|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **INT:** | **No, that’s absolutely fine, no, don’t worry about it at all. So, I thought-- just to start off, if you tell me a bit more about your background? So, the name of the Organisation that you work for, the type of organisation that is and then your role within that?** |
| DEU28: | So, I’m the Conservation Manager for [statutory body]. So, we were set up by an Act of Parliament, the [statutory body] Act. We’re about 50 years old and we’re quite unique in that we’re a Regional Park so-- and the fact that we are set up by statute. S,o we are about 26 miles long, starting in [Town] in [County], we follow the [County] and [County] borders right down to [area] on the [River]. We don’t own and manage all the land but we do own quite a lot. But there are areas within the Regional Park that, boundary that don’t fall within our ownership.  So, we have a whole range of open spaces, from sort of locally important wildlife sites, SSSIs and then a number of our sites join together to form the Lee Valley Special Protection area and RAMSAR site.  We also have a number of built facilities, so we have things like marinas, Ice Centre, White Water Centres, hockey and tennis, VeloParks, some of which were part of the [Sport] Park. So, they were [Sport] venues that we’ve taken on in legacy.  So, in terms of my work, so I cover the whole park and my role is to provide biodiversity advice to the open spaces, to our venues and also to kind of-- so, we’re a statutory planning consultee, so I respond in terms of looking at biodiversity impacts of planning applications within the Regional Park or just outside but having an impact on.  I also take a lead on the delivery of our Biodiversity Action Plan, which was launched in 2019 and that’s our kind of over-arching strategy for nature conservation and delivering projects to do with that. So, they could be specific biodiversity projects or they could be looking at engagements, or some-- getting money through planning, getting them to deliver enhancements on site, so it’s quite varied. Quite nice, yes, so, I provide advice also to the Ranger service who directly manage our open spaces. So, I sort of come in and do some nice projects, but don’t really get too much involved in the day-to-day management, that’s down to the Operational Ranger Teams. |
| **INT:** | Yes, of course, no, that’s brilliant. And you mentioned just then about the Rangers? Is that a constant exchange with them, in terms of sort of biodiversity then? |
| DEU28: | Yes, yes. So, we have a close working relationship. We’re not a very big organisation as well which does help. But yes, no, we work quite closely together. So, they-- we will work with them, I say we, there’s two of us in my Team. We’ll work with them on the sort of organising and writing them site management plans, and then, yes there are constant discussions about site management.  Also, we kind of link up more strategically I guess with local partners. So, we work quite closely with the adjacent landowners. So, we’ve got [WILDLIFE ORGANISATION], [Wildlife charity] and [water service company]and [BUILDING AND STRUCTURE CHARITY] to try and get the kind of, to link-up the Lee Valley up to the wider regional habitats and networks. |
| **INT:** | **Is that because they hold different like data sets that are useful to you, or as a partnership they work well in terms of strategic planning?** |
| DEU28: | I think just-- yes in terms of strategic planning and trying to get-- maximise the biodiversity benefits of work that we’re doing is to make sure that it’s all very connected. So, we try and not look at just quite insular on our sites, we try and look at-- so, for instance we have something, the [wildlife charity]strategy which is, we’ve looked back historically at what waders were using the Regional Park. And then we’ve worked with partners, the Wildlife-- [wildlife charity], [WILDLIFE ORGANISATION], to kind of try and plan future works so that if a site, one site is having some management works done on, perhaps another site isn’t. And so that we can do that co-ordinated approach across the Valley. And data collection’s quite important within that.  So, as an Organisation we support the local Environmental Record Centres as well. So, we have service level agreements with-- so annoyingly, we sit within three different organisations, so we have data agreements with [biodiversity information centre], [Wildlife charity] and [environmental records centre.]. Which probably ends up costing us more money, because-- but I’m pleased that we’re able to support the Record Centres. |
| **INT:** | **Brilliant, yes, that’s great. So, focusing a bit more on the species record data that you do use, is that-- do you focus on single species, or groups of species?** |
