

**Minutes of STAP Meeting 5**

**The Royal York Hotel**

**07<sup>th</sup> February 2011**

**Attendees:**

Trevor Jameson - TJ – Chair

Joanna Redhead - JR - Net gain

Peter Barham - PB - Seabed User & Development Group

Rob Spray - RS - MCS & Sea Search - (LW & EE Hub)

Paul Leroyd - PL - Wildlife Trust - (LW Hub standing in for Kirsten Smith)

Dale Rodmell - DR - NFFO

Chiara Polce - CP - Net gain

Jon Whitton - JW - Whitby Charter Boats - (YH Hub)

Paul Reynolds – PR - Renewables UK

Nigel Proctor - NP - Recreational Fishing – NSRAC (YH Hub)

Neal Hill - NH - Royal Yachting Association

Paul Lane – PL - NESFC (YH Hub)

Mick Borwell - MB - Oil & Gas UK

Steve Williamson - SW - Kings Lynn Fishermen/ESFC - (LW Hub)

Aisling Lannin - AL- Natural England (NE Hub)

Mark Russell - MR - BMAPA - (LW & EE Hub)

Iain Mills - IM - Crown Estate

Ana Jesus -AJ - JNCC

Rachel Hanbury - RH - MMO

Steve Barnard - SB - Net gain

**Apologies:**

Dave Lock - DL - BSAC - (EE Hub)

**Not Present:**

Adrian Lester - Chamber of Shipping

Clive Stockton – LGA SIG

Phil Walsh - NUTFA

| <b>Item 1 Expected outputs of this meeting</b>   | <b>ACTIONS</b>  |
|--|---|
| <p>TJ: Welcomed everyone to the 4<sup>th</sup> StAP meeting. And explained the expected outcomes were to bring the StAP up to date on progress made at the January hubs and receive targeted advice for each Regional Hub to consider post 3<sup>rd</sup> iteration.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Item 2 Minutes and Actions from 18-19 November meeting</b></p> <p>The previous minutes were approved as a fair &amp; accurate record. JR confirmed that actions were complete:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• MR did liaise with SAP over room availability for the next Sap meeting, but could not accommodate the numbers required. JR says is in hand.</li><li>• The National meeting for management measures proposals was accepted. There is a Public authorities meeting at the beginning of March to develop a “management tool box”.</li></ul> <p>Comment: There is concern over the exclusion of key stakeholders from the Public Authorities workshops. Would like some real and urgent clarity on the process.</p> <p>JR – The meeting is to clarify what measures are available from each management authority. Stakeholders will then be able to access this larger tool box to identify which measures would be most appropriate at sites.</p> <p>Q –Will the StAP be the forum for discussing management options?<br/>JR – No. That will be done at hub level.</p> <p>Comment: Made the point that at the next round of hubs where management measures are being discussed, the sector representatives are well briefed. They will need to have been enabled/encouraged to discuss the measure tool box in their sectors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Defra document (on management measure process) is not yet available to send out but as soon as it is available it would be circulated.</li></ul> | <p>JR to find out if there would be an opportunity for RSG to comment on tools/measures coming out of this meeting.</p> <p>JR to circulate once final version ready</p> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No specific feedback from SNCBs yet received on their vision for role of RSG beyond project. A DEFRA questionnaire to seek views is being prepared.</li> <li>• All other actions complete</li> </ul>   |  |
| <p><b>Item 3 Final 2<sup>nd</sup> Iteration SAP feedback</b></p> <p>TJ – Outlined the positive feedback from SAP and reported that at the National Project Board meeting the Net gain Project received encouraging and supportive comments. The StAP were asked for any comments or concerns on the final SAP 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration report.</p> <p>Comment: SAP section 2.10 questions the confidence in UKSeaMap 2010. It would be good to know what outputs (sites) are based on poor data (e.g. Seamap 2010).</p> <p>CP – Indicated that the NG project is making use of and recording local knowledge/best information to augment and replace data where necessary. Each MCZ will have an associated narrative to help clarify the basis for its designation.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Item 4 Update on NCS applications</b></p> <p>JR presented an updated list of NCS including new additions:</p> <p>Duncan Carter – Carbon Capture and Storage<br/> Matthew Pearce - National Grid<br/> David Mitchell - Angling Trust.</p> <p>Comment: There is a need to clarify the feedback loop for both of the NCS members and from the wider stakeholders. For the audit trail you need to be able to show that views are being considered – we need to have a way of demonstrating where feedback comments have been incorporated and addressed.</p> <p>JR – outlined how we use feedback from the last round at hub meetings and posted to website. About 3 pieces of feedback received from NCS – all rest was from hub members liaison or Net Gain LOs working with fishermen.</p> <p>Comment: Many NCS feedback comments are generic – e.g. from renewables sector. Could we look at how the renewable sector could be more focused.</p> <p>Q – No reference to feedback for the 3<sup>rd</sup> iteration at the hubs – what will happen?</p> <p>JR – As the last round, when 3<sup>rd</sup> iteration is presented to the SAP we will seek feedback. We may alter the structure of the feedback following</p> | <p>JR to remove Dave Tudor from NCS</p> <p>JR to cross reference other Regional Projects to see if there is a better approach.</p> |

discussions in the other Regional Projects.

