

**WATER STAKEHOLDERS' FORUM**  
**26<sup>th</sup> February 2010**  
**Defra – Nobel House, Smith Square, London**

**Meeting Note**

Contents

- 1) Agenda
- 2) Attendees
- 3) Welcome & introductions
- 4) Review outstanding actions from last meeting
- 5) Environment Agency Update
- 6) Thames RBMP Implementation Strategy
- 7) Non-Agricultural Diffuse Pollution Measures
- 8) BRADA/UKBMF concerns
- 9) Update on Agricultural Diffuse Pollution
- 10) Presentation from NFU regarding action by the agricultural sector
- 11) Any other business and date of next meeting
- 12) Actions summary

1) Agenda

**10:00** Coffee. Welcome & introductions

**10:15** Review outstanding actions from last meeting

Chris Ryder

**10:30** Environment Agency Update

Geoff Bateman

- Publication of River Basin Management Plans

- Additional £1m for investigations

- WFD Implementation

- Q&A

**11:10** Thames RBMP Implementation Strategy

Robert Oates

**11.30** Non-Agricultural Diffuse Pollution Measures

Vicky Dawe

<b>12.00</b> BRADA/UKBMF concerns	Peter Hampson
<b>12:15</b> Lunch	
<b>13:00</b> Presentation from NFU regarding action by the agricultural sector	Diane Mitchell
Update on Agricultural Diffuse Pollution	Chris Ryder
<b>14:00</b> Any other business and date of next meeting	Chris Ryder
<b>14.15</b> Close	

## 2) Attendees

Mike Murray	Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry
Jane Salter	AIC
Mark Owen	Angling Trust
Jean Venables	Association and Drainage Authorities
Liz English	Association British Ports
Andrew Frankton	BIS
Adrian Abbott	British Hydropower Association
Peter Hampson	British Resorts and Destinations Association
Grahame Newman	British Waterways
Brian Clark	British Marine Association
Antoinette Hasson	C2C Group
Kevin East	Canoe England
Matt Pitts	Cascade Consulting
Francois Edwards	CEH Wallingford
Laura Grant	CIWEM
Derek Holliday	CLA
Sarah Thomas	Consumer Council for Water
Janet Williams	CPA
Alice McGregor	Defra
Chris Ryder	Defra
Claire McCamphill	Defra
Kate Hedges	Defra
Jaya Shah	Defra
Louise Clark	Defra
Neil Maycock	Defra
Rory Wallace	Defra
Todd Russel	Defra
Verity Zurita	Defra
Vicky Dawe	Defra

Claire Pollard	Drinking Water Inspectorate
Clare Blackledge	EA
Simon Clark	Entec UK
Geoff Bateman	Environment Agency
Michael Payne	Environmental Consultants
John Adlam	Horticultural Trade Association
Camilla Puzey	LEAF
Karen Simpson	Mouchel and Pipeline Industries Guild
Glen Cooper	Natural England
Diane Mitchell	NFU
Piat kiewicz	NonFerrous Alliance
Martin Furness	Ofwat
Jan Brooke	PIANC
Ralph Underhill	RSPB
Neil Edwards	RWEn power
Paul Rayner	RYA
Jania Gray	Salmon and Trout Association
Lewis Jones	South West Water
John Spence	Southern Water
Robert Oates	Thames Rivers Trust
Jonathan Westlake	Thames Water
Grant Stark	The Chemicals Regulation Directorate
Sue Compton	United Utilities
Barrie Clarke	Water UK
Paul Stanfield	Wessex Water
Ivana Wilson	WFDIC
Carrie Hume	Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust
Robert Moore	WRCPLC

### 3) Welcome & Introductions

3.1 Chris Ryder welcomed everyone to the Forum and asked attendees to introduce themselves to the group.

3.2 He also introduced a new member of the Water Quality team at Defra, Verity Zurita, who will be the main point of contact going forwards for the Forum. A new email address for any queries regarding the forum has been set up - [waterforum@defra.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:waterforum@defra.gsi.gov.uk)

3.3. By way of introduction, Chris also highlighted some headline updates (since the last Forum meeting):

- Publication of the River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs) in December which represents a huge effort from EA and everyone involved.