| DEU28: | I suppose it varies, so we-- so, we get the data exchanges from these various groups. So, we have an internal GIS system. I would say that we probably don’t use the data to its fullest at the moment because we’re still not where quite we need to be with our own, accessing our own data. And you’ll appreciate that kind of understanding the data is kind of the key thing, really. So, you can all look at it but it’s about sort of interrogating it and understanding it.  So, I guess primarily we would look at, well it varies so for instance we’ve got a couple of sites that are important for their dragonfly assemblage or for invertebrates, so therefore we would look more broadly at the species present on site. But we’ve also done targeted work, so we’re just looking at a project on hedgehogs in the lower Lee Valley and so there we’ve drilled down to sort of looking more at hedgehogs, foxes, badgers, that kind of thing. So, we’re just starting a project on that.  So, I guess it does vary. A number of our priority species are things like water vole, otter, bittern, things like that. So then again, we would drill down to quite targeted species records, individual species.  But also looking again, some of our sites, the water bodies, the SPA designation is about the assemblage of waterbirds. Whilst it’s about specific ones it’s also about looking-- the importance of these lakes are about the whole assemblage of waterbirds. So, that’s when we would go at a broader level as well.  So yes, quite varied I guess. |
| **INT:** | **Yes, no that’s brilliant and would you say that this is probably influenced by sort of protected species and sort of priority species at all, in terms of where you focus?** |
| DEU28: | Yes, definitely, yes. So, priorities species-- but I guess within the Biodiversity Action Plan we’ve kind of identified species that are a priority. Obviously, there are the nationally priority species but the ones that are locally, of regional significance, and regional conservation concern. So, we might then drill down looking at those and trying to pull out records for those ones. And especially ones that are particularly associated with some of the habitat management that we might be doing.  I think it’s something we’re not great at, at the moment but something that we will be leaning on more on, based on the sort of data side of things when we’re looking at our management plans. |
| **INT:** | **Is this because of your resources? The time that you have in order to make use of that data to its full potential?** |
| DEU28: | Yes, I think so. It’s probably-- so we have a GIS Team, sort of I don’t know one to two people. But it’s-- I guess that they’re quite broad in terms of they have-- they do a lot of mapping and other stuff for quite a broad organisation in that respect. So I-- yes, so we haven’t really got a species or a GIS person from a biodiversity perspective. So, I think we’re trying to sort of bring ourselves up to speed by having sort of discussions and that’s where our data agreements and local Environmental Record Centres have been really helpful in trying to help us interpret and look at information and actually tease out what we want as well. So, that’s been useful. But I think it’s something that we need to probably improve on, in terms of how we use the data a bit more, and evidence-based decisions. |
| **INT:** | **Brilliant and you’ve talked about it already I think, in terms of the data that you do use, what decisions does that inform?** |
| **[00:10:00]** |  |
| DEU28: | So, at the moment-- so we-- a lot of the work of the Biodiversity Action Plan is looking at work where certain species are and looking at trying to link habitats. So yes, I don’t think we do it particularly well at the moment but what I would like to see is that when we get our surveys done for protected species, like we’re doing a water vole survey this year and next year which will give us a bit of an overview of the whole valley. Perhaps if we could then overlay that onto known habitat maps then we could look to prioritise areas where we might be able to undertake work to enhance and link these core populations.  So, that’s the aspiration. We don’t do that at the moment but that’s kind of where we want to get to. And looking at-- so for instance, with the hedgehogs we were looking at where the records are at the moment and then looking at gaps and trying to fill gaps as well. |
| **INT:** | **No, that’s brilliant.** |
| DEU28: | No records doesn’t mean there not there, it just means they’ve not been recorded, yes. |
| **INT:** | **So, the data that you obtain, is that raw data? And does it come from any other audiences at all, other than the Record Centres?** |
| DEU28: | Yes so, I guess, we have a wildlife-sightings on our page and we collect data from open, you know some from Twitter and things like that, so we will pull in data, cause it’s such a good resource at the moment. But I guess we might do it in a sort of clumsy way but we have an Excel spreadsheet that we just put data in, and then we submit those to the Record Centres which then come back to us in a GIS data set. Because at the moment what we can’t do is enter our own records onto GIS, which is, I don’t know how to do it. You’ll see me go blank, you know.  So, that’s something that we need kind of-- to get better and we’re looking to have like Apps on our phone that we can then collect data and it can just appear straight. Because at the moment, whilst we own the data, I guess the data we get from the Record Centres is only ours whilst we have that agreement. So, if we then finish our agreements with them, we need to find a way of putting our own data onto our GIS.  So, we used to use things like Recorder but we don’t use that anymore. Excel spreadsheets are the main way that we keep any ad-hoc data because we can still search that without having to use GIS. |
| **INT:** | **So, essentially you sort of collect the data yourself through volunteers who post it?** |
