



**Management Committee Meeting 63 Minutes**

**Date:** Thursday 21 March 2024 **Time:** 1:00 – 3:00pm

**Location:** CQUniversity Leo Zussino Building 1.22, and Zoom

**Attendees:**

Name	Position	Organisation
<b>Chair</b>		
Professor Iain Gordon	GHHP Chair	GHHP
<b>Staff</b>		
Ms Hannah King	GHHP Project Officer	GHHP
Dr Kirsten McMahon	GHHP Research Officer	GHHP
<b>Partner Tier 1</b>		
Mr James Harris	Chair	Gladstone Air Quality Community Group
<b>Partner Tier 2</b>		
Ms Elyse Riethmuller	Chief Executive Officer and GHHP Deputy Chair	Fitzroy Basin Association
<b>Partner Tier 3</b>		
Mr Alan Hayter	Environmental Lead	Conoco Phillips
<b>Partner Tier 4</b>		
Dr Megan Ellis	Environment Specialist	Gladstone Ports Corporation
<b>Government</b>		
Ms Rachel Darcy	Manager, Reef Partnerships	OGBR&WH, DES
Ms Ali Moore	Manager Environment and Conservation	Gladstone Regional Council
<b>Research</b>		
Professor Emma Jackson	Director, Coastal Marine Ecosystems Research Centre	CQUniversity
<b>ISP Members</b>		
Professor John Rolfe	ISP Chair	GHHP Independent Science Panel
Dr Rob Coles	Principal Research Scientist	James Cook University
<b>Observers</b>		
Fiona Chandler	Principal Consultant	Alluvium Consulting

**Apologies:**

Name	Position	Organisation
Cr Darryl Branthwaite	Councillor	Gladstone Regional Council
Mr David Voss	Chief Executive Officer	Gladstone Industry Leadership Group
Ms Demi Blucher	Gladstone Manager	Gidarjil Development Corporation

## **Agenda Item 1 – Introduction**

Meeting Started: 1:00pm

### **1.2 Apologies and Introductions**

Iain provided an Acknowledgement of Country.

Apologies were noted from Demi Bucher, David Voss, and Darryl Branthwaite.

Alan Hayter also sent an apology that he would be late to the meeting.

Iain welcomed Dr Rob Coles, Principal Research Scientist at James Cook University, and member of the Independent Science Panel, to the GHHP Management Committee meeting. Rob is conducting research on seagrass and coastal management and has been with the ISP since inception in 2012.

### **1.3 Previous Minutes and Actions**

The Chair invited a review of the previous minutes and actions with updates made to the actions that are included in the Meeting Action Register.

The meeting minutes of Management Committee Meeting 62 were accepted as a true and accurate record.

**Moved:** James

**Seconded:** Rachel

## **Agenda Item 2 – Items Requiring Decision**

*Please note that this information is CONFIDENTIAL and for GHHP INTERNAL USE ONLY.*

### **2.1 Community Survey and Incentive**

Within the Ten-Year Review, two surveys were conducted: one for the community, and one for the Partners. The community survey only received four responses, and thus wasn't discussed in the workshop, and mentioned only briefly in the report.

Hannah suggested that the community survey questions be reviewed to make them more understandable and Gladstone-community friendly and be rereleased with an incentive to complete. Hannah noted that Alluvium Consulting had been paid to analyse and incorporate the community survey results, and as that did not happen with the original four responses, the work was still outstanding, and any new responses could be reviewed by Alluvium at no additional cost. Hannah also asked, if the Management Committee approved the rerelease of the community survey, what would the Management Committee like answered within the survey?

Rachel asked what the original community survey questions were. Kirsten responded that the community survey questions were very similar to the questions for the Partners survey. Many of the questions were about the products produced by GHHP, the monitoring undertaken, and if the data is used. Kirsten suggested that a review would focus more on how the questions are framed, rather than the questions themselves. Hannah agreed that the questions were presented on more of a technical level, as if assuming the participant had already heard of GHHP and was in the environmental space. Hannah suggested more high-level questions such as if the community had heard of GHHP, which products specifically, where the products useful, and what GHHP could do better.

Rachel asked how the community survey was shared. Hannah responded that the survey went through GHHP's Harbour Heroes newsletter, the GHHP Facebook page, and some printed media presented in key areas. The survey itself was also only open for one week, which didn't provide a good response time.

