OPERAs Project Kick-Off Meeting
Monday 21st – Wednesday 23rd January
Edinburgh

Minutes and actions

NB All 8 of the PowerPoint presentations from the Kick-Off Meeting and the video recordings of these presentations will be made available on the internal section of the OPERAs website (http://www.operas-project.eu/) and the log-in details are:
user: partneroperas
password: Ecosystem1

Monday 21st January

Welcome (Mark Rounsevell- PowerPoint 1)
Mark introduced the project and gave an overview of the aims and objectives, the project components and the collaboration with the OpenNESS project. He also highlighted the 9 deliverables due in the first 18 month reporting period and the unique combination of partners involved in the project. He stated that this meeting aimed to achieve the following: getting to know each other; revisiting the work packages; exploring cross work package integration; working towards the Research Implementation Plan (RIP); completing the project "timeline" with new milestones; taking everyone's photos for the project website & short videos to be produced.

Working Group Breakout Session 1 Reporting back
WP2 (Practice) – Have redrawn how things fit together. Task 1 is about meta-analysis, task 2 is about exemplars, and task 3 is about synthesis. There are 11 exemplars in the project. Central to WP" is the Blueprint (criteria and indicators for evaluating existing case studies)- also used for monitoring and reporting back (to see progress in the exemplars). WP3 knowledge contained within the exemplars. At the meeting in September it will be clearer how WP2, WP3 and WP4 fit together. In one years time we will know what, where, when and how. Synthesis is each of the WPs – discuss it all on the same page and focus on the vertical and the horizontal. There is a loop between knowledge, practice and instruments. The development of instrument could be done decoupled from OPERAs but they will need the data derived from the exemplar (and knowledge about data) s to refine the instruments. Need to try and find a match between exemplars and instruments

WP3 (Knowledge) – will develop a Conceptual Framework (to bring natural, social and economic together). Will test the framework and should choose one exemplar to apply it to (and maybe other exemplars too). How to address issues of uncertainty, time and spatial scale and analysis? 2 challenges: 1. Within WP need to get going quickly and communicate and train each other about the different methodologies (language) – what information to exchange? 2. Need good discussion with exemplars and how to work together (2 way dialogue needed)

WP4 (Instruments) – Sessions and tasks (types of instruments). Develop tools for certain needs- decision making processes. How to justify choice of instruments?

Categories and groups of instruments to focus work on. Discussion with exemplars (systems needed for application). It will be clearer what doing in 2 days time.
<u>Tuesday 22nd January</u>

Overview of Exemplars (Ariane Walz- PowerPoint 2)
Ariane gave an overview of all 11 of the Exemplars:
1. Dublin urban-rural fringe
2. Barcelona urban dunes
3. Montado in Portugal
4. Baleric islands marine/coastal ecosystems
5. Lower Danube river and wetland management
6. Alps land management
7. Wine production in Europe
8. Scotland & multi-scale environmental policy
9. Circum-Med agricultural land abandonment
10. Pan-European regulatory Directives
11. Global climate protection and habitat conservation

It was suggested that there needs to be a "stream-lining" of the work and there could be exemplar leadership to provide structure and movement in the same direction.

Issues discussed included: an Exemplar Matrix; importance of local stakeholders; procedure for adding new exemplars (opportunity to do this but would require external funding); how exemplars feed into knowledge (reporting of the exemplars in a framework to allow comparison – a common protocol/reporting framework for all exemplars to allow synthesis); problem of coordination of data flows (comes back to the Resource Hub); possible new exemplars in collaboration with OpenNESS (protocol and procedure)

Overview of Instruments (Marcus Lindner- PowerPoint 3)
Marcus gave an overview of the 3 groups of instrument types:
1. ES/NC information tools (e.g. data capture, indicator frameworks, mapping/visualising tools)
2. Decision Support tools (e.g. MCDA , procedural modelling, back-casting, ES assessments, CBA tools)
3. Implementation tools (e.g. Market tools, spatial planning, REDD + schemes)

Need to think about what the tool can do, for which application sector, data needs, and who can use the tool (level of expertise).

It was mentioned that a potential issue is that the "tools" in WP4 are the same as the "methods" in WP3 – they are doing the same thing. It is not always easy to distinguish between a "method" and a "tool". Therefore, need teams across the WPs to work on the whole chain (knowledge with instruments with practice). It was suggested that the key to tools is the "interface" (with models behind it) and this is the difference between knowledge and tools (usability).

Stakeholder process (Martin Watson)
Martin gave an insight into Prospex's involvement in the stakeholder process in
OPERAs. There are 2 opportunities for structured stakeholder engagement within the
project:
1. The User Board (Task 5.2.2)- 4 meetings and an online platform (A User
   Board of Shareholders- an interactive "sounding board")
2. Exemplars (Task 5.2.3) – working with at least 4 Exemplars (will depend on
   tools used)

There will also be joined up stakeholder thinking with the OpenNESS project through
discussion with Wing (the people in OpenNESS working on stakeholder
engagement).

Exchange Session- "Speed dating" (see Matrix)
This session aimed to match up exemplars with instruments and knowledge and as a
result of these "speed dating" sessions a matrix was produced to see which exemplars
could be paired up with which tools. Please see the "Matrix" document for more
details.

