

## Stakeholder Group Structure and Conundrums

### Outputs and notes from the meeting with advisers on the 19<sup>th</sup> Jan 2010

Draft 01

#### Introductory Points

The aim of the meeting was to arrive at a clear rationale for the interests who get a place on the Stakeholder Group and why.

The group was convened because the results of a questionnaire threw up a number of conundrums and the independent facilitators needed the advice of people with knowledge of the region's stakeholders.

Those present who were also ISCZ board or team members were not attending in that capacity but because of their knowledge of the regional sea and marine stakeholders.

As facilitators, we normally stay out of the discussion. However, the day's discussion was about the stakeholder process and so our views and thinking were given and explained where relevant.

The discussion was facilitated to:

1. Consider which interests should have a place and why
2. Resolve questions thrown up by the Stakeholder Group questionnaire results and the JNCC national stakeholder survey results

Advisers who took part in the meeting:

Caroline Salthouse	Regional Coastal Project Officer and North West Coastal Forum Secretariat	Regional knowledge of all sectors including recreation activities
Graham Ford-Keyte	District Inspector Marine and Fisheries Agency	Knowledge of fisheries and marine industries
Chris Lumb	Marine Delivery Leader Natural England	Regional knowledge of natural environment, fishers and other sectors through work on eg the Irish Sea Pilot
Nick Storer	Chief Executive Envirolink North West	Knowledge of marine industry
Sue Kidd	Director of the MSc in Marine Planning and Management Liverpool University	Knowledge of all sectors

ISCZ team members present:

Rowan Byrne	ISCZ Project Manager
Emily Hardman	ISCZ Liaison Officer
Greg Whitfield	Marine Protected Area Planner

## Considering all the interests that have been suggested who has a place and why?

The interests listed below were from the following sources:

- On the original draft list in the questionnaire
- New suggestions made via the questionnaire
- From the JNCC list which was national organisations asking for a place

INTEREST	REASONS FOR HAVING A SEAT ON THE GROUP	REASONS AGAINST HAVING A SEAT ON THE GROUP	DECESION
INDUSTRY			<b>8 places available</b>
Marine and Fisheries Agency (marine works)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are a regulator and provide an overview of the industrial uses of the sea</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<b>1.</b>
Shipping (no split between freight and passenger)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical to include in terms of navigation/ shipping lanes and the potential effect on MCZ location</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question raised as to potential to incorporate this interest with Ports and Harbours but this was rejected</li> </ul>	<b>2.</b>
Ports and Harbours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must be included as undertake activities that impact the sea such as dredging</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<b>3.</b>
Energy Sector Wind	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although they have different requirements for operations they do have a single body that represents their interests in the form of BWEA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<b>4.</b> Decided to combine these interests under a single heading termed MARINE RENEWABLES
Energy Sector Tidal		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	
Energy Sector Oil and Gas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold a big interest in the sea</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gateway gas (developing a storage facility for natural gas in the Irish Sea) raised as a potential additional stakeholder to be included (but later decided to have industry representative bodies not companies)</li> </ul>	<b>5.</b>
Sand and Gravel Extraction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a major activity in the Irish Sea and as such this interest must be represented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<b>6.</b>
Sub Sea Cables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a major existing interest in the Irish sea with some new activities planned so they must be included</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<b>7.</b>
Small Scale Marine Industries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to be involved but perhaps don't require a seat at the table</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to identify representative for this interest group as due to scale of operations most likely be focused on very small areas or very small area of interest</li> <li>• BMF want to be involved but do not want a seat on the SG</li> </ul>	No but see point below
Charter Boats and small industries		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<b>8.</b> Decided that need

