

**Irish Sea MCZ – Stakeholder group  
workshop 3  
15 July 2010**

Workshop outputs  
Word for Word Report

<b>Processed and sorted by:</b>	<b>Diana Pound</b>	<b>dialogue matters</b>
<b>Outputs typed by:</b>	<b>Greg Whitfield</b>	<b>ISCZ</b>
<b>Workshop Facilitators:</b>	<b>Diana Pound</b>	<b>dialogue matters</b>
	<b>Kathryn Hardcastle</b>	<b>dialogue matters</b>
	<b>Matthew Sutcliffe</b>	<b>ISCZ</b>
	<b>Kieran Bell</b>	<b>ISCZ</b>
	<b>Greg Whitfield</b>	<b>ISCZ</b>
	<b>Joanne Pilkington</b>	<b>Envirolink Northwest</b>
	<b>Dave Taylor</b>	<b>Envirolink Northwest</b>
<b>Event support</b>	<b>Holly Deary</b>	<b>ISCZ</b>
	<b>Rowan Byrne</b>	<b>ISCZ</b>
	<b>Emily Hardman</b>	<b>ISCZ</b>
	<b>Fran Moore</b>	<b>ISCZ</b>

## Contents

<b>About the workshop and this report .....</b>	<b>5</b>
▪ <b>Purpose of the workshop.....</b>	<b>5</b>
▪ <b>About this report.....</b>	<b>5</b>
▪ <b>Why sort the outputs?.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1 Mapping MCZ locations .....</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 <b>Presentation.....</b>	<b>7</b>
1.2 <b>Other questions of clarification (Eg questions that start ‘what did you mean by...’ or ‘can you tell me more about.....’).....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2 Discussing and exploring potential locations .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 <b>Group 1 Discussion Map.....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.2 <b>Group 2 Discussion Map.....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.3 <b>Group 3 Discussion Map.....</b>	<b>10</b>
2.4 <b>Group 4 Discussion Map.....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.5 <b>Group 5 Discussion Map.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3 Guidance for working together .....</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1 <b>In relation to the first iteration/progress report .....</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1.1 <b>What are the advantages with making the progress report available to others ...</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1.2 <b>What are the risks and challenges.....</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1.3 <b>What guidance do you want, to help deliver the benefits but overcome the risks and challenges?.....</b>	<b>18</b>
3.2 <b>Generally for inclusion in the Guidelines for working together: .....</b>	<b>19</b>
3.2.1 <b>What solutions or guidance can you think of?.....</b>	<b>19</b>
3.3 <b>People communicating with you – email and contact information .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4 Mapping session 2 - Look at the common ground and make additions and refinements .....</b>	<b>21</b>
4.1 <b>Discussion about how to do the mapping .....</b>	<b>21</b>
4.2 <b>Group discussion on potential MCZ locations .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>5 What is your view of the map and each possible MCZ location?.....</b>	<b>24</b>
5.1 <b>The Whole Map .....</b>	<b>24</b>
5.2 <b>Each possible MCZ location as a whole .....</b>	<b>27</b>
5.2.1 <b>Location 1 .....</b>	<b>27</b>
5.2.2 <b>Location 2 .....</b>	<b>29</b>
5.2.3 <b>Location 3 .....</b>	<b>31</b>
5.2.4 <b>Location 4 .....</b>	<b>33</b>
5.2.5 <b>Location 5 .....</b>	<b>35</b>
5.2.6 <b>Copy of levels of support for each potential/possible MCZ for comparison .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>6 Short term Actions following the workshop .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>7 Parking Place .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Annex 1 List of Attendees.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Annex 2 Agenda .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Annex 2 Discussion about whether or not some locations should be excluded. ....</b>	<b>43</b>



## About the workshop and this report

- **Purpose of the workshop**

This is the third Stakeholder Group workshop aiming to help participants share knowledge and understanding and to discuss various locations in the sea and their suitability for consideration as possible locations for MCZ.

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

- **About this report.**

The discussion was recorded on flip charts, 'post-it' notes and comment sheets. Following the workshop these have been typed word for word and then sorted to put similar ideas together 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 from within a conversation are sorted and clustered.

