Marine Biodiversity Hub

National Environmental Science Programme

2019 HUB WORKSHOP

Hobart, Tasmania
29-31 October 2019

Summary Report

Paul Hedge and Nic Bax

www.nespmarine.edu.au

Enquiries should be addressed to:
Paul Hedge
Paul.Hedge@csiro.au

Distribution List

Workshop attendees	numerous

Preferred Citation

Hedge, P & Bax, N (Eds) (2020). 2019 Hub Workshop: Summary report. Report to the National Environmental Science Program, Marine Biodiversity Hub. University of Tasmania, Australia.

Copyright

Acknowledgement

This work was undertaken for the Marine Biodiversity Hub, a collaborative partnership supported through funding from the Australian Government's National Environmental Science Program (NESP). NESP Marine Biodiversity Hub partners include the University of Tasmania; CSIRO, Geoscience Australia, Australian Institute of Marine Science, Museums Victoria, Charles Darwin University, the University of Western Australia, Integrated Marine Observing System, NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, NSW Department of Primary Industries.

Important Disclaimer

Contents

PREFACE

The NESP Marine Biodiversity Hub has through its core partnerships, collaborations, and co-investments provided policy and decision-makers in the Australian Government, other agencies and the general public with invaluable knowledge and tools that have deepened our understanding of and respect for marine biodiversity and the importance of our oceans for our wealth and well-being.

To their great credit, the Australian Government's continuing support of the Hub for over a decade has reflected and in part anticipated the steadily increasing public awareness and concern about the state of our oceans and their influence on our national prosperity and climate.

The Hub's vital work has enabled a diversity of research projects to be undertaken that have greatly extended our knowledge of and capacity to understand our marine environment. Significantly these research projects have been developed and delivered in close collaboration with policy and decision-makers.

This report is a timely and excellent example of the thought and focus of Hub researchers, and in particular the Hub's Director for over twelve years, Professor Nic Bax and his deputy and Hub knowledge broker, Paul Hedge, on synthesizing, communicating, and sharing their work, and on promoting its relevance and impact with research-users.

As the state and trajectory of our oceans becomes an increasing priority for governments and the public, the inclusion in this report of the discussion on future research priorities will contribute to guiding essential future investment in marine biodiversity research.

Peter Cochrane
Chair, Marine Biodiversity Hub Steering Committee

1. WORKSHOP CONTEXT

The NESP Marine Biodiversity Hub periodically convenes whole of Hub or specific research theme workshops to progress implementation of its research plans and communicate research achievements. Between 29-31 October, 2019 the Hub convened a whole of Hub workshop designed to achieve the following objectives:

1. To generate a shared understanding among the Hub researchers about what we have achieved to date and the impact of our research
2. To progress development of collaborative research outputs for Hub research, and
3. To identify future research priorities for marine biodiversity.

The workshop was attended by more than 60 Hub researchers and structured to provide a mix of interactions between researchers, including; plenary sessions, smaller working group sessions to progress implantation of projects, and world café style exchanges of ideas and experiences (see workshop program at Attachment A). This summary report provides a reflection from the Hub Director, key points from the three main plenary sessions and links to presentations shared throughout the workshop.

2. DIRECTOR'S REFLECTION

The Marine Biodiversity Hub started in 2007 with 5 partners under CERF, focussed on Australia's marine biogeography, its description, mapping and prediction in support of the developing national marine reserve system. A new emphasis for the 8 partners under NERP (2011-2015) was how to effectively monitor the national marine reserve system, the pressures on the marine environment and a new research area supporting the management of threatened and migratory marine species. All these research areas have been continued by the 10 partners and many collaborators under NESP (2015-2020), with the addition of habitat restoration and a more explicit focus on understanding human patterns of use and their impacts on the marine environment.

The Hub has research partners in every State/Territory with the exception of South Australia, a strong national presence and an international reputation and impact. While the completed projects and their products are the most tangible outputs of Hub researchers, some of the greatest impact from the Hub comes from the combined expertise of its many researchers and their direct and enthusiastic engagement with and support of policy and decision makers. This collaboration has grown steadily as researchers and research users have gained a clearer understanding of the constraints that we both work under, and the opportunities these constraints provide to increase research impacts. Steadily increasing trust between researchers and research users has been an important part of this progress and has increased the strength of the NESP approach to applied environmental research.