INTEREST	REASONS FOR HAVING A SEAT ON THE GROUP	REASONS AGAINST HAVING A SEAT ON THE GROUP	DECISION
			to find someone for charter boats and they can also speak for small-scale commercial interests.
Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make large releases of wastewater to the ocean</li> <li>• Potential to impact on MCZ's is a reason to have them at the table</li> <li>• Water utilities have a greater potential to impact and are perhaps more important to include</li> <li>• Can provide a regional perspective</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are heavily governed by operating licenses</li> <li>• Are heavily regulated and any impacts are localised</li> <li>• Not a marine spatial user in the same way as cables for example</li> </ul>	<b>no</b>
Nuclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are more likely to be about protecting their patch rather than taking a regional perspective</li> <li>• Heavily regulated and licensed and as such their activities do not need to be at the table</li> <li>• Why this industry and not other industries with a coastal location?</li> </ul>	<b>no</b>
<b>COMMERCIAL FISHING</b>			<b>8 places available</b>
Marine and Fisheries Agency (fishing)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides an overview of commercial fishing interests for the entire region</li> <li>• A single person can represent all of the MFA's interests</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MFA also down for industry so inclusion would raise issues about why some groups/agencies have been provided with multiple seats at the table while other groups have missed out entirely</li> </ul>	No Decided MFA should have one seat under Industry but bringing both areas of knowledge to the table
Sea Fisheries Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relevant authority and a statutory body</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<b>9.</b>
Trawling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mobile Gear is essential interest to have</li> <li>• Very little Seine Netting at present</li> <li>• Fisherman swap between mobile gear types</li> <li>• There is no single group that formally represents this activity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<b>10.</b> Decision to unite these groups under a single heading of MOBILE GEAR (WHITEFISH)
Seine Netting		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	
Static Gear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small inshore operators primarily</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question about splitting fishing interests by fishing method but a recognition of need to do this because their knowledge about how and where different types of</li> </ul>	<b>11.</b>

INTEREST	REASONS FOR HAVING A SEAT ON THE GROUP	REASONS AGAINST HAVING A SEAT ON THE GROUP	DECESION
		fishing take place is crucial to the discussions	
Inshore Shell Fishers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broad usage across the region</li> <li>Brown shrimp is a significant fishery in localised areas</li> <li>High value fishery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very localised</li> </ul>	<b>12.</b>
Mariculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does this include mussels and other shell fish? YES</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<b>13.</b>
Scallop Dredging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant activity in the region both financially and geographically</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<b>14.</b>
Fish Producers Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should hold a seat because they know what is happening across the entire region</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<b>15.</b>
Fisheries scientist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need this science and necessary for inclusion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<b>16.</b>
Seafood processing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Their capacity to process can impact on what is caught</li> <li>Can act as a focal point for interests that otherwise might be missed in this process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drive the demand only</li> <li>Not a spatial user so do not need to be part of the decision making about where the MCZ are - but can be involved in other ways and engaged in other ways through the process</li> </ul>	<b>no</b>
Haaf Netters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very small and localised</li> <li>Very small operation</li> </ul>	<b>no</b>
<b>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</b>			<b>8 places available</b>
JNCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regulator</li> <li>Links with other countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<b>17.</b>
Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regulator</li> <li>Responsible for nature, species, other MPA landscape, access.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<b>18.</b>
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regulator</li> <li>Environment Agency have multiple functions – water, fish, coastal processes and who ever comes will have to represent all of these</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<b>19.</b>
Habitats NGO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cover wider interests than Natural England can represent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<b>20.</b>
Marine Migratory Animals NGO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mobile marine mammals and other species need to be taken into account</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are several NGO but are the staffed do they have sufficient regional knowledge</li> </ul>	Decision to incorporate this interest with the general habitat NGO
Birds NGO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cover wider interests than Natural England can represent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<b>21.</b>
Geodiveristy / Geology/Geomorphology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need a specialist NGO to speak for this interest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data from the NGS will come through the process</li> </ul>	<b>22.</b> Was decided later