| DEU28: | Yes, so we have volunteers that go out and do surveys, also, noting things when we’re out on site. We also commission surveys, so we’ve had invertebrate surveys done, we’ve had you know this water vole survey will be done by a Consultant. Things like river corridor surveys. Any habitat surveys as well. And when we commission that we always ask that they provide the species list in an Excel spreadsheet format, which will be then submitted to the local Environmental Records Centres. |
| **INT:** | **Okay, no, that’s brilliant, and so then the Records Centres process that into a product that you can then use?** |
| DEU28: | Yes. |
| **INT:** | **No, that’s brilliant, I was just understanding the relationship, no, that’s great. And so, from the volunteers do you ask them to collect it at a particular resolution at all that is of use to you?** |
| DEU28: | Well, it is something that we-- it’s really funny because the more-- I guess I’m not a GIS, you can tell, data person but I-- the more we’ve used it and the more we try to interrogate it, the more I realise the limitations of the data that we’ve been collecting to date and the more we fine-tune our processes. So, for instance I was trying to look at species on a particular site and it was for a planned change of use for this area and it was really hard for me to find out what was actually in that site because we didn’t have a defined polygon for that site, so it was then looking at how it sits within the tech, or whatever it’s called. Yes.  No, it was kind of-- so that was a bit-- I kind of got my head around that and I realised that perhaps when we’re recording, we need to provide certain boundaries that we can also then provide to the Record Centre so that we can then say, “Right well this is within site A or site B.” And it can be quite clearly defined. And when we’re searching the data that comes back to us, we’ll be able to know where it comes-- so yes, I think-- and with better technology. So, you know everyone’s got smartphones and things like that, that you know the recording of species, I want to get it as near as possible really to where it is. And a lot of people have started using What-Three-Words, but [00:15:13 inaudible] grid references and so I want to make sure that our GIS system will work, do that for us as well, so-- |
| **INT:** | **I guess the-- another issue with sort of the technology side is that you’ve got so many different ways of mapping or using different Apps that it can become sort of confusing and slightly frustrating.** |
| DEU28: | Yes, yes, I think we probably need to-- so we have quite-- for our volunteers who go out and do surveys we have quite-- sort of a protocol that they go out and follow so that we can in that I suppose we could specify how we want them to collect the data. I have enough trouble getting them to submit the data at the moment, so you know. But a lot of people are, you know it’s changing and a lot of people are now using their phones, I mean we get better pictures and things like that, so you know, it’s easier if you get a record that you think, you’re not sure whether that’s quite right, people will send a picture now and you realise that you should eat some humble pie and believe them. |
| **INT:** | **Yes, absolutely. Do you take on a role as sort of verification of those records at all, or--?** |
| DEU28: | Yes, yes, so generally, I mean, generally we will know what’s about and we’ll know. But I think nowadays as well so many people do take pictures, but that does really help, yes. |
| **INT:** | **And just quickly, does the Record Centres, do they provide guidance as to how you’re giving them data?** |
| DEU28: | I don’t know, it’s not me personally that send it off. I think we have spoken to them, so I think they’re all happy with our, [environmental records centre.] for instance have a standard, is it meta-data Excel spreadsheet which we kind of have tweaked. And having had like a bulk of information back from them, so I asked them under our service level agreement to do a data search for us to provide a little report and actually we’ve added a couple of columns on to our record sheet which makes it easier for us to track back data as well. So yes, yes, we’ve kind of between us we’ve looked at refining that a little bit. |
| **INT:** | **Yes, brilliant. So, in terms of the information that you use to inform the interpretation of the data, how do you deal with data gaps?** |
| DEU28: | Well, I think we have so many data gaps that I think we just, we try to limit who can actually access the data to start with, because what we’re concerned about is that it is to do with the interpretation of the data there and this whole presence, absence, not-recorded, no surveys undertaken. It’s kind of-- so, that people-- you know say for instance someone in our planning team wouldn’t look up a protected species map and say, “Oh, obviously there’s nothing there.” Because that’s not right, that just means there’s nothing new recorded, it doesn’t mean-- you know you need to look at the habitats that are there. So, I think it really, because we’re quite a small team, it really is most stuff just comes through us two and we will interpret what’s there. So, that’s how we limit it really.  I mean, the Rangers can access it and the Rangers know their sites brilliantly. So, they would know, they would be able to know as well but really it’s just for other people outside that might interrogate the data and not quite appreciate it, I guess. |
