in information for actions/targets during the production of the LBAP.
N8v	D	
N9	D	
N10	DK	
N11	SD	– the LBAP sets out specific actions and targets that need doing.
N12	A	<i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
N13	A	
G1	A	
G2	D	
G3	A	
G4	A	
G5	D	
G6	A	
G7	A	This may not be such a bad thing, though sad if it just ends there.
bN1	D	
bG1	D	
cN1v	A	
dN1	SA	<b>This is the biggest flaw of the whole process</b>
dN2	A	
dN3	A	
eN1	O	<b>Somewhere in between, though more of a reference list of 'who should be doing...'</b> .
eN2	A	
eN3	DK	
eG1	A	
eG2	DK	
eG3	A	
eG4	A	
fN1	A	
fN2	O	Somewhere in between, though more of a reference list of 'who should be doing...'
fN3	SA	
fG1	A	
fG2	D	The LBAP both sets the agenda and reports who is doing what (and thereby helps establish synergies)
gN1	D	
gN2	D	
gG1	D	As I said above the LBAP acts as a trigger and supports new work.

#### 2.iv) LBAP Reporting and Results

a) We report on BARS or to the LBAP Officer thus ensuring that progress on our actions is normally clear.

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
------------	------------------	---------------------------

N1	A	
N2v	O	– I haven't got round to regular reporting on progress with the x plan but I hope to get to grips with reporting this year!
N3	DK	Communication within our organization as regards LBAP reporting is rather sketchy. <i>Author's Note: Reporting on LBAPs in this NGO is an unresolved issue.</i> <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
N4	D	
N5	O	I have not used BARS but have passed on information via one to one meeting. Certainly LBAP reporting is important. <i>Author's Note: Has reported once.</i>
N6	DK	As far as I'm aware, only one member of the x Team has had BARS training, so I'm not sure what details are inputted.
N7	A	We've made a start but I think we have a long way to go on this!
N8v	D	
N9	D	however this is <b>simply because of time constraints</b> and as an organization this is something we need to look at!
N10	SD	
N11	SA	
N12	O	
N13	O	We currently have no reporting into to either BARS or the Biodiversity Officer, whether that is because we don't have these responsibilities or whether we don't know about them is what we need to know. <i>Author's Note: Is unclear about reporting. NB This NGO is not listed for current LBAP actions by name</i>
G1	DK	
G2	DK	
G3	O	Each of the 6 Conservation Managers in Wales are unable to report directly to BARS/LBAP as the x ( <b>organisation</b> ) <b>prefer the information to go through a centralised reporting process</b> , which unfortunately still needs to be developed. <i>Author's Note: N.B. Reporting not happening on BARS at present.</i>
G4	A	
G5	D	
G6	A	
G7	A	However, in the scheme of things, <b>BARS reporting is not the highest priority.</b> <i>Author's Note: 'Highest priority' for x organisation. Reporting is high priority for LBAP process/ evaluation</i>
bN1	SD	
bG1	D	The <b>actual operation of BARS is unclear to us.</b>
cN1v	D	
dN1	D	... but will do soon hopefully
dN2	A	
dN3	DK	

eN1	O	we do not have user rights for this LBAP within BARS. We would use BARS to report on actions if we had this facility.
eN2	D	
eN3	DK	
eG1	DK	
eG2	D	
eG3	D	(Continued ...)
Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
eG4	D	– we are not currently finding BARS to be a useful tool for reporting. We haven't come up with an adequate process for reporting on progress as a partnership, although <b>each of the partners do their own comprehensive corporate planning and reporting</b>
fN1	O	We report as lead partner and strive to keep LBAPs informed but not always successfully due to <b>lack of capacity to deal with 24 LBAPs</b> <i>Author's Note: Problem of dealing with many LBAPs</i>
fN2	A	
fN3	DK	
fG1	SD	
fG2	SA	
gN1	D	
gN2	A	
gG1	A	We report via a local authority officer and don't use BARS.

**b) Although significant numbers of actions in the LBAP may show little or no progress, their inclusion shows what needs to be done, and can help draw in funding.**

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N1	A	
N2v	A	– but funding for the road verge plan is a serious problem now that Landfill Tax money is no longer available
N3	DK	I'm unclear how the funding works , but <b>the LBAP does not always show what needs to be done</b> . Also, surely <b>the LBAP should be there to ensure things do get done</b> , otherwise there is little purpose to it.
N4	A	
N5	A	
N6	SA	
N7	SA	- I think <b>this is very important</b> – it provides a focus and is extremely valuable in drawing in funding.
N8v	D	
N9	A	
N10	A	
N11	SA	
N12	A	

N13	SA	
G1	D	- uncertain about funding statement
G2	SA	
G3	A	
G4	A	
G5	SA	
G6	A	(Continued ...)
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
G7	SA	
bN1	A	
bG1	A	
cN1v	A	
dN1	A	
dN2	A	
dN3	SA	
eN1	A	
eN2	A	
eN3	A	
eG1	A	
eG2	DK	
eG3	A	
eG4	D	
fN1	SA	
fN2	A	
fN3	SA	
fG1	DK	
fG2	A	It is impossible to do everything ! but the LBAP documents establish an agenda of a rolling programme of work.
gN1	SA	
gN2	SA	
gG1	SA	

**c) The LBAP enthuses and informs many local people.**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
N1	DK	
N2v	SD	<b>I doubt that many people are aware of the LBAP</b> outside those involved with wildlife conservation
N3	D	<b>I am unsure how many people understand the LBAP process, and what the priorities are.</b> There is a <b>general apathy</b> it is true, but I also believe that there is an opportunity for the LBAP – with the right resources to make a big difference.
N4	SD	
N5	A	
N6	O	Don't necessarily agree that the document itself does, however, someone talking to people about it does, especially when in the context of practical project work that's actually being carried out.