It has always been a challenging task to balance the strategic needs of the co-invested partners and the more applied needs of the government agencies and in particular the Department of Environment. This challenge has been made easier by the many aspects of our oceans and its biodiversity that are poorly known or yet to be discovered. And we must add to that, how this biodiversity is changing in response to rapid marine environmental change as a function of the warming oceans. The need for improved understanding of condition and trend has never been greater. The Hub and its many collaborators has had an important role in improving our understanding.

As we move towards the final year of this NESP Marine Biodiversity, it is important to understand where we have had most impact and why that impact has occurred. It will have required well designed and conducted science communicated to research users at the appropriate time and format to support their decision making. The Hub has also developed considerable national leverage through promoting national standards for surveying and monitoring, national overviews of marine resources and pressures, development of new technologies or their application to biodiversity issues and Indigenous engagement. The greatest impacts have been built on the best relationships, at individual and organisation levels. An important consideration for future research will be to identify where those relationships exist or can be built that enable a clear path to impact.

3. DAY 1 PLENARY SESSION – HUB ACHIEVEMENTS AND IMPACT

The Hub Director provided an overview of the Hub's many achievements in marine biodiversity research during the last ten years. The presentation included achievements under Commonwealth Environment Research Fund (CERF), The National Environmental Research Program (NERP) and the National Environmental Science Program (NESP). Key areas of achievement in the Hub's research are:

- Discovery and prediction of marine biodiversity patterns at regional and national scales
    - Description of biodiversity in Australia's marine reserves
- Assessment of Marine Reserve performance
- Marine reserve and ecosystem health monitoring
- Understanding human patterns of use and interactions with the marine environment
- Integrated ecosystem assessment, including assessment of risk
- Restoration of marine habitats
- Status and trends of threatened and migratory marine species; and
- Recovery of threatened and migratory marine species

Advances and achievements under NESP in science communication, data management and Indigenous engagement and participation were also profiled in the presentation.

The first plenary session also included a session on the importance of understanding and communicating the impact of the Hub's research (i.e. the benefits generated when the Hub's research is used). The Director's presentation demonstrated the Hub has delivered well against the broad suite of NESP research priorities and also the NESP Marine Biodiversity Hub Strategic Plan (2017-2021). The Hub Executive will complete an assessment or research impact under the NESP in 2020. A process will be developed that will involve research partners, research users and research leaders. There is a range of methods and approaches for assessing research impact and some of these were identified, including CSIRO's Impact Framework and the Results Based Accountability Framework. The presentation was followed by an interactive discussion, key points raised were:

- The Hub has developed a number of approaches to capture and communicate its research impact, including impact case studies, meeting with research-users to showcase the Hub's research benefits and use of a diverse use of communication channels to communicate the benefits
- Common research impact themes that emerge from the Hub's impact case studies are:
    - Impact through generation of new shared understanding about Australia's marine biodiversity
    - Impact through use of new understanding to inform decision making for the conservation of biodiversity and environmental protection
    - Impact through building or enhancing capacity of research-users to discover, access and use data and information that forms the basis of new understanding

    - Impact through the expression of social, economic and environmental benefits
- The Hub has delivered a diverse range of research outputs that have generated a broad and impressive range of benefits for Australia. The Hub needs to clearly communicate the full spectrum of research impact, particularly from the NESP.
- The Hub has addressed the full range of NESP research priorities and the directions and considerations outlined in the Hub's strategic plan. We need to find impactful ways to communicate these achievements.
- The Hub has generated considerable benefits beyond Australian Government research-users, for example State, Territory and local government research-users have benefited from the Hub's research. The Hub needs to communicate these benefits to a broader audience.
- The Hub's research impact is multi-faceted in that impacts are generated at the project level and also at the research theme and Hub level.
- A Hub assessment of research impact needs to capture a mix of quantitative and qualitative (i.e. descriptive) elements, noting that it is difficult to measure social, economic and environmental benefits within the timeframe of the program as these typically become evident after the program has finished. Good examples of environmental benefit impacts of the Hub's research in terms of 'lives saved' are increased survival for largetooth sawfish, spotted handfish and white shark.
- Project teams have an important role to play in communicating project impact by ensuring all research-users listed in the project plan are kept up to date with project progress and are provided relevant project outputs and explanations of how they are to be used.

4. DAY 2 PLENARY SESSION – REFLECTION AND LESSONS LEARNT

This plenary session was designed to have researchers reflect on 'how' the Hub has worked to develop, implement and deliver its research plans. Workshop participants were pointed to the 'Overarching considerations – national collaboration' section of the Hub Strategic Plan as examples of the key areas, which include: strategic research, Indigenous engagement and participation, capacity development, collaboration between partners, collaboration with research-users, data discovery and access, national role and international role.

