

Draft Minutes of STAP Meeting 1

The Royal York Hotel

22nd June 2010 – 10.00 am – 4.50pm

Attendees:

Trevor Jameson - TJ - Chair

Joanna Redhead - JR – Netgain Project Manager

Dani Sewell - DS – Netgain PR and Communications Manager

Steve Barnard SB – Netgain Stakeholder Manager

Chiara Polce – Netgain GIS Planner

Enock Bamusi EB – Netgain Economist

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)

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

Mick Borwell - MB - Oil & Gas UK

Neal Hill - NH – Representing Leisure Boating

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

Nigel Proctor - NP - Recreational Sea Angling, NSRAC, NESFC

Paul Garnett PG - Representing shell fisheries and processing, Kings Lynn Fishermen/ESFJC - (LW Hub)

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

Clive Stockton CS – Local Government Authorities Special Interest Group

Peter Madigan PM – Renewables UK

Ruth Thurstan RT – BSAC

Adam Ferguson AF – MMO

Apologies:

Paul Lane - NESFC

1. Welcome	ACTIONS
<p>TJ: Outlined the importance of the meeting in finalising the first iteration to be submitted to SAP. The main objective was to bring together the Hub outputs taking into account the socio-economics. The importance of communication between the StAP, Hub members and wider sector was re-iterated.</p> <p>2. Minutes and Actions from the last meeting</p> <p>The Minutes of the Meeting held on the 20th April were approved as a true and correct record.</p> <p>Item 1 - Membership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We are still looking for a geologist.• StAP deputies have been approved and some are present at this meeting.• Ian Rowe is continuing to liaise with NE fishermen about representation. <p>Items 2 & 3 – Project Delivery Guidance & overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Completed. <p>Item 4 – Terms of Reference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We will come back to. <p>Item 5 - ENG</p> <p>JR checked on the plain English version of ENG. This has not been delivered as yet but all up to date versions of this document will be on JNCC and Natural England websites.</p> <p>JR investigated the use of Marxan – this was taken forward.</p>	<p>CVH to check when the sensitivity matrix will be available – this is with ABPmer and should be available end of July/1st week in August.</p> <p>NH – checking availability of the OSPAR information, this is in draft at the moment. Neal to discuss this with Jo outside of the meeting.</p> <p>JR to check which Hub</p>

<p>Item 6 – Regional Hubs</p> <p>DS updated on communications following challenges session in last meeting</p> <p>Comment - noted that responses are important, waiting for update following exchange at last meeting, to be revisited.</p>	<p>Mick Borwell sits on – conclusion is that MB will remain on STAP instead.</p> <p>DS to forward comms progress to StAP</p>
<p>Terms of Reference</p> <p>The TOR document has been revised following our last round of meetings taking account of feedback from Stakeholders. It has now been redrafted to clarify that the StAP and Hubs collectively form Net Gains Regional Stakeholder Group. It is the responsibility of the RSG to deliver recommendations and within that the StAP and Hubs have distinct but complementary roles. The redraft includes more points of clarification on the working relationships between the Hubs and StAP, and removes repetition between the previous separate TORs. It is also addresses the perception of hierarchy between groups. The TOR have been signed off by Net Gains Regional Project Board.</p> <p>Any comments of the revised TOR?</p> <p>Question – Has this gone to Hub members as well?</p> <p>JR – It is on the website.</p> <p>Comment – It is a very useful clarification and positive step. An explanatory document is required as to why these steps have been taken.</p> <p>TJ – This should be taken to the Hubs.</p> <p>Comment – There is an issue with the accessibility and transparency of the SAP. Stakeholders are unhappy with the SAP. He found the reply from the SAP Chair unacceptable re RSG members observing SAP meetings.</p> <p>JR – Perhaps SAP felt that observers asking questions may impede their progress as they only have one day to work through all the recommendations.</p> <p>Comment– one or two observers would do just that, observe. In the interests of transparency they should not be operating behind closed doors.</p> <p>JR – Peter Ryder will attend the next StAP meeting.</p> <p>Comment – That is creating more meetings. One or two observers who</p>	<p>JR to draft a cover note to attach to TOR for the website.</p>