The sorting is done by 'emergent processing' 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
FOCI	Features of Conservation Importance
ENG	Ecological Network Guidance (authored by Natural England and JNCC)
RSG or SG	Regional stakeholder group (otherwise referred to as the ISCZ stakeholder group)
EU	European Union
FAQs	Frequently asked questions
MCZ	Marine conservation zone
pMCZ	Proposed marine conservation zone
MPA	Marine protected area
IoM	Isle of Man
GIS	Geographical Information System (mapping software)
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
DECC	Department for energy and climate change
VMS	Vessel monitoring system (tracking device for vessels over 15 m in length)
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea

## 1 Mapping MCZ locations

### 1.1 Presentation

The ISCZ provided a presentation with the maps that had been prepared at workshop 2 and the areas where several groups had suggested the same location for consideration.

**Note from facilitator:** The map presented by the ISCZ (summarising the findings from workshop 2 and as the basis for groups to work on at this workshop) contained an error in leaving out certain areas. Before it was realised this was an error, it provoked considerable debate and concern. However JNCC and NE went out of the workshop to ring key people and came back to clarify that all of the project area should be considered during the mapping activities in the workshop.

The questions raised at this time have been included in this report for the record only, but placed in the Annex to avoid further misunderstanding.

### 1.2 Other questions of clarification (Eg questions that start ‘what did you mean by...’ or ‘can you tell me more about.....’)

**Q: What is happening to the research that Natural England / JNCC / Defra was conducting on synergies between socio-economic and MCZ activities? It is difficult to make decisions without this important data.**

**A:** ISCZ are chasing this up at a national level. It may be that this research will filter into the compatibility matrix - that will be delivered for the 4<sup>th</sup> workshop.

**Q: 50% of the groups at workshop 2 targeted windfarm areas adjacent to the Wirral coast and the Dee estuary. This area is a critical fishing ground.**

**A:** That needs to be considered during the mapping today.

**Q: The exercise in workshop 2 looked at broadscale habitats. When will the other requirements of the ecological guidance (e.g. species, highly productive areas, mobile species, areas of high biological diversity) be factored in?**

**A:** This new information will be filtered in when it becomes available (and for the 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration)

**Q: Is there a bias in siting broadscale habitat MCZs by areas where participants originate from? I think so. Also, is there a bias in terms of habitat assumption which is not proven? I think so.**

**A:** The group needs to be looking at the whole project area and working out the optimum locations

**A:** The broadscale habitats used in workshops 2 and 3 are broadly defined, and are reliant on modelled data in many places. Some of the data has lower confidence than everyone would like - but getting more accurate information would take detailed ground truthing across the whole area which is not feasible.

**Q: What do the new Defra ministers think of MCZs?**

**A:** We have had written confirmation from the coalition government that they support the delivery of MCZs and are committed to fulfilling the objectives of the Marine and Coastal Access Act.

**Q: How does the cumulative group response method for MCZs account for some large industries being represented by only one person?**

**A:** The group membership is one person for each main type of activity/effect( for example each main type of fishing has a representative as does each main type of marine industry because each has different effects.) The process is being designed to maximise the opportunity for each person to influence the result. Following working in small groups in the second workshop, there was an opportunity to comment on each other's discussion maps. The work today will start with locations several groups suggested.

**Q. When are we going to know what MPAs will mean? Closures to a particular type of fishing or just restricted use?**

**A:** The group developed compatibility tables in workshop 2 to develop thinking on compatibility between each activity and the broadscale habitats. We will ask for more input on those from you before the next workshop.

The conservation agencies will also be providing some information on compatibility for the next workshop. Thinking about compatibility will indicate which activities need management.

**Q: What about other European fishermen? They need to be involved.**



**A:** JNCC are working with international fisheries to help them input into the process. Letters have been written regarding this issue. There is ongoing communication between UK fishers and European fishers.





## 2 Discussing and exploring potential locations

The working group's discussion maps have not been reproduced here to avoid misunderstanding and because they would make this document too big.

### 2.1 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	- Out of the way	- Possible conflict with European fishing vessels	-
1.2	- Out of the way	- Could be in EU fishing grounds	-
3.1	- Good for birds – Guillemots etc.	- Bad for fishermen – do you prefer birds over fishermen?	-
2.2	- To extend on previously agreed areas from workshop 2	- Lots of protection already in this location	-
4.1	- Least conflict – happy to lose grounds here	- Conflicts clearly with windfarms and oil and gas activity	-

