

**Minutes of STAP Meeting 1**

**The Royal York Hotel**

**20<sup>th</sup> April 2010 – 10.30 am – 4.00pm**

**Attendees:**

Trevor Jameson - TJ - Chair

Joanna Redhead - JR – Netgain Project Manager

Peter Barham - PB - Seabed User & Development Group

Rob Spray - RS – Marine Conservation Society & Sea Search - (LW & EE Hub)

Kirsten Smith - KS – The Wildlife Trusts, LINK - (YH Hub)

Dave Lock - DL - British Sub Aqua Club - (EE Hub)

Paul Reynolds – PR - Renewables UK

Dale Rodmell - DR – National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations

Kat Wojtaszekova - KW – Netgain GIS and Data Officer

Mick Borwell - MB - Oil & Gas UK

Neal Hill - NH – Representing Leisure Boating

John Whitton - JW – Representing Charter Boat Skippers - (YH Hub)

Nigel Proctor - NP - Recreational Sea Angling, NSRAC, NESFC (YH hub)

Steve Smith - SS - Facilitator

Ian Rowe - IR – Netgain Senior Liaison Officer

Steve Williamson - SW – Representing shell fisheries and processing, Kings Lynn Fishermen/ESFJC - (LW and EE Hubs)

Robbie Fisher - RF - Natural England

Phil Walsh - PW – New Under Ten Fishermens Association - (NE Hub)

Mark Russell - MR – British Marine Aggregate Producers Association - (LW & EE Hub)

Iain Mills - IM - Crown Estate

Adrian Lester - AL - Chamber of Shipping

Christina Vina-Herbon - CVH - JNCC

Dani Sewell - DS – Netgain PR and Communications Manager

**Apologies:**

Richard Hill – UK Cable Protection Company

Clive Stockton – Local Government Authorities Special Interest Group

<b>Welcome</b>	<b>ACTIONS</b>
<p>TJ: The main objective is to ensure the STAP is ready to deal with the first iteration. The first iteration has to be with the Stakeholder Advisory Panel by 30th June. Order of the day outlined.</p> <p><b>Item 1 Membership and Introductions</b></p> <p><b>Members introduced themselves, their organisation and which sector they are representing.</b></p> <p>TJ: We are still searching for representation from Geologists. We welcome suggestions.</p> <p>Members were reminded that they are able to elect a deputy if they are unable to attend in the future and to check that Netgain had their correct contact details. It was agreed that contact details can be made available online provided that emails are encoded so that they cannot be harvested.</p> <p>The STAP was reminded that Steve Barnard is the common link between the Hub and STAP. Responsibility also falls to STAP members who sit on Hubs to pass on communications.</p> <p>Q: Are North East and East of England represented to a lesser degree on the STAP? Does this need to be addressed?</p> <p>Response: Neal Hill and Phil Walsh are based North East.</p> <p>Comment: The solution is to ensure that communication flow is effective between the Hubs and STAP. This should be revisited next meeting.</p> <p>Comment: There is interest from other fishermen further North than Northumberland. One in particular wishes to sit on the Hub and STAP.</p> <p>Comment: It would always be a concern, we must make sure STAP is representative, on terms of location as well.</p> <p>JR: We have given consideration to this which is why Hub meetings are throughout the Project area. The TOR of STAP and Hub members will be covered in presentations which should clarify any confusion and need for different representation.</p>	<p>JR to check contact details and DS to add to website.</p> <p>DONE</p> <p>IR to contact PW after meeting to discuss</p> <p>DONE</p>

