

Irish Sea MCZ – Stakeholder group workshop 2

Workshop outputs
Word for Word Report

Workshop Facilitator

**Diana Pound
Kathryn Hardcastle**

**dialogue matters
dialogue matters**

Processed by:

**Fiona Woolmer
Diana Pound**

**dialogue matters
dialogue matters**

Outputs typed by:

**Laura Bates
Kieran Bell
Emily Hardman
Francesca Moore
Greg Whitfield**

**(ISCZ)
(ISCZ)
(ISCZ)
(ISCZ)
(ISCZ)**

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| About the workshop and this report | 5 |
| ▪ Purpose of the workshop | 5 |
| ▪ About this report | 5 |
| ▪ Why sort the outputs? | 5 |
| Introductory briefing Q & A | 6 |
| 1 What does the Irish Sea provide for us? (e.g. resources and materials, life support, culturally) | 6 |
| 2 Understanding more about sea uses | 8 |
| 2.1 Understanding human activities & uses | 8 |
| 2.2 Humans activities and the broad scale habitats: stakeholder’s views and perspectives on the effects of human activities on the different habitats and likely compatibility | 8 |
| 2.2.1 Habitat Type: 1. High Energy Infralittoral Rock | 9 |
| 2.2.2 Habitat Type: 2. Moderate Energy Infralittoral Rock | 11 |
| 2.2.3 Habitat Type: 3. High Energy Circalittoral Rock | 13 |
| 2.2.4 Habitat Type: 4. Moderate Energy Circalittoral Rock | 15 |
| 2.2.5 Habitat Type: 5. Low Energy Circalittoral Rock | 17 |
| 2.2.6 Habitat Type: 6. Subtidal Coarse Sediment | 19 |
| 2.2.7 Habitat Type: 7. Subtidal Sands | 21 |
| 2.2.8 Habitat Type: 8. Subtidal Mud | 23 |
| 2.2.9 Habitat Type: 9. Subtidal Mixed Sediment | 25 |
| 2.2.10 Habitat Type: 10 Low Energy Infralittoral Rock | 27 |
| 3 Mapping Activity | 29 |
| 3.1 Ecological Network Guidance Presentation – Q & A | 29 |
| 3.2 Mapping activity Q & A | 29 |
| 4 Discussing and exploring places | 30 |
| 4.1 Group 1 Discussion Map | 30 |
| 4.2 Group 2 Discussion Map | 31 |
| 4.3 Group 3 Discussion Map | 33 |
| 4.4 Group 4 Discussion Map | 35 |
| 4.5 Group 5 Discussion Map | 37 |
| 4.6 Group 6 Discussion Map | 40 |
| 5 Comment on maps | 42 |
| 5.1 Comments on Group 1’s Discussion Map | 42 |
| 5.2 Comments on Group 2’s Discussion Map | 43 |
| 5.3 Comments on Group 3’s Discussion Map | 44 |
| 5.4 Comments on Group 4’s Discussion Map | 45 |
| 5.5 Comments on Group 5’s Discussion Map | 46 |
| 5.6 Comments on Group 6’s Discussion Map | 47 |
| 6 Guidance for working together | 49 |
| 6.1 What do you like ? | 49 |
| 6.2 Room for Improvement | 49 |
| 6.3 Comments on section 1 | 49 |
| 6.4 Comments on section 2 | 49 |
| 6.5 Comments on section 3 | 49 |
| 6.6 Comments on section 4 | 49 |

6.7 Comments on section 549
6.8 Comments on section 6, 7, 8, 9,49
7 To what extent do you support the Guidance for working together?..... 50
8 Parking Place 50
9 Short term Actions following the workshop..... 51
Annex 1 List of Attendees..... 52
Annex 2 Agenda 54

About the workshop and this report

- **Purpose of the workshop**

This is the second Stakeholder Group workshop aiming to help participants share knowledge and understanding.

The Group also had the opportunity to comment on the ‘Guidance for working together’ which will guide the group as it works together.

The list of participants and the full agenda can be found in the Annex.

- **About this report.**

The discussion was recorded on flip charts or ‘post-it ‘ notes. Following the workshop these have been typed word for word and then sorted - like with like - to aid understanding. This report follows the same order as the event.

- **Why sort the outputs?**

Conversations do not progress in a linear fashion but go off at tangents, circle back and change direction suddenly. As a result, it can be very difficult to make sense of a dialogue when it is reported in the sequence in which it happens and important themes and ideas can be obscured.

It is for this reason that the outputs of the workshops are sorted and grouped.

The sorting is done by ‘emergent analysis’ ie seeing what themes emerge rather than to a predetermined set of titles. The ideas could have been grouped differently, or different titles chosen, so no weight should be attached to them.

Whilst this report serves as a record of what was discussed, and an *aide memoir* for those who took part in the workshop, the contents are inevitably quite cryptic in places so it is strongly recommended that it is not used as a means of communicating with non-participants without proper explanation.

| Acronyms used in this report | Meaning |
|------------------------------|--|
| IMO | International Maritime Organisation |
| GPS | Global Positioning System |
| MCA | Marine and Coastguard Agency |
| IoM | Isle of Man |
| NI | Northern Ireland |
| ISCZ | Irish Sea Conservation Zones |
| JNCC | Joint Nature Conservation Committee |
| NE | Natural England |
| MMO | Marine Management Organisation |
| Nephrops | Norway lobster (<i>Nephrops norvegicus</i>); also known as scampi, Dublin Bay Prawn, or Langoustine. |
| SAC | Special Area for Conservation |
| SPA | Special Protection Area |
| SSSI | Site of Special Scientific Interest |
| nm | Nautical mile |

Introductory briefing Q & A

Q. How will economic impact of MCZs be included?

A. Having people from all the main sea uses is part of including the social and economic as well as environmental considerations. The formal Impact Assessment will be incorporated later in the process when there is a clearer idea as to where MCZs may be

Q. What is process for correcting documents?

A. Workshop reports are a record of what was recorded in writing at the workshop so no corrections.

For the guidelines for working together, sea use information tables or other working documents, please send comments through

Q. What is meant by conservation?

A. Some MCZs have to be reference sites but most will be multi-use and managed in a more cohesive way

1 What does the Irish Sea provide for us? (e.g. resources and materials, life support, culturally)

Life Support systems

Life support

- Oxygen, 1/3 of Oxygen comes from phytoplankton
- The sea provides the basis for all life on earth
- Life

Climatic Change

- Temperate climate, the Irish Sea keeps us warm in winter and cool in summer
- Carbon Dioxide absorption, 1/3 of Carbon Dioxide is absorbed by plankton
- Marine habitats – carbon storage, reducing impacts of climate change

Jobs and way of life

Jobs

- Natural resources to help create jobs and wealth
- The Irish Sea is a place where opportunities are available to go to work and have employment at the same time
- Employment
- Jobs
- Work and leisure
- Commerce

Fishing as a livelihood and way of life

- Fishing
- The Irish Sea provides a way of life for fishermen and their families
- The Irish Seas has provided me with a living from fishing for over 40 years
- As a fisherman, the Irish Sea provides my family with a livelihood. Also tourism and local employment
- Resources, Cockles/Mussels, Jobs

Community link

- Community link

Resources

Human uses

- Marine ecosystems – supporting many human uses

Food

- Food
- Food – fish
- Food for local people, food for profit

Building materials

- Aggregates from the sea for building and coastal defence

Energy

- Energy
- Energy
- Energy
- Power – wind farms

Medicines

- Potential pharmaceuticals

Transport

- Transport, passengers and freight

Knowledge and learning**Research and knowledge**

- Scientific experimental sites/controls
- Preserves rare and non-renewable evidence for people coping with climate change in the past

Learning

- Culture/education resources
- Training (sea survival etc.)

Fun and inspiration**Recreational resource**

- Recreation: Angling, Diving, Sailing
- A natural environment to enjoy recreationally
- Dive sites
- Recreation
- Recreation
- Recreation
- Recreation

Inspiration / experiences

- Inspiration
- Beautiful marine life experiences, rock pooling, mud beasties and dolphins
- An expanse that needs to be crossed
- A beautiful view and coastline

Wildlife**Wildlife**

- An important place for many migratory species of international importance e.g. Risso's Dolphins, Basking Sharks and Leatherback Turtles
- Fantastic diversity of life

2 Understanding more about sea uses

2.1 Understanding human activities & uses

The tables produced at workshop 1 were available for additional comment. The results are contained in a separate document.

2.2 Humans activities and the broad scale habitats: stakeholder's views and perspectives on the effects of human activities on the different habitats and likely compatibility

What effect might this activity have on this broad habitat type?

Is the sea use: compatible, not compatible or possibly with good management?*

Please note well: Developing management measures for the MCZ is not part of the Stakeholder Group's responsibilities. However, to make decisions the group needs to have some insight into the different sea uses, their effects, and the ease with which they might be managed and be compatible with MCZ.

**In this activity, the phrase 'possibly with good management' means that you think it is possible that good management could overcome negative effects. Good management includes solutions which manage:

- Where the activity takes place (spatial solutions)
- When it takes place (temporal solutions)
- How it takes place (either technical solutions or behavioural solutions eg codes of conduct)

2.2.1 Habitat Type: 1. High Energy Infralittoral Rock

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|--|--|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| Industry cluster 1 (5) | | | | |
| 1. Shipping and shipping channels | As they operate on the surface and controls are already in place. Ballast water! Speed control – near shore (wash) | ✓ | | |
| 2. Ports and harbours | For all infra-littoral as they need to be dredged/blasted | | ✓ | |
| 3. Aggregate/mineral extraction. | Would not dredge | ✓ | | |
| 4. Dumping of dredge spoil and other licensed dumping areas | Due to too much movement Worried that this is not being thought about from the habitat perspective – high energy would see sediment dumped moving off it quickly so less effect on a habitat? | | | ✓ |
| 5. Sub sea cables | Need clarity on cable types to check compatibility Management already in place Maintenance of cables should not be compromised (applies to all) O/S 12 mile limit, no restrictions to telco cables by UN law (applies to all) | | ✓ | |
| Industry cluster 2 (6) | | | | |
| 6. Wind farms (current and proposed) | Wouldn't build wind-farm in this habitat for engineering reasons The current maintenance/renewal should not be compromised by any management imposed – needs consideration | - | - | - |
| 7. Wave, tidal, other marine renewables | Need to separate these technologies Impacts dependent on spp. Technology There are 2 crosses because it depends on the exact area/site and the proposed developments | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 8. Current oil and gas fields including pipelines | The current maintenance/renewal should not be compromised by any management imposed – needs consideration | | ✓ | |
| 9. Prospecting for oil and gas | | - | - | - |
| 10. Charter boating | Low impact activity | ✓ | - | - |
| 11. Small scale marine industries | Shipways? Breakwaters | | ? | ? |
| Fishing (7) | | | | |
| 12. Mobile gear fishing (demersal fishing e.g. bottom trawling) | No Impact – This type of sea bed is not suitable for bottom trawling | ✓ | | |
| 13. Mobile gear fishing (pelagic fishing e.g. mid-water trawling) | No Impact – no contact with seabed | ✓ | | |
| 14. Static gear fishing (eg potting, creeling, various netting, long-line) | Suitable for all static gear fishing – little disturbance of seabed (May impact on species/communities) | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 15. Scallop dredging | N/A | | | |
| 16. Inshore shellfisheries (e.g. whelks, cockles, mussels, clams). | Intertidal activity so N/A | | | |