### 2.2 Group 2 Discussion Map

Location Number	 Benefits of this location and why here?	 Disbenefits of this location why not here?	C Other comments
	- Area to NW of Isle of Man, Mixed Habitat and Interesting Geology.	- Valuable fishing (scalloping) area.	-
Yellow area SW of I of M	-	- Fishing area - Scalloping	-
Mixed Area NW	-	- Fishing Area	-

of Anglesey			
1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protects part of St. Georges Channel, which is a Quaternary geological feature.</li> <li>Also interglacial deposits.</li> </ul>	-	-
1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protects part of St. Georges Channel, which is a Quaternary geological feature.</li> </ul>	-	-
1.3			
1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Also interglacial deposits.</li> </ul>		
1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>interglacial deposits</li> </ul>	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Probably chosen to build on existing area of agreement.</li> </ul>
1.6	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too important as a fishing ground</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rather than due to high support.</li> </ul>
1.7	-	-	-
4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protects on a large scale feature (tunnel Valleys) i.e. geodiversity.</li> </ul>	-	-
4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adds to 1.5 and 1.6 – see comments for 1.5 and 1.6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not ideal in terms of fishing, but could be worse.</li> </ul>	-
4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protects “patterned ground”, an important geodiversity feature.</li> </ul>	-	-
2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tunnel Valleys</li> </ul>	-	-
2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dumiln field</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very firm objection due to fishing.</li> </ul>	-
3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overlays oil and gas area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(Potentially) compounds restrictions on fishing and greater large area restricted to fishing.</li> </ul>	-
3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protects unusual geodiversity feature</li> <li>Only damaging activity would be aggregates, not fishing.</li> <li>Oil and gas/wind farms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NI fishermen likely to object very strongly to any fishing restrictions b/c close to ports and also very important for prawns.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need fishing data</li> </ul>
3.3	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any management measures that would restrict Nephrops fishing likely to be strongly opposed by NI fishermen, but it may be the least worse area.</li> </ul>	-

### 2.3 Group 3 Discussion Map

Location Number	 Benefits of this location and why here?	 Disbenefits of this location why not here?	<b>C</b> Other comments
1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Next to overlap area</li> </ul>	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used as a tidying up</li> </ul>

dialogue matters

Green	- Not encroaching on fishing		effect for the overlap area.
1.1 Blue	- Extending mix sediment area	-	- Used as a tidying up effect for the overlap area.
1.2 Blue	- Extending mix sediment area	-	- Used as a tidying up effect for the overlap area.
1.3 Blue	- Extending mix sediment area	-	- Used as a tidying up effect for the overlap area.
1.4 Green	- Already on a major shipping route. There's existing disadvantages to other activities in that area (impact is low)	-	-
1.5 Green	- Shipping is controlled	-	-
1.6 Pink	- Protect rocky reef rather than sub tidal mud	- Possible conflict with wind farm.	- Find out exact habitats in this area – what are we protecting there?
1.7 Pink	- More manageable area - Next to one area already identified	- Countries near to here going to be goss boarder close border issue - not necessarily a disadvantage - Fishing issue – high prawn fishing	-
1.8 Pink	- More management area - Next to one area already identified	- Fishing – high major prawn fishing - Trawling issue.	-
1.9 Pink	- More management area - Next to one area already identified	- Fishing – high major prawn fishing - Trawling issue.	-
1.10	-	- Conflict to prawn fishing	-
1.11	-	- Conflict to prawn fishing	-
1.12	-	- Conflict to prawn fishing	-
1.13	-	- Conflict to prawn fishing	-
1.14	- Less activities / fishing conflict	- Some potting/ caveat to continue. - Issues with activity data with regards potting and traps - Shrimp fishing / trawling - Boats coming out of Maryport. - High activity of shrimp fishing	- Staying above N54° / 30 mins N.
1.15	- Less activities / fishing conflict	- Some potting / caveat to continue - Shrimp fishing / trawling	-