- The Floods and Water Management Bill, which had received its second reading in House of Lords
- A positive outcome from the judgement in early December re: sensitive areas case for the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive .

#### 4) Review outstanding actions from last meeting

4.1 There was one outstanding action from the last meeting: ‘Jan Brooke asked about the change downwards in the assessed quality of TRAC waters and why this was the case?’

4.2 Geoff Bateman responded: This is only to do with the difference between the draft plans and final plans – there has been no deterioration in quality, just more data available.

#### 5) Environment Agency Update – Geoff Bateman

5.1 **Please see Geoff Bateman’s slides for more detail** (available on the Water Stakeholder Forum webpages: [http://www.euwfd.net/html/england\\_and\\_the\\_wfd.html](http://www.euwfd.net/html/england_and_the_wfd.html)). The points below are mainly in addition to, rather than repeating, the content of the presentation.

5.2 Firstly Geoff responded to the request for an EA Communications update; he stated that this was an oversight and would be rectified next time, however there has been little to report with no ‘launch’ of the plans in England, though there had been a successful launch in Wales.

5.3 Geoff noted that only 1/3 of EU Member States published their River Basin Management Plans on time.

5.4 The Plans set out the ambition between now and 2015. Geoff noted that it has been harder to achieve a higher level of ambition in the East compared to the West.

5.5 Geoff commented that the What’s In Your Backyard web tool has been revamped and should be working better.

5.6 Geoff emphasised that investigations were needed to confirm the sources of some failures and to confirm the measures to resolve them at water body level. for failure and as some failures have been determined using modelling

5.7 Geoff emphasised that where EA can identify pollution, it will act. Linked to this, when considering how to develop Water Protection Zones, we need to identify what evidence is needed.

5.8 Action at the regional level: Regional Liaison Panels are continuing to operate as co deliverers and to monitor the delivery of the plans.

5.9 Monitoring is a key element of what EA is doing. There are 3 levels of monitoring for WFD:

- Surveillance – 10% of water bodies in England & Wales are being monitored for all elements
- Operational – Risk based – where pollution is suspected
- Investigative – Tactical level monitoring to support remedial action

5.10 Geoff flagged up the limited use that has been made to date of third party data and confirmed this would be of great value in helping with the EA and others such as Rivers Trusts to identify the causes of failure and how to tackle them.

5.11 Geoff then took attendees through a series of case studies/investigations from around the country demonstrating where EA is carrying out work on the ground to identify causes of failure and actions to address the problems.

5.12 Geoff noted that nutrients like phosphorus appear to be often causing problems. EA monitoring for nutrients and ecology is continuing to help refine the main problem areas.

5.13 He highlighted that EA had received great support from some sectors, such as water companies, and ports/navigation sector. This sharing of information and expertise is crucial if we are to succeed in our ambitions; the Dutch and Germans are very interested in learning from the Dredging protocol project.

### **Questions and comments**

5.14 RSPB asked a question about the level of monitoring and were concerned that resource would be moved from some catchments where compliance had been achieved. So how would the EA pick up changes in unmonitored catchments? Geoff responded that we need to keep returning to the risk assessments and the results of surveillance monitoring to check whether pressures on the water environment were changing. In addition there was increased biological monitoring, which is giving more confidence about the assessments. Operational monitoring also provides a flexible resource to increase investigation of problem areas. He added that WPZ's would give EA a tool to potentially solve diffuse pollution sources by

identifying a boundary around a problem element to focus specific measures on the problems.

