

9 Conclusions Section

9.1 Overall assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of estuary management in England.

Table 10 sets out an overall assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of estuary management in England. This helps to provide a link between the main findings of the objective review and the conclusions / recommendations, which make up the remainder of this report.

The table covers each of the key outcomes set out within the objective review. It is structured according to the following features of estuary management:

- Partnerships
- Plans
- Project officers
- Projects

Table 10.1 Key strengths and weaknesses of estuary management in England.

<p>Awareness Raising. Directly related to core functions: 2 <i>"to promote a common understanding of the objectives, beliefs and activities of the organisations reliant upon estuarine resources."</i> 3 <i>.To inform decision-makers about the status of the estuary and what progress is being made / needs to be made towards sustainable use.</i></p>	
Partnerships	<p>Strength -joint working of partners to shared objectives for estuary management. Increase the awareness of estuaries and organisations through better communication. Promotes a common understanding of estuary issues. Weaknesses -No method for measuring quality of awareness raising outputs. Awareness raising can be delivered through other mechanisms and initiatives c.g. shoreline management plans.</p>
Plans	<p>Strength -Can raise awareness via information presented in the plan, and especially during the plan preparation process. Weakness - Effectiveness of awareness raising depends on plan quality, content and distribution.</p>
Project Officers	<p>Strength -can provide a focus for an estuary management project via presentations, events and meetings. Weakness - dependant on the communication skills of the officer.</p>

Table 10.2 Key strengths and weaknesses of estuary management in England.

Conflict prevention	
Directly related to core function:	
<i>5 To help prevent conflict by providing a balanced framework for resource allocation, objective setting and decision-making.</i>	
Partnerships	<p>Strength – regular contact and better mutual understanding via the estuary management partnership reduces the likelihood of conflict / confrontation. Concerns and difficulties identified before a conflict arises. Joint objective setting reduces the likelihood of conflict.</p> <p>Weakness – reliant on commitment to the partnership and peer pressure. No mechanism or authority to arbitrate a solution. Voluntary approach must be clearly explained so as not to undermine the statutory process.</p>
Plans	<p>Strength - provides consistency via a policy framework and baseline to inform decision making. This is thought to lead to reduced conflict.</p> <p>Weakness – consensual nature of plan policies are open to wide interpretation. No mechanism to measure the success (if any) of conflict prevention. Can be inflexible with regards to new pressures and conflicts.</p>
Project Officer	<p>Strength - can help provide support and provide informal advice to prevent conflict. Able to respond flexibly.</p> <p>Weakness - quality of advice open to subjectivity, must be accountable to plan guidance.</p>
Projects	<p>Strength - joint projects can help cement relationships and build shared objectives that are less likely to conflict.</p> <p>Weakness - few examples of successful conflict resolution.</p>

Table 10.3 Key strengths and weaknesses of estuary management in England.

Assisting the plans and initiatives of others.
Directly related to core function 1 " <i>to influence the statutory planning system and the regulation of activities below the low water mark</i> ", and core function 6 " <i>to be aware of the initiatives and plans of others and to communicate their implications to those organisations who are reliant on the estuary.</i> "

Partnerships	<p>Strength – the estuary management process and framework can assist in joint objective setting and partnership working. There is evidence of delivery of economies of scale and scope e.g. integrated plans and fewer consultations.</p> <p>Weakness – partnerships are likely to develop anyway through the work of the partners and their other initiatives.</p>
Plans	<p>Strength – can identify gaps, duplications, and potential conflicts and can clarify the relationship between plans and initiatives.</p> <p>Weakness – another planning initiative in estuaries that creates confusion with both statutory and non statutory plans and initiatives.</p>
Project Officers	<p>Strength - can add value to the process of developing other plans and initiatives by providing an all embracing estuary-wide perspective.</p> <p>Can provide a single point of advice and assistance, especially in getting up to date information about what's happening on the estuary</p> <p>Weakness – totally dependant on the skills of the individual. Plans and initiatives will continue irrespective of an officer. At worst officers can be seen to complicate processes that do not need assistance.</p>
Projects	<p>Strength - can promote the initiatives of partners.</p> <p>Weakness – issue of legitimacy as partner projects will happen regardless.</p>

Table 10.4 Key strengths and weaknesses of estuary management in England.