INTEREST	REASONS FOR HAVING A SEAT ON THE GROUP	REASONS AGAINST HAVING A SEAT ON THE GROUP	DECISION
NGO		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seat not necessary at the table as Natural England will take this on</li> </ul>	this interest should be covered because the MCZ can include geological and geomorphologic features and an NGO should be able to make the case for these
Ecological scientist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional ecological /ecosystem process knowledge is needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be ecologists in the Science Advisory Panel</li> </ul>	<b>23.</b>
NGO General Environment (beyond nature conservation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognition that this needs to be included due to the large amount of other environmental concerns in the region</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<b>24.</b>
Waste Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will be covered by regulators</li> </ul>	-
Meteorology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question the need to have this interest at the table</li> </ul>	-
<b>TOURISM AND RECREATION</b>			
Tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May need a regional perspective but can be brought to the table by the regional bodies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question as to the relevance of having this interest at the table for decision making about where the MCZ are</li> </ul>	<b>NO</b> Decided that this interest can and will be covered by the North West Development Authority -
Charter Boating	Moved to industry		<b>(yes in ind'y)</b>
Sea Angling (to include shore and boat)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seen as an interest that must be included due to numbers involved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<b>25.</b>
Diving	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seen as an interest that must be included due to numbers involved and knowledge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<b>26.</b>
Recreational inshore craft Yachts and cruisers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need a voice for recreational craft of all types</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are multiple recreation craft (some listed below) and it is not possible to include all of them</li> </ul>	<b>27.</b> Decision made to join these two categories under the name and RECREATIONAL/ LEISURE CRAFT
Wind surfing / kite surfing Canoeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These activities are very inshore and also comparatively low effect</li> <li>• These are included under recreational craft</li> </ul>	<b>No</b> Included under 'recreational craft'
Walking rambling access Wildfowlers Shooting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These are above low water /land based so given the huge area of sea being considered these aren't key marine stakeholders</li> </ul>	<b>No</b>

INTEREST	REASONS FOR HAVING A SEAT ON THE GROUP	REASONS AGAINST HAVING A SEAT ON THE GROUP	DECISION
Health and wellbeing	•	•	<b>No</b>
Heritage			
English Heritage	• Required for marine archaeology and heritage	•	<b>28.</b>
Marine Archaeology	•	• Covered by EH	<b>29.</b>
Coastal heritage/ landscape/sea scapes/beauty	•	• Covered by Natural England and other representatives	<b>No</b>
Navigation and Safety			
Marine coastguard agency	• Regulators	•	<b>30.</b>
Owners			
Crown estate	• Owners of sea bed	•	<b>31.</b>
Ministry of Defence	• Owners of sea bed	•	<b>32.</b>
CLA	•	• Represent only small landholders at local level • If included these landowners there are many other eg coastal industry landowners who would want a place	<b>No</b>
NFU	•		
Science, research and education			
Marine research and science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes need 'research activities' represented</li> <li>• Need science that does not have a particular interest in either fish or nature</li> </ul>	• Is it covered by other representatives?	<b>33.</b> Decided that a broad scientific research view is needed and suggested oceanography with Proudman Oceanographic Laboratory being asked to nominate a suitable person
Social scientist	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not seen as necessary for the deliberation</li> <li>• Science and research interests will be covered by other representatives</li> </ul>	<b>No</b>
Education	•		
Coastal Forum			
North West Coastal Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bring a great deal of regional knowledge to the table</li> <li>• Knowledge of a great many interests and activities</li> <li>• Links with the smaller coastal Forum</li> </ul>	• No real knowledge beyond the 12 NM limits	<b>34.</b>
Morecombe Bay Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They have good connections with other sea users and interests</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These are locally focussed</li> <li>• They can't 'represent' or take a view</li> </ul>	No Important to involve and work with these forum in other ways
Sefton Partnership			
Regional Unitary and County Authorities			
4NW	• this group must be	•	<b>35.</b>