		<i>Author's Note: Partial agreement - people more likely to enthuse than the document itself.</i>
N7	DK	- I hope it does but <b>I still wonder how many local people are aware of the LBAP and the BAP process in general.</b> It is certainly something that people are becoming aware of and will become more aware of in time by trickle feed.
N8v	SD	<i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
N9	SA	
N10	DK	
N11	SA	
N12	A	
N13	SD	-Although it can inform local people, I would say it <b>suffers from formatting problems and needs to be produced in a simpler version</b> (using more pictures than text) to make them more accessible to the public.
G1	D	- <b>doubt if many have heard of the process</b> outside of conservation etc.
G2	A	
G3	DK	
G4	DK	
G5	A	
G6	D	
G7	A	<b>... not sure about enthuses</b> ...or whether the word is in the OED! Certainly should inform and might suggest appropriate actions. <i>Author's Note: Only 'might' suggest appropriate actions.</i>
bN1	SD	
bG1	A	
cN1v	D	
dN1	A	
dN2	D	
dN3	D	
eN1	DK	
eN2	SD	
eN3	A	
eG1	DK	
eG2	DK	
eG3	D	People enthuse people.
eG4	D	– see responses above (i.e. Taken to refer to: 2. iii) a) – the LBAP has failed to engage with any individuals or organizations. It is barely relevant to the day to day work of any of the people working in nature conservation. It needs to be radically reviewed as does the national guidance for LBAPs, which is where it originated from in the first place. LBAPs generally are not useful and are not read and understood by most people, particularly the people making the decisions at national and local government levels.

		and .... 2. iii) b) – The LBAP is used to set the context of local nature conservation action with international and national legislation and policies. It provides us with a framework only, it isn't actively used to generate work programmes or project programmes)  <i>(Continued ...)</i>
Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
fN1	SA	
fN2	DK	
fN3	D	
fG1	DK	
fG2	A	Overall the <b>LBAP</b> has had a positive effect at awareness raising
gN1	A	
gN2	A	
gG1	A	

d) There is lack of clarity about how LBAP targets and action reporting stand in relation to national HAP and SAP management and steering processes.

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N1	D	
N2v	DK	
N3	A	
N4	D	
N5	SA	With red squirrel it is clear that the national SAP has failed to consider LBAP for Anglesey and to some extent has elected to ignore much of the material because, as a unique island location, red squirrel conservation here often contradicts national policy e.g. establishing hazel and oak in coniferous plantations. <i>Author's Note: N.B. UK SAP was written before LBAP. Understand new Welsh target takes more account of Anglesey population.</i>
N6	A	Would be useful to have more information on that aspect.
N7	A	Although this will probably improve with the use of BARS.
N8v	A	
N9	DK	- don't really know that much about these process in a strategic way.
N10	DK	
N11	A	
N12	A	
N13	A	
G1	DK	

G2	A	
G3	A	Adds comment (after Other) - x tends to be governed by national BAPs especially where they are seen to be the lead partner, mostly these are woodland habitats. <i>Author's Note: Note on UK-orientation of organisation</i>
G4	DK	
G5	A	(Continued ...)
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
G6	D	
G7	A	We have assumed that the LBAP should reflect the priorities set by UK BAP, with the addition of some local colour and detail. Recent discussion (Newborough) suggests that this may not be universally accepted. <i>Author's Note: Newborough case - restoration of dunes by felling pines was opposed by small but strong local group.</i>
bN1	D	
bG1	A	
cN1v	D	
dN1	A	But that is probably more to do with me than the processes!
dN2	SA	
dN3	A	
eN1	A	The distinction between national as meaning the Welsh or UK level adds weight to the lack of clarity response in a sliding scale from Strongly agree to Agree. <i>Author's Note: Issue: use of 'national' for Welsh and UK</i>
eN2	A	
eN3	DK	
eG1	DK	
eG2	DK	
eG3	A	
eG4	A	
fN1	A	
fN2	A	The distinction between national as meaning the Welsh or UK level adds weight to the lack of clarity response in a sliding scale from Strongly agree to Agree. <i>Author's Note: Issue: use of 'national' for Welsh and UK</i>
fN3	DK	
fG1	DK	
fG2	D	The National BAP Steering groups rely heavily on feedback from the LBAPs to measure the extent of effort and resources being spent on the delivery of the national targets. BARS provides a good window on the work
gN1	DK	
gN2	D	

gG1	A	
-----	---	--

e) It would be better to focus more on priority objectives with long-term flexibility for project decision-making, rather than including long lists of detailed actions with variable degrees of backing commitment.

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N1	O	- but then its not an action plan
N2v	O	- I'm not sure that I know what this means!
N3	SA	
N4	SA	
N5	SD	
N6	A	
N7	A	Although, sometimes it is useful to have some detailed actions that people can pick up on perhaps at a later date if funding becomes available etc.
N8v	A	
N9	SA	
N10	A	
N11	D	
N12	SA	
N13	A	
G1	SA	
G2	DK	
G3	A	
G4	D	
G5	A	
G6	A	
G7	O	Opportunity is the key. The coming together of key individuals make things happen.
bN1	SD	
bG1	A	
cN1v	SA	
dN1	DK	
dN2	A	
dN3	A	
eN1	O	- both <b>Long term objectives are imperative</b> to keep the LBAP focused on sustainable outcomes. <b>In combination with detailed actions</b> for short and medium-term. <b>If either are left out there arises the threat of disjointed action and therefore waste of resources</b> across sub-regional / regional and national

		scales and / or too much outward focus and no short-term gains made for locally important wildlife and issues. <i>Author's Note: Is in favour of detailed actions</i>
eN2	A	
eN3	D	
eG1	A	
eG2	DK	<i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
eG3	DK	
eG4	A	
fN1	A	Though it <b>has helped with funding applications to refer to specific LBAP actions</b>
fN2	O	- both Long term objectives are imperative to keep the LBAP focused on sustainable outcomes. In combination with detailed actions for short and medium-term. If either are left out there arises the threat of disjointed action and therefore waste of resources across sub-regional / regional and national scales and / or too much outward focus and no short-term gains made for locally important wildlife and issues. <i>Author's Note: Is in favour of detailed actions</i>
fN3	A	
fG1	A	
fG2	A	<b>To some degree this is already happening</b> - since much of the delivery in the wider countryside is through funding derived from agri-environment schemes. Targeted advice aimed at a range of habitat and species can be achieved through the agri-environment schemes meeting species specific needs as well as general best practice.
gN1	SA	
gN2	D	
gG1	A	

## 2.v) Other

a) Local Biodiversity action would benefit greatly by focusing more on Climate Change-related projects (such as habitat linking) and mutually-beneficial projects for health and wildlife.

Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N1	O	Agree 2 <sup>nd</sup> statement could provide benefits
N2v	A	– I agree that habitat-linking is an important objective but it is also important that the habitats that are to be linked are biodiverse and are being managed adequately. I can see that linking health and wildlife conservation has some merit particularly if it means that money for habitat management might become available from some unlikely sources! I think a good

		<p>case can be made for the value of the enjoyment of a biodiverse environment, both within nature reserves and in the wider countryside e.g. roadside verges, to mental health. And of course walking or cycling in the countryside to visit and enjoy biodiverse areas, benefits physical health. <b>It is noteworthy that there are many very healthy wildlife enthusiasts of very mature years!</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(Continued ...)</i></p>
Respondent	Response (Basic)	Response Comments, if any
N3	DK	<p>-It would be sensible to refrain from going over to this completely as <b>it is important to keep to species and habitats focused plans</b>. However, where this is possible without losing the benefits of the action plan for a species/habitat, it could be contemplated. Also, where it is possible to focus on climate change and health as well , it is an opportunity to involve more people, more organizations, and more county council departments.</p> <p><i>Author's Note: Partial agreement.</i></p>
N4	D	
N5	A	
N6	O	<p>In some instances.</p> <p><i>Author's Note: Partial agreement.</i></p>
N7	A	This is certainly something we should be considering.
N8v	D	
N9	D	<p>- while these issues need to be considered they should not detract from the core aims.</p> <p><i>Author's Note: Partial agreement here. Is climate change not intimately bound up with core aim issues?</i></p>
N10	A	
N11	SD	
N12	DK	
N13	A	- If the funding and coordination is there.
G1	D	<p>- not convinced by climate change argument</p> <p><i>Author's Note: Not clear whether this is in general or only in relation to LBAPs</i></p>
G2	A	
G3	A	
G4	D	
G5	D	
G6	SA	
G7	A	The LBAP should be seen as a way of informing non-conservation circles of the options and looking for links across sectors
bN1	SD	
bG1	DK	
cN1v	A	
dN1	D	I think <b>action driven by climate issues should be led by planning at a national level and the targets feed down that</b>

		<p><b>way if relevant.</b> Benefits for health will come naturally with some projects but <b>smack a little of funding-chasing</b>, which should not drive the planning process (though should be considered with regard to timing of delivery etc. - but not in deciding targets).</p> <p><i>Author's Note: Notes risk of funding driving agenda</i></p>
dN2	SA	
dN3	SA	(Continued ...)
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
eN1	D	<p>- however, <b>habitat linking and integrated projects should be a priority whether or not climate change adaptation / mitigation is the underlying driver.</b></p> <p>Pembrokeshire will arguably feel a lot of the brunt of changes wrought by climate change particularly in terms of increased storminess and the erosive effect it will have on coastal habitats and associated species. So perhaps there is argument to focus a degree of effort towards mitigation measures. However, there is a danger that by focusing on climate change at the expense of current action, species will continue to decline and there won't be anything left to worry about by 2050. After all, the species and habitat changes (range changes, species composition etc.) linked to climate change are only predictions with varying degrees of confidence in the accuracy in both the predictions and the models that inform them. <b>Therefore any work whether it be short or long-term needs to consider current issues as well as addressing future needs - and integrated approach is the only way forward.</b></p>
eN2	A	
eN3	A	
eG1	D	
eG2	DK	
eG3	O	<b>Biodiversity action in itself shouldn't focus on these, but it should link better with these other interests and issues</b>
eG4	A	
fN1	O	<p>This is 2 questions. <b>Climate change – in principle this is fine</b> so long as we don't neglect the fact that many scarce species won't survive while we restore landscapes if we don't continue to undertake more localized actions. <b>Health and Wildlife – new in thing</b> that funding is forcing environmental groups to consider, <b>this is politically driven</b> and not necessarily best approach for biodiversity conservation.</p> <p><i>Author's Note: Notes two issues in the statement</i></p>
fN2	D	<p>- however, LBAP biodiversity protection / enhancement projects <b>would benefit more from being implemented with consideration given to addressing climate change adaptation measures.</b></p> <p>There is little doubt climate change is a big issue and alleviation measures need to be put in place to mitigate the effects it will</p>

		bring. However, there is a danger that by focusing on climate change at the expense of current action, species will continue to decline and there won't be anything left to worry about by 2050. After all, the species and habitat changes (range changes, species composition etc.) linked to climate change are only predictions with varying degrees of confidence in the accuracy in both the predictions and the models that inform them.
fN3	A	<i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
fG1	D	Disagree on second part <i>Author's Note: so A on 1st part?</i>
fG2	A	Landscape scale projects, the buffering of habitats and the involvement of communities can embrace many aspects of the LBAP.
gN1	D	
gN2	O	– the above factors are important but <b>too much work has been done on everything else to chicken out now</b> , more resources are required to achieve all objectives in the long term.
gG1	A	

**b) For us, most, if not all, important local conservation decisions are made outside the LBAP partnership and process.**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
N1	A	
N2v	A	– as someone viewing local conservation decisions from the periphery but this is probably a consequence of the Local Authority having very limited funds that they can apply to promoting LBAP work. <i>Author's Note: Council referred to, rather than LBAP Partnership.</i>
N3	A	
N4	A	
N5	A	
N6	A	<b>Economics is the deciding factor a lot of the time.</b>
N7	A and D	- In terms of the species work that $x$ is involved with a lot of the day-to-day decisions have to be made outside the LBAP Partnership, however any major decisions are discussed with relevant committees e.g. $y$ and $z$ on which the LBAP officer is represented. Most of the work relates to the actions and targets listed in the LBAP document. <i>Author's Note: LBAP officer referred to, rather than LBAP Partnership.</i>
N8v	A	
N9	SA	Agri -environment schemes, national policies on energy, individual organisations interests, etc. <i>Author's Note: Examples of decisions outside the process</i>
N10	A	

N11	SD	
N12	A	
N13	SA	
G1	DK	
G2	SD	
G3	A	
G4	A	
G5	D	<i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response (Basic)</b>	<b>Response Comments, if any</b>
G6	SA	
G7	SA	
bN1	SD	
bG1	O	<b>Although many decisions may be outside the process, they are informed by it.</b>
cN1v	SA	
dN1	DK	
dN2	D	
dN3	DK	
eN1	A	
eN2	DK	
eN3	A	
eG1	SA	
eG2	DK	
eG3	A	
eG4	A	
fN1	O	<b>The local level informs how projects implemented on the ground and timescales but the decision to have a project usually comes from outside the LBAP partnership.</b> <i>Author's Note: Sees local level as fine-tuning.</i>
fN2	A	
fN3	A	
fG1	SA	
fG2	D	<b>LBAP forums provide a good networking opportunity to bring partners together and find ways of cooperative working and decision making.</b>
gN1	DK	
gN2	D	
gG1	A	

### 3. Open-ended Responses:

i) You have £2 million for local Biodiversity work - what would be your first priorities for spending it?