Partnerships	<p>Directly related to all 6 core functions.</p>
Partnerships	<p>Strength – helps reduce the risk of pursuing hidden agendas and encourages consideration of other interests.</p> <p>Weakness - ease of withdrawal from partnerships, commitments not binding. Inequality of membership can create tension. Reason for missing stakeholders needs clarification.</p>
Plans	<p>Strengths - a focus and quantifiable output of the partnership. The main reason for the formation of partnerships. An opportunity to influence future agendas and priorities.</p> <p>Weaknesses – partnerships untested by big difficult issues. Use of the plan to influence policy and decisions is discretionary and inconsistent. Partnerships focus on plan production and not on implementation and the longer term sustainability of the partnership. Quality variable with little evidence of evaluation.</p>
Project Officers	<p>Strength – officers provide a focus for the partnership and a mechanism for the delivery of outputs on behalf of the partnership.</p> <p>Weakness – partnership can become heavily dependent on a single individual. Difficult to distinguish between the person, the plan and the process. Can act as a disincentive for partner organisation action.</p>
Projects	<p>Strength – projects can be used to build commitment to the estuary management partnership.</p> <p>Weakness – projects can deflect the focus of the partnership from core functions.</p>

Table 10.5 Key strengths and weaknesses of estuary management in England

Wildlife and environmental gain	
Indirectly related to core function 3 " <i>to inform decision makers about the status of the estuary and what progress is being made / needs to be made towards sustainable development.</i> "	
Partnerships	<p>Strength - can indirectly lead to gain via partnership working, raised awareness, and conflict prevention.</p> <p>Weakness – environmental gain only one part of sustainable development and is not a core function of estuary management. It is the responsibility of the stakeholders to deliver direct environmental / wildlife gain, not the estuary management partnership.</p>
Plans	<p>Strength - provide a policy framework to focus and prioritise issues and can encourage progress beyond the legislative minimum.</p> <p>Weaknesses – plans very broad and can mean all things to all people.</p>
Project Officers	<p>Strength - can assist in setting objectives and encouraging compatibility with the plan policies and objectives.</p> <p>Weakness - usually insufficient expertise and resources to directly deliver.</p>
Projects	<p>Strength – able to identify and prioritise wildlife / environmental projects.</p> <p>Weakness - few examples of direct wildlife / environmental gain.</p>

Table 10.6 Key strengths and weaknesses of estuary management in England.

Funding	
Directly related to core function 4 " <i>to act as a mechanism for agreeing the short, medium and long term priorities for an estuary.</i> "	
Partnerships	<p>Strength – leverage potential and opportunities for pooling resources and sharing financial burden of the estuary management process.</p> <p>Weakness - funding partnerships short term, fragile, unsustainable and not a core area of partner work (seen as a luxury). It is difficult to identify outputs of estuary management considering the large time and financial investment into the process.</p>
Plans	<p>Strength - cost of preparation can be shared amongst partnership.</p> <p>Weakness - cost of preparation not evaluated against outputs and outcomes</p>
Project Officers	<p>Strength - provides a focus and means of co-ordination for the producing a plan.</p> <p>Weakness - two thirds of direct financial costs due to funding an officer post. Value for money hard to demonstrate, could funds be diverted more effectively elsewhere? Not expert at fund raising. Confusion about the fundraising role of Project Officers.</p>
Projects	<p>Strength - partners often more willing to fund specific projects with specified outcomes.</p> <p>Weakness – projects as a direct consequence of the estuary management process need to be managed and may not always relate to core functions.</p>

9.2 Conclusions

Overall this objective review has shown that the current system of estuary management is delivering some benefits. The process that has evolved is broader than English Nature's Estuaries Initiative. The establishment of partnerships and the delivery of plans are the primary focus. No evaluation of the quality of the plans produced has been made as part neither of this review nor systematically at the local or national level.