| **INT:** | **Yes, no, definitely, cause the data gap almost sort of flags up that this is potentially an area that needs a bit more recorder effort but then you don’t want to open it too much, cause then they can, like you say, read into it a bit too much.** |
| DEU28: | Yes, so most things like planning responses we would always, you know nothing is written without us seeing it or writing it first. And so, that’s how we get round it really. |
| **INT:** | **That’s great and how do you consider confidence, accuracy and precision in the data?** |
| DEU28: | Yes, I guess it’s quite-- it’s a hard one isn’t it because we have to, I guess we know quite-- so we know quite a lot of people who are out and about in Parks, so when people submit something we generally will think, Oh that’s odd, or Oh it’s from so-and-so that’ll be why. And that’s a bit mean, but I-- you know, we wouldn’t dismiss it out-of-hand but what we would do is then go back to them and ask further details, or have you got a picture, you know can you describe it. So, it is going back to that, do you know, describing what it looks like or where you found it. And perhaps then, if it was something that we really didn’t-- we thought perhaps need to have further investigation then we can always go out and have a look as well. |
| **[00:20:00]** |  |
| DEU28: | So, I think-- but we wouldn’t necessarily dismiss a record, we would perhaps just make a note of it that it was unverified. And I think we’ve done that previously when we’ve sent stuff into Record Centres and we were, there was a little question mark over it, yes. |
| **INT:** | **I guess part of it, as you sort of mentioned it just then, sort of who do you know and whether they’re expertise is, you know good.** |
| DEU28: | Yes, yes and we can all make mistakes you know, so it’s-- and some stuff you know-- I think sometimes as well, people see something and then will-- it’s you know, sometimes it can only, a moth could only be told by dissecting it or something and you know so you need to look into that and think, no actually, let’s take it up a level and just say-- and call it this. So, I think yes, knowing the people and we do know a lot of our-- obviously we know our own surveyors but a lot of people in the area will just kind of, we do know them or you see them on Twitter and things like that and know who they are and you start having a bit of a chat with them so it, you can kind of in a way you get a feeling for who, you know, who to trust. But it is difficult because especially when, if you know people don’t want us to do something or don’t want any developer to do something it’s very, it can be easy to send in kind of erroneous records and it has been flagged with me internally, or do you think people just submit records to stop development and I was probably like, “Yes, well I’m sure people go out and scrutinise a site more, it doesn’t mean necessarily that they’re sending records that are untrue it’s-- they might just focus their intention on an area that’s previously unrecorded.” Which I suppose in, can then skew the local importance of something in an area that’s not been-- |
| **INT:** | **Yes, that’s not come up before about the sort of planning applications side, people going out intentionally to sort of restrict that. Do you--** |
| DEU28: | I mean, I don’t, no I-- well, I wouldn’t know but I just know that yes, one of our sites has been unrecorded and it was this one, we were looking at a change of use and that then created a lot of focus locally. But that’s not a bad thing because you can only make, then it emphasises the importance of having that information. |
| **INT:** | **Yes, definitely. So, do you share or produce any reports with anyone?** |
| DEU28: | Well, so we-- any professional report we do is shared with the local Environmental Record Centres. We don’t-- I would like to produce some kind of report annually about what’s seen in the Lee Valley and we-- I just don’t have time to do it, so we don’t do that. The Biodiversity Action Plan did do a review of species that had been found within the Parks. So, we did a big collaborative work between the three Record Centres to produce a list of species recorded within the Park and from that looked at which ones were kind of the regional conservation concern and that’s where our kind of list of long list of priority species and our short list of priority species came out. But no, we don’t.  And in terms of sharing, so we-- we’ve always said that we provide our reports to the local Environmental Records Centres which is where any member of the public could do it and also, they can just ask us for it. We would obviously take out any sensitive data but yes so, we have been FOI’d about data before. But they could just ask for it and I would share it.  And also, just more recently on one of our sites where we’ve had quite a lot of public interest, we’re going to put some of the surveys on the website so that people can just access it. But again, we do need to be a little bit cautious about sensitivity but this is historical data, well last year’s breeding bird survey, so I’m not too worried about making it public. |
| **INT:** | **Yes, brilliant and just quickly how far do you go back for your records, in terms of time, time period?** |
| DEU28: | So, when we did the bat, we sort of took it from 1980, I think. But when we search-- so if we were searching on-- just on the data that comes back from the Environmental Record Centre, so I would just take everything, I’d look at everything I think. But probably when you were commenting or interpreting it then you need to look, you know you need to look at what’s around at the moment, or what’s been lost or gained or something. |