Rachel suggested sharing the survey in-person. For example, within a shopping centre, and getting a good cross-section of people from the community who don't already know about GHHP. Hannah noted that the Human Dimensions survey has just been released via paid Facebook advertisement. One of the questions is asking if the respondent would like to subscribe to Harbour Heroes. Hannah suggested that it could be assumed that those saying 'yes' to signing up to Harbour Heroes may be new to the GHHP space. There is a

high proportion of respondents responding 'yes'. Therefore, the paid Facebook advertisement is reaching a great selection of community members who don't have that prior knowledge of GHHP. Kirsten noted that the initial community survey with the Ten-Year Review did not have a paid Facebook advertisement.

Iain raised that the point of doing the original community survey was to garner community understanding of the report card, the activities of GHHP, and understand what further they would like done. There wasn't much response. Iain asked the Management Committee if they believe that the survey and questions are still important, and if so, how can GHHP reach the community more broadly than in the past?

Emma reviewed the report and noted that many of the questions asked which outputs or factors were still relevant. Emma asked how much additional information was given to the respondents about the factors so that they could make an informed response. One of key outputs from the survey was to identify what people care about and what they value in the harbour, but that was not clear in the way that the questions were phrased.

Megan asked if GHHP still had a copy of the survey questions from the inception of GHHP. Rob noted that responses were collected through a series of community meetings. Kirsten asked if that was able to happen because there were active community groups, such as GREAN. Rob agreed that noted that there were also industry groups through to green groups involved. Hannah asked what the likelihood was that there would be a good community representation, now what GREAN and other groups were either disbanded or inactive. Rob stated that, when GHHP was first formed, there was a lot of media publicity as a result of the fish deaths.

Megan noted that the Partners have their own different stakeholder groups than can be reached out to. Hannah asked what the benefit would be having a community workshop over an anonymous online survey. Emma replied that it would be to provide the audience with more context and help understanding questions. Hannah suggested that, if the survey was to be reviewed and released, then the questions could be asked in such a way that they are very easy to understand and answer. Megan suggested that engagement would benefit more from a community workshop, and Hannah noted that there is also a preference for a quick online survey with a prize, so Hannah suggested having both a survey and a workshop. Kirsten suggested integrated an anonymous survey within a workshop.

Emma raised that AI does have some issues with online surveys. Some people search for incentivised surveys and complete, regardless of if they meet the criteria. Rob suggested that online surveys may have difficulty getting publicity and suggested that questions need to be simpler. John raised that online surveys typically do very well through paid advertising on Facebook, and the ones sent through email do not. An example of this is the Human Dimensions survey that is out currently and gathering a great response rate.

John raised that the Human Dimensions survey currently has a question regarding if the respondent had heard of GHHP or the report card previously. John asked if the Management Committee thought that that was enough or was there more information that is needed. Hannah also noted that there were elements of what threats the community perceive as being the most problematic. Megan raised that it really needs to ask the community what they want from GHHP, what they want monitored, and what their main concerns are with social, cultural, environmental, and economic health of the harbour. John responded that these questions would be answered within the Human Dimensions survey, and Kirsten noted that although the Human Dimensions survey does not have an open box forum, GHHP can still learn a lot from the responses – possibly as much as would be learned from rerunning the community survey.

Megan noted that it would not be a good idea to run a second incentivised survey straight behind the incentivised Human Dimensions survey. Hannah asked the Management Committee if they would be comfortable waiting for the results of the Human Dimensions survey and seeing if that answered the questions. Megan asked to review the Human Dimensions questions and, if any questions aren't being addressed, they could then be asked in a different forum.

Hannah noted that, if the Management Committee agrees to wait until the results of the Human Dimensions and decide to run a second community survey, then the report won't be completed in time for the Partners meeting in May.

Iain agreed to wait until the results of the Human Dimensions survey are received and reviewed and see whether it meets the needs of the Partnership. He noted that Partners would be more concerned if the review was rushed and didn't meet the needs, than if the review presentation was delayed.

**ACTION: Hannah to send set of Human Dimensions questions to the Management Committee for review, and to see whether the questions asked would be fit for the purpose of the Ten-Year Review.**

### 2.2 Confirmation of Partner Tier Table

Hannah presented the Partner Tier Table and Narrative to the Management Committee. At the last Management Committee meeting in January, the Partner Tier Criteria, specifically for Partner Tiers 2 and 3, were presented and accepted by the Management Committee.

Partner Tier 2 would be based on having less than 50 employees and operating on a regional or state-wide basis. If the organisation met one of the two criteria, but not the other, then annual profit would be assessed. If annual profit was less than \$15million, then the organisation would be classed as Tier 2. Partner Tier 3 would have more than 50 employees and operate on a national or worldwide basis.