INTEREST	REASONS FOR HAVING A SEAT ON THE GROUP	REASONS AGAINST HAVING A SEAT ON THE GROUP	DECISION
	represented at the table as they hold so much regional knowledge and can represent interests such as tourism that may otherwise be overlooked or missed		
North West Regional Development Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have interest up to 12 NM limit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	36.
GO NorthWest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have interest up to 12 NM limit</li> <li>Represents all government offices and need to be aware of this when they are asked to nominate a representative</li> <li>Additionally will be necessary to check with government interests that they are happy to be represented from GO North West</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	37.
Local Government Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have a specialist interest group for coastal interests that has a regional perspective and is seen as important to include</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	38.
Coastal Local Authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given need regional and other countries this governance level is too local</li> <li>They can have input via the LGA coastal group</li> <li>Complex situation in the region</li> </ul>	
Coastal parish town councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too local for the purposes of this exercise</li> </ul>	
Mersey Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considered too local to be able to contribute at the regional sea level necessary</li> </ul>	-
All District Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>		
Other Countries			
Scottish Executive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Must be included as share boundaries</li> <li>Will need ensure that they bring to the table the interests of all their marine sectors and interests</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	39.
Northern Ireland Assembly		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	40.
Welsh Assembly		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	41.
Isle of Man		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	42.
EIRE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seen as necessary to include in deliberation because of significant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	?
France		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	?
Belgium		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	?

INTEREST	REASONS FOR HAVING A SEAT ON THE GROUP	REASONS AGAINST HAVING A SEAT ON THE GROUP	DECISION
Holland	fisheries interests (eg Belgium as v large portion of the quota) but questions raised as to how to include them	•	?
Other Countries NC bodies			
Nature conservation bodies as nominated including SNH, CCW, DOE NI, IOM Conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need to coordinate where MPA are across boundaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Their main knowledge is of their inshore waters which are outside the project boundary</li> <li>• Including all these would add an extra 5 voices to nature conservation - which changes the balance with industry and commercial fishing</li> <li>• Will their concerns be covered and represented by JNCC</li> <li>• Can Natural England be a conduit</li> </ul>	<b>No</b>
Others			
Consultancies	•	• Not seen as necessary for the deliberation	-
Professional institutes	•		

## Conundrum Questions

Questions related to the sectors

	Response
<u>Industry</u>	
The question about representative bodies versus company members on the stakeholder group?	Decision made that companies will not be invited to sit on the stakeholder group as the perception is that these representatives will be concerned about their own interests/location and find it difficult to take a regional or broad sector perspective.
The question of appropriate representatives for Ports - because APB and Peel are commercial competitors so are unlikely to be happy to accept the other for the ports and harbours place.	It was suggested by the panel that Mersey Maritime (Jim Teesdale or David Pendleton) would be an appropriate representative for this interest group to avoid conflict between Peel and APB.
Three names were raised for the interests of Charter Boats two from north Wales and one from England but a question was raised regarding the selection process from this point on and does this person need to be English. (This interest group has been placed in the small marine industries area of the industry group).	The Welsh Charter Boat Operators use the project area and so it was felt that for this interest group we should follow the selection process as described in the original questionnaire.
<u>Fishing</u>	
If we amalgamate seine netting and trawling to mobile gear we lose a place for fishing interests – how do we resolve this?	A suggestion from Ron G was that there could be two places for trawlers – one from England and one from Northern Ireland. But this raises issues about why two places for trawlers when everyone else gets one. Also the Belgium fleet have a significant interest too so why not them? The decisions was taken to have one place for mobile gear and to ask the regional Fish Producers Organisation to have the other place because they have knowledge and contacts across the region
Static Gear Fishermen – some names that have been put forward are from adjacent countries - they are stakeholders too but if there is only one places on the SG does this need to be an English fisherman - or do we follow the process as described in the initial questionnaire?	Follow the process in the questionnaire
A similar question was raised for scalloping as an interest group.	Scallopers were not a category in the initial questionnaire but were suggested several times with names provided. The response for this interest group was to follow the selection process described in the questionnaire
<u>Research and science activities</u>	
Questions raised about the science representatives, who and what type of science should be represented in this process?	After discussion arrived at the decision that ecological science should be represented by Chris Frid, general research/science should be represented by Proudman Oceanographic Laboratory, and CEFAS should be approached to nominate a suitable fisheries scientist to sit on the stakeholder group.
The question of appropriate	Discussion within the panel determined that the Morecambe