5.15 Michael Payne asked a question on source apportionment. He commented that it is a myth that only water companies are taking action. Agriculture is taking basic voluntary measures to contribute to the first cycle and can have a significant effect on e.g. reducing phosphorus. EA's impact assessment does not reflect the full benefits of non-regulatory measures.

Geoff Bateman responded that he had just shown some examples, and that more information was needed to get to the full extent of what was happening.

5.16 Thames Water referred to a collaborative research project on the public's feeling for priorities relating to water quality. The project found that the public preferred water bodies close to where people live to be a priority.

5.17 Ralph Underhill of RSPB asked whether the maintenance dredging protocol would be published?

***5.18 ACTION: Geoff offered to send RSPB a copy***

5.19 Geoff added that he believed there is a lot of additional data EA and others can use to supplement monitoring and understanding impacts. He reiterated his request for third parties to continue to provide useful data/info.

5.20 Neil Edwards from RWE nPower asked if the investigative programme allowed for the conclusion that the system of classification may not be perfect this round. Geoff responded that it did.

5.21 Martin Furness from Ofwat asked about how a national template from the River Kennet project was progressing.

Geoff replied that the project was going well and much useful work was being done. However the EA did not want to produce further plans, preferring action to achieve improvements. However the template would be of great value in some complex catchments so may use in every case, as some water problems just needed sorting and the problems were well understood.

**6) Thames RBMP Implementation Strategy – Rob Oates**

6.1 For his presentation Rob Oates from the Thames Trust referred to the paper 'Implementation strategy for the Thames River Basin Management Plan', which was circulated to Forum members before the meeting. **Please see Rob's paper for further detail.**

6.2 Rob commented that the RBMPs are not tools that external stakeholders can work with. The Thames Rivers Restoration Trust are lobbying the EA for implementation strategies.

6.3 Rob said that the group began with the desire to improve on a '2% improvement' highlighted in the RBMP.

6.4 A progress report will be produced at the end of 2010. They plan to work with EA to make progress in the meantime.

6.5 The group used Table 3 (suggested scoring system) to assess catchments and identify potential priority areas. These included (Table 4):

- Kennet – has an action plan around it already
- Lea – a priority for the Olympics
- Mayes Brook – tiny tributary river – a WFD demo project. Additional funding through Mayor of London's Priority Parks scheme.
- Wandle – additional resources deployed, for example through the Wandle Trust
- Ravensbourne -
- Wey – no. 1 priority for investigations. Working with external partners on this.

6.6 Rob emphasised the need for source apportionment, to enable better targeting of actions.

6.7 Funding from the EA, TRRT and others to RRC to create 'PRAGMO': a guidance tool to plan the monitoring of river restoration projects to WFD standards. Should be published in the autumn. Suggestion to invite RRC to present at a future meeting.'

6.8 The Thames River Basin Liaison Panel has been turned into a delivery panel; however there is still more to do.

### **Questions and comments**

6.9 Chris Ryder thanked Rob for his contribution.

6.10 Geoff Bateman also thanked Rob for his presentation. He stated that this is a view and a contribution to debate. He also emphasised that any action taken using public funding need to achieve WFD objectives.

6.11 Michael Payne from NFU thanked the Thames Trust for creating the forum around the Wey – found it very valuable to discuss practical issues around the RBMPs..

6.12 Rob added that Phase 1 of the report of the River Wey project would be available in the next 2 weeks.

**6.13 ACTION: Rob to send to Verity Zurita for circulation**

7) Non-Agricultural Diffuse Pollution Measures – Vicky Dawe

7.1 **Please see Vicky Dawe’s presentation slides for more detail** (available on the Water Stakeholder Forum webpages: [http://www.euwfd.net/html/england\\_and\\_the\\_wfd.html](http://www.euwfd.net/html/england_and_the_wfd.html)). The points below are mainly in addition to, rather than repeating, the content of the presentation.