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|---|--|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| 17. Mariculture | | | | |
| 18. Migrating game fish (e.g. haaf netting) | No impact – doesn't happen here, it's intertidal (?) No it isn't! Game fish migrating that is. | ✓ | | |
| Recreation (6) | | | | |
| 19. Recreational sea angling (shore and boat). | Good habitat for fish species Areas under ↑ use could have detrimental effects from anchoring (eg abrasion) | ✓ | ✓ (some guidance) | |
| 20. Dive sites - Pleasure diving | Impact only localised, occurring only at very high diver densities | ✓ | | |
| 21. Small near shore craft /water sports (eg surfing, powerboats, jet skis, canoe, kayak, kite surfing) | | | ✓ | |
| 22. Yachting/recreational boating (Yachting, sailing, cruising) | Just sail high above no damage | ✓ | | |
| 23. Wildlife watching from craft (bird, seal, shark) | Just sail high above no damage | ✓ | | |
| 24. Recreation and tourism generally | Energy of system makes low use + impact | ✓ | | |
| Other key activities (6) | | | | |
| 25. Marine nature and geological conservation | Contribute to recovery potential of marine ecosystem as a whole Conservation will ensure the protection of habitat and geology | ✓ ✓ | | |
| 26. Marine research activities | For sensitive areas research could be damaging if adequate measures or considerations are not taken into account Fisheries research – No impact/no activity Research groups may want to do small beam trawls, grab samples, anchor ship for survey, anchor fixed buoys with scientific equipment and deploy bottom-mounted equipment. Bottom mounted equipment may need to be recovered by dragging with wire if acoustic releases fail. | | ✓ ✓ | |
| 27. Marine historic and archaeological features | Conservation bodies should ensure the maintenance of these sectors Possibility of wrecks. Likely to suffer scour etc | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 28. Water quality and management (outfalls, discharge and abstraction) | Compatible as long as the appropriate measures or controls are in place to avoid eutrophication (sea-algae mats) Managed raw IMO/MCA regulations (i.e. from ships) | | ✓ ✓ | |
| 29. MOD activities | Tends not to operate (other than small boats close to shore) except entering/leaving harbour when discharge restrictions apply | ✓ | | |
| 30. Navigation and safety | Manageable – buoy laying and spar marker for harbours cover small craft set areas | | ✓ | |

2.2.2 Habitat Type: 2. Moderate Energy Infralittoral Rock

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|--|---|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| Industry cluster 1 (5) | | | | |
| 31. Shipping and shipping channels | As they operate on the surface and controls are already in place. | ✓ | | |
| 32. Ports and harbours | For all infra-littoral Would be affected due to depth | | ✓ ✓ | |
| 33. Aggregate/mineral extraction. | Would not dredge | ✓ | | |
| 34. Dumping of dredge spoil and other licensed dumping areas | As long as it is understood – the effects of dumping on habitats | | ✓ | |
| 35. Sub sea cables | Management already in place | | ✓ | |
| Industry cluster 2 (6) | | | | |
| 36. Wind farms (current and proposed) | Cabling routes may impact | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 37. Wave, tidal, other marine renewables | Barrages Other tidal devices? Wave? | | ✓ | ✓ ✓ |
| 38. Current oil and gas fields including pipelines | Pipeline routes | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 39. Prospecting for oil and gas | | - | - | - |
| 40. Charter boating | Low impact activity | ✓ | - | - |
| 41. Small scale marine industries | ? | - | - | - |
| Fishing (7) | | | | |
| 42. Mobile gear fishing (demersal fishing e.g. bottom trawling) | No Impact – Mobile gear vessels do not work in these areas | ✓ | | |
| 43. Mobile gear fishing (pelagic fishing e.g. mid-water trawling) | No Impact | ✓ | | |
| 44. Static gear fishing (eg potting, creeling, various netting, long-line) | No impact – same as one (May impact on species/communities) | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 45. Scallop dredging | | | | |
| 46. Inshore shellfisheries (e.g. whelks, cockles, mussels, clams). | Intertidal activity so N/A (same for all 10 habitats) | | | |
| 47. Mariculture | | | | |
| 48. Migrating game fish (e.g. haaf netting) | N/A | | | |
| Recreation (6) | | | | |
| 49. Recreational sea angling (shore and boat). | Good habitat for sea angling from shore Anchorage – detrimental impact in high use areas | ✓ | ✓ | |

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|---|--|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| 50. Dive sites - Pleasure diving | Frequent diving habitat. Impacts at only at very high diver densities but localised | ✓ | | |
| 51. Small near shore craft /water sports (eg surfing, powerboats, jet skis, canoe, kayak, kite surfing) | Power boats can cause damage in shallow waters – propeller and sediment disturbance? Compatible If regulated | | ✓ | |
| 52. Yachting/recreational boating (Yachting, sailing, cruising) | Just sail high above no damage | ✓ | | |
| 53. Wildlife watching from craft (bird, seal, shark) | Just sail high above no damage | ✓ | | |
| 54. Recreation and tourism generally | Energy of system makes low use + impact | ✓ | | |
| Other key activities (6) | | | | |
| 55. Marine nature and geological conservation | Conservation will ensure the protection of habitat and geology Contribute to recovery potential of marine ecosystem as a whole | ✓ | | |
| 56. Marine research activities | For sensitive areas research could be damaging if adequate measures or considerations are not taken into account Fisheries research – little activity Research groups may want to do small beam trawls, grab samples, anchor ship for survey, anchor fixed buoys with scientific equipment and deploy bottom-mounted equipment. Bottom mounted equipment may need to be recovered by dragging with wire if acoustic releases fail. | | ✓ | |
| 57. Marine historic and archaeological features | Conservation bodies should ensure the maintenance of these sectors Possibility of wrecks – medium risk scour | | ✓ | |
| 58. Water quality and management (outfalls, discharge and abstraction) | Ship discharge (IMO/MCA regulations) | | ✓ | |
| 59. MOD activities | Tends not to operate (other than small boats close to shore) except entering/leaving harbour when discharge restrictions apply | ✓ | | |
| 60. Navigation and safety | Acoustic surveys used | ✓ | | |

2.2.3 Habitat Type: 3. High Energy Circalittoral Rock

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|--|--|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| Industry cluster 1 (5) | | | | |
| 61. Shipping and shipping channels | As they operate on the surface and controls are already in place. Ballast water! Speed control – near shore (wash) | ✓ | | |
| 62. Ports and harbours | As too deep | ✓ | | |
| 63. Aggregate/mineral extraction. | Would not dredge | ✓ | | |
| 64. Dumping of dredge spoil and other licensed dumping areas | Due to too much movement As long as it's understood – the effects of dumping on habitats | | ✓ ✓ | ✓ |
| 65. Sub sea cables | As management already in place | | ✓ | |
| Industry cluster 2 (6) | | | | |
| 66. Wind farms (current and proposed) | Round 3 | | | ✓ |
| 67. Wave, tidal, other marine renewables | Tidal stream? Could be compatible with proper management, depending on the devices to be used | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 68. Current oil and gas fields including pipelines | n/a | | | |
| 69. Prospecting for oil and gas | n/a | | | |
| 70. Charter boating | Potential angling honeypot Low impact activity | ? ✓ | ? | |
| 71. Small scale marine industries | n/a | | | |
| Fishing (7) | | | | |
| 72. Mobile gear fishing (demersal fishing e.g. bottom trawling) | | | | |
| 73. Mobile gear fishing (pelagic fishing e.g. mid-water trawling) | | ✓ | | |
| 74. Static gear fishing (eg potting, creeling, various netting, long-line) | Honeypot for static gear? Scour, line damage, drag damage | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 75. Scallop dredging | | | | |
| 76. Inshore shellfisheries (e.g. whelks, cockles, mussels, clams). | See habitat 1 | | | |
| 77. Mariculture | | | | |
| 78. Migrating game fish (e.g. haaf netting) | n/a | | | |
| Recreation (6) | | | | |
| 79. Recreational sea angling (shore and boat). | No impact Anchorage = detrimental impact in high use areas | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 80. Dive sites - Pleasure diving | Infrequent diving activity | ✓ | | |

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|---|--|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| 81. Small near shore craft /water sports (eg surfing, powerboats, jet skis, canoe, kayak, kite surfing) | Power boats can cause damage in shallow waters – propeller and sediment disturbance (?) Compatible if regulated | | ✓ | |
| 82. Yachting/recreational boating (Yachting, sailing, cruising) | Just sail high above no damage | ✓ | | |
| 83. Wildlife watching from craft (bird, seal, shark) | Just sail high above no damage | ✓ | | |
| 84. Recreation and tourism generally | Energy of system makes low use + impact | ✓ | | |
| Other key activities (6) | | | | |
| 85. Marine nature and geological conservation | Contribute to recovery potential of marine ecosystem as a whole | ✓ | | |
| 86. Marine research activities | Fisheries research – little or no activity Research groups may want to do small beam trawls, grab samples, anchor ship for survey, anchor fixed buoys with scientific equipment and deploy bottom-mounted equipment. Bottom mounted equipment may need to be recovered by dragging with wire if acoustic releases fail. | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 87. Marine historic and archaeological features | Possibility of wrecks – probably suffering from scour | | ✓ | |
| 88. Water quality and management (outfalls, discharge and abstraction) | Pollution a potential problem to all assets in any habitat | | ✓ | |
| 89. MOD activities | Vessels unlikely to operate close to this category unless on a directed task (police caution) | ✓ | | |
| 90. Navigation and safety | GPS / BEACONS used | ✓ | | |

2.2.4 Habitat Type: 4. Moderate Energy Circalittoral Rock

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|---|--|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| Industry cluster 1 (5) | | | | |
| 91. Shipping and shipping channels | As they operate on the surface and controls are already in place. | ✓ | | |
| 92. Ports and harbours | As too deep | ✓ | | |
| 93. Aggregate/mineral extraction. | Would not dredge | ✓ | | |
| 94. Dumping of dredge spoil and other licensed dumping areas | As long as it is understood – the effects of dumping on habitats | | ✓ | |
| 95. Sub sea cables | As management already in place | | ✓ | |
| Industry cluster 2 (6) | | | | |
| 96. Wind farms (current and proposed) | Round 3 | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 97. Wave, tidal, other marine renewables | Tidal stream also see H3 comment | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 98. Current oil and gas fields including pipelines | N/A -? pipelines | | | |
| 99. Prospecting for oil and gas | ? Pipelines but unlikely | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 100. Charter boating | ? Honeypot for angling Low impact activity | ? ✓ | ? | |
| 101. Small scale marine industries | N/A | | | |
| Fishing (7) | | | | |
| 102. Mobile gear fishing (demersal fishing e.g. bottom trawling) | | | | |
| 103. Mobile gear fishing (pelagic fishing e.g. mid-water trawling) | | ✓ | | |
| 104. Static gear fishing (eg potting, creeling, various netting, long-line) | Pot line scour can impact on key species – E.G. Ross Coral, Sea fans | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 105. Scallop dredging | | | | |
| 106. Inshore shellfisheries (e.g. whelks, cockles, mussels, clams). | See 1 | | | |
| 107. Mariculture | Site of some fish/algae mariculture anoxia, nutrient enrichment | | ✓ | |
| 108. Migrating game fish (e.g. haaf netting) | N/A | | | |
| Recreation (6) | | | | |
| 109. Recreational sea angling (shore and boat). | Not areas targeted Anchorage ⇒ detrimental impact in high use areas | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 110. Dive sites - Pleasure diving | Common habitat for diving. | ✓ | | |