Workshop participants identified ten topics for consideration (see Table 1) and subsequently voted to prioritise six topics to be discussed in the workshop. Topics were explored using the 'world café' process for structuring conversations. Each of the six groups were asked to consider three questions"

1. What has worked well?
2. What are the opportunities for improvement?
3. What are the actionable steps?

The key points for each of the six discussion topics were captured on paper for later consideration by the Hub's Research Leadership Team. Key points for each of the discussed topics are provided below (Table1).

Table 1: List of topics for reflection, votes for each topic and discussion leaders.

Topic	***Votes***	***Discussion leader***
Indigenous engagement and participation	12	Paul Hedge (2)
Outputs, delivery and outcomes	18	David Peel (5)
Linking with other sectors (e.g. fisheries, oil/gas)	17	Piers Dunstan (1)
Internal communication (within Hub)	9	Karen Miller (3)
Links to Department of the Environment and Energy (DOEE) committees, e.g. Threatened Species Scientific Committee (TSSC) and Indigenous Advisory Committee (IAC)	7	
Outreach and education (to public)	4	
Data discovery and accessibility	16	Tim Langlois (6)
Update of social and economic data	9	
Linking to state and territory governments	8	Alan Jordan (4)
Handling diverse funding sources	1	

4.1 Linking with other sectors

What's working	• Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) providing shared approaches. • Diverse group on Research Users committee. • Addressing market failure with expertise. Doing the science that no one else will do/fund. • Tension between DOEE focus and multi-sector applications/research. • Pressure layering is cross-sectoral information; Key Ecological Features (KEFs).
Opportunities for improvement	• Where there are shared objectives, working without sectors is easier. • Working across different governance models. • Stacked benefits. • EPBC review / Post 2020 review. Providing input, eg National Marine Science Council (NMSC). • Understanding which outputs can be used across sectors • Understanding sectors information needs and thresholds • Building on examples like KEFs - certainty of outcomes. Management strategy evaluation (MSE) for threatened, endangered or protected species (TEPs)
Actionable steps	• Transition from oil and gas → National Decommissioning Research Initiative (NDRI). Role for NESP/NMSC • EPBC review input – October 2020 • Dialogue on what is possible/appropriate with case studies • Synthesis between projects and methods to understand synergies and gaps. • Blue Economy CRC.

4.2 Indigenous engagement and participation

What's working	• Commitment from partners to engage at project level • Long term relationship with individual groups (willingness and commitment) • Commitment from NESP • National level profile (AMSA and Hub Steering Committee, Partners) • Providing opportunities that did not previously exist (e.g. incorporating traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) and capacity for research participation) • Exploring and resolving issues
Opportunities for improvement	• Improved links and representation of Indigenous • Engage before project is developed • Building science capacity in Indigenous communities • Resourcing collaboration • Improved understanding in DOEE at officer level • Deeper understanding about Indigenous culture and regional variation • Understanding whether your project requires engagement and if so to what level (need a bit more 'scaffolding' for NESP 2.0) • Building in sufficient time for engagement before project is approved
Actionable steps	• Engage before project is developed • Improved understanding in DoEE at officer level • Deeper understanding about Indigenous culture and regional variation • Understanding whether your project requires engagement and if so to what level (need a bit more 'scaffolding' for NESP 2.0)

4.3 Internal communication

What's working	• Chirp – perspective across All hubs • Energy for collaboration • Workshops • Voyages – gets everyone working together: early career researchers (ECRs)/students/'grown ups' • Within–project communication • Cross-generational communications • Twitter feeds (but limited to ECRs)
Opportunities for improvement	• Internal "chirp" newsletter • Director updates • Research Leadership Team updates • Individuals connecting with Hub processes • Promote cross-disciplinary projects / theme • Look at alternative for early career researchers to contribute (big rooms too scary!) • Avoid 'forced marriages' • More regular workshops • Proactive with social media, re-tweets/tags etc • Importance of top-down communications in building the 'community'
Actionable steps	• Better resourcing for collaborative sessions • Increase social media reach, including training, encouragement for 'Neanderthals' • Regular updates/emails from Hub Executive (i.e. post Research Leadership Team/Steering Committee/Research User Committee meetings)