Comments	Author's Notes
<p>N1 - Spend it all on <b>making Anglesey the most wooded area of Europe</b>; thro' land purchase, agreements, tree planting, "abandonment" and natural succession all on agricultural land.</p>	<p>Landscape-scale habitat management.</p>
<p>N2v - The <b>major problem in all Biodiversity work is "ongoing management" particularly appropriate grazing.</b> Most areas that we value for their biodiversity have attained their biodiverse status as a result of a particular history of agricultural land management practices which may be considered obsolete or uneconomic by modern farmers. Past management could be described as "seat of the pants" management i.e. the management of a site varies from year to year according to the weather in that particular year, available stock etc. This is not easy to accommodate in highly rigid and prescriptive management plans written by conservation bodies. So, if I had £2 million to spend.</p> <p>i) I would make sure that <b>management of designated sites</b> was being carried out and was delivering the desired outcomes.</p> <p>ii) I would <b>expand protected sites and acquire the necessary land to link them</b> where possible.</p> <p>iii) I would try to <b>involve local communities and particularly primary schools in looking after valuable biodiverse areas</b> in their localities</p>	<p>- Habitat management for important sites. Link and expand protected sites. - More public and schools involvement in management.</p>
<p>N3 - The money would be best spent on <b>projects that would significantly improve priority habitats, and conserve important target species.</b> Research should be done prior to beginning project to ensure that other areas/organizations have not had issues with similar projects, or more success in implementing them differently. This would also highlight <b>whether resources could be shared</b> to ensure the work gets done at its cheapest. These projects' successes and failures</p>	<p>Habitat improvement projects (with target species covered therein). Backed by careful planning and consideration of partnership benefits/ options. Careful evaluation and publicity of results.</p>

should be recorded and monitored, and subsequently, publicized widely and used as <b>best practice examples</b> .	
N4 - Making sure put money into <b>what is achievable</b> – success breeds success	Feasible targeting
N5 - I would place it all on ‘red’ on one turn of the roulette wheel. I’d give the winnings to you to spend as you saw fit, and the original £2 million stake <b>would go on red squirrel conservation</b> .	Red squirrel work.  <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Author’sNotes</b>
<p>N6 - I answer this question acknowledging I’m biased (!). Create a <b>red squirrel reserve</b> on Anglesey, and put in place measures for it to be managed sustainably. Commission <b>research into a Parapox vaccination</b> for reds.</p> <p><b>Create a public, dedicated environmental education / interpretation centre</b> on the island (at an existing location or purpose-built) that would contain material from all of the natural science disciplines, and would include a reception area, exhibitions and displays, a shop, a café, work rooms, field study equipment and laboratories, storage, basic accommodation, specialist library, public conveniences etc.</p> <p>Invest in and develop a <b>biodiversity-based, holistic primary education programme</b>, duly linked with the National Curriculum, and tailored specifically to Anglesey.</p> <p>Improve <b>public access</b> for all (sustainably) to Anglesey’s top wildlife sites.</p> <p>Secure funding to <b>sustain project staff</b>, where relevant.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Red squirrel reserve.</li> <li>- Parapox research.</li> <li>- Environmental centre.</li> <li>- Primary school biodiversity programme.</li> <li>- Site access for public.</li> <li>- Staff funding.</li> </ul>
<p>N7 - 1. Set up a <b>team of Biodiversity workers</b> – (these could be employed on a short-term contract in the first instance (one of which should be looking for further funding in order to maintain the jobs created and to undertake further work!)</p> <p>2. <b>Prioritise habitats/species actions</b> in terms of their immediate and long-term outcomes for biodiversity (<b>involving the LBAP partnership</b>)</p> <p>3. <b>Undertake works</b> relating to the priorities identified working <b>in partnership</b> with any organizations that are currently working on the habitats/species – in some cases this could simply be in the form of giving grants to the organizations to undertake the work)</p> <p>4. Initiate <b>survey work</b> to assess any species/habitats where information is limited</p> <p>5. Initiate a huge <b>awareness raising campaign</b> to educate people about biodiversity and to encourage them to get involved in their local areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Set up Biodiversity Team (including fund-seeking role)</li> <li>- Prioritise actions with partnership, and begin to undertake accordingly.</li> <li>- Survey as needed.</li> <li>- Awareness raising.</li> </ul> <p>Option to invest money and work with interest.</p>

The other option of course should it be available, would be to <b>invest the money and use the interest</b> generated to match fund any additional funding that could be sought and to undertake project work or employ people in the long term! (At 3% 2 million would earn £60,000 per annum – not a bad start!)	
N8v - <b>Buying more Reserves</b> because it is so much easier to just get on with your own management than try and spend years and loads of money on trying to persuade landowners to do it – and then they just don't anyway.	Land purchase for habitat management.  <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Author's Notes</b>
N9 - On Anglesey (presumably!) - Coastal <b>heath</b> , maritime heath, <b>appropriate grazing</b> regimes for identified areas.	Heathland management.
N10 - I'd produce a decent <b>book about all the local species for all the primary schools</b> in Anglesey to use. If 10 year olds know about biodiversity they are more likely to be active in doing something about it as adults.	Education - local species book for schools.
N11 - <b>Fund posts – LBAP Officer, LBAP Awareness &amp; Education Officer, LBAP Ecologist &amp; Assistant LBAP Warden.</b> Establishment of Isle of Anglesey <b>LBAP Fund for community biodiversity projects.</b> Anglesey <b>Field Studies Centre.</b>	- Fund Biodiversity Team. - Fund for community projects. - Field studies Centre.
N12 - Due to the importance of hedges and traditional boundaries as <b>wildlife corridors</b> and for plant species and the benefit this would bring to the Anglesey landscape spending it on <b>boundary management and creation</b> would be hugely beneficial and good value for money.	Boundary management and creation
N13 - Not exactly sure about projects, but I would say <b>something that has the biggest impact upon the most amount of people.</b> Thereby taking the <b>approach that its people's minds that we need to influence rather than biodiversity.</b> Of course if it has great biodiversity benefits then that's great.	Influence 'hearts and minds' - as many people as possible.
G1 - The <b>major influences on biodiversity on the island are the landowners.</b> A <b>targeted project on say rhos pasture or other areas</b> where no other opportunities occur may be of benefit. Note how quickly Natur Gwynedd spent out. This <b>demonstrates a need beyond Tir Gofal/Tir Cynnal.</b>	Habitat management: Target rhos pasture or other areas with funding gaps.
G2 -	
G3 - Ensure that what ever the money was to be spent on would be <b>sustainable.</b>	Sustainable spending
G4 -	