7.2 Vicky began by outlining the broad policy areas covered by her team, including: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS); sewer misconnections; looking at ban on phosphates in domestic laundry detergents; also looking forwards – building evidence base for where intervention might be needed.

7.3 The Flood and Water Management Bill. Vicky explained that in the 2007 floods, most damage was in fact caused by surface water, not rivers. The Bill will include measures to address this problem, as well as other issues around water scarcity and drought. The Bill has now finished its second reading in the Lords, and has had a very positive reception with cross-party support.

7.4 SuDS. Have an important role in managing flood risk and water quality. SuDS can mimic natural drainage and can be very effective in rural areas as well as urban areas. Can reduce localized floods and floods downstream, by slowing the rate of flooding. They can be incorporated into public spaces, parks etc. Local Authorities have a key role in embedding SuDS.

7.5 Vicky showed attendees images of SuDS in different contexts, and different types of SuDS (such as permeable paving, or attenuation areas). She emphasised that good site design can make SuDS attractive.

7.6 The Bill will establish SuDS Approving Bodies in unitary and county LAs. LAs have an important strategic overview in terms of implementing SuDS. SuDS will be adopted and maintained by Approving Bodies where they serve more than one property.

7.7 Vicky added that natural SuDS can have a positive impact on water quality and biodiversity.

7.8 Phosphates. Plan to ban sale of detergents containing phosphates to the domestic market by 1st January 2015; currently gathering further evidence to understand the impacts of a possible limitation of phosphates in auto-dishwasher detergents, both on water quality and the wider environmental impacts.

7.9 Misconnections. There are thousands of misconnections in England and Wales; many are due to people wrongly connecting their washing machines. Current campaign 'ConnectRight' from EA and Water UK.

7.10 General Binding Rules. Currently gathering evidence for further regulation or looking at where regulation is not working as well as it could.

### **Questions and comments**

7.11 Jonathan Westlake from Thames Water asked if SuDS which retained metal and hydrocarbon would become contaminated land?

Vicky responded no, LAs will need to regularly maintain SuDS and remove sediment etc from the SuDS system.

7.12 Vicky was asked whether something on the right to connect would be included within the home improvement packs?

Vicky explained that Defra is talking to CLG about this – not yet possible, but the packs will be reviewed in 2 years' time.

7.13 Brian Clark of British Marine Association Question on where the Bill will expand regulation – for example, hose pipe bans etc. In particular, will boat owners be able to clean their boats?

Vicky explained that this was not her area but Defra would find the right person to get back to him **under AOB**.

7.14 Comment from Jean Venables of Association of Drainage Authorities – fully support these measures around SuDS except for the inclusion of water butts – they are more for rainwater harvesting than useful part of the SuDS system.

Vicky said it was a good point. Water butts can however often be a useful 'visual cue' or reminder for people re: water use – in this way more of a behavioral tool. There is a debate on whether or not to define them as SuDS.

7.15 Carrie continued that the WWT had been advocates of SuDS for years, but they do block up – especially with phosphates. WWT has a PHD student currently looking at this – offer to talk to Vicky's team.

### **7.16 ACTION: Carrie Hume to contact Vicky Dawe re: PhD study of SuDS.**

7.17 Michael Payne Question re: run off from highways and septic tanks – is this also Vicky's area?

Vicky responded that septic tanks were not her responsibility, but highways run off – yes. Future measures/activities under WFD are on her radar; at the moment it is the interaction between highways and SuDS.

7.18 Michael Payne Question re: misconnections. Figures from presentation were from domestic – what about non-domestic?

Vicky believes the figures include both but will check.

### **7.19 ACTION: Vicky Dawe to check if misconnection figures include non-domestic misconnections**

7.20 Robert Moore from WRC commented that the Highways Agency have developed a tool around run off.

7.21 Derek Holliday from CLA asked a question re: how to deal with already concreted over areas in cities etc. Consideration is being given to retrofitting SuDS, and in the next 2 years may be given more prominence. The move towards LAs taking more of a role on SuDS will help to drive this also.