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|--|---|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| | Localised impacts at high density | | | |
| 111. Small near shore craft /water sports (eg surfing, powerboats, jet skis, canoe, kayak, kite surfing) | Power boats can cause damage in shallow waters – propeller and sediment disturbance? Compatible If regulated | | ✓ | |
| 112. Yachting/recreational boating (Yachting, sailing, cruising) | | | | |
| 113. Wildlife watching from craft (bird, seal, shark) | Disturbance during breeding season must be considered | | ✓ | |
| 114. Recreation and tourism generally | | | | |
| Other key activities (6) | | | | |
| 115. Marine nature and geological conservation | Contribute to recovery potential of marine ecosystem as a whole | ✓ | | |
| 116. Marine research activities | Fisheries research – some activity very limited Research groups may want to do small beam trawls, grab samples, anchor ship for survey, anchor fixed buoys with scientific equipment and deploy bottom-mounted equipment. Bottom mounted equipment may need to be recovered by dragging with wire if acoustic releases fail. | | ✓ ✓ | |
| 117. Marine historic and archaeological features | Possibility of wrecks probably medium risk of scour | | ✓ | |
| 118. Water quality and management (outfalls, discharge and abstraction) | | | | |
| 119. MOD activities | | ✓ | | |
| 120. Navigation and safety | | ✓ | | |

2.2.5 Habitat Type: 5. Low Energy Circalittoral Rock

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|--|---|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| Industry cluster 1 (5) | | | | |
| 121. Shipping and shipping channels | As they operate on the surface and controls are already in place. | ✓ | | |
| 122. Ports and harbours | As too deep | ✓ | | |
| 123. Aggregate/mineral extraction. | I would not dredge | ✓ | | |
| 124. Dumping of dredge spoil and other licensed dumping areas | As long as it is understood – the effects of dumping on habitats | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 125. Sub sea cables | As management already in place | | ✓ | |
| Industry cluster 2 (6) | | | | |
| 126. Wind farms (current and proposed) | | | | |
| 127. Wave, tidal, other marine renewables | Unlikely to occur here | | | |
| 128. Current oil and gas fields including pipelines | | | | |
| 129. Prospecting for oil and gas | | | | |
| 130. Charter boating | Low impact activity | ✓ | | |
| 131. Small scale marine industries | | | | |
| Fishing (7) | | | | |
| 132. Mobile gear fishing (demersal fishing e.g. bottom trawling) | | | | |
| 133. Mobile gear fishing (pelagic fishing e.g. mid-water trawling) | | | | |
| 134. Static gear fishing (eg potting, creeling, various netting, long-line) | Pot/line drag/scour | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 135. Scallop dredging | | | | |
| 136. Inshore shellfisheries (e.g. whelks, cockles, mussels, clams). | Intertidal activity so N/A | | | |
| 137. Mariculture | Site of some fish/algae mariculture anoxia, nutrient enrichment | | | ✓ |
| 138. Migrating game fish (e.g. haaf netting) | N/A | | | |
| Recreation (6) | | | | |
| 139. Recreational sea angling (shore and boat). | Species removal No impact Area under high use has detrimental impact due to anchorage | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 140. Dive sites - Pleasure diving | No removal of material Impacts only at extreme diver densities. Major habitat for diving | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 141. Small near shore craft /water sports (eg surfing, powerboats, jet skis, canoe, kayak, kite surfing) | Power boats can cause damage in shallow waters – propeller and sediment disturbance (?) Compatible if regulated | | ✓ | |

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|---|---|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| 142. Yachting/recreational boating (Yachting, sailing, cruising) | | | | |
| 143. Wildlife watching from craft (bird, seal, shark) | | | | |
| 144. Recreation and tourism generally | | | | |
| Other key activities (6) | | | | |
| 145. Marine nature and geological conservation | Contribute to recovery potential of marine ecosystem as a whole | ✓ | | |
| 146. Marine research activities | Fisheries research – very little activity Research groups may want to do small beam trawls, grab samples, anchor ship for survey, anchor fixed buoys with scientific equipment and deploy bottom-mounted equipment. Bottom mounted equipment may need to be recovered by dragging with wire if acoustic releases fail. | | ✓ ✓ | |
| 147. Marine historic and archaeological features | Possibility of wrecks, probably safe <u>in situ</u> | ✓ | | |
| 148. Water quality and management (outfalls, discharge and abstraction) | | | | |
| 149. MOD activities | Vessels unlikely to operate close to this category unless on a directed task (police caution) | ✓ | | |
| 150. Navigation and safety | GPS / BEACONS used | ✓ | | |

2.2.6 Habitat Type: 6. Subtidal Coarse Sediment

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|---|---|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| Industry cluster 1 (5) | | | | |
| 151. Shipping and shipping channels | As they operate on the surface and controls are already in place Dredging of channels damaging → release of invasive species from ballast | ✓ | | |
| 152. Ports and harbours | Depending on depth Pollution of sediments | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 153. Aggregate/mineral extraction. | Licence if of good quality Important herring spawning sites incompatible with aggregate extraction | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 154. Dumping of dredge spoil and other licensed dumping areas | As long as it is understood – the effects of dumping on habitats Smothering ↓ primary production, loss of species | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 155. Sub sea cables | Management already in place | | ✓ | |
| Industry cluster 2 (6) | | | | |
| 156. Wind farms (current and proposed) | In terms of impact on seabed, these are the types of habitats where windfarms are located. → replacement of sediment with hard structure – disturbance, species loss Management measures need to be in place for any protected species e.g. birds | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 157. Wave, tidal, other marine renewables | Devices are already in these habitats. There are changes, but they are not always negative. Impacts should be picked up in the planning process. | | ✓ | |
| 158. Current oil and gas fields including pipelines | | | | |
| 159. Prospecting for oil and gas | (noise disturbance damage to fish cetaceans) Managed | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 160. Charter boating | Anchoring effect Low impact activity | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 161. Small scale marine industries | | | | |
| Fishing (7) | | | | |
| 162. Mobile gear fishing (demersal fishing e.g. bottom trawling) | Trawl gear area Severe habitat damage and loss Drift netting area – low impact | ✓ | | ✓ |
| 163. Mobile gear fishing (pelagic fishing e.g. mid-water trawling) | Pelagic – no impact Species loss, ghost fishing | ✓ | | ✓ |
| 164. Static gear fishing (eg potting, creeling, various netting, long-line) | Fixed gear area – pots/creels Gill nets etc – low impact Migratory species disrupted | ✓ | | ✓ |
| 165. Scallop dredging | Important terrain for scallop dredging Massive habitat loss | | ✓ | ✓ |

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|--|---|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| 166. Inshore shellfisheries (e.g. whelks, cockles, mussels, clams). | Habitat loss | | | ✓ |
| 167. Mariculture | Fish diseases Invasive species Nutrification of sediment | | | |
| 168. Migrating game fish (e.g. haaf netting) | N/A | | | |
| Recreation (6) | | | | |
| 169. Recreational sea angling (shore and boat). | No significant impact Moorings and anchors? (across all habitat types) | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 170. Dive sites - Pleasure diving | | | | |
| 171. Small near shore craft /water sports (eg surfing, powerboats, jet skis, canoe, kayak, kite surfing) | Power craft can cause disturbance in shallow waters. Power boats can cause damage in shallow waters – propeller and sediment disturbance? Compatible if regulated. | | ✓ ✓ | |
| 172. Yachting/recreational boating (Yachting, sailing, cruising) | No impact | ✓ | | |
| 173. Wildlife watching from craft (bird, seal, shark) | No impact | ✓ | | |
| 174. Recreation and tourism generally | Activity dependent | | ✓ | |
| Other key activities (6) | | | | |
| 175. Marine nature and geological conservation | Areas of patterned ground need to be protected. Contribute to recovery potential of marine ecosystem as a whole | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 176. Marine research activities | Research groups may want to do small beam trawls, grab samples, anchor ship for survey, anchor fixed buoys with scientific equipment and deploy bottom-mounted equipment. Bottom mounted equipment may need to be recovered by dragging with wire if acoustic releases fail. Fisheries research – lots of activity | | ✓ ✓ | |
| 177. Marine historic and archaeological features | Major destruction caused by aggregate extraction. Archaeological assets sparse but of global significance (v. early human interaction with climate change). Sediment itself is compatible. | ✓ | | |
| 178. Water quality and management (outfalls, discharge and abstraction) | | | | |
| 179. MOD activities | Shoal areas are traditionally avoided, with medium power sonar activity giving prior warning to ship. | ✓ | | |
| 180. Navigation and safety | Shoal areas to be avoided. May be buoys/markers (minimal impact) but see 'Dredge Spoil'. | | ✓ | |

2.2.7 Habitat Type: 7. Subtidal Sands

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|---|--|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| Industry cluster 1 (5) | | | | |
| 181. Shipping and shipping channels | As they operate on the surface and controls are already in place. | ✓ | | |
| 182. Ports and harbours | Depending on depth. Must ensure growth of Port of Liverpool to support driver of economic growth in North West is not hindered. (also applies to Barrow shipyard) Pollution of sediments | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 183. Aggregate/mineral extraction. | If suitable area | | ✓ | |
| 184. Dumping of dredge spoil and other licensed dumping areas | As long as it is understood – the effects of dumping on habitats Same as coarse sediments | | ✓ ✓ | ✓ |
| 185. Sub sea cables | Management already in place | | ✓ | |
| Industry cluster 2 (6) | | | | |
| 186. Wind farms (current and proposed) | See comments from habitat Replacement / destruction of habitat replaced with giant hard surface | | | ✓ |
| 187. Wave, tidal, other marine renewables | | | | |
| 188. Current oil and gas fields including pipelines | | | | |
| 189. Prospecting for oil and gas | Noise disturbance damage to fish and cetaceans | | | ✓ |
| 190. Charter boating | No impact Low impact activity | ✓ ✓ | | |
| 191. Small scale marine industries | | | | |
| Fishing (7) | | | | |
| 192. Mobile gear fishing (demersal fishing e.g. bottom trawling) | Important terrain for queen scallop trawling Trawl / mobile gear – area of operation (bottom trawl) Drift netting operation Severe habitat loss and disturbance | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ ✓ |
| 193. Mobile gear fishing (pelagic fishing e.g. mid-water trawling) | Pelagic no impact Loss / extinction target species ghost fishing | ✓ | | ✓ |
| 194. Static gear fishing (eg potting, creeling, various netting, long-line) | Static gear – use of anchors (fixed) Potting, creels use of area Disruption of migration salmon / eels. Species impact on target. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 195. Scallop dredging | Slightly coarse sand important for scallops On sand? | | ✓ | |
| 196. Inshore shellfisheries (e.g. whelks, cockles, mussels, clams). | Suction dredging from boats (management via rotation) Massive disturbance, increases turbidity, decreases production, local species extinction | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 197. Mariculture | | | | |