<p><b>Items 2 &amp; 3 Presentation by Joanna Redhead on project overview and framework, including Project Delivery Guidance followed by questions.</b></p> <p>Question: Queried the Hub graphics. How are you allocating the distribution of offshore waters?</p> <p>JR: The slide is just a graphic. We have a flexible approach, people have elected to sit on Hubs where they feel it would be best for them to sit. We do not have rigid boundaries.</p> <p>KW: Each Hub will have inshore and offshore maps. Each Hub also has maps of the whole Project area with zooms to assist joined up planning.</p> <p>Comment: It appears that there is very little for the STAP to do. This issue is how best to facilitate the stakeholder involvement. Stakeholders are not just local though – how do you facilitate stakeholders that operate throughout the Project area. I would suggest that the STAP has a key responsibility to feedback to Hubs. You mentioned the need for a level playing field. Is the first iteration to be a science only iteration if you are not using stakeholder data?</p> <p>JR: We are looking at species and habitats as well as existing data. It is the aim of the first iteration to identify where our options are, and where they cannot be. We have information from some sectors but not all, we were keen to maintain a level playing field by holding back stakeholder information until we have a further spread across users.</p> <p>Question: It is still not clear what is meant by “iteration” given the amount of issues. Is the first iteration intended to focus on all the named habitats, species etc or are we operating on a top 10? What are the Hubs aiming to do?</p> <p>JR: It is not the intention to focus on conservation objectives, or get into too much detail. But we will need to get an idea of where our options are for the habitats and species in the ENG.</p> <p>Question: Is there a feeling of <u>what</u> the objectives are? There are 76 features, 1 day, its an enormous task. You need to make the process more iterative. How can it be made more manageable/achievable? Look at Finding Sanctuaries stepwise process as a starter.</p> <p>JR: I acknowledge that there is too much for the first iteration in the PDG. Ideally we would like to see where our options are by the end of the first iteration. We are also waiting for a gap analysis, detailing what is already achieved in existing sites toward our targets, which will help. I acknowledge that it is a fair point though.</p> <p>Question: Will Netgain suggest areas for Hub members to comment on?</p> <p>JR: It must be stakeholders only that draw lines on maps.</p>	
--	--

<p>Comment: I meant more maps which show <u>where</u> things are within the Project area.</p> <p>JR: We will have maps showing habitats, biotopes, species among others but the Netgain team will not be drawing lines on maps.</p> <p>Question: Will Hub meetings be paper based or will we be using PCs?</p> <p>JR: Paper based, with maps on acetates for overlaying and a laptop for support and zooming.</p> <p>Comment: There is an issue with the quality and detail of the maps with Finding Sanctuary. Electronic layers are more practical.</p> <p>Comment: We (Natural England) have tried to obtain Marine Maps software but it was impossible.</p> <p>Comment: There is also an issue of scaling.</p> <p>KW: Explained what documents would be in the FTP site.</p> <p>Question: Could we have a basic electronic viewing and layering software capability?</p> <p>JR: We have a range of resources that will help as far as possible with Hub and STAP meetings. We will have the laptop for this and we will also be able to bring 'options' based on decision support software if that would help kick start discussions.</p>	
<p><b>Item 4 – Terms of Reference (TOR) – Review Regional Hub TOR and agree TOR for StAP.</b></p> <p>15 Minutes Facilitated Discussion.</p> <p>SS: Are there any fundamental issues?</p> <p>Comment: It struck me that there is a concern – that there is a perception that this is a hierarchical process. It would be helpful to build on what the STAP can and cannot do. This needs to be made clear in the TOR as it is a lingering concern at the Hubs.</p> <p>SS: Drew attention to Will &amp; will not section.</p> <p>Comment: These need to be built up and made clearer.</p> <p>Comment: This (roles of the StAP vis a vis the Hubs) was made very clear at the Hubs.</p> <p>Comment: The Project Delivery Guidance outlines the process, but the Netgain Project is different, this is where the confusion has come from.</p>	<p>JR to incorporate comments to draft TOR for circulation and approval.</p> <p>DONE</p>

SS: Recommended changes?

Comment: We need to balance tension between Regional and National Stakeholders. The part where it says STAP will not make recommendations needs to be clarified. Vicariously they will – there is a fine line between guidance and recommendations. That section must be defined. The StAP might want to look at maps to facilitate the session and inform their input.