Working Group Breakout Session 2 report back
WP2 (Practice) – they produced their own matrix of 5 deliverables and milestones
added, 11 exemplars discussed, first deliverable due in month 15 – description of
Study Design – discussed how the document will look and will have conference call
before summer and a draft for the September meeting.

WP3 (Knowledge) – Discussed deliverables and filled out the content, shifted
milestones around considerably, discussed and tried to ensure that for each task there
was a milestone linked to the Resource Hub.

WP4 (Instruments) – the milestones in the RIP are obsolete and so created new ones.
Checkpoints after several months (in between 12 and 18 months), will follow up on
RIP, gaps and needs analysis, need for discussion between IEEP and Prospex
(workshops planned), first deliverable in month 16 (top down and bottom up policy
needs), results of the matrix table exercise – at least some people disappointed, not
broad range of tools identified so far, room for new innovations and interface between
WP3 and WP4.

Wednesday 23rd January

Resource Hub presentation (Paul Weaver- PowerPoint 4)
Paul discussed the Resource Hub (RH) and Communities of Excellence (CoE) and
stated that they are central to the consortium approach to address the challenges of
dissemination, communication, and achieving lasting (continuing) impact. There are 2
challenges driving the RH: 1. a gap for innovative methods and 2. a need to
harmonise tools/methods different users. The RH will be a web base portal and, like
the CoE, will be though about throughout the project and assist in dynamic delivery. It
will have tailored content and tailored communication for different audiences. Both
the RH and the CoE will need to involve all the OPERAs consortium in their design

delivery and how they move forward. At the next full project meeting in September a plan for the RH and CoE will be presented.

Issues discussed included: a need to engage with a new generation of people and understanding how they function and access information; how the RH would need to driven by content and the work being done in the project over the 5 years; how the EC will judge the success of the project by what comes out of the RH and CoE (need good science communicated well and real engagement with stakeholders); must recognise that OPERAs is unlike most other FP7 projects as it is more operational and has ¼ of the partners as SMEs (hence, not just science); project should be policy-relevant but not policy proscriptive; WPs need to identify demand buy asking their audiences what their needs are.

Project Management & Admin Q&A (Janet Taylor & Bill Bruce- PowerPoint 5)
Janet and Bill gave a presentation covering the key administrative and financial information for the project. It covered the role of the coordinator; the 4 reporting periods; eligible and non-eligible costs; Form C for claiming costs; periodic reports and final report and timesheets. As well as the presentation a document addressing financial issues will be put on the OPERAs website.

Role of EC Officer (Sofie Vandewoestijne- PowerPoint 6)
Sofie gave an overview of European research and FP7 projects in the Environment Theme, then discussed the collaboration with OpenNESS as well as commenting on deliverables, payments, amendments, audits and publications from the EC perspective. She stated that she was open to lots of communication with the project partners but would ask that they contact her either through Jess Bryson or Mark Rounsevell.

Communication within OPERAs (Jess Bryson- PowerPoint 7)
Jess discussed how best to communicate within the OPERAs project and gave suggestions about emails, meetings (full, PMT and WP), teleconferences, the project website and the collaboration with the OpenNESS project.

Outreach, dissemination and open access (Marc Metzger- PowerPoint 8)
Marc discussed dissemination (making project results available -one way communication), outreach (trying to ensure results are useful -two way communication which understand the audience and tailors the approach accordingly).He mentioned many of the planned activities for OPERAs such as the website, flyers, films, policy briefs, lunch meetings, summer school, the project conference, Peer to peer exchange, training workshops & training material, scientific papers, a Special Issue, conference symposia , exemplars, the Resource Hub & Community of Excellence. He also highlighted that branding needed careful consideration and discussed issues relevant to Open Access.

Discussion
Inés Mazarrasa told the consortium that Nuria Marba had offered to host the next full meeting of the project in Mallorca in September 2013.

The issue of project milestone labelling was raised, as was the process of amending the DoW.

Summary of Actions in Chronological order

Deadline	Action
February 2013	Financial document from Edinburgh to be sent out to consortium for reference (Jess Bryson)
February 2013	Discussion between the Coordinators and Nuria Marba and her team in Mallorca about the next full project meeting in September (Jess Bryson)
March 2013	Discussion with OpenNESS about a Task Group and new exemplar protocol (Mark Rounsevell)
March 2013	Discussion between IEEP and Prospex about workshops (Marianne Kettunen & Martin Watson)
March 2013	Prospex to clarify working with Wing (Martin Watson)
March 2013	Exemplar Matrix to be populated (Kim Nicholas)
March 2013	Fsign electronic signature (Mark Rounsevell)
March 2013	Record of suggested changes to DoW (for a possible amendment) (Jess Bryson)
March 2013	Update list of milestones (taken from timeline) (Jess Bryson)
April 2013	Draft agenda for next full project meeting in September (PMT)
May 2013	Research Implementation Plan (D1.2) is due in Month 6 (Work Package leaders to complete their sections)
May 2013	Possible project meeting in Brussels- to discuss with Sofie Vandewoestijne (Jess Bryson)
September 2013	Plan for Resource Hub and Community of Excellence (Paul Weaver)