diana.pound@dialoguematters.co.uk



dialogue matters

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Boats coming out of Maryport</li> <li>- High activity of shrimp fishing</li> <li>- Issues with activity of data with regards to potting and traps.</li> </ul>	
1.16	- Less activities / fishing conflict	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shrimp fishing/trawling</li> <li>- Boats coming out of Maryport</li> <li>- High activity of shrimp</li> <li>- Some potting caveat to continue.</li> </ul>	- Issues with activity data with regards to potting and traps
1.17	- Less activities / fishing conflict	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shrimp fishing / trawling</li> <li>- Boats coming out of Maryport</li> <li>- High activity of shrimp fishing</li> <li>- Some potting / caveat to continue</li> <li>- Issues with activity data with regards to potting and traps</li> </ul>	-
1.18	- Expanding	- Less activity	-
1.19	- Expanding	- Less activity	-
1.20	-	- Too big a zone	-
1.21	-	- Too big a MCZ	-
1.22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shipping lanes are there</li> <li>- Less conflict with this type of activity</li> </ul>	-	-
1.23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shipping lane</li> <li>- Less conflict with this type of activity</li> </ul>	-	-
1.24	- Lack of conflict specifically fishing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Possible issue with Ireland i.e. 12 n mile</li> <li>- Some netting activity</li> </ul>	-
1.25	- Lack of conflict specifically fishing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Possible issue with Ireland i.e 12 n mile</li> <li>- Some netting activity</li> </ul>	-
1.26	- Lack of conflict specifically fishing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Possible issue with Ireland i.e 12 mile</li> <li>- Some netting activity</li> </ul>	-
1.27	- Lack of conflict specifically fishing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Possible issue with Ireland i.e 12 mile</li> <li>- Some netting activity</li> </ul>	-
1.28	- Tidying up existing area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Line fishing (possibility shouldn't conflict)</li> <li>- Ireland and Wales Possible Issue</li> </ul>	- Potting may / may not cause an issue.
1.29	- Tidying up existing area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Line fishing (possibility shouldn't conflict)</li> <li>- Ireland and Wales Possible Issue</li> </ul>	- Potting may / may not cause an issue.
1.30	- Lack of conflict specifically fishing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Possible issue with Ireland i.e 12 mile</li> <li>- Some netting activity</li> </ul>	-
1.31	- Shipping lane – less activities	- Scallop dredging	- Scallop data needed to



diana.pound@dialoguematters.co.uk

			be more accurate in placement
1.32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continued from 1.3</li> <li>- Lack of conflict specifically fishing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Possible issue with Ireland i.e 12 mile</li> <li>- Some netting activity</li> </ul>	-
1.33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Same as 1.31</li> </ul>	-	-
1.34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Same as 1.31</li> </ul>	-	-
1.35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Next to overlap area</li> </ul>	-	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General Comments and Points</li> <li>- Don't know enough about what we're protecting to be able to make a decision on where the MCZ should be.</li> <li>- In coastal areas management measures may need to vary across the MCZ in order to protect the wider ecosystem in the area while allowing activities such as anchoring to take place in specified parts of it (but protected other specified parts e.g. mud flats).</li> <li>- Habitats are going to be unusual – 1.6 because it is not just mud i.e. it is an artificial area!</li> </ul>			

## 2.4 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"> <li>- Joins two areas of overlap</li> <li>- Are there benefits to the industry in having some protected areas to enhance/improve fisheries?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Important scalloping area for the NI fleet, IoM, Scotland.</li> <li>- Doesn't allow long corridor activities as it blocks the pathways</li> </ul>	-
1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Existing overlap</li> </ul>	-	-
1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Co-located with phase 3 wind farm</li> <li>- Large area</li> </ul>	-	-
1.4	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a well head in that area that needs to be considered</li> </ul>	-
4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Area overlap</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Important fishing area, dependent upon management</li> </ul>	-
4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Must be placed on actual wind farms</li> </ul>	-	-
4.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Area of overlap</li> <li>- Neighbouring scalloping areas, might add protection to the fishery in the long term</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Important area for fishing, potential impacts dependant on management</li> <li>- Potential for displacement of effort</li> </ul>	-
3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Avoids Nephrops fishing to the north</li> <li>- Least valuable habitat for Nephrops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Important meet requirements of ENG due to different (subtly) habitats</li> </ul>	-

## 2.5 Group 5 Discussion Map

Location Number	 Benefits of this location and why here?	 Disbenefits of this location why not here?	<b>C</b> Other comments
2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Linking with overlap areas</li> <li>- Larger area link</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- none</li> </ul>	-
4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Connecting with overlap</li> <li>- Connecting with "green" habitat</li> </ul>	-	-
4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Large area</li> </ul>	-	-
4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Large area</li> </ul>	-	-
4.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Large area</li> </ul>	-	-
4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining large area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some cables in area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Until you know "management" difficult to make decisions</li> </ul>
4.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Covered more habitats</li> <li>- Larger area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cables</li> </ul>	-
4.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Large area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Covers some prawn fishing areas</li> </ul>	-
4.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Misses prawn fishing area</li> </ul>	-	-
3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In area of wind farm</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lot of cables – unsure of management already conflict between these uses.</li> </ul>	-
3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In wind farm area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- With area of cables</li> </ul>	-
3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Over gas rig areas</li> </ul>	-	-
3.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Big area</li> </ul>	-	-
3.5			
3.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- According to data lower volume</li> <li>- Fishing area</li> </ul>	-	-
3.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Large area connecting</li> <li>- Less dense fishing volume</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cables</li> </ul>	-
3.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Avoids fishing hotspot</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cables</li> </ul>	-
1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Large area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposed interconnector power cables</li> </ul>	-
1.2			
1.3			
1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Large area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lots of cables</li> </ul>	-
1.5			
1.6			