<p>would not impact on what they do could feed back. My concern is that they have their own agendas, transparency should operate throughout.</p> <p>Question – How many? Per project? It could be many people – we have to consider practicality.</p> <p>Comment – It doesn't matter who (Project) how many, it is important that someone is there to ensure transparency.</p> <p>Comment – Maybe we could suggest one main observer for all regional project.</p> <p>TJ – We will push for Peter Ryder/SAP representative to attend the next StAP meeting where we can ask them directly.</p> <p>Question – Who has the power to allow the request?</p> <p>Comment – Maybe clarification is required, Nigel should reiterate his request?</p> <p>Comment – There is a typo in 7.7 of TOR. It needs changing from 2010 to 2011.</p> <p>Comment – Explanation is required on process for amending and the sign off for TOR.</p> <p>JR – It was the Net Gain Regional Project Board's responsibility for signing off the TOR. This must be made clear.</p> <p>Terms of Reference agreed as correct.</p>	<p>JR to co-ordinate NP's communication with Peter Ryder.</p> <p>JR to action</p> <p>NG –To develop a full explanation to accompany the TOR.</p>
<p>3. Regional Hub Progress Review</p> <p>JR presented an overview of the Regional Hub meetings.</p> <p>CP updated and explained the map work completed at the Hubs.</p> <p>SB delivered a presentation over viewing what tools and programmes were available to Regional Hubs members for use in the mapping work.</p> <p>Question – Are we using boarding and sighting data from MFA and SFC?</p> <p>CP – It is now being mapped, as obtained through secondary sources. There are gaps that have been highlighted, Fisherman should cover these maps. As new maps are produced NG will send out a notification – part of MB0106.</p> <p>Question – What about leisure boaters, marinas etc?</p>	<p>CP to follow up with NH</p>

data. There were also issues with the boundaries between the hub areas. Marxan was very helpful but VMS was a problem. Transparency was an issue. How can we share? Issues still need clarification.

Comment - YH Hub – It is interesting that other Hubs have crossed between hub areas. One day is not long enough, a significant part of the day is taken up with presentations etc. Facilitators reduce the time greatly, this undermined critical work from Chiara.

Comment - Attended all the Regional Profile meetings. Less facilitation is better in the meetings.

Comment - Attended KL and E of E hubs. Jeff did waste time – he built his part and wasn't helpful. He also pushed Marxan. They need to step back and not take over.

Comment - Attended KL and E of E hubs. KL was a very different meeting to Lowestoft. The facilitators acted as a buffer between difficult stakeholders and the Project team. Questioning of data occurs throughout all four regional projects. Stakeholders took a leap of faith with broad scale habitat, there were significant concerns whether data correlated to where habitats actually are. By splitting sectors you split expertise and agenda as well as method. This leads to inconsistencies in what is considered and how broad caveats are communicated when iterations are passed to SAP. How do we address this?

JR – It has become clear that much more time is needed to reach consensus in Hubs as a whole to pull outputs together before StAP.

Comment– Stakeholders made an effort to interact with as many fishermen as possible. Inshore worked well, involving all parties early has worked well giving lots of local knowledge.

Comments agreed with. We have to start somewhere. Habitat data is broad-scale, that is a problem. Local knowledge fills in gaps in key features and gives stakeholders no confidence.

The NESFC carried out an acoustic survey of NTZs from Bridlington to Spurn out 4m - this information would be invaluable. One site has been drawn round Hornsea and Withernsea launch grounds – this is where local knowledge must be taken into account.

Comment – Data has modeling broad-scale which means that they may be hierarchical level features, this is explained in ENG. The same features cannot be protected as MCZ and SAC.

Comment – Small scale activities must be taken into account or impacts.

SB – Impacts have been taken into account, Stakeholders did use compatibility matrix to check activities and impacts, what may be restricted.