At Management Committee meeting 62, the Management Committee expressed a desire to retain the information of PCIMP contribution and other in-kind contributions. Hannah has therefore added a section to the narrative about what the PCIMP is, and other Partners may contribute to GHHP above and beyond their annual financial contribution. Hannah noted that there are some edits to be made to the Gladstone Ports Corporation narrative, and Megan replied that GPC has reviewed and will send through their desired amendments. The table itself was also updated to include a column for 'other in-kind contributions' which includes acknowledgement of contribution to PCIMP, advertising for GHHP, co-funding for indicator monitoring, and provision of seagrass data in the case of Gladstone Ports Corporation.

*Please note that this information is CONFIDENTIAL and for GHHP INTERNAL USE ONLY.*

**ACTION: Hannah to contact Mark Baird at CSIRO, to inform him of the Management Committee's decision to remove CSIRO as a Partner.**

*Please note that this information is CONFIDENTIAL and for GHHP INTERNAL USE ONLY.*

When the table is published, the annual profit, employees, and footprint scale columns will be removed. John suggested changing from annual profit to annual surplus if the column is retained.

*Please note that this information is CONFIDENTIAL and for GHHP INTERNAL USE ONLY.*

**ACTION: Hannah to remove the \$7,000 figure from the Other In-Kind Contributions table and remove CSIRO. Assess Hosting Agreement and remove from CQU Other In-Kind Contributions column if no in-kind provided. Change headings as requested. Megan to provide Hannah with an updated narrative for GPC.**

### 2.3 GHHP Communications Delivery Provider

The Communications Delivery Provider Scope of Works and tender process was launched in mid-February and closed on 12 March 2024. At the time of closing, three applications had been received, although a late proposal arrived on Friday 15 March from Dentsu Creative for \$360,000.

Hannah presented an overview of the three applications received on time.

- Marketing Mafia \$35,101
- Elevate Media \$49,080
- Rachel Buchanon Consulting \$161,700

Megan and Hannah met on 13 March to discuss the three applications and presented a breakdown of costs and other criteria to the Management Committee. Hannah suggested removing Rachel Buchanon Consulting from consideration as the proposal was over budget, to which the Management Committee agreed.

Other criteria assessed included locality, experience with industry, experience with Report Cards, and other costs included in the proposal.

	<b>Marketing Mafia</b>	<b>Elevate Media</b>
<b>Cost</b>	\$35,101	\$49,080
<b>Location</b>	Rockhampton	Gladstone
<b>Industry Experience</b>	Nil known	GPC, GAWB
<b>Partnership Experience</b>	With GHHP since 2021. Contracted by Fitzroy and Dry Tropics Partnerships.	Nil known
<b>Other</b>	Cost breakdown: monthly  Accurate quote as considered previous hours taken to complete.  Includes printing in quote.	Cost breakdown: every four months.  Does not include printing (approx. additional \$4,000).

Iain asked Megan for comment as part of the GHHP Communications Working Group. Megan noted that her comments were captured in the table, and raised the Elevate Media was currently for sale. She also raised that it was important to ensure that there were no cost blowouts but thought that this was in hand with Hannah taking on more communications responsibilities and Marketing Mafia providing a quote based on past expenses and invoices.

*Please note that this information is CONFIDENTIAL and for GHHP INTERNAL USE ONLY.*

Hannah raised having a contingency for the Communications budget, for pieces of work that pop up outside of the agreement with Marketing Mafia, no more than \$2,000. Taking into consideration the proposal from Marketing Mafia (\$35,101), the proposed contingency (\$2,000), and other costs outside of the agreement (Gladstone News article \$2,850, billboards \$800, Mailchimp \$480), the Communications is still under the Budget Principles of \$60,000.

*Please note that this information is CONFIDENTIAL and for GHHP INTERNAL USE ONLY.*

**ACTION: Hannah to discuss Harbour Reflections with Marketing Mafia to ensure that the content is relevant to GHHP and its audience.**

**OUTCOME: Marketing Mafia approved by the Management Committee to be the Communications Delivery Provider.**

**OUTCOME: Hannah to organise a Contract Services Agreement with Marketing Mafia as the selected Communications Delivery Provider.**

### **Agenda Item 3 – Items for Consideration**

*Please note that this information is CONFIDENTIAL and for GHHP INTERNAL USE ONLY.*

#### **3.1 Ten-Year Review Survey and Workshop Report**

*Please note that this information is CONFIDENTIAL and for GHHP INTERNAL USE ONLY.*

**ACTION: Hannah to organise a session with the Management Committee to discuss the Ten-Year Review Survey and Workshop Report.**

#### **3.1 Ten-Year Review Independent Science Panel Recommendations**

John stated that the Independent Science Panel Ten-Year Review has been conducted in several methods. Kirsten has collated the scores over the last ten years, the ISP has reviewed water and sediment data and assessing any outliers and trends. The work will continue by assessing data through statistical analysis.

