



Cambridge Conservation Forum

Minutes of Council meeting Wednesday 27th June 2019

Present¹

Humphrey Crick (Natural England)	Chair
Judith Schleicher	Vice Chair
Roger Mitchell (ARCT, ARC-ESL, RSB)	Treasurer

Richard Barnes (Knysna Basin Project)
Danny Buss (BAS)
Lydia Collas (Dept. of Zoology)
Hannah Cubaynes (BAS – non-voting)
Barbara de Waard (Biodiversity Business)
Anna Feeney – UNEP-WCMC non-voting)
Laura Friedrich (UNEP-WCMC)
Katie Leicester (Shepreth Wildlife Park)
Julia Mackenzie (ARU – non-voting)
Bryony Morgan (Women in Conservation Leadership group & Traffic non-voting)
Teresa Mulliken (TRAFFIC)
David Noble (BTO)
Olivia Norfolk (ARU)
Peter Pilbeam (Cambridgeshire Mammal Group)
Hugo Rainey (WCS)
Katy Scholfield (Synchronicity Earth)
Thomas Starnes (RSPB & GIS Group),
Hazel Thornton (Marine Group & UNEP-WCMC non-voting)
Aunald Topling (CPARG)
Keith Virgo (TAA)

Apologies

Louise Bacon (Cambridge Bird Club), Chris Bowden (Individual member), Alice Bücker (FFI), Amy Burden (TBC), Josie Chambers (Membership Secretary; Dept of Geography), Nigel Cooper (Diocese of Ely), Edward Darling (Redlist Revival), Julia Grosse (CCF/ CCI – non-voting), Pippa Heylings (Talking Transformation), Kevin Hughes (BAS), Roger Ingle (UNEP-WCMC – non-voting), Martin Lester (NT Wicken

¹ Organisational voting representatives are indicated in parentheses

Fen), Keri Russell (Website manager), Adeline Serckx (TBC), Kit Stoner (Bat Conservation Trust), Will Simonson (UNEP-WCMC), Stephen Tomkins (Kingfishers Bridge), Charles Turner (Cam Valley Forum), Angelika von Heimendahl (Cam Cattle)

1. Introduction (Humphrey Crick, HC)

HC welcomed everybody and those present introduced themselves and the organisational ‘voting’ members indicated which organisations they represented.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting 1st May 2019 (Annex 1)

Actions from previous meeting:

- Most had been undertaken, as indicated in the minutes or were to be dealt with during this meeting
- Rewilding conference: Citizen Zoo (CZ) had sent an Eventbrite screenshot which showed that the amounts received by matched the numbers of tickets sold. CCI has agreed to hold, on behalf of CCF, the donation to be made by CZ arising from the conference. We have just finalised the arrangement and hope to complete the transfer very soon.
- Work on the planning the new website is planned to start

Subject to these amendments, the minutes were proposed by Peter Pilbeam, seconded by Keith Virgo and approved unanimously.

3. CCF Operational matters

3.1 HC noted the need for volunteers to take on the roles of Council Secretary and Membership Coordinator. For the former, the person would need to be interested in the Governance of CCF and be good at taking minutes, although Julia Grosse can help in that regard. For the latter it was clarified that this role was not as onerous as it once was because Julia Grosse has taken on a substantial amount liaison with member reps and individual members, so the Membership Coordinator would have more of a role to oversee this side of CCF business and be a point of contact for Julia to discuss matters as arise.

3.2 HC welcomed the formation of a new Social Committee for the CCF, comprising:

- Holly Griffin (UNEP-WCMC) who is coordinating the CCF’s autumn Symposium on 2nd October – offers of papers and help will be gratefully received.
- Anna Feeney (**AF**, UNEP-WCMC) and
- Catherine Dew (County Ecologist in Norfolk) who are both organising a punting trip potentially involving bat observing.
- Chris Bowden (Freelance), who is organising a field trip in the autumn.

AF described the first meeting of the Committee. **Olivia Norfolk** described an idea that she was proposing that would aim to match ARU Masters students up with CCF members who might be able to host such students in taking on a dissertation research project in their area of interest.

3.3 Treasurer's Report

Roger Mitchell (RM) introduced the report (**Annex 2**) and noted that the CCF's bank balance had not been so low for a long time, due principally to the payment of £2833 as the first annual contribution for Julia's post earlier in the year. However, we were expecting a large donation arising from the Rewilding Conference very soon that will provide the matched funding required for the next two annual instalments towards Julia Grosse's post and to support CCF's future engagement activities and website development. The payment for carbon offsetting was likely to be of the order of several hundred pounds, in the past we had provided carbon off-setting donations to the Great Fen Project, but this still had to be decided.

Questions were raised by **Bryony Morgan (BM)**

- At a WICL event a small amount was raised from donations on the door to help defray the meeting costs – should such small sums go through the treasurer's accounts. **RM** said no if they were effectively being used to fund the meetings.
- Was there any restriction on WICL attempting to raise funds to support their activities? **RM** said all fund-raising for CCF activities were to be welcomed, but it would be useful if the Treasurer was kept informed.

3.4 Reports from CCF Groups

HC invited verbal updates to support the reports provided in **Annex 3**.