Comment: There needs to be clarity that STAP is involved in planning work, just differently.

Question: How is the synergy between the four Regional Projects dealt with across Regional Hubs? The language needs refining: The stap will not make recommendations but advise, input and make recommendations back to the hubs. It will not just duplicate what the hubs do.

SS: This could be a role for the STAP.

Comment: Presumably there will be crossover of zones, this must be referenced and would explain why some organizations are on STAP and not Hubs.

SS: Reasons why Hub members are here need to be crystallized in TOR. It must be stated more clearly.

Comment: Balance across the Hubs of features for protection, how do we deal with percentages across the Hubs. Is addressing this the role of the STAP? This must be referenced somewhere in TOR. The StAP will have a role in looking at whether we need to reach targets in each hub or across the project area.

Question: Is this the role of the STAP?

SS: This must be made clear.

Comment: NE and JNCC can offer advice on this to STAP and Hubs. However, there is the issue of addressing the socio-economics. This is something that NE would like to reflect on more and are developing a document currently.

Comment: There is a lot of detail on percentages in the ENG.

Question: Input of International Stakeholders engagement as Netgain has offshore waters. TOR for working with International Stakeholders must be developed. How can they have direct involvement?

JR: International Stakeholders, like large Nationals may attend STAP or be a named consultative stakeholder.

Comment: With STAP not planning there may be a disadvantage to International Stakeholders.

<p>Comment: Under CFP there would be a risk in taking that approach.</p> <p>JR: The Netgain team will research this.</p> <p>SS: Key challenges will be explored in later facilitated session.</p>	
<p><b>Item 5 – Ecological Network Guidance (ENG) Presentation</b></p> <p>Question: Who decides what restrictions will be put in place?</p> <p>JR: The Regional Hubs will look at conservation objectives and management measures.</p> <p>Question: Are there scientists on Hubs? This is a scientific decision.</p> <p>JR: There are some independent scientists on the hubs. Hubs will be provided with pressure matrixes, it will be for Hubs to decide restrictions. There will be people from NE and JNCC who will be there to assist that process.</p> <p>Comment: We (Natural England) will be on each Hub to give expert advice on this area and help to inform.</p> <p>Question: When are the pressure matrixes available?</p> <p>Comment (Natural England): ASAP.</p> <p>Comment: We need them before the Hubs.</p> <p>JR: Having spoken to other Regional Projects, we hope to devise a “scale of protection” at the first planning meeting, grading/traffic light system. Then we can use the pressure matrixes to make decisions when they are delivered to the regional projects later on.</p> <p>Comment: The Project Delivery Guidance is comprehensive but there is a lot of guidance and many documents needed. We need them now. NE and JNCC need pushing for these.</p> <p>Question: What will the process be for grading activities and managing them in the future, consent etc?</p> <p>JR: That will be addressed following The Netgain Project.</p> <p>Comment: This means that we will have to second guess what management is needed – a fundamental flaw in the process.</p> <p>Comment: Everyone will adopt a cautionary/“worst case” stance, this will be a pressure point. This would be eased by having an indication of what to expect.</p>	