4.4 Working with state and territory governments

What's working	• There are good examples of knowledge transfer in the Hub, with the Standard Operating Procedures outputs being widely communicated and adopted • Direct involvement with NSW agencies has provided significant benefits, and secondary collaboration with NT and WA has resulted in work focused on state priorities • The delivery of national programs has resulted in work being conducted in most regions, and many of these have focused on coastal waters (e.g. STP review) • There has been some building relationship with the IMOS State nodes
Opportunities for improvement	• A revised governance structure could more directly engage States/Territory, with a view to aligning NESP and agency research priorities • Further improvement on Indigenous engagement to build on recent successes, and tying in more closely with existing programs/projects • Need to tap into and strategically build on State/Territory agency capabilities, educational/engagement programs and regional university partnerships • Further linking across to existing fishery research/science structures • Further development of linkages with IMOS State nodes to build on monitoring infrastructure investment and local priorities
Actionable steps	• There needs to be a specific structure established for engagement with States/Territory. At present this relies on existing networks that cover specific issues such as marine park science/management • Need to better understand/quantify the risks to marine biodiversity in coastal waters, which will allow improved engagement • Specific discussions with other potential partners would allow a better evaluation of options for involvement • A new governance model could be explored to allow better agency engagement • A gap analysis of existing projects/collaborations would allow an evaluation of who would want to be engaged, by when, and how • National Marine Science Plan refresh may identify specific State/Territory needs and strategic goals, although agency contributions unclear

4.5 Outputs, delivery and outcomes

What's working	• NESP does an excellent job of emphasizing impact and engagement right from the start of projects' formulation e.g. in proposals identifying stakeholders and impact. • NESP has good support facilitating engagement/delivery (e.g. workshops) • Data management within the hub helps provide long-lasting impact/delivery beyond the project end
Opportunities for improvement	• Project/Funding hard endings are not conducive to post project engagement/ expanding delivery • Stakeholder staff turnover make it difficult to build trust/relationships/capability • Emphasis on final report rather than consultation/workshop is maybe not the best model. It was pointed out that we write the proposals and they can be written to make a workshop the final deliverable. So maybe it is something we can already do and just don't. • Handling on-going requests from stakeholders for expertise. • Difficulty balancing our roles between NESP and our individual organisations and who we represent with these post-project interactions.
Actionable steps	• Internal budgeting to maintain capacity beyond project or longer projects • More emphasis on direct delivery than reports • Secondment/Hot desk • CRC have an engagement plan with specific actions • Stakeholder contact updates (as this can be across projects maybe a central hub person coordinates) • Make project leaders more aware of the support the hub can give to help promote/engage with stakeholders. • Look at projects that have worked and those that didn't and see if there is a reason • Point was made it's a balancing act that if we engage/deliver too much post project there is the danger we diminish our capability to do strategic research and move more into a consultancy role.

4.6 Data discovery and accessibility

What's working	• We have good will and are trying • We are getting better at Metadata • Some new platforms provide example of benefit of FAIR workflows • Some data types being done well (e.g. BRUVs)
Opportunities for improvement	• Identify and resolve bottlenecks • Consistent metadata and data formats • End to end workflows to ensure FAIRness of data • Some data types are still not mature - e.g. legacy data. • State and Institutional compartmentalisation is a bad thing. • Industry data could be brought in through engagement with SOP's, Discoverability, demonstration of the benefits of FAIR workflows. May need MOU's?
Actionable steps	• See 2019 report on Image and image annotations discoverability and accessibility (when available) • SOP's need data release and recommended FAIR data workflows • 1 pager - incentives for FAIR - will save money and cost-efficiency. • Link to international initiatives - e.g. OBIS • Fix GeoServer - issue of links breaking when content is moved or refreshed • Need a process to ensure provenance of WMS/WMF

5. DAY 3 PLENARY SESSION - LOOKING FORWARD

Plenary sessions on day 3 were designed to provide the Hub's researchers with the opportunity to share their perspectives and ideas about future priorities for marine biodiversity research in Australia to inform any future NESP bids for research for 2021 onwards. The session also provide for a discussion on priorities for effectively completing the Hub's research commitments under NESP 1 (to the end of 2020).