CP to search for data

<p>Question – Has all Hub decisions been habitat rather than species?</p> <p>SB – The majority – yes.</p> <p>Comment – I just wanted clarity on how we have got to where we are.</p> <p>JR – Because the recommendations were <u>so</u> draft, stakeholders did not want them to go on the public Netgain website. <u>However</u> it must be noted that part of the TOR is that the responsibility of members is to collect feedback of their recommendations.</p> <p>Question – Will NG outputs go on the National MCZ website?</p> <p>JR – We need to continue making enquiries about this but we have advised the national project that our stakeholders do not wish to publish them.</p> <p>Comment – We were under the impression the Scarborough Hub was an experiment, <u>not</u> an iteration so we would not want to publish it.</p> <p>JR – This is an issue that we have taken forward and was not present at other meetings. We are also looking at the logistics of another meeting in Scarborough to ensure that the Scarborough Hub does not feel disfranchised.</p> <p>Question – The Callum Roberts report has come out, will this influence designation?</p> <p>CP & JR – That report influenced the ENG, but was not made publicly available until afterwards.</p> <p>Comment – The site user agreement on ftp needs amending to factor in the sharing of documents. It seems that at the moment it will be difficult to feedback to stakeholders in the NG progress.</p> <p>JR – We are engaging with you this afternoon on how you can feedback to Hubs.</p> <p>Question – Are there any other sets of data that you are missing/waiting for?</p> <p>CP – Updated broad scale habitat, including intertidal habitats, Compatibility matrices</p> <p>Not yet mapped but recently received: inshore fishery layers derived from SFC and MFA and compiled by Cefas</p> <p>Nursery and spawning ground</p> <p>High mobile species</p> <p>Question – What about aggregates, windfarm maps etc?</p>	<p>SB to set up extra YH Hub meeting</p> <p>SB to redraft to clarify context</p>
--	--

<p>CP – What we have is in the Regional Profile. We welcome any information that people can provide.</p> <p>Question – What about wrecks and wargraves?</p> <p>CP – We are following these up.</p> <p>Comment – There may be some cable information that you can access including favored routes for future projects.</p> <p>4. Map work</p> <p>Presentation by JR followed by two hours reviewing the maps from Regional Hubs</p> <p>The Stakeholder Advisory Panel was divided into two groups and discussed the map work derived from the discussions in the regional hubs. The groups examined both socio-economic implications of the recommendations, as well as the extent to which the recommendations met the criteria outlined in the Ecological Network Guidance.</p>	
<p>Notes from Group 1- Maps discussion</p> <p>ENG review discussion</p> <p>The main discussion held was on collocation of MCZs with other features. A query was raised over co-location of SACs and MCZs. CVH advised that at present the RSG should not be including the draft SACs in their recommendations (we cannot include them in our targets). Others in the group disputed this as being incorrect.</p> <p>A query was raised on co-location of R3 windfarms and MCZs. When windfarms are erected they require a hard base to prevent scour which can change large areas around the base of the turbines to a different habitat. How would this affect the targets, as it would no longer be the same habitat within the MCZ?</p> <p>JR explained we are waiting for a policy statement on co-location.</p> <p>Socio-economic Review discussion</p> <p>Most of the discussion focused on the use of Marxan and how to take account of compatibility of activities in the process.</p>	

Notes from Group 2 – Maps discussion

Socio-economic discussion

- There is a lack of fishing data, more accurate data is available from organizations such as the Crown Estate, BMPA and the Chamber of Shipping
- There is an overlap of sites with anchoring and dredging activities
- There are significant overlaps with Round 3 windfarms as well as existing windfarms
- There are significant overlaps with aggregate dredging
- There are significant overlaps with oil and gas concerns
- There is significant overlap with ports due to inshore areas and estuary designations (particularly the Humber)
- Some overlap with anchorage, not highly significant
- Direct overlap with Humber anchorage – site protecting A.3.1
- Project as a whole needs to look at the whole picture with installations, construction and decommissioning can be an issue
- We need to know management measures before looking at how much pressure an activity causes
- Some activities eg, windfarms, oil and gas do not cause an environmental issue until construction/decommission, this must be considered
- Navigation safety will be a concern, displacement of activity to other areas. This highlights the importance of knowing impacts
- We feel we can make many general comments but not specific ones because of not knowing why sites are there, what the implications of designation would be or what the impacts would be
- John Hartley of the SEA has some useful information
- Co-location is a major issue that will need addressing

ENG review discussion

- The outputs largely meet all targets, in fact we are in excess on some
- We are all stating that we would not be happy passing these recommendations to the SAP as an indication of where we think that MCZs would be with the current limitations in place
- What is going to be the difference between the first and the second iteration?
- Could we possibly use more information about pressures to meet the baseline for discussions
- To be effective, all the information will still require detail on impacts and responses of pressures