The ISP has reviewed all elements of the Report Card and assessed whether they should be kept or amended. The review conducted in 2017 has also been reviewed and cross-checked the recommendations.

*Please note that this information is CONFIDENTIAL and for GHHP INTERNAL USE ONLY.*

**ACTION: Kirsten and John to create a new Scope of Works for the Fish HAI indicator and present to the Management Committee at the May 2024 meeting.**

**OUTCOME: The Management Committee supported the recommended approach to the new Traditional Owner Values reporting.**

### **Agenda Item 4 – Reports**

No reports were presented at Management Committee Meeting 63.

### **Agenda Item 5 – General/Recurring Business**

Megan raised that the GPC annual seagrass report is almost due, and the Gladstone Central School Under 8's day has been advertised for 22<sup>nd</sup> May 9am to 12pm.

Iain raised that he had attended a workshop by the Dry Tropics Partnership regarding a fish indicator. They are interested in bringing in a fish indicator into their Report Card. They are considering using i-Naturalist to gather data for fish communities to develop a diversity index. Iain had asked the Dry Tropics Partnership why they wanted a fish indicator, and what the community had said regarding it, but the Partnership were unsure. There is still work to be done in the space. This is specific to marine fish.

Iain also raised that the Partnership Chairs would be having another meeting with the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) within the next few weeks.

Iain is looking forward to attending the Partners meeting in person in May.

#### **5.2 – Meeting Closure and Next Meeting**

Meeting Closed: 2:45pm

Next meeting: GHHP Partners Meeting 64, 9 May 2024, 1pm – 3pm

## Meeting Action Register

Number	Action	Responsible	Due	Status	Notes
<b>MC Meeting 55</b>					
MC55.7	Consider adding coral monitoring data collected by Gidarjil Development Corporation into the report card.	ISP Chair		In-progress	This has been discussed at the ISP meeting. This will likely not be integrated with the current coral indicators, as adding extra data will impact consistency. As work with PCCC continues, the ISP will explore the possibility of adding a new indicator.
<b>MC Meeting 62</b>					
MC 62.1	Update the Communications Scope of Works, obtain final approval, and release. GHHP Communications Working Group to meet once all applications are received and assess against criteria.	Project Officer	Feb 2024	Completed	Four proposals received, and Communications Working Group met to discuss. To be discussed at MC Meeting 63.
MC 62.2	Update the Partner Tier table with a column for in-kind support and/or contribution to PCIMP, and update narrative to reflect. Hannah to present at the March 2024 Management Committee meeting.	Project Officer	Mar 2024	Completed	Updated as requested and will be discussed at MC Meeting 63.
MC 62.3	Edit the Finance Report as requested and speak to Alana Richardson regarding the potential to have an expected spend to date column.	Project Officer	Mar 2024	Completed	The updates were made as requested. Research Finance has recruited a new employee, and further discussions will be had once fully on board.
<b>MC Meeting 63</b>					
MC 63.1	Send set of Human Dimensions questions to the Management Committee for review, and to see whether the questions asked would be fit for the purpose of the Ten-Year Review.	Project Officer	Mar 2024		
MC 63.2	Contact Mark Baird at CSIRO, to inform him of the Management Committee's decision to remove CSIRO as a Partner.	Project Officer	Mar 2024		

MC 63.3	Remove the \$7,000 figure from the Other In-Kind Contributions table and remove CSIRO. Assess Hosting Agreement and remove from CQU Other In-Kind Contributions column if no in-kind provided. Change headings as requested. Megan to provide Hannah with an updated narrative for GPC.	Project Officer	Apr 2024		
MC 63.4	Discuss Harbour Reflections with Marketing Mafia to ensure that the content is relevant to GHHP and its audience.	Project Officer	Apr 2024		
MC 63.5	Organise a Contract Services Agreement with Marketing Mafia as the selected Communications Delivery Provider.	Project Officer	Apr 2024		
MC 63.6	Organise a session with the Management Committee to discuss the Ten-Year Review Survey and Workshop Report.	Project Officer	Apr 2024		
MC 63.7	Create a new Scope of Works for the Fish HAI indicator and present to the Management Committee at the May 2024 meeting.	Research Officer ISP Chair	May 2024		