G5 - <i>x (organisation)</i> has written its <b>own BAP</b> which takes in local and national BAP targets, I would envisage the money would be carved up between those priorities.	Spend on <i>x</i> organisation's BAP priorities.
G6 - <b>Woodland management and linking woodland</b> habitats in the southern and eastern parts of the Island	Woodland habitat management and linking
G7 - 1. <b>School nature reserves</b> , linked to curriculum 2. Better <b>interpretation and access to NNRs</b> 3. Buy a lottery ticket and reinvest the winnings	- Schools nature reserves (= habitat management). - NNR interpretation and access. <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Author's Notes</b>
bN1 - Getting appropriate sustainable grazing management of all sites and habitats with the BBNPA area. Thereby linking LBAP partners, stock owners, commoners, and getting long term good site management with the lack of CO2 emissions of machinery and hopefully with a product that could be marketed locally by graziers.	- Thorough sustainable grazing management
bG1 -	
cN1v - Prioritise HAPs/ SAPs and generate action plans <b>which guarantee control over impacts incl. management agreements, partnerships, land acquisition, community involvement etc.</b>	- Prioritise HAPs and SAPs and make strong action plans with control over management agreements, partnerships, land acquisition, community involvement etc.
dN1 - Employing biodiversity staff to implement new projects, at least one or two of which would be hosted by an NGO	- Staff for new projects, some of whom to be NGO-hosted
dN2 - Can only comment on site-specific details – lapwing recovery habitat management, employment of <b>long-term</b> contract staff.	- Staff, long-term contract staff
dN3 - Working with landowners to improve wildlife habitat and provide areas for people to observe, appreciate and learn about that wildlife. Make landowners aware of effects of climate change to land use and biodiversity.	- Work with landowners on: i) Habitat management ii) Wildlife observation/ learning iii) Climate change impacts awareness
eN1 - 1) Ensure key areas for priority species and wider biodiversity ('hot spots') have the management mechanisms in place to ensure their sustainable management (and adaptive management processes in place - as below). 2) Ensure all current designated sites/ habitats are in favourable condition and the mechanism in place to ensure the management is sustainable and adaptive to emerging threats/ knowledge and management progressions.	- Key areas - sustainable management of. - Ensure favourable condition for designated sites/ habitats - Plan habitat connectivity network, implement if funding allows

3) Identify and develop plans/ strategies to create habitat links (corridors and/ or stepping stones) to mitigate climate change impacts at the species level. Implement these if there is any money left after the first two objectives are met.	
eN2 - To financially support the biodiversity officer and employ an assistant officer. To financially support the many voluntary organisations i.e. Pembrokeshire Bat Group and Pembrokeshire Fungus Recording Network to enable more use of the expertise that members of these groups have. Publicity and marketing of the importance of biodiversity work.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff, Biodiversity Assistant.</li> <li>- Fund voluntary group expertise</li> <li>- Publicity/ awareness raising</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(Continued ...)</i></p>
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Author's Notes</b>
eN3 -	
eG1 - Research into species biology/ecology leading directly to developing a variety of options/management actions. Possibly habitat creation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Research to develop options/ management actions</li> <li>- Possibly habitat creation</li> </ul>
eG2 - Get the right people	- Get the right people
eG3 - Pembrokeshire needs a showcase partnership project, landscape or habitat-based rather than species-based. Wetlands are the current focus.	- Showcase partnership project, landscape or habitat-based
eG4 - Building on our conserving the park scheme to reinstate the network of wildlife friendly corridors and to manage and enlarge the key wildlife habitats that make up the circulation system of our countryside. This will give species the chance to establish larger, more sustainable populations, and to create new ones.	- Habitat management for sustainability and connectivity
fN1 - Increase abundance of rare Lepidoptera - Reduce habitat fragmentation by restoration/recreation to allow species to colonise new/former areas and withstand climate change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Species work on rare Lepidoptera</li> <li>- Habitat management for connectivity (climate change)</li> </ul>
fN2 - 1) Ensure key areas for priority species and wider biodiversity ('hot spots') have the management mechanisms in place to ensure their sustainable management (and adaptive management processes in place - as below). 2) Ensure all current designated sites / habitats are in favourable condition and the mechanism in place to ensure the management is sustainable and adaptive to emerging threats / knowledge and management progressions. 3) Identify and develop plans / strategies to create habitat links (corridors and / or stepping stones) to mitigate climate change impacts at the species level. Implement these if there is any money left after the first two objectives are met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Key areas - sustainable management of.</li> <li>- Ensure favourable condition for designated sites/ habitats</li> <li>- Plan habitat connectivity network, implement if funding allows</li> </ul>

fN3 - Projects that can be demonstrated to leave a legacy when funding dries up. E.g. practical education, awareness raising and community involvement (not just consultation / rubber stamping).	- Projects with 'legacy' e.g. Education, awareness, community involvement
fG1 - Linking wildlife habitats and commissioning specific species research and implementing recommendations.	- Habitat connectivity management - Species research and resulting action work  (Continued ...)
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Author's Notes</b>
fG2 - With a £2M resource fund there would be a fantastic opportunity to grant aid direct action on the ground through careful targeting to maintain and enhance habitats, create buffers and establish linkages. Habitat fragmentation and population fragmentation are the big drivers in the extinction process. Create habitat schemes (such as tree planting schemes on intensive agricultural land in the upper river catchment) could ensure connectivity and address issues such as future flooding and climate change. The opportunity to purchase land should also be taken as this will secure its future management.	- Habitat management to maintain/ enhance sites - Habitat schemes to address connectivity, future flooding, climate change - Land purchase to secure management
gN1 - Promotion and education.	- Promotion/ education.
gN2 - Long term habitat protection, restoration and management in both terrestrial and marine contexts.	- Habitat management, protection/ restoration (land and sea)
gG1 - Habitat management on LNRs and SINC sites, Interpretation panels for visitors – we NEED to tell people about nature Focus on wildlife corridors - - protected existing ones and creating new ones by filling in gaps. And finally – creation of green bridges over roads and motorways – expensive but brilliant!	- Habitat management on LNRs and SINCs - Wildlife corridor protection and creation - Green bridges over roads/ motorways

**ii) Please give an example of how you would change the LBAP document to improve it.**

(Note: suggestions for improvements relating to *process* were also received in response to question 4, covered below).