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|--|---|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| 198. Migrating game fish (e.g. haaf netting) | N/A | | | |
| Recreation (6) | | | | |
| 199. Recreational sea angling (shore and boat). | Non intrusive Good for shore angling / inshore boat | ✓ ✓ | | |
| 200. Dive sites - Pleasure diving | No removal of material (?) rare to use | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 201. Small near shore craft /water sports (eg surfing, powerboats, jet skis, canoe, kayak, kite surfing) | Power boats can cause damage in shallow waters – propeller and sediment disturbance (?) Compatible if regulated | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 202. Yachting/recreational boating (Yachting, sailing, cruising) | | | | |
| 203. Wildlife watching from craft (bird, seal, shark) | | | | |
| 204. Recreation and tourism generally | | | | |
| Other key activities (6) | | | | |
| 205. Marine nature and geological conservation | Contribute to recovery potential of marine ecosystem as a whole (true across all habitats) | ✓ | | |
| 206. Marine research activities | Fisheries Research – lots of activity Research groups may want to do small beam trawls, grab samples, anchor ship for survey, anchor fixed buoys with scientific equipment and deploy bottom-mounted equipment. Bottom mounted equipment may need to be recovered by dragging with wire if acoustic releases fail. | | ✓ ✓ | |
| 207. Marine historic and archaeological features | Possibilities of drowned landscapes and activity areas largely unknown locations | ✓ | | |
| 208. Water quality and management (outfalls, discharge and abstraction) | | | | |
| 209. MOD activities | Vessels unlikely to operate close to this category unless on a directed task (police caution) | ✓ | | |
| 210. Navigation and safety | GPS / BEACONS used | ✓ | | |

2.2.8 Habitat Type: 8. Subtidal Mud

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|---|--|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| Industry cluster 1 (5) | | | | |
| 211. Shipping and shipping channels | As they operate on the surface and controls are already in place. | ✓ | | |
| 212. Ports and harbours | Depending on depth Invasive species | | ✓ | |
| 213. Aggregate/mineral extraction. | Would not dredge | ✓ | | |
| 214. Dumping of dredge spoil and other licensed dumping areas | As long as it is understood – the effects of dumping on habitats Pollution (HMs, radiation, organics) Increase in turbidity = decrease in productivity | | ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ |
| 215. Sub sea cables | Management already in place | | ✓ | |
| Industry cluster 2 (6) | | | | |
| 216. Wind farms (current and proposed) | replacement of sediment with hard structure – disturbance, species loss Sediment loss. Replacement of habitat of subtidal mud with hard structures. Soft sediment species loss and disturbance | | | ✓ |
| 217. Wave, tidal, other marine renewables | | | | |
| 218. Current oil and gas fields including pipelines | | | | |
| 219. Prospecting for oil and gas | Noise disturbance damage to fish and cetaceans | | | ✓ |
| 220. Charter boating | No impact Low impact activity | ✓ ✓ | | |
| 221. Small scale marine industries | | | | |
| Fishing (7) | | | | |
| 222. Mobile gear fishing (demersal fishing e.g. bottom trawling) | Mobile fishing very evident in area – both Cumbrian coast and west of IoM. Mobile gear trawled along bottom of sea bed – trawl doors contact Drift netting Massive habitat damage and disturbance – severe | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ ✓ |
| 223. Mobile gear fishing (pelagic fishing e.g. mid-water trawling) | Pelagic no impact | ✓ | | |
| 224. Static gear fishing (eg potting, creeling, various netting, long-line) | Fixed nets with anchors – it doesn't disrupt seabed Potting | ✓ ✓ | | |
| 225. Scallop dredging | | | | |
| 226. Inshore shellfisheries (e.g. whelks, cockles, mussels, clams). | Foreshore gathering | ✓ | | |
| 227. Mariculture | | | | |
| 228. Migrating game fish (e.g. haaf netting) | n/a | | | |
| Recreation (6) | | | | |

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|--|---|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| 229. Recreational sea angling (shore and boat). | Non intrusive Good habitat for flat fish species | ✓ ✓ | | |
| 230. Dive sites - Pleasure diving | Non removal of material Rare to use | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 231. Small near shore craft /water sports (eg surfing, powerboats, jet skis, canoe, kayak, kite surfing) | Non intrusive Power boats can cause damage in shallow waters – propeller and sediment disturbance (?) Compatible if regulated | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 232. Yachting/recreational boating (Yachting, sailing, cruising) | Anchor? | | ✓ | |
| 233. Wildlife watching from craft (bird, seal, shark) | Non intrusive | ✓ | | |
| 234. Recreation and tourism generally | Various activity | | ✓ | |
| Other key activities (6) | | | | |
| 235. Marine nature and geological conservation | Contribute to recovery potential of marine ecosystem as a whole | ✓ | | |
| 236. Marine research activities | Fisheries research – lots of activity Research groups may want to do small beam trawls, grab samples, anchor ship for survey, anchor fixed buoys with scientific equipment and deploy bottom-mounted equipment. Bottom mounted equipment may need to be recovered by dragging with wire if acoustic releases fail. | | ✓ ✓ | |
| 237. Marine historic and archaeological features | High potential for important archaeological assets in excellent preservation (drowned landscapes/sites) | ✓ | | |
| 238. Water quality and management (outfalls, discharge and abstraction) | Potential issues with discharges if dispersion is not appropriate Potential pollution | | ✓ ✓ | |
| 239. MOD activities | Surface activity unlikely to have any effect. Sub-surface (towed bodies or submarines) will avoid area | ✓ | | |
| 240. Navigation and safety | GPS / BEACONS used | ✓ | | |

2.2.9 Habitat Type: 9. Subtidal Mixed Sediment

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|---|--|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| Industry cluster 1 (5) | | | | |
| 241. Shipping and shipping channels | As they operate on the surface and controls are already in place. | ✓ | | |
| 242. Ports and harbours | Depending on depth Pollution of sediment, invasive species | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 243. Aggregate/mineral extraction. | If the mixed sediment is of quality then there will be a licence application | | ✓ | |
| 244. Dumping of dredge spoil and other licensed dumping areas | As long as it is understood – the effects of dumping on habitats Massive smothering ↓productivity Pollution (heavy metals + organics + radiation) | | | ✓ |
| 245. Sub sea cables | Management already in place | | ✓ | |
| Industry cluster 2 (6) | | | | |
| 246. Wind farms (current and proposed) | In terms of impact on seabed these are the types of habitats where windfarms are located. Management measures need to be in place for any protected measures (e.g. birds) Habitat loss and replacement. Applies to all habitats – must ensure that anti-offshore renewable lobby does not hindered meeting UK renewable targets/carbon reduction targets | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 247. Wave, tidal, other marine renewables | | | | |
| 248. Current oil and gas fields including pipelines | | | | |
| 249. Prospecting for oil and gas | Noise disturbance damage to fish and cetaceans | | | ✓ |
| 250. Charter boating | Anchoring effect? Low impact activity | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 251. Small scale marine industries | | | | |
| Fishing (7) | | | | |
| 252. Mobile gear fishing (demersal fishing e.g. bottom trawling) | Trawls cause sig habitat disturbance massive bycatch Loss of structural diversity | | | ✓ |
| 253. Mobile gear fishing (pelagic fishing e.g. mid-water trawling) | Target species loss? | | | |
| 254. Static gear fishing (eg potting, creeling, various netting, long-line) | Non in subtidal? | | | |
| 255. Scallop dredging | On mixed sediments? | | | |
| 256. Inshore shellfisheries (e.g. whelks, cockles, mussels, clams). | ≠subtidal | | | |

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|--|---|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| 257. Mariculture | | | | |
| 258. Migrating game fish (e.g. haaf netting) | N/A | | | |
| Recreation (6) | | | | |
| 259. Recreational sea angling (shore and boat). | Dependent on type | | ✓ | |
| 260. Dive sites - Pleasure diving | Dependent on depth (?) Rare to use | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 261. Small near shore craft /water sports (eg surfing, powerboats, jet skis, canoe, kayak, kite surfing) | Minimal physical impact Power boats can cause damage in shallow waters – propeller and sediment disturbance? Compatible If regulated | | ✓ ✓ | |
| 262. Yachting/recreational boating (Yachting, sailing, cruising) | Anchor? | | ✓ | |
| 263. Wildlife watching from craft (bird, seal, shark) | Non intrusive | | ✓ | |
| 264. Recreation and tourism generally | | | | |
| Other key activities (6) | | | | |
| 265. Marine nature and geological conservation | Contribute to recovery potential of marine ecosystem as a whole | ✓ | | |
| 266. Marine research activities | Fisheries activity – lots of activity using commercial fishing gear Research groups may want to do small beam trawls, grab samples, anchor ship for survey, anchor fixed buoys with scientific equipment and deploy bottom-mounted equipment. Bottom mounted equipment may need to be recovered by dragging with wire if acoustic releases fail. | | ✓ ✓ | |
| 267. Marine historic and archaeological features | Good potential for well preserved arch'l assets preserved in situ (drowned landscapes and wrecks) | ✓ | | |
| 268. Water quality and management (outfalls, discharge and abstraction) | Pollution potentially damaging for arch' assets Discharges will affect sensitive species, contaminates will accumulate in sediment | | ✓ | |
| 269. MOD activities | Surface activity unlikely to have any affect subsurface (towed bodies or submarines) will avoid area | ✓ | | |
| 270. Navigation and safety | GPS/beacons used | ✓ | | |

2.2.10 Habitat Type: 10 Low Energy Infralittoral Rock

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|---|---|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| Industry cluster 1 (5) | | | | |
| 271. Shipping and shipping channels | As they operate on the surface and controls are already in place. | ✓ | | |
| 272. Ports and harbours | Depending on depth | | ✓ | |
| 273. Aggregate/mineral extraction. | Would not dredge in the area | | ✓ | |
| 274. Dumping of dredge spoil and other licensed dumping areas | As long as it is understood – the effects of dumping on habitats | | ✓ | |
| 275. Sub sea cables | Management already in place | | ✓ | |
| Industry cluster 2 (6) | | | | |
| 276. Wind farms (current and proposed) | replacement of sediment with hard structure – disturbance, species loss Ok with suitable site assessment and management and mitigation. This applies to all habitats – not ruling out windfarms anywhere | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 277. Wave, tidal, other marine renewables | | | | |
| 278. Current oil and gas fields including pipelines | | | | |
| 279. Prospecting for oil and gas | | | | |
| 280. Charter boating | Low impact activity | ✓ | | |
| 281. Small scale marine industries | Shipways, marinas etc. | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Fishing (7) | | | | |
| 282. Mobile gear fishing (demersal fishing e.g. bottom trawling) | | | | |
| 283. Mobile gear fishing (pelagic fishing e.g. mid-water trawling) | | | | |
| 284. Static gear fishing (eg potting, creeling, various netting, long-line) | | | | |
| 285. Scallop dredging | | | | |
| 286. Inshore shellfisheries (e.g. whelks, cockles, mussels, clams). | | | | |
| 287. Mariculture | | | | |
| 288. Migrating game fish (e.g. haaf netting) | n/a | | | |
| Recreation (6) | | | | |
| 289. Recreational sea angling (shore and boat). | Sustainable levels | | ✓ | |
| 290. Dive sites - Pleasure diving | High turbidity – poor visibility Vis is environmentally determined – limited surface sediments. Training (major habitat) | ✓ | | ✓ |

| What effect might this sea use have on this broad scale habitat type? | | Green | Yellow | Red |
|--|--|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | Compatible | Compatible with Mgmt | Not compatible |
| 291. Small near shore craft /water sports (eg surfing, powerboats, jet skis, canoe, kayak, kite surfing) | Power boats can cause damage in shallow waters – propeller and sediment disturbance (?) Compatible if regulated | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 292. Yachting/recreational boating (Yachting, sailing, cruising) | Anchoring needs management | | ✓ | |
| 293. Wildlife watching from craft (bird, seal, shark) | No impact | ✓ | | |
| 294. Recreation and tourism generally | | | | |
| Other key activities (6) | | | | |
| 295. Marine nature and geological conservation | Contribute to recovery potential of marine ecosystem as a whole | ✓ | | |
| 296. Marine research activities | Fisheries activity – no impact Research groups may want to do small beam trawls, grab samples, anchor ship for survey, anchor fixed buoys with scientific equipment and deploy bottom-mounted equipment. Bottom mounted equipment may need to be recovered by dragging with wire if acoustic releases fail. | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 297. Marine historic and archaeological features | Possibility of wrecks. Probably ok if in situ | ✓ | | |
| 298. Water quality and management (outfalls, discharge and abstraction) | Potential impacts for species present in those habitats | | ✓ | |
| 299. MOD activities | Surface activity unlikely to have any affect subsurface (towed bodies or submarines) will avoid area | ✓ | | |
| 300. Navigation and safety | GPS/beacons used | ✓ | | |