representation for inshore shell fishes and the mariculture interests under the commercial fishing header.	Bay Fishermen’s Association in the form of Janet Butler would provide a suitable representative for inshore shellfisheries, and that mariculture should be represented by someone from the Seasalter (Walney Ltd). There was some question as to whether Seasalter would be able to represent all the interests adequately and it was resolved that the Sea Fishery Committee be approached to answer this question.
<b>Recreation</b>	
Questions about the representation for Diving given the various diving bodies	Decided that the selection process as described would be used with the provision that selected representative is made aware of the fact that they represent the interests of divers not their individual club or affiliation (e.g. Padi or BSAC).
Selection of an appropriate representative for Yachting interests given the variety of names put forward through the stakeholder process.	Decided that the representative should be selected from within the RYA as this group are broad based representing a wide range of aquatic recreational interests.
Selection of an appropriate representative for sea angling given the large number of national, regional and local associations available and nominated through the stakeholder process.	Decided to follow the selection process as detailed in the questionnaire
The question around the inclusion of county tourism boards.	Decided that county tourism boards are too local in their focus to take a regional view. Additionally, it was felt that the North West Development Authority were able to represent the issues of tourism in the region and as such tourism as an interest group could be removed.
<b>Natural Environment</b>	
The question around the inclusion of naturalist groups.	Decided that naturalist groups are too local in their focus to take a regional view – and that the views of nature conservation are represented
The question around general environmental NGO’s and the selection of one from the names submitted during the stakeholder process and the JNCC process both of which identified Marinet and MCS.	It was felt by the panel that MCS were the preferred general environment NGO to be present on the Stakeholder group. They do general work around eg marine litter and have an existing program of activity (your sea, your voice) about MPAs. They also have a long-standing interest and involvement in the Marine Bill and its implementation in the UK. Additionally they have actively lobbied for the implementation of marine reserves in near shore waters.
The question was raised about how to handle the various Wildlife trusts	After discussion it was decided to follow the selection process as described in the questionnaire. Additionally, as the wildlife trusts have employed an officer for the marine interests it was most likely that this person would be a common nominee from this sector.
<b>Organisations and Agencies with multiple responsibilities or interests</b>	
The question was raised about agency or organizations with multiple responsibilities/departments eg Natural England, EA and the Marine & Fisheries Agency.	The resolution is that there would only be a single representative from each agency/organization and that it was to be left up to the individual organization to nominate an appropriate person who can cover all of their various interests/responsibilities and that it must be made clear to the representative that they have the very serious

	responsibility of maintaining the lines of communication within their agency/group.
--	---