<b>Comments</b>	<b>Author's Notes</b>
N1 - Add <b>pictures</b>	Pictures
N2v - I think the loose-leaf format of the LBAP is very good because it enables the user to update and replace sections without having to replace the entire document. I don't have any	

particular comment on the content which I envisage would evolve over time.	
N3 - The LBAP document is quite clear, it is <b>implementation and communication that need to be improved.</b>	Need better implementation and communication
N4 - User friendlier for the public – <b>usable separate chunks</b>	Break down for public
N5 - I would put it <b>on the web</b> in a format that enabled the public to post thoughts and opinions ad lib. And then use the returns to create a constantly evolving document	Web - ongoing consultation/ evolution  <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Author'sNotes</b>
N6 - As 2 iii a, include <b>more species photos.</b> Include HAPs and SAPs (in line with the UK BAP) for some of the better known local species that the general public can readily relate to.	More photos Have more well known HAPs and SAPs for public.
N7 - Perhaps <b>add a few more species/habitats, update</b> the actions and targets as more information becomes available (although I know this is in the pipeline anyway)	More HAPs and SAPs; update.
N8v - I can't think of a way.	
N9 -	
N10 -	
N11 - Recycled, coloured, card <b>summary</b> for members of the public with photographs and <b>easy explanations – things you can do to help local species</b> (see Wrexham LBAP).	Summary with photos; public-friendly advice.
N12 -	
N13 - Slimmer, more <b>interactive</b> , more worded for the lay-person, use appendices to put lists/tables of targets and actions, thus creating <b>two separate documents</b> (one for use by professionals, one for the public).	Make into two parts: public basic and professionals' technical.
G1 - Simple <b>leaflet demonstrating how landowners influence biodiversity</b> sent to <b>all registered farmers and smallholders</b> on the island. Those with further interest could access the full document. Would work only with a small scale grant scheme?	Leaflet to landowners.
G2 -	
G3 - ?	
G4 -	
G5 - <b>Maintain the document in an electronic (web based) form that was more responsive to changing priorities / completed actions.</b> There is a tendency for paper based documents to become obsolete quickly.	Make evolving web-based definitive LBAP (BARS could fulfill this).
G6 - It really depends upon who it is being marketed to. If it's	User friendly to public.

for the general public then it needs to be as <b>free of jargon as possible</b> and have clear and bold statements, if it's for the <b>partners then it can be more complicated</b> and in a language that they understand. In general though it needs to be made a <b>more friendly and accessible document, web-based allowing linking to partner organisations' web sites.</b> A summary document for the general public could be produced with regular updates to show what is being achieved.	Web-based.
G7 - Put it on the Web!	Put LBAP on Web
bN1 - In the ways Gareth was doing before I left x (organisation).	i.e. Working towards better LBAP/ BARS compatibility (Continued ...)
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Author's Notes</b>
bG1 -	
cN1v - Make it more legible to the general public and how they can be involved.	Public legibility and how can get involved
dN1 - Encourage statutory bodies to commit to delivery of more projects that they are not already running	Better statutory body delivery
dN2 - I have not yet seen the final document to enable me to answer	
dN3 - No comment	
eN1 - Review the actions within the LBAP and their allocation as lead / support to partner organisations in order to: 1. Link it more closely with Welsh and UK BAP actions and objectives. 2. Reaffirm organisations commitment to allocated actions and amend, delete or create new actions in line with current and emerging issues.	Review LBAP to: - Link more to Welsh/ UK BAP - Update actions and reaffirm commitment
eN2 - Don't know	Don't know
eN3 -	
eG1 -	
eG2 -	
eG3 - I wouldn't change it – I'd maybe get a college design class and conservation management class to pool resources and do it for me. Involve people from outside the club...	Look for suggestions outside 'the club'
eG4 - I'd like for it to be less detailed on habitats and species and concentrate more on articulating issues affecting wildlife and the types of strategic measures that can be brought to bear to address these issues over a certain timescale.	Less detail, more strategic focus
fN1 -	
fN2 - Link it more closely with Welsh and UK BAP actions and objectives.	Link more to Welsh/ UK BAP
fN3 -	
fG1 - DK	Don't know

fG2 - SMART targets should be formulated to assist the review of the Actions and future monitoring of the LBAP. Opportunities for developing new actions aimed at connecting habitats and de-fragmenting populations of priority species.	Make SMART targets to help action review. Develop habitat connectivity/ de-fragmentation
gN1 -	
gN2 - Not necessary	Not needed
gG1 - I might reduce the text but also increase the suggested projects – actually think up ideas for projects and sites – so the basis is there and the thinking has been done if any funding comes up.	Less text but more project detail to back fundraising

iii) If the LBAP and process were abolished, what would be the biggest losses to your area for biodiversity conservation?

Comments	Author's Notes
N1 - CW <b>Local perspective</b> on national priorities	Local perspective
N2v - Don't know!	Don't know!
N3 - I think losing the LBAP process would be a great loss for any area. They're <b>a tool to get people thinking about the local biodiversity priorities</b> in most cases, but the process could be refined to be more effective. If the process were abolished it would mean that organizations that are currently working together to deliver on priorities would not have the <b>focus</b> they currently have. Nor would they necessarily <b>meet or work together</b> to ensure that work is not being doubled up, or to see whether it could be done in a better or more efficient manner. At present the LBAP is a tool to <b>get people together to work towards common goals</b> , and it is a system that can only improve with use, and monitoring. Losing the LBAP would be a step backwards.	Local focus for common goals.
N4 - Exactly that – losing <b>conservation of biodiversity</b> , and the push for <b>public involvement</b>	Conservation, public involvement
N5 - The biggest loser would be those <b>species and habitats that aren't particularly popular with the public</b> – invertebrates, lichens, fungi, sand dunes etc. and for which LBAP is an important reminder.	Less popular species and habitats.
N6 - Lack of <b>focus and direction for conservation</b> management planning, and loss of <b>single, easily accessible contact point</b> for biodiversity information.	Focus and direction. Contact point.
N7 - For us, it would be a major loss in terms of <b>backing for funding</b> and providing a <b>focus for works</b> .	Funding backing, focus.