2 Hub members confirmed that the presentation of the feedback provided at the hubs was very good and that groups did make use of the feedback as intended.

#### **Item 5 Revised Project Delivery Timeline**

JR introduced the revised project delivery timeline.

WRT 8/9 March – Public Authorities workshop - On request JR showed draft list of invitees

Comment: questioned if SNCB representatives at the hubs would be able to provide sector specific input to ensure that the outputs may be practical and readily applicable to the real world.

JR – The first half of day one is to present and help people get up to speed. (Ahead of time the admin costs of each potential measure will be developed by each competent authority). Then move into the workshop format to develop an agreed toolbox and approach to use.

Comment: This is a new approach to planning– to expect authorities to be able to know which would be the “best” approach is unreasonable.

JR –The workshop will only deliver to us the tools or measures available from the different authorities. It is then for the stakeholders to help identify which measures would suit particular sites.

Comment: Would like to see consistent and evidence based approaches to the process. This suggested approach seems to go against this.

Comment: At the MMO meeting in Hull (13/01/11) the group was asked if there were issues – he suggested that the wrong stakeholders were being asked about deciding a future that will affect key stakeholder groups.

Comment: The same information from other sources seems to be giving different messages to those being promoted by others.

Q – Would the workshop discuss mitigation options?

JR – No. Mitigation would be discussed at the site specific meetings (hubs). Clarified that the public authorities workshop is a way of setting out and communicating what can be done.

WRT 16 March Pressures/assumptions workshop

JR advised that RPs and SNCB technical experts will be discussing:

- Tools available (PRISM & PISA etc)
- Assumptions being made.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Comment: –matrices are not well defined and are too crude to allow meaningful discussion.</p> <p>JR – Hopes that the sector representatives will be able to provide the detail on how factors in matrices are interpreted in hub meetings.</p> <p>Comment: Still concerned over the level of detail of knowledge required by the hub representatives.</p> <p>Comment: Would want more information on the benchmarks. Not comfortable with them or their application.</p> <p>WRT the March Net Gain/MMO Hub Meetings</p> <p>JR – Hopes that these meetings will help introduce potential management measures. The afternoon session is planned to be used as a mop up session. May need to reconsider and start to develop an understanding of pressure benchmarks and vulnerability assessments etc. Times are tight.</p> <p>Comment: Noted some lack of consistency between the NE support at the last round of hubs. Some of the comments made by NE advisors were not helpful during the presentation (wrt the YH hub).</p> <p>Comment: Might it be possible for one of the meetings between the sector lead and NE “expert” to develop a 2 or 3 side document covering how the matrices should be interpreted in a consistent manner (at National level) for each sector?</p> <p>Comment: Would like it to be noted that all the Liaison officers have done a great job! Concern noted over what will happen to the “relationships” that have been developed between Los and stakeholders?</p> <p>JR – Recognises the importance of the Liaison Officers and is currently reviewing the situation.</p> | <p>JR to liaise with AL to set up small meetings for RSG to learn more on the matrices. SW particularly requests this.</p>   |
| <p><b>Item 6 January Hubs Progress Update - PowerPoint</b></p> <p>AL suggested that IFCAs/SFCs take a more lead role at the March MMO/Hub meetings i.e. at front of house and not just attending as a stakeholder – also suggested and supported by PL &amp; RS.</p> <p>AJ – Suggested there is still “some way to go” in terms of developing sites for FOCI.</p> <p>JR – We have done well for Habitat FOCI – where we cannot meet targets we have in most cases got good reason why we cannot do more. For species FOCI we do not have a full data set. We do not envisage being able to develop new sites to accommodate new species FOCI as</p>   | <p>CP to include a map of the developing network (dMCZs and MPAs) to help inform discussions on RA placement at the hubs as an acetate/map in the Regional Profile</p> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>and when it becomes available – we will only do so where data falls within existing draft sites.</p> <p>Comment: supported this view. Also commented that some of the species data is the result of specific surveys and do not give a good representation of the true distribution of a species – e.g. Ocean Quahog. Are there grounds for discounting such species??</p> <p>Q - re 8/9 March – are we able to consider attendance at this meeting. Are we looking at Local Councils or IFCAs. When we are talking about “public authorities”?</p> <p>JR – Presented the draft list of invitees.</p> <p>Comment: Presence of some bodies on the list initiated comment. E.g. British Posts Association? Forestry Commission? Some of the invitees are not public authorities but trade associations.</p> <p>Comment: Will we have a full evidence base for each site to show how the site selection process has been done? Better to have this information sooner rather than later. E.g. NG 2.13 REC data that supports (at least part of) each site.</p> <p>Q – Will there be site specific meetings after April/May?<br/>JR – Yes. Short meetings (MMO) in March. The management options meetings in April/May. These meetings will be based on site specific discussions. There may be an option then for site specific meetings at a smaller scale in June.</p> | <p>JR to feedback to Jamie Davies to restrict to public authorities only.</p> |
| <p><b>Item 7 Consultation on dMCZs</b></p> <p><b><u>Balance of sites across Hubs</u></b></p> <p>JR – How does the StAP feel the balance of dMCZs across the hubs is?<br/>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More emphasis on coastal areas in the South?</li> <li>• R3 windfarms have blocked off a lot of the offshore area in the South.</li> <li>• Also, the North has more options for offshore sites?</li> </ul> <p><b>The StAP agreed that taking account of existing MPAs and other limitations there appears to be a good balance of sites throughout the project area.</b></p> <p><b><u>Reference Areas</u></b></p> <p>JR – Reference Areas tend to have been put forward more for BSH and Habitat FOCI. Clear that the reference area checklist (showing features with limited distribution) focused minds. Probably not the best option to</p>  |   |