General plenary comments following group discussions on maps

Comment - Industry people were interested in socio-economics on our table. We were working on recommendations from maps that had fundamental flaws in knowledge of pressure etc. As much info as possible is

Net Gain team to discuss
John Hartley with Peter
Barham

<p>needed for exercises such as this to succeed. The next Marxan outputs should include more activity data rather than restricting to a few layers.</p> <p>JR – We only used a few layers this time due to time available and we were also unsure if stakeholders would like working with Marxan. Now we know people are happy to work in this way we can look to run the software again but with more datasets.</p> <p>Comment- We talk a lot about pressures but we don't know the impacts or the responses that have been made to those pressures and impacts- more info is needed</p> <p>Comment- Oil and Gas industry may not have an impact on existing installations, decommissioning is an entirely different thing and we may not be able to meet conservation objectives</p> <p>Comment- Management measures need to be known or it is impossible to know impacts. There is too much data on the table at the moment</p> <p>Comment- Whilst we need more information, there are also too many maps to overlay, there is a presentation issue with this data. It would be more helpful to have a site by site profile with pros and cons that gives the opportunity to take individual information into account</p> <p>JR- Would the group feel happier working on screen with GIS as a group on a site by site basis? Question not answered</p> <p>Comment - There is too much info here, but we have the context. This working could have been done on day 2 of the Hubs so that a more thinned and refined set of outputs could have been provided to the StAP for discussion. If an interactive version was available on Day 2 of Hubs, we could have tackled this process there and then. 2 day Hub meetings would mean that the StAP could work more effectively</p> <p>Comment- There are gaps in the data. However, as we go further down the process GIS will become more useful as these issues get resolved</p> <p>CP- We will be using the ftp site to an even greater extent as maps are updates</p> <p>Comment- Would be helpful to have GIS in the room to measure consensus and percentages and to inform discussion</p> <p>Comment - Habitat by habitat analysis would be useful</p> <p>Comment: GIS in the room is essential for discussion on offshore sites due to the scales involved</p> <p>Question- Could data be presented in levels of confidence- who has viewed recommendations, levels of agreement, extent to how much each stakeholder feels that there is a consensus</p>	<p>JR to factor this into planning for next Hub round</p> <p>CP to email the Stakeholder Advisory Panel members as updates are available on FTP</p>
--	---

Comment- Again, 2 day hubs would have meant that votes on confidence/measurements of consensus could be taken – at the moment the vast majority of sites are ‘red’

Comment- It is important to highlight the benefits of working this way so far. Lets present the benefits of this working process first, then the challenges

Comment- I think that we should submit what the Hubs generated, but covered by a statement that lists the caveats and health warnings attached to the nature of the outputs due to the data available

Comment- We can have confidence in the Net Gain team to produce a statement with these caveats that state clearly that this is a PRACTICE RUN and that this iteration is NOT set in stone – this is not a true reflection of where we believe that MCZs should be

Comment - Caveats have to include the missing information and enough information to tell the Science Advisory Panel why each area was selected, pros and cons
Missing information becoming available may result in fundamental changes to recommendations

CP – Should we add existing MPAs to the maps or just mention it as a caveat?

Comment- That information needs to be with the Hubs for the next round and with the SAP to inform them where we are likely to go with the next round

JR- read out covering statement on Balanced Seas recommendations to group

Comment- Net Gain would need to reflect on and edit the text to ensure that it is Net Gain specific

5. Socio-economic considerations

Socio-economic activity introduction and discussion

A discussion was held on how to find a common measure for different types of activity so that data layers with different costs (eg hours at sea, kW hours energy, economic value) can be compared in the Marxan analysis

Comment- Common factor is the area. Values on an area are the best way to go. 1st pass is the area that it occupies.