5.1 Marine Biodiversity research from 2021 onwards

The Director provided a presentation that considered marine biodiversity research beyond the end of the current NESP program. A future national environmental science program was likely given the Australian Government has set the funding aside in its forward budget estimates. He shared his thoughts on how emerging issues and developments in the broader spheres of environmental policy and marine science investments might influence the focus and scope of a future research program, including; the National Marine Science Committee's interest to update its decadal science plan, the development of 'blue papers' by the High-Level Panel for a Sustainable Ocean Economy, Australian Government investment in the Blue Economy Cooperative Research Centre and the decadal review of the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

The opening presentation was followed by a broader discussion with workshop participants about current and emerging developments in the broader spheres of environmental policy and marine science investments that might influence the focus and scope of a future research environmental program, key points raised were:

- Opportunity for marine environmental research to enable and inform Australia's response reporting on progress toward United Nations Sustainable Development Goals set by the United Nations General Assembly.
- Opportunity to inform the development of blue papers being developed by the High-level Panel for a Sustainable Ocean Economy, and to potentially align future research proposals to the blue papers.
- Understanding relationship/alignment with research planned for the Blue Economy Cooperative Research Centre. The Blue Economy CRC is a major Australian and industry marine research investment with an environmental and ecosystems component. There are opportunities to scope future NESP research proposals to complement this investment. Also need to able to explain how the two complement each other/do not overlap.
- Understanding relationship/alignment with research proposed for the Marine Bio-Products and Biotechnology Cooperative Research Centre (MBB CRC). Need to able to explain how future Hub bids complement each other/do not overlap.
- Understanding relationship/alignment with research proposed for the Productive Coasts and Industries Cooperative Research Centre (PCI CRC). Need to able to explain how future Hub bids complement each other/do not overlap.

- The National Marine Science committee is discussing the idea of refreshing the marine science priorities identified in the National Marine Science Plan. A future Hub bid needs to be informed by the outputs of the NMSC refresh of marine research priorities.

Each of the Hub's research theme leaders provide a presentation of their proposed research priorities for research beyond 2020, this included:

- Priorities for threatened and migratory marine species
- Priorities to support sustainable use in Australia
- Priorities for understanding ecosystems and social and economic benefits

There was also a discussion among workshop participants about the current themes of the Hub's research and whether or not they would be fitting for a future research bid. There was a general feeling the current research themes had worked well but future themes would be dependent on the research areas outlined in a call for bids. Ideas for alternative research themes included: Indigenous heritage and sea country, integrating research to meet the needs of multiple sectors, integrated research focused on marine regions, and data delivery and synthesis.

5.2 Completing research commitments under NESP 1

The Director pointed out that 2020 will be the final year for the Hub's research funded under the NESP and that it will be important that researchers deliver all research outputs by the end of 2020. Effectively communicating research findings and outputs is an important aspect of NESP research and this needs to be done well. Theme and project leaders were reminded of the importance of ensuring their research outputs were effectively communicated to all research-users and stakeholders listed in approved project plans, including face to face meetings and telephone conversations.

The final year will see the development of a final report that captures the Hub's achievements from 2015-20. A condensed hard-copy version of the final report (i.e. compared to the more extensive reports produced under the former research CERF and NERP programs) will be produced and this will point readers to the website for more detail. The Hub website is being redesigned to include a number of landing pages (gateways) that align with the interests of our primary research-users, these will include landing pages for: marine parks; threatened and migratory marine species; sustainable use of the marine environment; habitat restoration; Indigenous engagement and participation; and access to the Hub's data.

Attachment A

2019 NESP Marine Biodiversity Hub Workshop

Daily Running List

Location: CSIRO & Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies (IMAS, UTAS)
Castray Esplanade, Battery Point

Tuesday 29 October 2019		
Time	**Item**	**Rooms**
8.45 – 9:00	Arrive CSIRO Auditorium Hub check-in desk, Castray Esplanade, Battery Point	CSIRO Auditorium – refreshments on arrival
9.00 -10.30	Plenary session - Achievements and impact Welcome (Nic Bax) The Hub's research achievements and research impact	CSIRO Auditorium
10.30 – 11.00	Morning tea	CSIRO Canteen (back room)
11.00 - 1.00	Theme workshop sessions Discuss workshop aim and tasks Provide overview of projects Progress collaborative theme/project outputs Prepare theme presentations	Theme A – CSIRO Freycinet Room, *located between the Auditorium and Reception* (Leaders Peter Kyne/Michele Thums) Themes B, C, E – IMAS Flex Space, Ground Floor (Leader Piers Dunstan) Theme D – IMAS Flex Space, Ground Floor (Leaders Neville Barrett/Rachel Przeslawski)
1.00 – 1.45	Lunch	CSIRO Canteen (back room)
1.45 - 3.30	Theme workshop sessions Provide overview of projects Progress collaborative theme/project outputs Prepare theme presentations	Theme A – CSIRO Freycinet Room, *located between the Auditorium and Reception* (Leaders Peter Kyne/Michele Thums) Themes B, C, E – IMAS Flex Space, Ground Floor (Leader Piers Dunstan) Theme D – IMAS Flex Space, Ground Floor (Leaders Neville Barrett/Rachel Przeslawski)
3.30 – 4.00	Afternoon tea	CSIRO Canteen (back room)
4.00 - 5.30	Plenary session - Theme A presentation including assessment of research impact	CSIRO Auditorium
Dinner	Organise yourselves	