## 8) BRADA/UKBMF concerns – Peter Hampson

8.1 Peter outlined his concerns relating to the Bathing Water Directive. His first concern was around mitigating the potentially negative effects of the new signs appearing on beaches to classify the bathing water quality. He emphasised the importance of the coastal tourism industry, which provides thousands of jobs in England and Wales and is worth £3.6billion. He believed that public perception of water cleanliness could be affected by the new signs, which could in turn have a negative effect on the industry. In the past, 'beach awards' such as those run by Keep Britain Tidy had helped on public perception but these are largely voluntary.

8.2 Peter's second concern related to beach managers' perception that different standards applied in different parts of the country re: monitoring and action from EA. He also mentioned that regulation says monitoring needs to be 30cm below in 1 meter of water 'where possible' – what does this mean?

8.3 Robert Moore from WRC said he was ex-policy adviser on beaches & bathing waters and could discuss further with Peter over lunch.

8.4 Michael Payne from NFU asked if there was any evidence that when bathing water monitoring was not done at certain depth there was a significant impact? Robert Moore from WRC answered stating that no, there is very tiny evidence.

8.5 Chris Ryder registered the point re: beach awards.

8.6 Geoff Bateman responded re: consistency in standards applied. Yes, there is consistency, and consistent response to failures.

8.7 Kate Hedges from Defra added that there was awareness about public perception of new signs on beaches. Visit England attend Defra's Bathing Water Directive meetings. Also to note that the signs appearing on the beaches here will be the same across the EC, so other MS will not have an 'advantage' of some kind. She added that market research last year showed public perception that bathing water had improved. Also, the public considered the actual beach itself being clean and free from pollution to be a higher priority. New signs at beaches may indeed raise awareness re: water quality, but when people were questioned over the words used for the new classifications, most said they would be happy to swim in water that was judged 'sufficient'.

## **8.8 ACTION: Defra to explore getting press notice onto Direct.Gov**

### 9) Presentation from NFU regarding action by the agricultural sector - Diane Mitchell

**9.1 Please see Diane Mitchell's presentation slides for more detail** (available on the Water Stakeholder Forum webpages:

[http://www.euwfd.net/html/england\\_and\\_the\\_wfd.html](http://www.euwfd.net/html/england_and_the_wfd.html) ). The points below are mainly in addition to, rather than repeating, the content of the presentation.

9.2 Diane began by showing Forum members a range of examples of environmental initiatives that NFU is involved in. She drew out some 'common principles' from these partnerships, which were:

- Targeted in approach
- Partnership projects
- Compliment activity not duplicate
- Messages must be simple & straightforward

9.3 She then took attendees through the various initiatives in more detail, including

- Campaign for the Farmed Environment, which is a partnership approach to achieving the benefits without compulsory set-aside, to encourage voluntary action such as Environmental Stewardship
- The Voluntary Initiative, which was brought in as an alternative to a tax on pesticides and has 3 elements: training for farmers, a national sprayer testing scheme, and crop protection management.
- Tried and Tested, which is funded through ECSFDI (England Catchment Sensitive Farming Delivery Initiative) and focused on raising awareness
- Greenhouse Gas Action Plan, which was an NFU, CLA and AC response to the Climate Change Act , with a focus on resource efficiency gains
- Catchment management scheme, working with water companies including a Wessex Water project in the South West.

9.4 Finally Diane brought the audience back to the 'common principles' of these initiatives, and emphasized the importance of using 'trusted routes' for farmers, to compliment not complicate the messages.

9.5 Chris Ryder commented that it is important to recognise the impact on WFD objectives.

9.6 Ofwat asked how NFU was monitoring the uptake of initiatives and the impact on eg. Water quality improvements?

Diane responded that it was a challenge. Currently not all of the benefits were being captured. This does need to be addressed – perhaps by using a proxy indicator.