| **INT:** | **So, I just-- as a sort of final section just focus a bit more on model data? So, you talk about how you use the Record Centres for most of your sort of GIS products, do you find these more useful than raw data?** |
| DEU28: | Personally, probably not but I think it’s probably more to do with my lack of understanding of it because, yes, I guess in a way because I know the sites so in terms of like maybe you know potential habitat modelling, so where you could look for woodland creation or wetland creation. I guess on a larger scale that might be really useful but I suppose our sites, I just know them so well so I kind of have that kind of on-the-ground knowledge. So, in a way I-- that sounds a bit-- like it’s that sort of on-the-ground knowledge, so maybe in a way I don’t find that sort of thing as useful. I guess maybe if it was something about-- I can be slightly blinkered to looking at just within our-- the boundary of the Parks, and maybe if it was modelling that looked at how we could link into a wider landscape then that’s probably something that I should be looking at. But I tend to get, find it a bit confusing if I’m honest. |
| **INT:** | **No, I mean we’ve had that before like local knowledge is you know key and you’ve been working on these areas for a long time and you know what’s there, so yes, no that’s completely understandable.** |
| DEU28: | Well, I suppose it could be useful when you’re looking at linking certain habitats or something and you could look at you know where things would work, where you know perhaps looking at underlying hydrology about where you could potentially wet things, and things like that. That’s quite useful, it might not be something that you know.  I guess the only other thing as well is it’s looking at-- there might be something really specific on site that’s really important and perhaps the modelling might not know that and it might draw you in one direction and you kind of think, no I need to keep this area not wooded because it’s a really important grassland or something. I don’t know it’s just-- I guess again it’s that sort of local knowledge. |
| **INT:** | **Yes, of course and you’ve just alluded to it a bit, would it effect the type of decisions that you could make?** |
| DEU28: | The modelling? |
| **INT:** | **Yes, model data, sorry.** |
| DEU28: | I suppose it could and I’ve seen in a couple of strategies where you know it has been suggested that they could use an area for certain, it was for woodland planting on a good grassland and perhaps if you know-- just because of modelling, it hasn’t taken in all the-- or perhaps the local knowledge and therefore it’s come out with woodland when perhaps retaining it as grassland and looking to enhance this grassland would perhaps be the best way. So, I think always, I guess modelling’s important at a broad level but then it needs to be ground-truthed as well, so it just needs to be considered as part of a process and not you know undertaken as the end product, I guess. |
| **INT:** | **Yes, course no, that’s brilliant. So, I’m just going to show you some examples of model data that part of the Team have created. So, I’ll just ask if you can interpret them?** |
| DEU28: | Oh, is it like a test? |
| **INT:** | **No, you’ll be fine, whether you’d find them useful and then if there’s anything that you would add to them to make them more useful. So, I’ll just share my screen now. So hopefully this works because,** |
| DEU28: | I might just get you on my bigger screen, hang on a second. |
| **[00:30:00]** |  |
| **INT:** | **Yes, no problem. I’ve had issues every time I share my screen it sort of lags, so hopefully this works. Are you able to see that?** |
| DEU28: | Yes, yes. |
| **INT:** | **Brilliant, so we’ll start with the one on the left, I don’t know if you can see my mouse there. But this is for a five-spot burnet moth and it’s a raw probability distribution at a national scale. Are you able to interpret this?** |
| DEU28: | Well, I guess it’s showing the probability of finding this species is greater in the areas where there is the darker green, is that right? |
| **INT:** | **Yes, absolutely. No, that’s brilliant, so essentially there’s a higher likeliness of this species being there in the sort of Wales and South West regions.**  **And I’ll just scroll down to the left, so now this again is a raw probability distribution for the same species but around a point in Wallingford at a 5 km scale and that’s in Oxfordshire. Again, are you able to interpret this model?** |
| DEU28: | Again, I guess that the darker green spaces that are where you would, are more likely to find it. |
| **INT:** | **Yes brilliant, and I would ask do you find any of these useful?**  **The long pause suggests no.** |
| DEU28: | Well, I guess it’s because I’m just not very I don’t use the modelling very much and so I think-- I guess if you were looking at, looking strategically at a species you could look at, say for instance bittern, which is something that we have in the Valley and it might be that you know looking at a probability map it could be showing that the Lee Valley could be for bittern, should be bittern but actually we weren’t getting any records for instance. So, that might then make me think-- Well, if the habitat is there why aren’t we? Maybe the habitat quality isn’t good enough. And then you would like perhaps how you could improve the habitat. |