3 Mapping Activity

3.1 Ecological Network Guidance Presentation – Q & A

Q UNIS System Level 3 – do our percentages relate to this level? Have we taken into account existing uses such as windfarms?

A Seeking synergy between uses. Therefore a wind farm may/could potentially be included in a protected area. Also the Guidance allows for reference sites to assess MCZ performance.

3.2 Mapping activity Q & A

Q Is it our aim to fulfil only the minimum requirement or go beyond that?

A We're at an early stage – to start the communication and to get an idea of space for the minimum – later we will consider the network

Q Is data for maps known to be factual?

A Based on coarse scale surveys from various sources/agencies with some predictive tools used to arrive at the current maps. It is iterative and will develop further as data comes in

Q Query regarding holders of information and area of responsibility i.e. artificially managing Irish Sea as an isolated area

A Artificial but there is a national process to stitch the various project areas together

Q Likewise for other countries i.e. Ireland and the Isle of Man?

A Will be resolved at a national level but process not defined as yet

Q How do percentages for protection work?

A Habitat numbers relate to habitats within our project area only, not areas outside of Irish Sea project areas and represent the minimum figure

4 Discussing and exploring places



! Please note well !

For this activity, people were divided into six groups of about 7 people. Each group was made up of a mix of people from different sea uses and interests but did not include the full spectrum of interests. Each group used a large map as an aid to discussion. These were the very early and first discussions about places. The discussions included areas that some sea uses would find very problematic for MCZ and places that would cause fewer difficulties. All locations were sketched onto the maps so they could be linked to the discussion about that area.

When the six maps were overlaid there were some locations which several groups thought might be worth considering further - either because of their distance from other possible locations, wildlife interest, or because they were (as far as that particular group was aware) further away from less compatible sea uses and so would have less negative socio economic impact.

We have not included the resulting maps in this report because they make the document too large to send to people electronically. We are considering the best way of making them available to SG members without running risks that non-SG stakeholders could misunderstand them.



4.1 Group 1 Discussion Map

| Location Number |  Benefits of this location and why here? |  Disbenefits of this location why not here? | C Other comments |
|-----------------|---|---|------------------|
| 1.1 | - Joined to location 9.4 and 2.1 for ease of policing | - | - |
| 2.1 | - Joined to 9.4 | - | - |
| 3.1 | - Covered by blue and green also (6.5 and 4.2) | - | - |
| 4.1 | - Out of the way | - | - |
| 4.2 | - Joins with other sites | - | - |
| 5.1 | - | - Area of fishing – least worst location | - |
| 6.1 | - Major fishery beds | - | - |
| 6.2 | - Area of least conflict for scallopers | - Within third round of windfarms – high conflict | - |
| 6.3 | - Well out of the way of most conflict - Out of the way of the wind farm | - | - |
| 6.4 | - Out of the way | - | - |
| 6.5 | - Covering a different habitat and creates good coverage | - | - |

dialogue matters

| | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|
| 6.6 | – Good as reference for oceanographic research | – | – |
| 6.7 | – Area of least conflict | – | – |
| 7.1 | – Joins up with habitat 6 – Out of the way | – | – Would create a very large no take zone |
| 7.2 | – Good for research | – | – |
| 7.3 | – Good for research | – | – |
| 7.4 | – Interesting geological features | – | – High value for fishing |
| 7.5 | – | – | – Will interfere with fishing |
| 8.1 | – Good reference point for research – Outside of oil and gas area | – | – |
| 8.2 | – Good for Isle of Man research | – | – Near scallops |
| 8.3 | – Joins with adjacent sand habitat | – | – |
| 9.1 | – Area of least conflict | – | – |
| 9.2 | – Outside of cable routes but nearby | – | – |
| 9.3 | – Joins the other two sites, so easier to enforce. Less conflict | – | – Near high value fishery |
| 9.4 | – Lower conflict | – | – |



4.2 Group 2 Discussion Map

| Location Number |  Benefits of this location and why here? |  Disbenefits of this location why not here? | C Other comments |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------|
| 1.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Already some EU designation in that area – SACs, SPAs – Morecambe Bay could be an opportunity to rationalise the existing designations – complicated into a single MCZ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Management measures could affect seed mussel supply and cockle, mussel fisheries. Also oyster and mussel farming (as opposed to fishing) | – |
| 2.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Comment as 1.1. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – As 1.1 – The management measures, rather than the designation, are the critical factor. This is a key point. | – |
| 3.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – This is the only option. – Links into a very large Welsh structure so could be a unified zone | – | – |
| 4.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Links to 3.1 to make a bigger zone – so easier to | – | – |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|---|---|
| | manage. – Potential links into Welsh zone | | |
| 4.2 | – Links into adjacent zones for other types of habitats i.e. 7.1, 9.3 etc. | – | – |
| 5.1 | – Covers the whole size that it needs to. – Part of bigger zone (8.1). Could be included with 8.1 | – See comment for 8.1 | – |
| 6.1 | – Links into adjacent zones (9.3, 7.3). Bigger zones are easier to enforce | – | – |
| 6.2 | – Links to adjacent zones | – Within round two wind farm zone – Whelk potting – UK industry | – |
| 6.3 | – Links to adjacent zones | – Whelk potting – UK industry | – |
| 6.6, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9 | – Based on connectivity and replicability principle – 6.8 and 6.9 build on the existing 6.2 site | – Maybe too fragmented – need to have larger areas of MCZs for conservation benefits | – |
| 7.1 and 7.1a | – Potential links with Northern Irish waters – Large sites are easier to enforce. This is a significant consideration | – Major sole and plaice fishery – especially for beam trawling. – Belgian, UK and Irish fleet operate here – Cuts into the round three wind farm area | – |
| 7.2 | – Already an SPA – Potential links to Welsh areas – Low fishing levels compared to elsewhere | – Impact on shipping to the port of Liverpool and its ability to grow – Burbo bank wind farm in this area – Needs to take into account the eastern margin of marine aggregate deposits NW of Dee estuary – Some inshore trawling – Some inshore skate netting | – |
| 7.3 | – Proximity to Welsh area so potential link up | – Significant fishery for Belgians (but less so than 7.1) | – |
| 8.1 | – Large sites easier to enforce – links to 7.1 | – Impact on fishing. Cod, haddock, nephrops. – NI, Irish fishermen impacted – Some beam trawling and potentially UK (but not for last three years) | – |
| 8.2 | – No impact on aggregates and windfarms – Avoids shipping lanes | – Some UK-based trawling by small boats (inshore) for plaice. – Areas outside 12nm – the Belgian's fish here. – Covers the entire area for the Fleetwood-based inshore fishermen | – |
| 9.1 | – Links with 8.2 – larger zones are easier to enforce | – See comments for 8.2 | – |
| 9.2 | – Links to 7.2. See comments for 7.2 | – See comments for 7.2 | – |
| 9.3 | – Less fishing activity than other similar habitat areas | – Scallop fishery – UK-based | – |

| | | | |
|------|--|---|---|
| 10.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An area that is already heavily protected - Avoids putting a zone in the other purple area, which is close to Liverpool Docks. This would harm investment in the port, with huge potential costs to entire NW economy | - | - |
|------|--|---|---|



4.3 Group 3 Discussion Map

| Location Number |  Benefits of this location and why here? |  Disbenefits of this location why not here? | C Other comments |
|-----------------|--|---|------------------|
| 1.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only large enough area to be viable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Major intertidal fisheries area - Mussel seeds – need to dredge on rocks to recover so the zone would close down the shellfisheries industry in the bay (Morecambe) | - |
| 1.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.1 is already protected for reef interest feature in the Morecambe Bay SAC – the site needed to move | - | - |
| 2.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lune Deep – important geomorphological feature - Co-exists with part of a new SAC (reef interest) | - | - |
| 3.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only realistic site in terms of size | - | - |
| 4.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Connects to site 9.2 | - | - |
| 4.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Connects to site 3.1 | - | - |
| 5.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only realistic site, and forms a continuation with the mud sites (8.4 and 8.5) | - | - |
| 6.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Covers most of the habitat and smaller areas of others | - | - |
| 6.10 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May give added conservation benefit (reef features; Maryport Roads – Eric Perkins’ research) | - | - |
| 6.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good coverage and connects to site 6.1 | - | - |
| 6.3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clean / clear area of habitat | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the middle of the round three wind farm area of search - Will this MCZ be compatible with windfarms – opportunity for co-location? - Don’t want to exclude wind farm development | - |
| 6.4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Even coverage in the study area introduced by this site | - | - |
| 6.5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further coverage in the study area introduced by | - | - |

| | | | |
|---------------|---|--|--|
| | this site | | |
| 7.1 | – Adjoining to 6.5 and 6.6 – a multi-habitat zone | – | – |
| 7.2 | – To avoid conflict with fishers | – | – Need to check whether different types of windfarms are compatible with MCZs. Some can be a large platform, whereas others can be individual turbines, with a lower footprint |
| 7.3 | – Contributes to a mixed habitat site | – | – |
| 7.5 | – Burbo Bank – compatible with windfarms? | – | – |
| 7.6 | – Continuity of 8.2, 8.7, 6.7 – Multi-habitat MCZ that could act as a reference area | – | – |
| 7.7 | – Ensures connectivity with 7.6 and gives some protection in the north part of the project area | – | – |
| 8.1 | – Coincides with deep muds which are on the FOCI list | – Prawn fishing and dredging in this area – Commercially important prawn fishing – Need to take into account the gear types used | – |
| 8.2 | – Already some fishing restrictions so could have limited impact – Association with oil and gas fields | – | – |
| 8.3 | – Shell flats – potential SAC | – Not actually a mud habitat! Sandy habitat in Shell Flats | – Need to check UKSeaMap10 data |
| 8.4 | – Connectivity with eastern muds in the project area and Isle of Man and NI MPAs | – Reliant on management of other devolved administrations (IoM) | – Need to include the habitat data from the other areas (devolved admins) for context |
| 8.5 | – Adjoining 8.4 – larger zones = more effective | – | – |
| 8.6 | – Connecting to 8.4 and 8.5 | – | – |
| 8.7, 8.8, 8.9 | – Build onto existing identified sites | – | – |
| 9.1 | – Connects to 6.6, 6.5, 7.1 | – | – |
| 9.2 | – Placed there to meet the connectivity principle | – Again, compatibility with windfarms needs to be confirmed | – |
| 9.3 | – Connectivity with site 6.4 | – | – |
| 10.1 | – | – This is mapped as a low energy area! It is one of the | – Check UKSeaMap10 |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | highest energy environments in the Irish Sea – c. 8 knots adjacent to the Mersey estuary. – How come this is low energy infra-littoral rock? | |
|--|--|---|--|