The estuary management process is contributing towards the sustainable development of estuaries because some of its outputs are directly linked to the six core functions. When compared to English Nature's original objectives for the Estuaries Initiative there is little evidence of direct wildlife / environmental gain or any reduction in casework load.

At the moment individual estuary management projects set their own priorities according to local circumstances. Whilst this should continue to be the case, it is recommended that estuary management in the future is guided by the six core functions. Core functions provide a benchmark against which all estuary management activities can be assessed. Other activities carried out at local level may add value and satisfy local needs but are additional to, and should not replace, the core functions. Referring back to the six core functions will provide greater control over the accountability, direction and focus of estuary management. It also will help discipline the evaluation process, which must become more outcome orientated.

A fundamental conclusion of this study is that the estuary management process can be effective at preparing a plan, developing partnerships and raising awareness, but more accountability, monitoring, evaluation and focus is required. In addition, the scale of the estuary will affect almost every aspect of the management approach taken.

Specific conclusions relating to each section of this objective review are set out below, in addition a set of conclusions is also presented on estuary project officers.

Awareness raising (see results section 7.1 and discussion section 8.1)

1. Individual estuary management plans do outline the institutional, policy and legislative framework for relevant organisations at local level. However, increased awareness has not necessarily led to a decreased duplication of effort, and there is still considerable scope for duplication and confusion in the coastal zone. This is being tackled at the local level via local agreements between organisations and their initiatives on an estuary by estuary basis and not at the regional or national level.
2. The estuary management process does raise awareness, but no assessment is being made of the effectiveness of awareness raising initiatives in relation to progress towards sustainable development. There appear to be no quality standards for awareness raising materials and events.

Conflict prevention (see results section 7.2 and discussion section 8.2)

3. Conflict prevention is a core function of estuary management. Conflict resolution is not core function but a desirable add-on. Conflict prevention and resolution should assist, not replace statutory systems. This fact is often not made clear and can lead to frustration within statutory bodies.

4. The data gathered for this study indicates that conflict resolution has only occurred in relation to 'smaller' issues (mostly recreational e.g. slipway access), and estuary management partnerships have not been tested by 'bigger' issues (e.g. large scale development), where statutory systems are, in any case, more appropriate.

Assisting the plans and initiatives of others (see results section 7.3 and discussion section 8.3)

5. The estuary management process has particularly influenced Special Area of Conservation management schemes and it has helped some Local Environment Agency Plans and Local Authority Plans. Generally this is in the form of informal consultation, provision of policy guidance and through the use of established estuary management frameworks and partnerships. On some estuaries this has led to the integration of policies and plans. However, it is important to note that without the estuary management plan, many of these initiatives would continue regardless.
6. The estuary management partnership and framework can add value by:
 - Providing assistance for launches and joint events e.g. Local Environment Agency Plan.
 - Providing access to informal mechanisms e.g. Local Plan informal consultation and access to established partnerships e.g. Schemes of Management for Special Areas of Conservation.
 - Communicating the relationship between different plans and organisations in an estuary.
 - Lending support in the development of funding bids.
 - Data and information collation and supply.
7. No prescribed process or framework has evolved in England to clarify the relationship between different plans. Accountability and adaptability is agreed at the local level through estuary management partnerships. The potential for duplication of initiatives and roles remains unless it has been addressed at the local level.
8. Estuary management plans and shoreline management plans are poorly integrated.