9.7 LEAF commented that they are currently doing research on NVZs and also producing a monitoring toolkit – happy to feed back on this.

9.8 Ralph Underhill of RSPB questioned a figure quoted re: water quality improvements in certain water bodies as a result of farmer voluntary action (40 – 100% improvements). What did this measure/ how was this measured?

This referred to presence of pesticides.

HSE commented that studies showed adoption of these voluntary initiatives to have a substantial reduction in the presence of pesticides.

9.9 Rob Oates from the Thames Trust welcomed the active participation of NFU. He asked if anyone had taken responsibility for collating the progress on water company catchment management schemes?

Claire McCamphill from Defra responded that a workshop had been held with Water UK, NE, EA, Ofwat and others on how to track progress and share learning on developing Water Company catchment management schemes. Water UK had been taking the lead on this but had since downsized. Defra now in discussions with Ofwat, NE and EA over who needed to take this forward.

Geoff Bateman from EA added that part of EA's £1million bid would include coordination of catchment schemes.

LEAF added that a framework to integrate all initiatives would be put in place through the Greenhouse Gas Framework.

#### 10) Update on Agricultural Diffuse Pollution – Louise Clark

10.1 Louise Clark from Defra then provided an update on the '3 pronged approach' to tackling agricultural diffuse pollution: advice, scheme and regulation.

10.2 On advice she emphasized that the team was looking wider than ECSFDI - at other advice initiatives eg CFE and VI and investigating, for example, the potential other measures under the Rural Development Programme for England such as 'Leader' (Axis 4) offered for making progress on tackling diffuse pollution.

10.3 Defra is also trying to build a picture of the totality of measures and initiatives already in place to address the problem, assessing the gap and then using this information so that more effective targeting can take place.

10.4 In December Defra managed to secure a 50% increase in capital grants funding, guaranteed to 2013 (through funding from the RDPE) . Also currently considering the business case for an enhanced ECSFDI.

10.5 Currently scoping out a study to assess contribution of current agri-environment schemes in addressing diffuse pollution.

10.6 There is a 'demonstration test catchments' project where bottom up approaches to tackling diffuse pollution will be carried out and monitored over the next couple of years. Defra had also recently carried out a farmer self monitoring project, where farmers tested their field drains for nitrate – the self monitoring being a tool to encourage farmer engagement.

10.7 On WPZs, we are currently working up the statutory guidance on this. We are addressing issues around the level of evidence needed to support designations and

what will be the trigger point at which voluntary initiatives will be deemed insufficient and a WPZ is necessary.

10.8 Claire McCamphill expanded on the farmer self monitoring project. In Waveney, E Anglia, there is a pilot to get farmers involved in evidence collection through monitoring themselves (for, nitrate and sediment). A final workshop will take place at the end of March. A final report will be available on Defras website in due course.

10.9 Claire added that demonstration test catchments is an EA/Defra r&d project which will:

- Help to build up the evidence base for impact of measures
- Help to build research communities and stakeholder engagement.

10.10 Claire ended by saying that timescales are to start baseline monitoring asap, run for a year and then identify measures to be applied next year. The funding is in the regiof of £6m for 5 years.

10.11 WPZs. Chris Ryder explained the position on the draft statutory guidance. Defra's aim was to produce guidance which explained not just the nuts and bolts of exercising the designation power but the whole process for addressing sources of diffuse pollution which would have to be followed before ever the prospect of designating a WPZ as the regulatory measure of last resort would come under consideration. This would start with identification of a pollution source, followed by engagement with all interested parties to see what action could be stimulated voluntarily and what incentives to that could be mobilised, with resort to regulation through the WPZ mechanism only where non-regulatory solutions would not deliver. There had been good discussions with stakeholders in the Sectoral Steering Group on how this would work, but Defra now needed to do some hard thinking about important issues –eg the evidence levels needed to trigger a WPZ, how to ensure designation of a WPZ did not affect existing beneficiaries access to Environmental Stewardship, what payments could be brought to bear etc. It was important to take the time to get these things right: Defra would reconvene the Sectoral Group as soon as it had clarified its thinking, and of course keep the Forum posted.