go back to the hubs with an “open” list at next meeting. JR suggests that we provide a list of features to each hub based on spatial distribution and seek opinion within JNCC/NE to help inform the hubs of potential sites within existing MPAs.

Comments:

- Maybe consider avoiding areas of high activity to avoid excessive contention.
- FOCI Reference Areas are not necessarily large – need to position them where they are representative and useful – shouldn’t be too hard in practice but don’t write off sites just on activity now.
- Could use Marxan to derive a start point for a Reference Area network? (It was done in Balanced Seas). Conceded discussions in Balanced Seas, despite a Marxan primer, didn’t go very far.
- Will HOCl “come with” SOCl?
- JR – Would suggest avoiding focusing on SOCl as the data is not probably of good enough quality.
- Can we restrict Reference Areas choices to areas of higher data confidence.
- JR – Higher confidence data is not wide spread – focusing on it would be harsh on certain areas where there is MESH or REC data.
- Can we restrict the areas where there are good survey records? E.g. in existing MPAs?
- AJ – Agreed this might be a possible approach.
- JR – Broadly, we should therefore narrow down by distribution of features and the existing network of MPAs – taking expert input from SNCBs.
- AL – Feels existing BSH covered by sites should provide a good starter for Reference Areas.

**StAP agreed that steer should be provided to the Hubs with more widespread features being divided between hubs and to also look for good examples within existing MPAs.**

**Geological features**

JR – Referred to a need to consider geological features e.g. Outer Silver Pit (N Sea Glacial Tunnel Valley) for protection

Comments:

- Gibraltar Point – a GCR site – was not covered adequately at the last round of meetings.
- Outer Silver Pit (OSP) only came up as an issue for discussion because of movement of site NG2.11. We have suggested Inner Silver Pit (ISP) in NG2.9
- OSP is very large – would only (realistically) be able to reasonably designate part of the feature.

JR to liaise with NE over potential options in existing MPAs.

Net Gain team to develop lists for hubs to use in next round

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ISP is a glacial River Valley – OSP is a glacial tunnel valley.</li> <li>• There is commercial fishing interest in ISP</li> </ul> <p>There was some debate about the designation of geological sites within the network. JR confirms that geological features can be designated in their own right (without need to include BSH etc) under the MACA Act.</p> <p>Q - Can we seek clarification from SAP – if we don't protect all of OSP is there any value in protecting only part? Also, If Berwick and N Northumberland SAC includes Holy Island GCR would MCZ designation provide any additional protection?</p> <p>Q Do we have “compatibility information” for geological information?<br/>CP – Yes we have some information on this.</p> <p>Comment: GCR should be considered as more of a priority than wider features. GCR sites could be a focus for reference areas as they are next to existing onshore SSSI's which have existing management in place.</p> <p>Q – Why do we need Reference Areas based on pristine sites?<br/>Comment: If we select “better condition” sites to start with then the process of restoration to Reference condition should be quicker.</p> <p><b>StAP agreed to refer question to the SNCBs and SAP for further advice</b></p> <p>Q – Given we can't designate a site on the basis of AAEL alone, can we have confirmation of whether a dMCZ boundary should be extended to include AAEL if the ENG targets are already met?</p> <p>JR – No. Discussion in JNCC &amp; NE has indicated that boundaries should be set by primary drivers from ENG and where a site has been identified it should not be changed just for AAEL –we will be taking more specific guidance on specific sites as we move forwards.</p> <p><b>Consolidation of site boundaries</b></p> <p>JR asked for advice on whether NG 2.12 and 2.7 (which join at the Humber Mouth) should be maintained or split into 2 separate sites. The StAP discussed the pros and cons for this:</p> <p>Pros for joining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estuary already heavily designated and there are no real implications on management/operation of activities within the Humber.</li> <li>• Would not be a problem to have them joined given that management (e.g. maintenance dredging) could be consented and continue.</li> <li>• Might look odd if there is a Humber Estuary (SAC SSSI etc) designation and designations to the north and south. It may look</li> </ul> | <p>JR to seek clarification from the SNCBs and SAP on benefit of protecting only a portion of a geological feature such as OSP</p> <p>SB to look to include this information within PRISM/PISA etc.</p> <p>JR to seek further advice from SNCBs on the inclusion of AAEL.</p> |
|--|---|