Partnerships (see results section 7.4 and discussion section 8.4)

9. The degree of commitment to the partnership appears generally sufficient to deliver an agreed estuary management plan.
10. Commitment to the partnership is less clear during estuary management plan implementation. Specific outputs and activities during implementation should be agreed between the stakeholders and clearly articulated to members of the partnership. An action plan, giving credit where credit is due, is an appropriate mechanism.
11. Membership of the management group should be equitable and, at all stages in the process, members need to act as message carriers to their own organisations.

12. The reasons behind stakeholder groups missing from the estuary management process is largely an issue of relevancy. If missing stakeholders are to be recruited the mutual benefits of involvement in the partnership should be evaluated before recruitment efforts are made. The perception by an estuary management partnership that an ‘outside’ organisation needs to be involved is not necessarily shared by the organisation in question (e.g. small and medium enterprises).
13. The local community is poorly represented in the estuary management process. An estuary forum is one proven mechanism for local community involvement. However, concern has been expressed at how representative spokespersons or “activists” are of the wider community.
14. Local Authorities are the most frequent host organisation for estuary management projects. The host organisation usually provides a package that includes administration support and access to support services.

Wildlife and environmental gain (see results section 7.5 and discussion section 8.5)

15. Estuary management partnerships do not directly deliver wildlife or environmental gain. However, through the establishment of partnerships, estuary management can assist the delivery of wildlife and environmental gain. It is the partner organisations who have the ability, resources and responsibility to deliver benefits on the ground, not the estuary management partnership or the Estuary Project Officer.
16. Significantly, the estuary management process and plan can assist in the delivery of shared objectives which can lead to the prevention of conflict / damage to wildlife habitat.
17. Wildlife and environmental gain should not be promoted as the primary goal of estuary management. Sustainability is the primary goal, with social, environmental and economic benefits of equal importance.

Funding (see results section 7.6 and discussion section 8.6)

18. The minimum investment in the estuary management process, under the aegis of English Natures Estuaries Initiative, in England since 1992 is £15.59 million. With such a large investment in estuary management, it is essential that a formal system for measuring the outputs and outcomes of the estuary management process is introduced.
19. It is essential that estuary management projects do not become dependent on a single major source of core funding, particularly if this is discretionary. A balance of funding streams is vital to sustain the management process irrespective of having an Estuary Project Officer or equivalent. A single major sum of money can usefully sustain a project for a period of time (e.g. European funding on the Tamar), but will not meet the need for long-term financial sustainability.
20. Fundraising is a time-consuming and specialist skill, which should be undertaken by specialists.

21. Raising small sums of money from the private sector does not represent good value for money in terms of officer time. More substantial applications to E.U. and public bodies are more efficient
22. Competition between estuary management projects, and between estuary management and other aspects of coastal zone management, is likely to intensify as discretionary core funding grant aid diminishes.

Estuary Project Officers

23. Estuary Project Officers fulfill a useful role in helping to provide a focus and accountability for the estuary management process and completing specific tasks on behalf of the partnership.
24. The role of Estuary Project Officers is highly variable in influencing the plans of others. Estuary Project Officers can legitimately champion the estuary management process and encourage the partners to participate in the process. However, there are examples of where Estuary Project Officers are perceived to hinder joint working and the initiatives of partners.
25. Estuary Project Officers represent one option for the estuary management process. They are especially effective during the plan preparation phase and the initial formation of estuary management partnerships. They cannot be classified as essential because some estuary management partnerships survive without them. It is too early to judge whether estuary project officers are necessary for implementation over the long term.
26. Estuary Project Officers can offer significant draw backs in terms of cost, legitimacy of role and by creating too much of a focus on the person rather than the process of establishing effective partnerships. This can result in over-reliance on the officer to deliver outputs when it is the responsibility of the members of the partnership.
27. However, if the day to day running of an estuary partnership is considered there is a need to: service and sustain a partnership; provide a single point source of information; monitor the implementation of the plan, monitor the state of the estuary; respond flexibly to new issues; review the plan; produce annual action programmes etc. A committed estuary project officer is likely to prove cheaper than a consultant in delivering this.
28. The decision to employ an Estuary Project Officer lies with individual estuary management partnerships and must be clearly justified.