#### 11) Any other business and date of next meeting

##### **AOB**

11.1 Progress on code of practice – hose pipe bans. John Adlam from the Horticultural Trade Association would like to see management of a ban which was better for consumers; what is the buy-in from water companies?

11.2 Carol Skilling from Defra responded that a need for consistency was raised when consulting on the ban in 2007. In taking forwards Defra has aimed to clarify water industry powers – flexibility to make exceptions eg timing, or type of user. However a code of practice was produced, couldn't be applied uniformly. Defra believes that the best way to take this forwards is through the statutory drought plans; will be meeting with stakeholders to discuss this.

Cleaning private motor boats will be prohibited, only when using public supply. To note, you cannot prohibit the use of grey water, for example.

11.3 Jan Brooke commented that there could be water quality issues re alien species, if people cannot clean their boats.

11.4 Carol responded that Defra would be looking at this.

11.5 NVZ item in Defra update. Michael Payne from commented that the NVZ appeals had an implication for WFD. Of the 760 appeals, half have been upheld. He commented that the appeals process is fair – thanks to Defra – but seems as though it was necessary. There is a need to address errors in the process of WFD.

11.6 Chris Ryder responded that WFD was designed with Nitrates Directive in mind. Agree there is a need to learn lessons from the appeals process.

11.7 Benchmarking RBMPs. Ofwat asked how will we get to understand how RBMPs are progressing in Europe?

11.8 Louise Clark reported that:

- Published: CZ, DE, FI, FR, LU, LV, NL, RO, SE, SK, UK
- Adopted and not yet published AT, BG, EE, IE, HU, LT, PL + NO
- Consultation ongoing IT, SI, DK.
- Partial: be (1 of 4); ES (22 out of 24 – not started).
- Not yet started EL, MT, PT, CY.

In terms of where UK 'sits', Louise said we are probably in the middle of the pack. UK has done more on economic issues than others.

The Commission are doing a formal analysis of the Plans; assuming no sensitivities, we can share this.

Louise added that perhaps we are being conservative in our targets, but other MS perhaps won't achieve theirs.

11.9 RSPB noted that yes, our level of ambition is mid-table, but our starting point is lower.

11.10 Jan Brooke commented on the overlap between the Marine Directive and the WFD; but there don't appear to be clear links between the EA and marine management organizations. The MSD has an even tighter timetable than WFD. We have an opportunity by coordinating early to address this – needs to be at a practical level, not just political.

**11.11 ACTION: Louise to follow up with Naomi Matthiessen (Defra marine strategy lead)**

**11.12 Date of Next Meeting**

Chris Ryder suggested that due to the elections in May/June, and subsequent changes in government, the Water Stakeholder Forum should meet again in September.

**11.13 ACTION: Verity Zurita to circulate next Forum date when available**

12) Actions summary

Ref.	Action	Owner	Status
5.18	Geoff Bateman offered to send RSPB a copy of the maintenance dredging protocol	Geoff Bateman	
6.13	Rob Oates to send Phase 1 of River Wey project report to Verity Zurita for circulation	Rob Oates	
7.16	Carrie Hume to contact Vicky Dawe re: PHD study of SuDS.	Carrie Hume	
7.19	Vicky Dawe to check if misconnection figures include non-domestic misconnections	Vicky Dawe	
8.8	Defra to explore getting press notice re: new bathing water signs onto Direct.Gov	Kate Hedges	
11.11	Louise to follow up with Naomi Matthiessen (Defra marine strategy lead) re: WFD and MSD overlap	Louise Clark	
11.13	Verity Zurita to circulate next Forum date when available	Verity Zurita	