Questions about further consultation

Another round of consultation?	
<p>The IS CZ Board wanted the meeting to discuss there being another round of consultation with stakeholders. It was suggested that this could be achieved by allowing every stakeholder to review the stakeholder group membership and confirm their support for the proposed structure. The Board think that if the process was delayed by two weeks to enable this to occur it would be time well spent.</p>	<p>The facilitator advised that this would take much more than two weeks and if the timeframes were to be met, there was now too little time to do this before the first workshop.</p> <p>Also if the consultation showed that people didn't support the Stakeholder Group, or suggested new interests or people, how would this be resolved, when and who by.</p> <p>To do this fairly would require a clear process that would take weeks to run (eg <i>developing a fair consultation method, asking people to comment, allowing a consultation period of a couple of weeks, processing the returns, sending out the new long lists for short listing, resolving any new contradictory views then sending out invites</i>). The time needed for these steps, combined with Easter, would delay the first workshop into late April/May - with a knock on effect to the process meaning the Stakeholder Group would not be able to provide the first iterations of the MCZ to the Science Advisory Panel in July –would this delay be OK with JNCC and NE.</p> <p>It would also mean overriding the results of the County questionnaire and the process that stakeholders were asked to comment on and supported. And, although the process can't be followed in all cases because of the issues discussed at this meeting, part of respecting stakeholders who did take part in the workshops is to respond to their comments and follow that process wherever possible.</p> <p>So it is not a straightforward suggestion and far greater consideration and discussion would therefore be required to understand the implications and develop the consultation process.</p> <p>In light of these considerations the group accepted that the time frames mean it is not possible to open up the process of selection and nomination to the stakeholder group, that it would take longer than two weeks, and that a process for handling the potential feedback had not been considered in making the proposal.</p>
<p>There is a particular challenge around commercial fishing interests. Many fishermen were unable to attend the County workshops due to being out at sea. In addition, despite a thorough</p>	<p>Reopening the questionnaire to the fishing industry now presents challenges to the timetable and delivery of the map to SAP when they want it.</p>

stakeholder analysis, additional fishermen, who are not members of fishing associations, have now come forward due to increased publicity and active engagement.

Members of the Board want to reopen the nominations for fishing.

The facilitator said the questionnaire results worked to identify at least one fisherman for each activity but when the team alerted the facilitator that many fisherman had been unable to attend the workshops, she convened an emergency meeting with members of the project team and one member of the board to discuss reopening the nominations process to fishermen. The issue was discussed thoroughly from all angles.

It was suggested as an option to the independent facilitator to possibly reopen the nomination of fisherman and she thought it just feasible at that point to do so and stay on the timetable. The others present felt that the issues and challenges of doing this were too great and would be unfair to all stakeholders sectors if one was reopen all would have to be.

It was decided not to re-open the process but for the facilitator to speak to a nominated fishermen and ask for his views on how to take this forward in their opinions. It was the result of that discussion that flagged up the need to have the meeting today and hear the views of the MFA and SFC (who were unable to attend) and other sectoral advisors.

Reopening now could not be done and would delay the process because it would generate a long list of names that would need to be short listed to the person who would get the place.

The MFA thought that even if it were opened up fisherman would still struggle to agree/shortlist who should have the place on the Group.

It was then suggested that fisherman should be asked to say if they would accept and endorse nominated colleagues (whose name came through the county questionnaire process). The facilitator asked what if they didn't all do so and there was a wide range of views about who should have a place on the Group – how would that be resolved. MFA thought it very likely that there would be a wide range of views.

There was also the potential difficulty of telling nominated fishermen that although his name had come forward through the questionnaire process in the same way as for other interests, that in this case the process was being overridden

	<p>and he no longer had a place</p> <p>It was acknowledged that this was more complex than the Board had realised and it was decided that the nominated fishermen should have the place for mobile gear and that the PO would also be asked to take a seat because of their links with all of the fishermen.</p>
<p>it was suggested that a letter be sent to all stakeholders letting them know how they can feed into the MCZ consultation process, i.e. through the person for their interest on the stakeholder group or via any member of the project team, this letter would guarantee them access to all the project information and data thus providing them with the opportunity to feed into the decision making process.</p>	<p>It was agreed that information needs to be sent to all stakeholders reassuring them that they would have access to project information via the website and can have direct contact with ISCZ Team continuously. Also that the various iterations, once developed, would be publicised and that any person can give their view at any point throughout the process. However, it was agreed that the wording of this information/letter must be very carefully crafted to avoid raising expectations. While the opinions and feedback from the broader community will be provided to the stakeholder group, the stakeholder group will help decide the extent that they can incorporate these views.</p>