9.3 Value for money

Assessing value for money in estuary management is subjective and varies according to the organisational objectives and performance of individual estuary management partnerships. Based on the results of the objective review and the core functions of estuary management, an overall assessment has been made in Table 11 of the different features of the estuary management process. This will assist organisations in making their own assessment of value for money.

Table 11 The desirability and effectiveness of key features of estuary management.

Feature of the estuary management process	Essential, desirable or not necessary	Overall effectiveness
<i>Estuary management preparation:</i>		
Plan	Desirable	Effective in providing the partnership with a focus and tangible outcome. Assists in communicating key messages.
Partnership	Essential	Broad partnership is the greatest strength of the voluntary approach. Partnerships would develop regardless of estuary management although they may be narrower in scope.
Process	Essential	Effective in building partnerships and helps provide a mechanism for integration and co-ordination with the initiatives of others.
Estuary Project Officer	Desirable	Variable quality and role but generally an effective mechanism to provide a focus and to deliver specific tasks for the partnership.
Projects	Desirable	Can be highly effective in focusing the partnership and communicating the benefits of the process.

Table 11 (continued) The desirability and effectiveness of key features of estuary management.

Feature of the estuary management process	Essential, desirable or not necessary	Overall effectiveness
<i>Estuary management implementation:</i>		
Plan	Desirable	Influence and effectiveness can increase over time. Need an effective mechanism for review and performance monitoring.
Partnership	Essential	Depth and breadth of partnership needs developing to build a shared commitment to working together and delivering outcomes.
Process	Desirable	Effective at providing a mechanism to assist co-ordination and communication.
Estuary Project Officer	?	Too early to say, although the role can add value it is poorly defined and costly. Probably most effective at the local level.
Projects	Desirable	Few examples of effective projects that are directly related to core functions. Partners will implement projects regardless if a need is identified.

In addition to the conclusions and key findings of the objective review, the key messages from the consultations completed as part of this study will be used to suggest ways forward for estuary management in England. The suggested ways forward are presented in Section III.

SECTION III – SUGGESTED WAYS FORWARD

10 Objective

The objective of this section is:

- **To make clear recommendations on the way forward for estuary management in England, including how to secure the necessary ownership, commitment and funding.**

The suggested ways forward presents the key tasks necessary to progress and improve estuary management in England. They directly relate to the key findings of the objective review. In addition, elements of this section reflect comments made by estuary stakeholders, Estuary Project Officers and chairpersons during consultation workshops. These workshops focused upon the possible options for the future of estuary management (see the Supporting Papers 8 and 10).

On the basis of the objective review it is important to note that the benefits of estuary management do not appear to significantly outweigh its drawbacks. This is may be due to inadequate accountability, monitoring, evaluation and focus. As a result many of the suggested ways forward focus on these matters.

10.1 Communicating the suggested ways forward

The following principles have been developed to help guide the communication of the main findings of this study.

10.2 Principles

Within the Steering Group:

- Gain consensus on which conclusions and suggested ways forward are to be communicated more widely.
- Agree a consultation and communication process for the conclusions and suggested way forward at the local, regional and national level. The existence of the Steering Group is a strength because it has the potential to offer a united and balanced approach to action arising from this report.
- Identify areas where it has not been possible to reach consensus within the Steering Group.
- Consider the financial implications of implementing the suggested ways forward.

At the local level:

- Careful consideration must be given to the potential impact of this study because of the many on-going estuary management projects.
- Clearly communicate any immediate action that needs to be taken.
- Implement recommendations on a trial basis – do not instigate wholesale changes to the existing system of estuary management in England.

At the regional level:

- Be quick to influence the regional agenda because it is emerging very rapidly. Opportunities to influence Government Office and the Regional Development Agencies will pass by 12.1999.