Attachment A

2019 NESP Marine Biodiversity Hub Workshop

Daily Running List

Location: CSIRO & Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies (IMAS, UTAS)
Castray Esplanade, Battery Point

Wednesday 30 October 2019		
Time	**Item**	**Rooms**
9.00 -10.30	Plenary session - Lessons learnt Lessons learnt exercise (SWOT analysis) OR Reflection of engagement and communication with research users	CSIRO Auditorium
10.30 – 11.00	Morning tea	CSIRO Canteen (back room)
11.00 - 1.00	Theme workshop sessions Progress collaborative theme/project outputs Prepare theme presentations	Theme A – CSIRO Freycinet Room, *located between the Auditorium and Reception* (Leaders Peter Kyne/Michele Thums) Themes B, C, E – IMAS Flex Space, Ground Floor (Leader Piers Dunstan) Theme D – IMAS Flex Space, Ground Floor (Leaders Neville Barrett/Rachel Przeslawski)
1.00 – 1.45	Lunch	CSIRO Canteen (back room)
1.45 - 3.30	Theme workshop sessions Progress collaborative theme/project outputs Prepare theme presentations	Theme A – CSIRO Freycinet Room, *located between the Auditorium and Reception* (Leaders Peter Kyne/Michele Thums) Themes B, C, E – IMAS Flex Space, Ground Floor (Leader Piers Dunstan) Theme D – IMAS Flex Space, Ground Floor (Leaders Neville Barrett/Rachel Przeslawski)
3.30 – 4.00	Afternoon tea	CSIRO Canteen (back room)
4.00 - 5.30	Plenary session - Theme D presentation including assessment of research impact	CSIRO Auditorium
6.30 onwards	Marine Hub researchers drinks and dinner The 'Sussans' - Hub Awards	Black Footed Pig Restaurant 8 Brooke Street, Hobart *(10 mins walk from CSIRO)* https://goo.gl/maps/6u6vgU35TtinYuoa9

Attachment A

2019 NESP Marine Biodiversity Hub Workshop

Daily Running List

Location: CSIRO & Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies (IMAS, UTAS)
Castray Esplanade, Battery Point

Thursday 31 October 2019		
Time	**Item**	**Rooms**
9.00 -10.30	Plenary session - Looking forward Research engagement and communication in 2020 - what do we need to do (e.g. final report, impacts stories, re-connecting/reporting back to research-users) Preparing for a NESP 2.0 bid	CSIRO Auditorium
10.30 – 11.00	Morning tea	CSIRO Canteen (back room)
11.00 - 1.00	Theme workshop sessions What are the engagement and communication priorities for 2020? What are the research priorities for 2021-26?	Theme A – CSIRO Freycinet Room, *located between the Auditorium and Reception* (Leaders Peter Kyne/Michele Thums) Themes B, C, E – IMAS Flex Space, Ground Floor (Leader Piers Dunstan) Theme D – IMAS Flex Space, Ground Floor (Leaders Neville Barrett/Rachel Przeslawski)
1.00 – 1.45	Lunch	CSIRO Canteen (back room)
1.45 - 3.15	Plenary session – Themes B, C, E presentation including assessment of research impact	CSIRO Auditorium
3.15 – 3.45	Afternoon tea	CSIRO Canteen (back room)
3.45 - 5.15	Plenary session Reporting back on research priorities for 2021-26? Identification of potential research themes for 2021-26?	CSIRO Auditorium
5.30	Close workshop (Nic Bax)	CSIRO Auditorium
Dinner	Organise yourselves	

www.nespmarine.edu.au

Contact:
Paul Hedge
University of Tasmania

paul.hedge@csiro.au
tel | +61 3 6232 5023