4.4 Group 4 Discussion Map



| Location Number |  Benefits of this location and why here? |  Disbenefits of this location why not here? | C Other comments |
|-----------------|--|---|---|
| 1.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Biggest area of habitat – Little fishery or conflict | – | – |
| 2.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Location of other MCZs proposed – Extension of proposed SAC | – | – |
| 3.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Only bit to be covered | – | – |
| 4.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Adjacent to habitat 3 – Away from restricted wind farm construction | – | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Should we be trying to conserve areas which have economic benefits or ecology? |
| 4.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Small outcrop of Carboniferous limestone – scarcity value – Next to boundary of other area – Least contention out of other areas | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Could lose some dedicated area into Welsh | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Need to know what Wales will do and what management measures (especially with respect to limestone) |
| 4.3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Could be just outside of wind farm area – Not likely to be fished – Control area within wind farm | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Could be cable planned there next year | – |
| 5.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Biggest area – Only area of habitat | – | – |
| 6.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Allocates large area – Lots of wildlife – Covers many habitats | – | – |
| 6.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – No cables – Interesting glacial geomorphology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Precaution – could scallops be pushed into this area due to regulation? | – |
| 6.3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – As above – Grouping sites makes for easier management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – As above | – |
| 6.4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Connectivity – Easier to manage a large zone | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – May cut into some fishery areas | – |

dialogue matters

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | – Close to Cardigan Bay SAC | | |
| 6.5 | – Interesting research area – relic patterned ground – Proximity to other areas – easy management – Lots of seabird colonies could use it for foraging off coast of Anglesey | – Cables need to be maintained – currently buried | – Not sure of what measures would be put in which would impact cables |
| 6.6 | – No cables – Good bird foraging area | – No proper conservation for geomorphology | – |
| 6.7 | – Easy to manage as it's near the other areas – Potentially interesting pro-glacial features – No cables | – Known shipping line – would this affect? | – |
| 6.8 | – Still in geomorphological interest – Keeps main cabling area free | – One cable | – |
| 6.9 | – Hard ground | – Electric cable, but far down | – |
| 6.10, 6.11, 6.12 | – Easier management in a block | – | – |
| 6.17, 6.18, 6.19 | – Covers multiple habitats | – | – |
| 6.13, 6.14, 6.15, 6.16 | – Different habitats – Close proximity to Ramsey – Out of fishing areas | – | – |
| 7.1 | – Cable free – Wind farm free | – Prawn ground | – Depends on what you can do – management? |
| 7.2 | – Cable free – Wind farm free | – Possible problem for prawn fishing | – |
| 7.3 | – Cable free – Wind farm free | – Possible problem for prawn fishing | – |
| 7.4 | – Little impact on most | – | – |
| 7.5 | – Possible interesting peat beds – Part of SPA | – | – |
| 7.6 | – Uncontentious | – | – |
| 7.7, 7.8 | – Near other big area – easier to manage | – | – |
| 7.9 | – Connectivity stepping stone | – | – |
| 7.10, | – Potential for good geomorphology | – | – |

| | | | |
|----------|--|---|--|
| 7.11 | – To connect zones | | |
| 8.1 | – SSSI for black guillemot – not under bird directive – No cables | – Fishing activity | – What management would be needed? – What if any restrictions on fishing? |
| 8.2, 8.3 | – Already designated for offshore development therefore fishing area already disrupted | – | – |
| 8.4, 8.5 | – Fishing levels low – Proposed SAC | – | – |
| 8.6 | – Fishing not affected too much | – | – |
| 8.7 | – Connectivity – ideally this strip | – On edge of prawn fishing area | – Thin strip for connectivity across edge |
| 8.8 | – Avoids main fishing grounds | – cable | – |
| 8.9 | – Least worst option for this area of sea | – | – |
| 9.1 | – Protect patterned ground for research purposes – May already have restrictions on activity due to proposed wind farm | – Impact on fishing industry – Cables are going through the area and they need maintenance | – Don't have all of the info |
| 9.2 | – No cables – Virgin ground – Fisheries only 1 tow in this area per year – low impact – Overlaps on other types of habitats – Away from proposed windfarms | – May be pelagic fishery – Not sure about fishery levels (need data) | – Seasonal closures? |
| 9.3 | – Not too much disturbance – If constrained to have within 80 km – need stepping stones across | – None | – Is it pointless for designating for sake |
| 9.4 | – Convenient | – none | – |
| 9.5 | – In area of national importance for birds | – | – |
| 9.6 | – Reasonable sized area within European SPA? | – Cables | – |
| 9.7 | – Within proposed Liverpool Bay SPA – Unique substrate within the sand | – Maybe some cables | – |
| 10.1 | – Geomorphology interesting – Little conflict | – | – |



4.5 Group 5 Discussion Map

| Location Number |  Benefits of this location and why here? |  Disbenefits of this location why not here? | C Other comments |
|-----------------|--|---|---|
| 1.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Joins the interesting area referred to at 9.2 | – | – Accuracy of mapping because this area doesn't seem to be there |
| 2.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Advantage of placement in already protected area – Good habitat and enhanced biodiversity | – | – Accuracy of mapping and reference to the Morecambe Bay area, as experience suggest that that doesn't exist in 1.5 |
| 3.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Builds on 6.5 and 4.1 – Only bit of this habitat type | – | – |
| 4.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Adjacent to rare habitat in the Irish Sea | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Quite distanced from the core area for this habitat type (?) – but this could also be a positive | – |
| 4.2 | – | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Small area of habitat – nothing adjacent so less potential for spill-over from similar habitats – Too small based on our map | – |
| 4.3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Part of a bigger unit of this habitat so more opportunity to enhance what's there – 1. maintain | – | – |
| 5.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Important biodiversity on underwater mounds | – | – |
| 6.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Could potentially affect the Scottish; they primarily fish this area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – High scalloping activity in this area | – |
| 6.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – It's better than 6.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – ? may be an area that is used by international fishing vessels | – |
| 6.3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Area of protection | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – ? suspect that it is an area that may be fished by Irish vessels | – |
| 6.4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Far away from known activity | – | – |
| 6.5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Joined to an area of habitat 4, building on an area already suggested for protection – Easier to police (1) fewer large areas than many smaller areas. Easier to use also | – | – |
| 6.6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – As per comment for 6.5 | – | – |
| 6.7 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Single large block – potential to protect multiple habitats | – | – |
| 6.8 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Area that has extensive Sabellaria which will be a FOCI for the Irish Sea | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Area that is vital to Maryport fishing fleet. Site lies adjacent to this area | – |

dialogue matters

| | | | |
|---------------|--|--|--|
| 6.9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allows for connection to 6.8 and links to same habitat in Isle of Man waters | - | - |
| 6.10 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Larger areas considered to be better so may fit with proposed wind farm areas (also at 6.7) | - | - |
| 6.11 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Last piece – felt better to add to a larger area than have it stand alone | - | - |
| 7.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs protection more closely from inappropriate uses such as beam trawling - Avoids impacts on local fishing industry - Sole breeding area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was once heavily fished by international vessels - Potentially open to beam trawling | - |
| 7.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Area that is oil and gas production area, so no fishing in the vicinity of platforms / infrastructure - Important habitat for multiple species | - | - |
| 7.3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better to build on the large area of importance as described at 7.1 | - | - |
| 7.4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needed to provide connectivity between 7.1 and 7.2 - In the Morecambe gas area - Potential area of drowned landscape | - | - |
| 8.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Important submerged landscapes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vital area for Fleetwood inshore fisheries | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ? believe this inaccurate on the map |
| 8.2, 8.3, 8.4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wind farm sites approved area under construction | - | - |
| 8.5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wanted to include something on the other side of the Isle of Man - Lots of interesting species in this deeper water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very important nephrops grounds - Extensively fished by Northern Irish vessels and southern Ireland fleet | - |
| 8.6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Connects with 5.1 | - | - |
| 9.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Connects to 6.1 – more habitats but same protection zone | - | - |
| 9.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interesting area for supporting lots of underwater life - Incorporates Barrow offshore wind farm - Ability to incorporate other habitats because of variety in that area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lucrative trawling ground - Not in this actual orientation (?) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has possibility |
| 9.3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opportunity to bridge space between 6.7 and 4.2 | - | - |
| 10.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Offers protection for wrecks and recreational diving - Sailing - Angling – lots of activity - Popular for sea angling | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Popular for sea angling | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accuracy of this habitat |

4.6 Group 6 Discussion Map

| Location Number |  Benefits of this location and why here? |  Disbenefits of this location why not here? | C Other comments |
|--------------------|--|--|---|
| 1.1. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – One of only two patches – Adjacent to other protection inshore | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mussel fishery | – |
| 2.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Largest habitat patch inshore | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Potential impact on potting | – |
| 3.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Falls within a larger site and is part of a bigger patch which is in Welsh waters so may match up with a Welsh MCZ | – | – |
| 4.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Part of 8.6 so one larger site | – | – |
| 4.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Adjacent to 9.3 | – | – |
| 5.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Only patch | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Possibly pelagic fishery | – |
| 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Close inshore – with national fishing bylaws – Within 8 mile limit – easily enforceable and accessible for recreational use – No scalloping here | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Small patch – Various shell fishing here | – Add other areas |
| 6.5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Species records – large numbers (116) – Same benefits as 6.1 etc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 4 potting boats here – Submarines go through this area on delivery voyage – Could be objected to by fishermen if fishing banned from area (potting and gill netting) | – Lots of recreational angling here |
| 6.6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Large offshore area – so more species | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Heavily modified – Important fishery for scallops – and there is an international agreement as part of CFP | – |
| 6.7 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Potential for MCZ / wind farm mixed use, so less impact on fishing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – May not be such a good MCZ because quality of habitat impacted by wind farm | – |
| 6.8 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Large continuous area so benefits of the area | – | – It's in the middle of the area |
| 6.9, 6.10, 6.11 | – | – | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Celtic deep – A lot of merchant shipping – European beam trawlers – Concerns about displacement of fishing |