At the National Level:

- Develop the Steering Group into a national steering group for estuary management in England (membership will need to be widened and protocol agreed). Engage key national bodies in this process.

11 The suggested ways forward

11.1 Rationale

The suggested ways forward for estuary management in England are presented in this section. They follow a similar structure to the objective review but are also sub-divided into local, regional and national actions. Each table identifies the objective, how the objective will be satisfied, by whom and by when.

11.2 Priority actions for the suggested ways forward

Awareness raising at local level.

Background: Considerable effort has been placed on raising awareness of estuaries, estuary management and the role of organisations. Few attempts have been made to measure the effectiveness of the outputs (conclusions 1 and 2).		
Objective 1 – To quantify and demonstrate the effectiveness of awareness raising.		
How?	Who?	When?
Individual estuary partnerships should evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of awareness raising by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devising an attitude and awareness survey. • Completing the survey. • Relating the survey findings to key communication objectives <p>Adopting a common format nationally to measuring the effectiveness of awareness raising could enable national standards to be maintained and place a greater focus upon areas requiring improvement.</p> <p>Promotion of quality standards in communication outputs, including communication planning, addressing the right audience, and identifying key communication objectives.</p>	Individual estuary stakeholder groups.	Within 2 years.
	Under the aegis of the national Steering Group.	
	Under the aegis of the national Steering Group.	

Conflict prevention at local level.

Background: Conflict prevention is a core function of estuary management but this study has identified that it is difficult to measure whether this is actually occurring (conclusions 3 and 4).		
Objective 2 – To identify and communicate the strengths and limitations of estuary management partnerships in conflict prevention and conflict resolution.		
How?	Who?	When?
To develop guidance on the role of estuary management partnerships in conflict prevention and resolution. Prepare a series of conflict resolution principles based upon, and supported by, working examples of good practice.	Managed by Steering Group / individual stakeholders.	Within 2 years.

Co-ordinating the plans of others at local level.

<p>Background: The role of estuary management partnerships and Estuary Project Officers in influencing the plans of others varies (conclusion 25). Few attempts have been made to measure the extent of influence. A quantitative measure is essential to justify further investment in estuary management partnerships (conclusions 5 and 6).</p>		
<p>Objective 3 – To measure the influence of estuary management plans and estuary management partnerships on the plans of others.</p>		
How?	Who?	When?
<p>Measure the influence of estuary management plans on the plans of others by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing a methodology that enables consistent measurement of influence. • Bench marking between estuary management partnerships. 	<p>Co-ordinated by the Steering Group. Implemented by individual estuary management projects.</p>	<p>Method Agreed 04.2000</p>

Co-ordinating the plans of others at regional level.

<p>Background: Considerable potential remains for the duplication of effort between different plans and initiatives on estuaries. The current approach is to identify local solutions on an estuary by estuary basis. There is no regional or national co-ordination (conclusion 8). Regionalisation of England is evolving at pace and offers opportunities to improve co-ordination by Regional Development Agencies and Government Offices.</p>		
<p>Objective 4 – To improve the co-ordination and reduce the potential for the duplication of effort between initiatives on estuaries and coastal zone management plans.</p>		
How?	Who?	When?
<p>Trial a regional approach to co-ordinating estuary and coastal zone management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get support from DETR and Government Office for a trial, including adequate funding. • Clarify the relationship between different plans and initiatives at the regional level. • Identify the trial region and gain local support. • Set-up a regional group to assist with co-ordination and specifically identify opportunities to reduce duplication. • Use the group as a mechanism to communicate with and to influence Regional Planning Guidance and the Regional Development Agency strategies. 	<p>Government Office, DETR, Shoreline Management Plans, estuary management plans, English Nature, Environment Agency, and Regional Development Agency.</p>	<p>Start ASAP in order to influence regionalisation before December 1999.</p> <p>Trial from start 2000.</p>

Co-ordinating plans of others at regional level.