Question- That is the fundamental question that has been around for years –

JR to draft Net Gain covering statement with caveats and health warnings

<p>how are you going to assess the socio-economic impacts? It is asking the impossible or at least very difficult, and we are now at a critical stage</p> <p>Comment- It's a stage too early for this question, management measures must be known first</p> <p>CP- To create maps that are similar to VMS but for different activities, we need to know how we would express the value – how do we layer this info without a common denominator?</p> <p>Comment- There is an existing scale in the SEA report for renewable energy that would be very helpful</p> <p>Comment– I suggest that you get in touch with the ABPmer team (Justine Saunders) on the Valuing Seas study</p> <p>Comment- PSEG data is out on the 21st July – Charting Progress 2 has a Total Economic valuation of different sectors</p> <p>Indicators Activity</p> <p>Groups completed a carousel exercise between 3 stations to draw out social, economic and environmental indicators. The outputs from this exercise have been recorded separately.</p>	<p>CP to find these reports</p>
<p>6. Next steps</p> <p>TJ- Next meeting is scheduled for the 18th August, any comments from the floor on this for any aspect of how the StAP is operating?</p> <p>Comment- There is a divide on the StAP between those that attend Hub meetings and those that do not. Can I suggest that we need a mechanism whereby those that have not attended the Hub meetings can catch up on what has happened there before the StAP meeting? Otherwise we end up losing part of a day catching everyone up to the same point</p> <p>Comment- Still unsure as to whether fishing sector has been adequately represented, feel that the StAP process and iteration has happened too early</p> <p>TJ- I think that we all share your concerns, it is important to keep in mind that this first iteration is a snapshot of work completed</p> <p>Comment- I have been very encouraged by the progress made at the hubs and the work that has been completed by the StAP to date. Do we need another StAP meeting in August or shall we let the hubs get on with the task in hand?</p> <p>Comment- This is the forum for dealing with accountability and transparency, eg, meeting with the SAP. For the second iteration we NEED the compatibility matrix. It is reliant on national partners to hit their deadlines. They have not had a good track record of this so far. Serious</p>	<p>JR to look at possibility of evening session</p> <p>JR- To liaise with DR outside meeting to discuss how to most effectively facilitate fishing sector presence at Hub meetings/dissemination of outputs</p>

<p>concerns over the delivery at national level.</p> <p>Comment- International data being collected by liaison officers also needs to be on the table at the next round of meetings</p> <p>Comment- For the Crown Estate, I need to give my input on all 4 hubs at one meeting- I cannot attend all and it would be unethical to attend one</p> <p>These comments were seconded.</p> <p>JR- At the 18th August meeting we will have feedback from the SAP, the NCS and the wider stakeholders. Emphasis at this meeting will be on bringing together the feedback of the hubs to ensure consistency</p> <p>We do expect Hub and StAP members to feedback to their sectors about where we are. We will be issuing a pro forma so that you can collect feedback, this will also have a deadline.</p> <p>Work goes to the SAP on the 30th June, with their feedback expected on 31st July</p> <p>Question- Who do you mean by wider stakeholders? Is there a limit?</p> <p>Comment - I know that Tammy and Dave Lock are aiming to collect info and opinions from divers</p> <p>JR – I hope that the pro forma clarifies things but do get in touch with the team if not</p> <p>Question- we started by saying that the Y and H hub does not want to share outputs – this has not changed, how do we address this?</p> <p>JR- It is stated in the Terms of Reference that all members have a responsibility to feedback to their sectors</p> <p>Comment- It was viewed as a practice, it is not what we are proposing, it was an experimental draft. That has not changed.</p> <p>Question – Could we have another meeting?</p> <p>JR – We will look into that possibility but we need to put integrated outputs on the ftp site. This is a Yorkshire and Humber specific issue. Potentially the Y&H outputs could be totally removed and not go to the SAP.</p> <p>Comment – It was an experiment- not to go live.</p> <p>Question – Could it be covered by a caveat that the terms under which these recommendations were created?</p> <p>Comment – This is the significance of the sheet if caveats that they must always be distributed as one.</p>	<p>CP/SB to circulate FTP site details and date when outputs will be available (12th July)</p>
--	---

<p>SB – We understood that stakeholders at the Hub meetings do not want the maps in the public domain – the compromise we reached was the ftp site.</p> <p>Comment – I have no problem with the Hub member s accessing it, but not the public.</p> <p>SB – The pro-forma is a vehicle to record feedback on what wider sector members think.</p> <p>Comment – They are experimental, but I have no problem with the outputs being shared as long as the wishes of the Yorkshire and Humber hub are reflected and the caveats are in place.</p> <p>Question – Can the powerpoints be made available?</p> <p>JR – Yes, they will be on the website.</p> <p>Meeting closed: 4:50pm</p>	<p>JR to liaise with Balanced Seas to see if we can look at their maps for the next round to address cross boundary issues.</p>