- **RM** noted that the paper reviewed the sites visited so far and that the MAR Group was always pleased to receive suggestions for sites to visit which face an interesting management issue for discussion.
- **BM** described the recent and upcoming activities of the WICL group.
- **Hazel Thornton** noted that the Marine Group needed volunteers to help with the committee, but that they had a good programme of exciting events lined up. **Richard Barnes (RB)** offered to give a talk at some point.
- **Thom Starnes (TS)** apologised for not having provided a written note before the meeting but this will be circulated with the minutes. The GIS group had been a little quiet of late not helped by the fact that its page mysteriously disappeared from the CCF website. This should be reinstated soon. The GIS group has a new email address and is hoping to get a simple sign-up box on their webpage. The GIS group is hosting a "Happy Hour" in the David Attenborough Building on 19th July and all are welcome. **TS** circulated a proposed logo for the GIS group which was met with general approval, subject to the use of the correct CCF logo within it.

4. New Applications for CCF Membership (Annex 4)

RM introduced the application from **Natural Cambridgeshire**, the Local Nature Partnership. This has 24 member organisations, including CCF.

- Membership was approved unanimously

Sean Butler and **Raffael Fasel** introduced the **Cambridge Centre for Animal Rights Law**. This application raised a great deal of interest and some controversy. Questions arose as to the impact on livestock and on conservation practice of pest eradication; and also whether the purpose was primarily biodiversity conservation. It was felt overall that this would be a useful addition to the forum because animal rights has significant implications for conservation and conservation thinking.

- Membership was approved almost unanimously, but with 2 abstentions.

Vision Wild was introduced by **HC**, because Victoria Price was unfortunately away on a business trip. This was considered to be a useful addition to the CCF, as its purpose is primarily biodiversity conservation.

- Membership was approved unanimously

5. Future Organisational Status

RM introduced the paper (**Annex 5**) and described that the small group set up to discuss options had suggested that the two key options for further consideration should be:

- Closer alignment of CCF and CCI, where CCF strengthens its governance by becoming a CIO
- Full merger of CCF and CCI into one new group, where CCF does not become a CIO

HC said that CCI Council had yet to discuss the merger option, but hadn't ruled it out on principle. He noted that merger wouldn't imply that all CCF members would become equal members of CCI, but it was more likely that a committee, equivalent to the current CCF Council would be constituted with its Chair being on CCI Council as at present. The potential pros were that CCI would take on all admin duties, CCF would have delegated responsibility to organise conferences and networking events as before, the website might be well supported, and communications would be supported and clearer. The potential cons might be that CCF partners would become marginalised and that we would lose the authority to accept new members or organise events without seeking approval from CCI Council. These were just some initial thoughts and needed proper discussion internally with CCF and with CCI.

RB suggested that when the decision is finally posed, that every CCF member should be required to vote on it. This met with general approval.

Julia Mackenzie asked about CCI's opinion on this. **HC** said that they had yet to discuss it.

David Noble noted that while some of CCF's members fit well with the existing make-up of CCI, there were large numbers of more local members with different constitutions that might not fit so well with the CCI.

Aunald Topling noted that it was difficult to discuss further until CCI had made its opinions known and until there were some firm options tabled. It may be that CCI might not want to pursue a merger.

- ACTION: the sub-committee to develop firm proposals for how each of the two options would work
- ACTION: Discussion with CCI should be held to discuss how the potential merger option might work
- ACTION: once two firm options have been proposed and discussed that all CCF Reps should vote, given the fundamental change to CCF that will be proposed.

6. AOB

6.1 CCI Strategy: **HC** said that the CCI were developing a new 10 year strategy and was starting a process that will develop over the next 18 months. The initial phase was a “listening phase” and we would be holding a meeting where CCF members could contribute their views. It was important that all CCI partner organisations contribute to this, as it will shape the future of this important partnership.

6.2 MPhil lecture: **HC** said that Will Simonson had been delivering a lecture for 4 years to the MPhil on Conservation Leadership course on “Designing and managing projects using logframes”. It discusses how to turn project concepts into project plans and fundable proposals. He has very kindly donated the fee to the CCF. He wondered if anybody else in CCF would be interested in taking this on. **Teresa Mulliken** noted that teaching on the MPhil course was immensely rewarding because the students are often extremely experienced and provide very interesting insights that is of great benefit to the lecturer – so very much a two-way process of knowledge exchange. If anybody is interested, do please contact Will Simonson or **HC**.

6.3 Logo: **Judith Schleicher** provided some new revised examples that Roger Ingle had kindly sent today. Council was very pleased with the new and there was a clear majority in favour of the symbols that have a “leaf vein” or “mouth”. **Hugo Rainey** noted that we should make sure that (a) it works in Black and White (B&W versions had been provided and looked fine); (b) it doesn’t accidentally look unfortunate when viewed in a different light (there was an example of a prototype logo created for another NGO that accidentally looked like a toilet!); and (c) that it doesn’t look like any other logo.

- ACTION: Roger Ingle to be informed that his new version was accepted by Council as CCF’s new logo and to be thanked for all his efforts on CCF’s behalf.
- ACTION: that the Committee and Roger Ingle should make sure that it doesn’t fall foul of the three potential problems.

6.4 Date of next meeting to be arranged.

HC closed the meeting and thanked everyone for their attendance.



@Annex2 - CCF @Annex3 - reports @Annex4 - @Annex5 - CCF –
Treasury Report 20th from CCF groups dc Applicants for CCF r Future Organisation