Background: Estuary management projects should not work in isolation (conclusion 5). Much can be learned from the experiences of others. At the regional level there may be issues and opportunities that benefit from a co-ordinated approach. There are examples of regional co-ordination in the North West with the Partnership of Irish Sea Coast and Estuary Strategies, in the South West with the E.U. funded Atlantic Living Coastlines project and on a sub-regional basis e.g. Solent Forum.

Objective 5 – To improve the communication and co-ordination between estuary management plans on a regional basis.

How?	Who?	When?
Develop and where necessary formalise the liaison mechanisms between estuary management projects including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occasional regional estuary project meetings. • Identify opportunities for joint working that deliver economies of scope and scale. 	Chairpersons and Estuary Project Officers.	Annual liaison meeting.

Co-ordinating the plans of others at national level.

Background: The study has revealed that estuary management projects have difficulty in communicating and quantifying the benefits of the process (conclusions 5 and 25). It is becoming increasingly important to communicate the outputs and added value of estuary management. Financial input should be linked to specific outputs (conclusion 20). Failure to do so is undermining the process and may lead to withdrawal of local funds and support.

Objective 6 – To develop a system that can clearly demonstrate and communicate the outputs, outcomes and added value of the estuary management process.

How?	Who?	When?
Measure the influence of estuary management plans on the plans and initiatives of others by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing a consistent methodology that enables comparison and benchmarking of influence between plans. • Developing performance indicators for individual plans. 	Steering Group.	Annually.
Link the provision of core funding to specified outputs by : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completing an appraisal of the influence that the estuary management plan is having on other plans once every two years. Identify this activity in the Action plan. Develop performance indicators based on the core functions of estuary management. • Identifying core outputs and outcomes in funding bids. • Prepare a national level Business Plan. 	Management groups of individual estuary projects. Management Group and/or Estuary Project Officer.	By 12.1999. Every two years. By 2001

Partnerships at the local level.

<p>Background: Given that the principle of sustainable use underpins the estuary management process and the six core functions of estuary management, few attempts have been made to measure whether progress is being made (conclusions 11, 17 and 20). It is important that sustainability indicators are developed that are informed by on-going studies and current knowledge.</p>		
<p>Objective 7 – To measure progress towards the sustainable use of estuaries that is a direct consequence of estuary management projects.</p>		
How?	Who?	When?
<p>Develop indicators of sustainable use, and monitoring methodologies, to measure progress towards the six core functions and objectives of individual estuary management projects.</p> <p>Set-up working group or complete a study that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops generic sustainability indicators. • Develops a monitoring methodology that can be applied on all estuaries in England. • Encourages local estuary management partnerships to develop and add their own local indicators. These must not replace generic indicators. • Monitors and report progress made towards the indicators. 	<p>Co-ordinated by Steering Group.</p> <p>Individual estuary project management groups.</p>	<p>Within 2 years.</p>

Estuary Project Officers at the national level.

<p>Background: The role of Estuary Project Officers during plan implementation is unclear and there are reservations about their usefulness (conclusions 26 and 27). The role of the partnership and Estuary Project Officers in implementation should be related to the six core functions and specifically to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify potential gaps, duplications and conflicts between the plans of others'. • Measure the influence on the plans of others. • Provide partners with assistance and advice for projects. • Track and publicise the progress of projects of others. • Review the plan and action plan. • Encourage the development of partnership working. 		
<p>Objective 8 – To clarify the role and focus of the partnership and Estuary Project Officers during implementation.</p>		
How?	Who?	When?
<p>Define and disseminate the key purpose of implementation in terms of partnership focus and Estuary Project Officer responsibilities.</p> <p>Relate any activities during implementation to the six core functions of estuary management.</p>	<p>Steering Group</p> <p>Individual estuary management groups</p>	<p>By December 1999</p>

Funding at the local level.