<p>Comment: We need a resolution at Hub level that it can be a clear and informed “second guess”.</p> <p>Comment: There needs to be a flexibility and ability to negotiate. We cannot negotiate unless we have <u>all</u> of the information possible.</p> <p>Comment: We (NE) are aware that the information is badly needed, I will take this issue further and attempt to progress it.</p> <p>Question: Are you liaising with a range of industries to formulate this information.</p> <p>Comment: Whilst this isn’t my area, I think I am correct in saying that we (Natural England) are using all available information from industries and from the natural process.</p> <p>Comment: It is important to liaise with all industries.</p> <p>Comment: OSPAR hold a lot of information, this should be taken into account.</p> <p>Comment: We (JNCC) need to take into account the ENG, then devise conservation objectives, it has been made clear though, that we do not need to get bogged down in detail of management. This will be managed by Defra. GAP analysis and pressure matrixes will be made available ASAP.</p> <p>Comment: Adequacy – is to be “transparent”, when you look at the indicative percentages it is impossible to see why each region has to reach them.</p> <p>JR: The percentages have been devised to provide resilience and replication.  - should it be 2 day meetings.  - timescales are a constant worry.</p>	<p>CVH to check when the information will be made available. ??</p> <p>NH to check information available through OSPAR and report back to JR. ??</p>
<p><b>Item 6 Progress on the Regional Hubs First Round and feedback from Hub representatives</b></p> <p>Comment: 2 Key things  - confusion between STAPS and Hubs  - ability to ENG and how it translates into recommendations. There is a need for Netgain team to be proactive and help with this.</p> <p>JR: There is a plain English version document of the ENG being developed by NE. It was due to be delivered in March but has been delayed.</p> <p>Comment: Check Finding Sanctuary’s “plain English” document for use.  Comment: Please class RYA as “recreational boating” <u>not</u> “yachting”.  Comment: There will always be a tension until all the information is available.</p>	<p>JR to action</p> <p>JR to check which Hubs MB sits on.  DONE – NOT ANY AT PRESENT BUT WELCOME TO.</p> <p>JR to check when this will be delivered. <b>Done – online version should be available mid May, final</b></p>



Comment: Huge regional profiles are impossible to work with.

Comment: In terms of percentages etc, you need to explain how you pull recommendations together particularly in terms of scale and figures.

Comment: In Finding Sanctuary it was the broad-scale habitats that were the driver.

Comment: I am encouraged to learn what maps will be available, the use of acetates and layering will be useful.

Comment: You must ensure that you can get the best value from peoples time at the Hubs.

Comment: You have a full team, they must spend a lot of time facilitating the practical work at the Hubs, not talking. Give them a starting point with some lines in maps.

JR: I am reluctant to go to a meeting where there are lines on maps. We have said from the start that there are none and there are not.

Comment: We could convert the required percentages to so many Km<sup>2</sup>. Also a grid could be produced to show where the zones could be put forward from the ENG, there are some features that must be protected, we could tackle them first.

Comment: People do want lines on maps in order to start discussions.

Comment: There are parallels with "River Basin" Management Plans. We need to help people find their way, it is too difficult otherwise.

Comment: It could be that the non-contentious areas are addressed first. We only know one out of three sets of criteria.

JR: This was the reason behind holding back on the socio-economic data until we have a fairly representative amount. Without all of the data the Marxan conclusions may be biased.

Comment: The blank canvas and the complexity of the ENG will hold up the process. Lines on maps will set it off.

Comment: You will never have the data. There will be some fishermen that are reluctant to input but they may be triggered by the first iteration. There needs to be flexibility for people to input throughout the process.

Question: Is the issue that everything is too rushed and this should be done in stages?

TJ: The time pressures are massive, we are aware of that. The Netgain team

did request an extension but it was declined.

Comment: There is a judgment call on when and if you use Marxan and at what point. Make sure that the evidence base is sound, this group has a responsibility to validate that information.

TJ: There is a limit to what we can expect from the first iteration.

Comment: An effective and positive first step must be taken. Everyone needs to be aware that they will be made with the best intentions.

JR to investigate the option of using Marxan outputs to kick start the first iteration. Also look at changing the hub dates so that the relevant data can be presented following national dependency delays.

DONE

--	--

<p><b>Item 7 – StAP Challenges</b> <b>Facilitated Discussion</b></p> <p><b>See attached summary provided by Steve Smith</b></p>	
<p><b>Item 8 AOB and DONM</b></p> <p>Next meeting – 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2010 in York to review at the end of the next meeting. Members do want to keep the second meeting of the STAP in August</p>	<p>JR to set up doodle poll to find out peoples availability for the meetings.</p>