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>odd if there is a wide gap. May appear as a bit of a weakness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would not like to see them split.</li> </ul> <p>Cons for joining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JR – There is a clear steer from management authorities in the room to divide.</li> <li>• MMO/IFCAs – Would like to see them split. Management and enforcement would be easier if there are clear boundaries between sites; separates different fisheries for example.</li> <li>• Suggested using shipping lanes and dredging channel as a clear break – otherwise we would just be protecting a degraded dredging channel.</li> <li>• If the ecological integrity is still there then keep them joined otherwise keep them separate. Wide area is dynamic and is not of great significance regarding its ecology.</li> <li>• Because of existing designations any changes to activities would require an EIA in any case so would effectively protect other adjacent areas of dMCZ (i.e. the coastal strips) anyway.</li> <li>• IFCA – Feels this is setting a precedent and would want that noting and similar concerns flagged in equivalent circumstances.</li> </ul> <p><b>StAP took majority decision to split the sites to maintain a gap over the mouth of the Humber. Agreed to refer back to the Hubs to decide the final boundaries of the split.</b></p> <p><u>NG 2.9 (Inner silver pit)</u></p> <p>JR – This site has been proposed for the geological feature, not the habitats in particular. Current boundary would not be manageable, so request advice on best way to carry this forward.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boundary at the southwest was decided for a possible Reference Area for Sabellaria.</li> <li>• NE aggregates specialist is looking at where this FOCI is. May be more a question of waiting to see if a distinct area (probably outside of the dMCZ) as a Reference Area for Sabellaria reef.</li> <li>• There are issues where NE say there are good areas within an area which is fished but that its designation might have implications for fishing. Also some lack of clarity over where the best Reference Area could be.</li> <li>• The boundary could be limited to the contours of the geological feature.</li> <li>• Boundaries should incorporate the approaches to the valley.</li> <li>• Can reconnect the bottom “flare” (subject to confirmation)</li> </ul> <p><b>StAP happy to accept NGs refined boundary for the 3<sup>rd</sup> iteration.</b></p> <p><b><u>Border between NG2.9 and NG 2.6</u></b></p> | <p>MR to provide CP with data for Sabellaria to inform SW boundary.</p> |
|--|---|

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>JR asked whether the StAP could advise on keeping the border between these sites (which would create one continuous site along the Yorkshire-Lincolnshire offshore area) or whether to open a channel up between them.</p> <p><b>StAP agreed to split the sites and accepted boundary proposed.</b></p> <p><b><u>Cumulative impacts</u></b></p> <p>JR asked if there were any cumulative impacts looking at the developing network that were cause for concern.</p> <p>Q- Would like to query apparent gap in NE?<br/>JR – When the map is zoomed in there is more evidence of coastal sites – gives a better impression.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Item 8 AOB</b></p> <p>JR: The SAP have made provisions for 8 RSG representatives from across the RPs to attend as observers on 3 March meeting. Request for volunteers or discuss option for Trevor to attend.</p> <p>NP, RS, KS, DR, PR all expressed interest.</p> <p>Comment: would like it recorded that there is appreciation for Net gains teams diligence in following through the original request to admit observers.</p> <p>Comment: Would like to know more about how Net gain will take cumulative impact into account. Also how mutual beneficial outcomes can be identified using flawed or imperfect data (VMS) and the uncertainty around collocation implications e.g. Westermost Rough 0 there is conflict in setting boundary along the coast but there are hard boundaries to be taken into account (e.g. OWF)</p> <p><b>Date of Next Meeting 6 April – York</b></p> <p><b>JR advised that the StAP meeting penciled in for 18 May may need rescheduling to allow more time following the final hub (13 May) to prepare materials for the StAP. JR to advise asap on alternative date.</b></p> | <p>JR to liaise with other PMs and advise of outcome.</p> |