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | elsewhere |
| 7.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Want large uninterrupted area of habitat so good for conservation - Inshore easier for bylaws - Spawning area for fish | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In a main shipping channel for Liverpool - Potential displacement otter trawling depending on management | - |
| 7.3 | - | - A bit small | - |
| 7.4 | - | - | - |
| 7.5 | - | - | - |
| 7.6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Close to bass nursery - Inshore advantages | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If closed problem for cockle, mussel fisheries and drift net fishery | - |
| Habitat 8 in general | - | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General point that whole area important to prawn fishermen (east of Isle of Man) - Whole prawn / large prawns east of IoM - West of IoM get smaller prawns which are tailed for scampi - ? generalisations? |
| 8.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inshore so easier to manage | - | - |
| 8.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inshore so easier to manage | - | - |
| 8.3 | - | - Not acceptable as too important for fishery | - |
| 8.4 | - | - Too valuable for nephrops fishery | - |
| 8.5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adjacent to 7.5 - Not in main prawn fishery - Includes a wind farm | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Affected by wind farm therefore not a true mud habitat any longer (stone dumped on seabed) | - |
| 8.6, 8.7 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adjacent to 7.1 - Don't think it's fished as much - Inshore so easier to manage / police with bylaws | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Restricts fishing grounds - Possibly on navigation routes - Loads of telecom cables | - |
| 8.8, 8.9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sample of western mud - Potential adjacent to rocky habitats | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Important to NI fishermen - Fishing function devolved to NI government so it would mean that NI exec would have to agree management measures - In offshore area so harder to police - Would need agreement between NI, IoM, England to control the UK fleet | - |

| | | | |
|------|--|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If wanted to exclude fishing then would EU involvement continue? Otherwise discriminate against English/NI/IoM/Welsh fishermen | |
| 9.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A diverse inshore area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Question location being this habitat (6) think it's hard ground - Impacted by dredged spoil from Walney/Barrow channel (used by submarine) but dredged BAE - So view of fishermen will depend on management | - |
| 9.2 | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very important fishing ground but if part of wind farm area it's closed to fish anyway - But also if wind farm may not be good habitat | - |
| 9.3 | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is it in wind farm area? Same points re wind farm for 9.2 | - |
| 9.4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No views | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No views | - |
| 10.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only habitat patch - Easy to police | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mouth of Mersey – major shipping route for imports/exports - dredged | - |

5 Comment on maps

Visit each other's maps and register pros and cons

General comments relevant to all maps:



- Nature of fisheries in area means you can't make a judgement on where the MCZs should be located without knowing what the protection levels are likely to be (and management measures)
- Have to take into account the limitations of the knowledge of individuals. Applies to all maps
- All mapping would have benefited from wider picture of habitats in non-English waters and would help address connectivity issues
- Mud off Fleetwood isn't mud and the protection is wrong
- Query underlying data off Blackpool

5.1 Comments on Group 1's Discussion Map

| Location Number |  Benefits? |  Disbenefits? | C Other comments |
|-----------------|--|--|------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good map which removes conflict – particularly | - | - |



| | | | |
|-------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | between IoM and Anglesey | | |
| | – Big zones make management easier | – | – |
| | – Big areas are easier to police | – | – |
| | – Well joined up and grouped | – | – |
| | – | – Two mud habitats are quite different – need protection in both | – |
| 6.1 and 7.1 | – | – Major scalloping area in Wales | – |
| 6.2 | – | – | – MCZs and windfarms? |
| 6.2 and 8.1 | – | – | – Found around windfarms – potential for de facto MCZs – need to be clear about restrictions |
| 7.3 | – | – Area is partly an aggregate area. If it could be moved slightly to the east it would avoid corresponding with a submerged river valley (remove unnecessary sterilisation) | – |
| 7.3 | – | – Main fishing area for small net fishing and shell fishing | – |
| 7.3 | – | – Over aggregate area | – |
| 8.3 | – | – Very important grounds for Cumbrian fishermen and exclusively fished by inshore fishermen | – |
| 10.1 | – | – Major implications for the port of Liverpool. Cannot possible be implemented. | – |

5.2 Comments on Group 2's Discussion Map

| Location Number |  Benefits? |  Disbenefits? | C Other comments |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| | – Like the clustering because it makes management easier. Multiple habitats within the area and its often the interface between habitats that are the most diverse | – | – |
| | – | – | – A lot of areas are offshore, which will make scientific monitoring more difficult |
| 5.1 | – | – Areas are scattered. The alternative area to the north is currently being studied and has underwater mounds, so has lots of biodiversity | – |
| 6.1, 7.3, 4.2, | – | – All are major scalloping grounds for vessels from | – |

| | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 9.3 | | several places – Scottish, NI, English | |
| 7.2 | – | – Main fishing area for shellfish | – |
| 8.2 | – | – | – This is an area of existing gas fields, which could be good for exclusion areas around the field, but bad due to the impact of production operations e.g. vessel movements and discharges |
| 8.2 | – | – | – The pink area to the east of 8.2 appears strongly to be the wrong classification i.e. sand not mud. Incorrect data at this stage could lead to legal challenges later. This needs checking. |
| 8.2, 9.1 | – | – Is in the area for underwater communications cables – New windfarms could bring power cables as well – To repair cables they have to be pulled up, which can damage these areas of the seabed | – |
| 10.1 | – | – | This is not a low energy area – very strong tidal currents |



5.3 Comments on Group 3's Discussion Map

| Location Number |  Benefits? |  Disbenefits? | C Other comments |
|--|---|---|------------------|
| | – Avoided areas of contention adjacent to Wales – Like that areas are clumped – easier to manage | – | – |
| | – | – Too dispersed | – |
| 1.2 | – | – Controversial. Barrow fishermen key grounds. Will this affect static gear? Not applicable for mobile gear | – |
| 6.1 | – | – Major scallop fishery | – |
| 6.3, 4.1, 4.2 | – | – Wind farm areas are impacted/altered habitats and should not be chosen over more pristine sites | – |
| 6.3, 9.2 | – | – Synergies with round 3 wind farm developments | – |
| 7.6 | – | – Query scallop fisheries? Could be moved to work alongside? | – |
| 7.6, 6.7, 6.3, 9.2, 4.1, 7.2, 8.2, 8.7 | – | – Major transatlantic cables intersect | – |
| 8.1, 8.8 | – | – Main prawn ground | – |

dialogue matters

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|---|
| 8.1, 8.8 | – | – Extensive productive Nephrops grounds for Cumbrian and NI fleet | – |
| 8.2, 8.7 | – | – Existing Morecambe Bay oil/gas fields within the area. Provides conservation value but there are day to day operations which could cause disturbance | – |
| 8.4, 8.5 | – | – Adjacent to major Nephrops fisheries (and including) | – |
| 8.6, 8.9, 8.1, 8.8 | – | – Not compatible with major nephrops fisheries | – |
| 8.9, 8.6 | – | – Extensive nephrops grounds for Irish fleet | – |
| 10.1 | – | – If an MCZ were put there it would be a millstone around the port. More appropriate to designate in Morecambe Bay | – |
| 10.1 | – | – Negative impact on the port of Liverpool growth and then wider economic growth of the northwest | – |

5.4 Comments on Group 4's Discussion Map



| Location Number |  Benefits? |  Disbenefits? | C Other comments |
|-----------------|---|---|------------------|
| | – | – Western approaches affect European fisheries | – |
| All | – | – Spacing of areas is unmanageable due to gaps – more logical to join those up. Practicality and nature conservation benefits | – |
| 1.1 | – | – Main mussel fishery for Morecambe Bay | – |
| 7.5 | – | – Main fishery area for small net fishing of thin fish and shell fish – Main cockle area on the Wirral – multimillion pound industry and the only place for this currently | – |
| 7.5 | – | – SW edge may be on aggregate extraction site | – |
| 7.5 | – | – Avoid unnecessary sterilisation of natural aggregates. Could be moved slightly to the NE – (21) data could assist on aggregate deposits. | – |
| 8.1 | – | – Area is important for mobile gears (trawlers) from Maryport and Whitehaven | – |
| 8.1 | – | – Prawn fishing and flat fish start here – impact on Whitehaven, Maryport and NI boats | – |

diana.pound@dialoguematters.co.uk

dialogue matters

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 8.9 | – | – Major nephrops fishery | – |
| 8.2, 8.3 | – | – Existing gas production facilities – disturbance especially when platforms get taken away. Same applies to pipelines. | – |
| 3.4, 6.1, 6.4, 6.9, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12 | – | – Area currently heavily fished by scallop fishers | – |
| 8.4, 8.5, 8.2, 8.8, 7.9 | – | – All are where cables are laid – Laying of new cables and maintenance of existing cables causes an issue. – Transatlantic cables are laid here too | – |
| 10.1 | – | – Negative impact on the growth of port of Liverpool and the economy of the northwest | – |



5.5 Comments on Group 5's Discussion Map

| Location Number |  Benefits? |  Disbenefits ? | C Other comments |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|
| | – | – | – Rationalisation of areas – fewer large areas rather than many small areas |
| | – | – | – Combining habitats in single areas makes good sense |
| | – | – | – Morecambe Bay area – one of the main areas for harvesting mussel seed |
| 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 4.2, 6.1 | – All areas at southern end avoid areas of contention and therefore avoid conflict | – | – |
| 6.7 and 9.3 | – | – Right in the middle of round 3 zone for wind farm. Conflict? Possible synergy? | – |
| 7.2 | – | – | – Corresponds to an existing aggregate extraction license |
| 7.2, 7.4, 8.1 | – | – Within the cabling area so therefore open to disturbance | – |
| 7.6 | – | – Existing oil and gas area and existing dredging license to the north of this | – |
| 8.2 | – | – Windfarms under construction. Conflict or possible synergy? | – |
| Hab 8 in | – | – | – The more that is protected the greater the impact on |

diana.pound@dialoguematters.co.uk

| | | | |
|---------|---|--|---|
| general | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> fishers assuming that MCZs restrict that activity – Was mentioned that the prawn fishery is already well managed , so may not require controls i.e. the resource is not in decline (anecdotal – 1) – (2) seasonal fishery so controlled by this – management would be a major consideration in habitat 8 – Also need to consider compatible uses |
| 10.1 | – | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Potential impact on the port of Liverpool and greater NW economy – Conflict on this map with existing sea bed users such as cabling | – |
| 10.1 | – | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Says low energy but actually high energy. Habitats need validating | – |

5.6 Comments on Group 6's Discussion Map

| Location Number |  Benefits? |  Disbenefits? | C Other comments |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Joining up of different habitats in single protection zones | – | – |
| | – | – | – Many areas adjoin Manx/Welsh waters. Possible displacement of negative effects of activity in these areas. |
| | – | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Morecambe Bay designations and potential conflict with power lines from nuclear development in Cumbria | – |
| 6.6, 6.17, 6.8, 9.2, 9.3, 4.2 | – | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All in zone designated for renewable energy | – |
| 6.8, 7.4, 8.9 | – | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Could be joined up into one area for easier management | – |
| 7.1, 8.7, 8.6 | – | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Possible conflict with subsea cables. | – |
| 7.2 | – | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Conservation value has been trashed – no point in designating | – |
| 7.3, 6.11, 4.4 | – | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Could be joined up into one area for easier management | – |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7.6, 9.1, 2.1, 1.1 | – | – Could be joined up into one area for easier management | – |
| 8.9, 8.8, (plus the two small squares to the north of), 8.3 | | – Conflict with nephrops fishing | – |
| 10.1 | – | – Negative impact on maritime economy and wider economy of the NW | – |

6 Guidance for working together

6.1 What do you like ?

- The format, nice size text and layout clear to read!
- Well presented.

