

Charles Hamilton

From: charles sheppard [csheppard@bio.warwick.ac.uk]
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2002 2:06 PM
To: charles.hamilton@fco.gov.uk
Subject: two docs



Attachment
information.



posford reply reply.doc



Attachment
information.



7degrees SouthEast
Group.doc

Charles

I attach one side on the Posford response.

I also attach something arrived today which I have not replied to! I
guess I am away for a little while...

Best wishes
Charles Sheppard
Dept Biological Sciences
University of Warwick
Leamington, CV4 7AL, UK
(+44)(0) 24 7652 4619

Charles

The response by Posford:

1. The positive approach taken to most points made is excellent; and their intention to fix the numerous details will certainly strengthen those sections.
2. Several areas clearly had more results which were not initially included, perhaps because of time. This again is excellent and their inclusion will strengthen the final result. Examples would certainly include the actual current measurements to add to the modelled study.
3. Some issues may be more difficult. Several times the response is that BIOT Administration subsequently removed the need for Posford to do an element of the Terms of Reference. This I wouldn't know about. However, Posford did put the original ToR in the report. If a revised one was issued, or if parts were later cancelled, then these should be there instead, or as well, or else the work will be judged against the ToR as I did. Examples might include the Differential GPS grid. This change is unfortunate given the pressing need to monitor erosion now. It may be that the data Posford state they have instead would do; this wasn't in the draft report though.
4. The lack of diving and then the lack of 'Manta-tow' snorkelling, and consequent inability to collect much of the natural resources material is history now, and presumably BIOT-agreed. There is already interest and pleas for information on natural resources from the Ilois - this could be the most important element to many and I am sure Posford are trying to strengthen it.
5. One or two points such as the seawater nutrient study are clearly deficient and irreparable. It simply is not simply a matter of scientific difference of opinion; no one could possibly agree that the limited sampling offered here is of any use. A minimum of a tidal cycle is essential (due to flushing), and many would say a neap tidal cycle and a spring tidal cycle, at least, is needed. As the ToR was apparently changed I recommend that you might simply consider another change here too, removing the need for it. (This might then pass the buck back to why an incomplete ToR was issued, but that might be more easy to deal with!)
6. I don't think it helps to comment (more than once) that this should not be viewed as a scientific research project, but was a resettlement consultancy etc. The implication is that the latter is somehow second best, and less than of scientific quality, and it shouldn't be. The project should be very scientific, and its conclusions may well be judged and challenged if it isn't!
7. It would be valuable if Posford could demonstrate the completed GIS when you meet with them. This would be useful for any work undertaken for or by BIOT Administration in future.