N8v - Having the authority of the document to make Rangers and Landowners on land that is not ours, actually do the management agreed to (I have had to quote LBAP doc.s on 2 occasions, and they did take notice after disagreeing with me verbally beforehand)	Secure management.
N9 - On <i>x (organisation)</i> land, probably not a lot of differences, but <b>the organization would probably operate in isolation</b> and lack <b>general support</b> and <b>possibly overall direction</b> in time.	Isolation without LBAP, lack support, poss. lack direction.
N10 - <b>Managed and targeted planning</b> on how to look after it all.	Management planning <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Author's Notes</b>
N11 - <b>Set targets and actions.</b> <b>Reporting</b> on actions and achievements. Point of <b>reference</b> . LBAP Officer <b>advisory and support</b> role.	Target and action setting and reporting. Reference. Advice and support.
N12 -	
N13 - <b>Impetus, recognition and focus</b> for a whole range of species and habitats.	Focus
G1 - Too much <b>money has already been spent</b> on projects (e.g. Mentor Mon otters/red squirrel/water vole) to stop the process now. However, they <b>need to be followed through</b> . Too often projects are approved on grandiose schemes/ideas where the outputs are "hopes" rather than reality. Better to have <b>clarity of focus &amp; measured outcomes</b> .	See things through, with focus and measured outcomes.
G2 -	
G3 - I'm sure that other group's organisations use the LBAP process to help them to <b>identify target species/habitats</b> . Without the LBAP's either <b>money would be spent on the wrong things or worst still would not be allocated</b> at all?	Identify priority species and habitats. Spending focus and funding.
G4 -	
G5 - Lack of <b>focus</b> , loss of <b>local partnerships</b> .	Focus, local partnership
G6 - The greatest loss would be the <b>co-ordination of organisations and targeting of effort</b> . I'm not sure how much of the conservation work locally is delivered nationally though, through HAPs and SAPs , but the one thing that the LBAP does is <b>focus effort on local species and habitats</b> . Without the LBAP we would lose this local focus.	Coordination, targeting and local focus.
G7 - hope	hope
bN1 - Buy in, action and funding from councils.	- Council buy-in, action and funding
bG1 -	
cN1v - Lack of direction of resources/ partnership with council	- Lack of direction

staff with expertise and equipment.	
dN1 - Our fantastic biodiversity officer! And with her, particularly, the links between the conservation organizations esp. NGOs and 'other' parts of the county council (i.e. departments other than Coast and Countryside)	- Biodiversity Officer - Links between organisations and within Council
dN2 - Loss of knowledge of project ownership and progress. Loss of funding opportunity	- Project knowledge - Funding opportunity
dN3 - Don't know	- Don't know
eN1 - The partnership and its operation and influence - including the Biodiversity Officer	- Partnership, including its operation and influence - Biodiversity Officer <i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Author's Notes</b>
eN2 - The biggest loss would be that of the biodiversity officer. Specific biodiversity project work would not be validated in the same way neither would prospective project work.	- Biodiversity Officer - Changes in validation of work, including prospective projects
eN3 -	
eG1 - As a lever to obtain project funding	- Funding lever
eG2 - LBAP officer	- LBAP officer
eG3 - Would be in terms of public interface rather than habitats or species.	- Public interface
eG4 - We would lose the significant gains that have been made in bringing biodiversity awareness to politicians and the decision makers in government. However, if the LBAP process does not improve we will lose political support in any case.	- Awareness amongst politicians and decision makers (but need improvement in process or will lose political support anyway)
fN1 - Local coordination - Local networks and information exchange - Loss of local political support - Reduced biodiversity funding from WAG	- Local coordination - Local networks/ information exchange - Political support - Less WAG Funding
fN2 - The LBAP officer and the momentum they have developed for biodiversity conservation action and awareness raising. A lot of time and money which will then need to be channeled into a comparable / alternative process.	- Biodiversity Officer - Conservation momentum and awareness
fN3 -	
fG1 - Losing Kate Williamson from SNP.	- Biodiversity Officer

fG2 - Loss of potential collaborative projects and outreach that are making a real difference to species conservation.	- Potential worthwhile collaborative projects
gN1 - Networking with conservation groups and loss of awareness of work and actions taken by local conservation and interest groups.	- Networking - Awareness of local work
gN2 - No	- No
gG1 - Local involvement, sharing of knowledge and ideas – ultimately leading to less care for the wildlife that's out there.	- Local involvement

#### 4. Do you wish to make any other specific or general comments?

Comments	Author's Notes
N1 -	
N2v - The part of the LBAP that I know most about is Flower-rich Road Verges. Another survey revisiting the sites of earlier surveys is needed to assess the effects of the current and recent-past management. It might be helpful to have a separate contract for the areas of verge that have been identified as of high conservation value. This would mean that they could be cut and raked off at the appropriate time in September. In selecting the “up to 20km” of high value verges to be managed, priority could be given to lengths within the AONB or on cycle routes or walking routes that are being promoted by the Local Authority. <b>Well managed biodiverse verges would enhance the recreational experience. None of this can be achieved without long-term funding.</b> How do other local authorities finance such work?	Specific points on the Flower-rich Road Verges HAP.
N3 -	
N4	
N5 - No	
N6 -	
N7 - I think it would be <b>useful for the Partnership to meet more frequently</b> to encourage cohesion.	More Partnership meetings.
N8v - The LBAPs are cumbersome and not really enforceable; the BARS reporting seems to consist mainly of entries like “continues” so that it doesn't have to be updated; however, I can't think of a better way of doing it at present – <b>at least we do have a document and some kind of plan!</b>	Message that LBAPs have problems, but are worth having despite these.
N9	
N10 - No	
N11	
N12 -	

N13	
G1 - Less talking amongst “those who know best” and <b>more actions on the ground</b> with those who can actually deliver. Identify where the gains can be made ( <b>rather than pie in the sky wish lists</b> ) and go after them. Engage with your farmers.	Urges more action on the ground.
G2	
G3 - I think it would be useful to have <b>LBAPs linked to national BAPs</b> e.g. like a hierarchy.	Linking to UK and Welsh levels.
G4	
G5 - The LBAP process is a very useful way of getting people “round a table” and has been useful for an organisation like x as the <b>well written plans and clear direction</b> in BAP makes it <b>easier to justify project expenditure</b> etc.	Getting players together. Justifying expenditure with appropriate plans.
G6	<i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Author's Notes</b>
G7 - No	
bN1 - Having worked under two LBAP's whilst CO at x [organisation] I know that the BBNPA LBAP team of Ecologist and LBAP officer are committed and the BBNPA LBAPO gets things done. This is in complete contrast to the other LBAP I worked under where there were occasional infrequent meetings, with the council thinking having an officer in post was sufficient, as they inputted nothing else into the process such as funds.	- Praise for LBAP team's commitment
bG1 -	
cN1v - There are many groups with limited resources but if they are all encouraged to work towards common aims/ objectives the cumulative gains for biodiversity can be significant. Unfortunately active conservation work is still seen by the young as unworthy of time and commitment as it is not seen as trendy or 'cool' to be involved with. Greater commitment is needed for education and inducements such as field courses in schools rather than sat at desks and PCs.	- Need to better encourage young to take part.
dN1 -	
dN2 -	
dN3 - x [organisation] attend LBAP as observers and are beginning to seek ways to become involved and help in the process. We would ask 'how does the LBAP and the Community Strategy (high quality environment theme) relate to each other?'	- Wants clarification of relationship of LBAP to Community Strategy
eN1 - <i>Note: Extra comments were added here, referring back by number to specific earlier questions. These have been included as comments at the appropriate questions, under the heading</i>	
eN2 - <i>Note: Extra comments were added here, referring back by number to</i>	