Background: Few estuary management partnerships are effective at raising funds (conclusions 21 and 23). Fund raising is a specialist skill (conclusion 22).		
Objective 9 – To improve the efficiency of fundraising for estuary management projects.		
How?	Who?	When?
<p>Improve the success of national and E.U. funding bid applications by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaging specialist fundraisers where possible. • Providing those with responsibility for fundraising with the appropriate training. • Focusing on large funding sources e.g. Life or Interreg, and not small individual pots of money. 	Locally determined management group.	Start ASAP

Funding at the regional level.

Background: Core funding will diminish over time with English Nature's Estuaries Initiative finishing in 1999, and a reduction in funds coming from Local Authorities is likely (conclusions 21, 23 and 24). Other Government Agencies e.g. Environment Agency is under increasing financial pressure. If estuary management is to continue a more sustainable approach to funding must be secured so that the projects can plan longer term, have credibility and that staff (if any in post) can concentrate on the core issues of estuary management rather than fund raising. In the short term it is necessary to provide some guidance to avoid short term loss of funds. <u>This is not a sustainable solution in the long term but has longer term merit when combined with other funding recommendations.</u>		
Objective 10 – To ensure that the financial partners in estuary management projects are understand what outputs to expect from an investment in the process.		
How?	Who?	When?
<p>Link the outputs and benefits of estuary management to the core functions.</p> <p>Link core funding to specific outputs and outcomes.</p> <p>Establish the core management costs of estuary management plans in the budgetary system of Local Authorities.</p>	Management Group and/or Estuary Project Officer.	ASAP.

Funding at national level.

Background: As local funds and the Estuaries Initiative draws to a close, the funding for estuary management projects is becoming increasingly fragile (conclusion 24). Although the Government advocates the voluntary approach to estuary management, no additional policy support or funding is available.

Objective 11 – Secure a national policy commitment to sustaining the estuary management process.

How?	Who?	When?
Demonstrate to Government the value and benefits of the estuary management process. Use the findings of this study as a basis for planning and implementing a campaign for national support for the further development of estuary management projects.	The Steering Group and the organisations they represent.	Start to plan on consensus of study recommendations. Long term process.

12 References

- ANDREW, D. & PINNEY, D., 1993. *Coastal Planning and Management: A good practice guide*. Exeter: National Coasts and Estuaries Advisory Group.
- DAVIDSON, J.P., LAFFOLEY, D.D=A., DOODY, J.P., DRAKE, C.M., PIENKOWSKI, M.V., MITECHELL, R., & DUFF, K.L., 1991. *Nature conservation and estuaries in Great Britain*. Peterborough: Nature Conservancy Council.
- DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT & WELSH OFFICE, 1992. *Planning Policy Guidance Note 20: Coastal zone protection and planning*. HMSO.
- DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT, 1992. *Coastal zone protection and planning. The Government's response to the second report from the House of Commons Select Committee on the Environment*. HMSO.
- DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT, 1995. *Policy guidelines for the Coast*. Report ref 95 CCG 218. HMSO.
- DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT, 1996. *Coastal zone management - towards best practice*. Nicholas Pearson Associates.
- ENGLISH NATURE, 1995. *Review of estuary projects*. English Nature internal report. Peterborough: English Nature.
- ENGLISH NATURE, 1993. *Estuary Management Plans – a co-ordinators guide*. ISBN 1 85716 121 1. Peterborough: English Nature.
- ENGLISH NATURE, 1993. *Estuary management plans B strategy for the sustainable use of England's estuaries*. ISBN 1 85716 120 3. Peterborough: English Nature.
- HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT. 1992. *Select Committee report on - Coastal zone protection and planning*. HMSO.
- MASTERS, D.M., et al., 1998. *Marine Wildlife Tourism: Developing a quality approach in the Highlands and Islands* Tourism and Environment Initiative, Inverness