6.2 Room for Improvement

- No Comments

6.3 Comments on section 1

- Expenses – is this in accord with Government compact on working with the 3rd sector?
- Substitutes / stand ins – will find it difficult / a strain to nominate only one substitute as trying to cover all UK MCZ meetings and do the day job. Have reservations on this.
- “if participants....” maybe change to “member / substitutes”.

6.4 Comments on section 2

- None

6.5 Comments on section 3

- Members only website for large documents etc is a good idea, as long as all the stakeholder group are computer literate and have access to suitable internet / pc's.
- All documents on the website (private section) would be helpful.

6.6 Comments on section 4

- Last bullet point on “telling the wider community” is this at odds with the idea not to share too soon to set heads turning – but we should be able to feed back to the groups / interests we represent.
- Struggling to work effectively as do not have enough knowledge of other activities to challenge or accept ideas put forward by those representatives – also incomplete knowledge of species and habitats etc.

6.7 Comments on section 5

- We need to be able to share the results from initial designations and intentions with groups or organisation outside this group. For example to share or show progress with locations of MCZs, exchange views etc particularly important for the Welsh project, Scottish MPA designation and Northern Ireland etc.
- Broadly happy although reserve the right to discuss any issues of extreme concern with the press in conjunction with discussion with the ISCZ project team.

6.8 Comments on section 6, 7, 8, 9,

- None

7 To what extent do you support the Guidance for working together?

| I have strong concerns | I have concerns | I can live with it | I can support it | I am very supportive |
|---|--|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| | | | 12 | |
| | | | 11 | |
| | | | 10 | 5 |
| | | | 9 | 4 |
| | | | 8 | 3 |
| | | 14 | 7 | 2 |
| | 15 | 13 | 6 | 1 |
| What would need to happen for you to move your tick to the right and increase your support? | | | | |
| 2 | – With such a diverse group of interests its good to have rules for working together in order to achieve your aims | | | |
| 4 | – I am very supportive, I just would like some clarity on how we can share maps or info with groups outside ISCZ e.g. welsh project | | | |
| 6 | – Nothing, the guidance seek to work for the benefit of a diverse group, they appear to do it very well | | | |
| 9 | – Minor clarification on a couple of apparent contradictions | | | |
| 10 | – Some conflict to see if it actually works | | | |
| 11 | – In the time spent to date I think we have good work together attitudes, which should develop further during future meetings | | | |
| 12 | – We must begin to address issues related to likely management measures, cross border / competence (legal meaning) issues and mobile fisheries issues. I also sense a lack of understanding of international legal issues/limiting factors which if addressed could help. | | | |
| 14 | – Need to be able to add factual corrections to workshop notes – so that wrong information is not perpetuated – How will cross boundary working take place to ensure consistency? - the sea does not recognise admin boundaries – Need for a communications strategy so that stakeholder group members publicise more widely with key network contacts | | | |

8 Parking Place

- Q. Please clarify the Intertidal Zone – probably the most important ‘habitat’ for archaeological activity/assets. How will it be assessed?
- Q. What is meant by 70% of species need to be protected? Is this biomass of all species or a count of individual species? So if there are 100 species, 30 of them can still be exploited?
- Q. Without knowing what protection levels will be implemented within the zones, it is not possible to make an informed decision on where the areas could be
- Q. Said that the economic impact would take place at a later date. Why is it not being seen as a priority?
- Q. Are not Welsh territorial waters now out to the median line? If do, ISCZ will not be in a position to designate MCZs in this area?
- Q. How can we make decisions without knowledge about management e.g. if its closed to a use, will affect our view

9 Short term Actions following the workshop

| WHO | WHAT | Aiming for: |
|------------------|--|--|
| ISCZ | Type up | 12 May |
| dialogue matters | Emergent processing to sort all comments out | 14 May if feasible 20 May at latest |
| ISCZ | Mail out to participants | 24 May |

Annex 1 List of Attendees

Special Guests: Jen Ashworth, Natural England. To provide a presentation on the Ecological Network Guidance

| | Interest | Stakeholder Group Member | Associations - if relevant | Substitute | Attended workshop 2 |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------|
| Industries (8) | | | | | |
| 1. | Marine Management Organisations | Graham Ford-Keyte | Marine Management Organisation | | ✓ |
| 2. | Shipping | Adrian Lester | Chamber of Shipping | | |
| 3. | Ports and Harbours | Jim Teasdale | Mersey Maritime Ltd | David Pendleton | ✓ |
| 4. | Marine Renewables | Julie Drew | BWEA (on behalf of members) | | ✓ |
| 5. | Oil and Gas | Robin Gilliver | Oil & Gas UK (on behalf of) | | ✓ |
| 6. | Sand and gravel extraction | Andrew Bellamy | BMAPA | | ✓ |
| 7. | Sub sea cables | Peter Jamieson | UKCPC | | ✓ |
| 8. | Charter boating & small marine industries | Andy Bradbury | Blue Mink Charters | | |
| Commercial Fishing (11) | | | | | |
| 9. | Sea Fisheries Committee | Dave Dobson | On behalf of both SFCs in the project area | | ✓ |
| 10. | Mobile Gear (white fish) | Ron Graham | Whitehaven Fishermen's Assoc (and NFFO) | | ✓ |
| 11. | Static Gear (pots, creeling, gill netting, fixed nets) | Garry Pidduck | Barrow Inshore Fishermen's Association | | ✓ |
| 12. | Inshore Shellfisheries | Chris Wood | | | ✓ |
| 13. | Producer Organisation | Dick James | On behalf of UKAFPO | | ✓ |
| 14. | Mariculture | Kelsey Thompson | Seasalter (Walney) | | ✓ |
| 15. | Scallop Dredging | John Hermes | Scallop Association | | |
| 16. | NI Fishermen | Alan McCulla | Anglo Northern Irish Fish Producers Organisation | | |
| 17. | IOM Fishermen | Tom Bryan-Brown | Manx Fish Producers Organisation | | ✓ |
| 18. | Welsh Fishermen | Jeremy Percy | Welsh Federation of Fishermen's Associations | Jim Evans | ✓ |
| Natural Environment (9 +2) | | | | | |
| 19. | Joint Nature Conservation Committee | Cristina Herbon | | | ✓ |
| 20. | Natural England | Chris Lumb | | | ✓ |
| 21. | Environment Agency | Clive Gaskell | | | ✓ |
| 22. | NGO Habitats and marine species | Kathryn Turner | Wildlife Trust | | ✓ |
| 23. | NGO Birds | Andrew Gouldstone | RSPB | Alys Edwards | ✓ |
| 24. | Geology/Geomorphology | Keith Williams | NW Geodiversity Partnership | | ✓ |
| 25. | NGO Marine environment | Kay Foster | Marine Conservation Society | | ✓ |
| 26. | Ecosystem/ecological scientist | Chris Frid | University of Liverpool | | |
| 27. | Fisheries Scientist | Mr Grant Course | CEFAS | | ✓ |
| | | (Fiona Gell) | | | ✓ |
| | | (Christopher Sweeting) | | | ✓ |
| Leisure and recreation (5) | | | | | |
| 28. | Sea Angling | John Amery | Angling trust | | ✓ |
| 29. | Diving | Christopher Sweeting | British Sub Aqua Club | | ✓ |
| 30. | Recreational/Leisure Craft | Howard Reynolds Jones | Royal Yachting Association | Peter Jones | ✓ |
| Cultural Heritage (1) | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|---|---------------|------------------|
| 31. | <i>English Heritage</i> | Sue Stallibrass | | | ✓ |
| Navigation and Safety (1) | | | | | |
| 32. | <i>Maritime & Coastguard Agency</i> | Colin Brown | | | |
| Owners (1) | | | | | |
| 33. | <i>Crown Estate</i> | Charles Green | | | ✓ |
| MOD(1) | | | | | |
| 34. | <i>MOD</i> | Tony Wyld | | | ✓ |
| Research (1) | | | | | |
| 35. | <i>Marine research activities</i> | Matthew Palmer | Proudman Oceanographic Laboratory | Phil Knight | ✓ |
| Coastal Forum (1) | | | | | |
| 36. | <i>North West Coastal Forum</i> | Caroline Salthouse | North West Coastal Forum | | ✓ |
| Regional Bodies and Authorities (4) | | | | | |
| 37. | <i>NW Regional Development Agency</i> | Michael Gallagher | | | ✓ |
| 38. | <i>4 NW</i> | Michael Gallagher | | | ✓ |
| 39. | <i>Coastal Authorities</i> | Dave McAleavy | Head of Coast and Countryside, Sefton Council | | |
| 40. | <i>Welsh Assembly</i> | (Declined involvement) | | | ✓ |
| 41. | <i>Scottish Executive</i> | David Mallon | | | |
| 42. | <i>Northern Ireland Assembly (DARD)</i> | Gerardine McEvoy | | Paddy Cambell | ✓ |
| 43. | <i>Isle of Man Government</i> | Fiona Gell | | | ✓ |
| 44. | <i>Government Office North West</i> | Elaine Howard | | | - with drawing?? |

Annex 2 Agenda

Irish Sea MCZ - Stakeholder group workshop 2

From 9:00 Registration, coffee and tea will be available

Starting activities:

- **What does the Irish Sea provide for us? (eg resources and materials, life support, culturally)** Add your thoughts to those of others.
- **Start to check the human use tables and make any comments.**

Start for those new to the process

9:30 Welcome & Setting the Scene
The process **Greg Whitfield** Marine Planner **ISCZ**
Diana Pound Independent Facilitator
dialogue matters

Start for those who came to workshop 1

10:00 Facilitators Briefing **Diana Pound** Independent Facilitator
dialogue matters

Broad Scale Habitats **Kieran Bell** **ISCZ**

Introductions to each other

10:30 Understanding more about sea uses

Human use tables

- Check what was written before and add more information or views

Compatibility matrix –sea uses and the broad habitats

- What effect might this activity have on this broad habitat type?
- Is the sea use: compatible, not compatible or possibly with good management?*

Please note well: Developing management measures for the MCZ is not part of the Stakeholder Group's responsibilities. However, to make decisions the group needs to have some insight into the different sea uses, their effects, and the ease with which they might be managed.

**In this activity, the phrase 'possibly with good management' means that you think it is possible that good management could overcome negative effects. Good management includes solutions which manage:

- Where the activity takes place (spatial solutions)
- When it takes place (temporal solutions)
- How it takes place (either technical solutions or behavioural solutions eg codes of conduct)

11:15 Tea and Coffee

11:30 Mapping MCZ locations
Briefing about the ecological guidance **Jen Ashworth**

Briefing the mapping activity **Diana Pound**

Exploring places

- Divide into mixed groups and work on a map
- Log the pros and cons of particular locations
- Note places that may be worth further consideration

12:50 Lunch

1:40 Continue mapping

Guidance for working together.

- Check the guidance. What do you like? Room for improvement? Specific comments?
- Levels of support?

3:15 Tea and coffee

3:30 Working Together

Comment on maps

- Visit each groups map and register pros and cons

Last things

What happens next

No later than 4.30
Finish

Brief 'Process Group' discussion

Finish