<i>specific earlier questions. These have been included as comments at the appropriate questions, under the heading</i>	
eN3 - I have not commented on the questions above as I have not yet got the experience to answer - sorry.	<i>(Ref. to open-ended questions)</i>
eG1 -	
eG2 -	
eG3 - No ta.	
eG4 -	
fN1 - Note: These are my personal comments and do not necessarily reflect the views of x (organisation).	
<i>fN2 - Note: Extra comments were added here, referring back by number to specific earlier questions. These have been included as comments at the appropriate questions, under the heading</i>	
fN3 -	<i>(Continued ...)</i>
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Author's Notes</b>
fG1 - I have little input in the LBAP process and the use of the LBAP because it lacks any mandatory action. I occasionally use it in letters but even this use is dwindling	- Makes little use of LBAP because it 'lacks mandatory action'. Use 'dwindling'.
fG2 - Most LBAPs came into being post 1995. Within this fairly short time frame a huge amount of work (especially partnership projects) has been achieved and the process is still underway. The adoption of BAPs within the planning process (and guidance material) has been a particularly noteworthy moment and has undoubtedly made a real contribution to conservation (as a carrot and a stick!).	- Praise for LBAP achievements since 1995: 'huge amount of work' including partnership projects and use in the planning process.
gN1 -	
gN2 - No	
gG1 - Swansea has worked really hard to get their LBAP going and get it adopted. I wish some of the pressure was taken off the local authority staff however.  I am disappointed with CCW's lack of knowledge sharing nationally on LBAP and BAP issues and their lack of commitment to sharing the efforts to get the LBAP s working.	- Praise for local LBAP team, which is under pressure.  - Disappointed with CCW on lack of knowledge sharing and lack of commitment to LBAPs.

## Appendix ix: Application of Local-scale LBAP Change: Case Example, Anglesey Local Biodiversity Partnership Forum, 2007

Following main analysis and drafting of chapters 4 - 6 on Officers' / Staff and Partners' Surveys, the author was able to develop a number of recommendations appropriate to local partnership scales of the LBAP process, and test reaction to these at Anglesey Biodiversity Partnership Forum in March 2007. There are limits to what is achievable at local levels at the present time, and the kinds of change envisaged in Recommendations at UK, Welsh and English levels would be necessary to remedy current fundamental problems identified in the present study. Even where current potential exists for change at the local level, a partnership may not feel inclined to make more radical decisions without back-up in the form of changes to UK/ Welsh/ English policy and guidance for LBAPs.

There was partial acceptance of the proposals made at the Forum meeting. Changes at more strategic levels (e.g. in UK and Welsh LBAP guidance, planning and funding) would be required before this and other LBAPs could be put on a surer footing from which bolder improvements could be made.

Though the Forum is not a steering group as such, opinion was sought from Partnership members to help inform decision making by consensus, under the heading: '**Proposals for Our LBAP 2007 - 12: Discussion and Agreement**'. This was the last item in a day which looked at Anglesey's LBAP 2002 - 07, and attempted to consider key issues for the five years ahead (2007 - 12). Much relevant survey result material was presented to partners, who also had group workshop sessions covering issues leading to the proposals which were presented later. Table IX.1 below presents the relevant recommendation-related material and outcomes from the Forum. Comments in the final column include material relevant to the further refinement and development of final recommendations.

Table IX.1 Proposals for Changes to Anglesey LBAP, Presented to Anglesey LBAP Forum, March 2007.

Theme	Proposal	Forum Outcome
<b>i) Steering the LBAP</b> Option: to attempt core steering of the process through a Steering Group and process.	Do partners wish to take this approach or continue with present less formal arrangements? <i>(Option open to Forum, rather than a direct proposal)</i>	<i>- It was suggested that a theme group focused on agricultural land biodiversity action could help with delivery in this area. An initial exploratory meeting of main players to be arranged to discuss options.</i>
<b>ii) Habitat and Species Targets.</b> Need to wait CCW county disaggregations of Welsh Targets and consider fine-tuning these to reflect Partner knowledge/ opinion	Challenge: meaningful targets for Anglesey Decide/ Agree: 1) Consult/ fine-tune when targets available 2) Timeframe to be 2007 - 12	<i>- Both accepted.</i>

*(Continued ...)*

Theme	Proposal	Forum Outcome
<b>iii) Action Plans</b>	1) Cut number of action plans  2) Put a number on hold (archiving on BARS) Justification: to allow better reporting and evaluation.	<i>- Opinion expressed against deleting plans on sole basis of lack of reporting; plans coverage will thus stay as at present, awaiting lead from the UK BAP review process due in April 2007.</i> <i>- Principle of grouping some plans to lessen repetition accepted.</i>
<b>iv) Individual Actions</b>	Focus and streamline actions by:- 1) Lessening repetition e.g. Education/ awareness can be covered in one new action plan. 2) Removing actions which have been abandoned or are known to have had no progress (targets will still be funding lever). 3) Archiving actions which are complete or not being reported.	<i>- Agreed in principle, pending outcomes of UK BAP Review.</i>  <i>- Can remove/ archive abandoned actions as appropriate, but leave those with no progress as this 'tells it as it is'.</i>  <i>- Completed actions can be archived; unreported to stay .</i>
<b>v) Definitive LBAP on BARS</b> Advantages include:- 1) Ongoing changes/ evolution in document can be kept up to date. 2) Action Plans and Reports can be printed as and when hard copies required. 3) Expense of producing fixed hard copy avoided. 4) Allows focus on customising detail for actions, using action goals and other BARS features.	Develop the LBAP on BARS and not produce a hard copy for 2007 - 12  A short glossy summary document can be produced, outlining targets and main changes in approach.	<i>- Suggestions accepted.</i>
<b>vi) LBAP and Climate Change</b> Annex H of Wales Biodiversity Framework suggests that an LBAP: 'Prepares for climate change by planning and carrying out action that maximizes connectivity, and will provide flexibility for biodiversity e.g. by the creation of corridors, buffer zones, stepping stones....?'	To make climate change adaptation a main focus for the LBAP	<i>- Climate Change to be a crosscutting theme, to be applied to LBAP action as and where relevant.</i> <i>- Partnership open to the idea of local fine-tuning of connectivity network to feed into all-Wales planning for biodiversity adaptation to changes.</i> <i>- opinion voiced on need for broad focus on local countryside management - i.e. outside protected sites (also see outcome of 6 i)).</i>