| **INT:** | **Yes, no, that’s brilliant. I’ll just focus on the one on the right now. So, this is a variation model for the same species. It sort of works alongside the raw probability. This is usually a bit more tricky to understand but are you able to interpret this one?** |
| DEU28: | No, I mean I-- no. |
| **INT:** | **That’s fine, no. So, essentially the variation model is sort of showing you the degrees of confidence that you have in the raw probability model. So, if we look at the raw probability model on the left, we look at Wales where there is a high likeliness of the species being there, if we then look at the variation model there’s a darker area in Wales and that’s because there’s a greater variation, so we have less confidence. So, that’s essentially what it’s showing. So, it’s aimed to sort of address the gaps that you may have in the data set.**  **With that description would you find that useful? Or again, because you don’t use--** |
| DEU28: | No, I probably-- |
| **INT:** | **No, that’s fine.** |
| DEU28: | Yes, it would take me a long time to get my head round it. |
| **INT:** | **No, no problem at all. So yes, again this is a variation model on a sort of local level, again showing the same sort of concept.**  **Would you add anything to these models to make them more useful to yourself, who perhaps doesn’t have a greater level of understanding in these? Or do you just generally, no?** |
| DEU28: | No, I mean I can get my head round the one on the left and sort of understand that. The other one, I guess, because it’s the same colours, I don’t know if that makes it more confusing. |
| **INT:** | **Course, no, we’ve had that before, yes.** |
| DEU28: | That’s all I can think of. |
| **INT:** | **No, no, that’s brilliant.**  **Was there anything else that you wanted to talk about these at all, or comment?**  **No, that’s it, done. No problem. I’ll switch off my screen then.**  **Okay, well that’s brilliant. I’ve asked all the questions that I intended to ask which is great, and was there anything that you wanted to ask me at all? Or you thought I should have asked you?** |
| DEU28: | So, what kind of other organisations, are you doing an end-report on how people are using the data and-- |
| **INT:** | **Yes, so we’re currently in the process of writing up a paper in terms of people’s current uses and what they want for, in data in the future and how they look at using data in the future. I think trying to apply that to model data as well. So, they’re creating a tool at the moment, the other half, the other partner Team, not within my expertise. Yes, so we’ve been talking to conservation groups, local authorities, ecological consultancies, biological consultancies. At National, Yorkshire and London level.** |
| DEU28: | I guess people’s experiences are quite broad on how to-- |
| **INT:** | **Yes, absolutely, I thought it would be quite similar but yes, there’s definitely variation in how people are using it, how people are using data. And certainly, their thoughts on model data as well is very varied as well.** |
| DEU28: | I think it’s-- I think for a lot of people, me included, it’s quite a new thing and it’s not something that we probably, like I certainly didn’t study at University and didn’t have kind of like any formal background in the whole GIS thing, so it’s kind of what you pick up along the way. And it’s-- yes, you’re quite lead by how much you can, within your organisation you can have the ability to delve into it and access it. And the more time I spend, you know going to [environmental records centre.] and meeting with HERC and stuff, you do learn more but it’s really an evolving process. And perhaps like the new wave of younger kind of ecologists that come in will have done it more at University and have you know, sort of have a better understanding of it. |
| **INT:** | **Yes, absolutely, I think it’s certainly to do with the exposure you have to sort of model data, it does get easier when you--** |
| DEU28: | So model, I probably look at flood risk quite a lot because we do quite a lot with planning and flood risk and that’s all to do with you know the levels of flooding, and I can get my head round that because I’ve used that data quite a lot. But I think, yes, it’s exposure to data and how often you look at it and really use it and understand it. And maybe if you haven’t got someone stood here that can explain it then it looks a bit more scary. |
| **INT:** | **Yes, course, I mean this is quite a new thing. So yes, no. But I really appreciate talking to you and it’s great to get your insight.** |
| DEU28: | Apparently, it’s been useful anyway. |
| **INT:** | **No, it has, no it has. No, they’ve all been useful in terms of just understanding what’s currently being used and how people are using it.** |
| DEU28: | Well, if you need anything just give us a shout then and we-- |
| **INT:** | **No, that’s brilliant, thank you very much. Was there anything else that you wanted to --** |
| DEU28: | I don’t think so, no. |
| **INT:** | **No, well thank you very much again, [DEU28].** |
| DEU28: | No problem. |
| **INT:** | **And then have a nice day.** |
| DEU28: | You too, take care. |
| **INT:** | **Okay.** |
| DEU28: | Bye. |
| **INT:** | **Bye.** |
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