1.11 1.12 1.13	- Builds upon an area of sub tidal mud which has been placed	- Patented site for possible future mariculture developments	-
1.7	- Builds on area of overlap	- None	-
1.8 1.9 1.10	- Builds on large area	- Many proposed cables	-
<p>- General Comments and Points</p> <p>- With the size of areas that must be allocated, and the locations of different habitats, it seems unavoidable that there will be some interaction with submarine cables. The ability to maintain/repair without delay is vital to international communication.</p> <p>- Without detailed GIS software it is very difficult to state the location of submarine cables as their diameter is not dissimilar to a garden hose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question. What is the timetable for I of M government to introduce their own conservation measures under MCZ?</li> <li>• Question. why is it suggested that the I of Man have a 12n/m limit which restricts placement.</li> </ul>			

### 3 Guidance for working together

#### Communicating with others

- In your comments on the **Guidelines for working together**, it is clear that SG members want more clarity and guidance around needing to communicate and share information from meetings with others, yet not sharing information too soon before it is well considered, and respecting the need for confidentiality during sensitive negotiations.
- We are now at a critical stage with the first progress report/iteration being sent to SAP and being available in the public domain (on the SAP and ISZ websites). Stakeholder Group members also now need to communicate effectively with people from their interest to collect their views and comments at this stage, but without causing unnecessary anxiety whilst things are still at such an early stage.

#### 3.1 In relation to the first iteration/progress report

##### 3.1.1 What are the advantages with making the progress report available to others

###### Keep people informed

- Important to inform how far things have gone
- Obvious way to disseminate information

###### Facilitate communication within the sectors

- Facilitating communication within the sectors

###### Engage a wider group

- Wider consultation could have benefits as long as termed 'early stages'
- Likely to catch people who the stakeholder group wouldn't otherwise capture
- Begins to engage a wider group
- Opportunities to encourage people to get involved and comment on the iteration: possibly give additional data.
- Gives every stakeholder the right to reply.

###### Explain and invite input

- Opportunity to explain how socio-economic impacts will be taken into consideration
- Opportunity to explain the process and let people know how they can input into it (including end date of project),

###### Get information from those outside the group

- Opportunities to get specific information to the stakeholder group,
- People expert knowledge from outside the group is included
- Feedback information and data,
- Feedback from academics and all saucers/industries
- Expert information can be filtered in to the team/process
- Fill in knowledge gaps

###### Transparency

- Transparency
- Promotes transparency
- Transparency
- Transparency of the process (not just us sat around the table without talking to anyone)

###### International Engagement

- International engagement
- Able to highlight cross boarder issues

###### Demonstrate progress

- Show Europe we're ahead of the game.

###### Ownership increased

- Ownership increased if people have a right to influence (at this stage)

###### Promote objectives of what trying to achieve

- Can promote the objectives of what you're trying to achieve



**Consistency / other projects**

- Consistency within the other 3 projects
- Other groups have done so we should (willingness to be open)
- Opportunity to get an idea of what is going on in the other project areas.

**Timing in the process**

- It's not too late, but early enough to get good feedback (opens door to get input),
- Sticking to a timeline and process and starts the ball rolling from that level

**Failure to do so would undermine the process**

- Failure to do so undermines the process

**Weight off RSG**

- Takes some of the weight off the stakeholder and group.

**Consistency**

- Mirrors onshore planning application process – consistency.

**Reduces bias increases accountability**

- Reduces bias and increases stakeholder accountability measures.

**Suggestions:**

- Needs to be clear what we have been doing
- Should invite a dialogue

**And another perspective!....**

- issa lotta bollocks.

**3.1.2 What are the risks and challenges****Personal risks to individuals**

- Risks to individuals – too much pressure on one group member
- Individuals may be at risk from the groups they represent and others

**Limited information used so far - could cause misunderstanding**

- Qualifier - does not include data from overseas fleets or <15 m boats (VMS reliant)
- Maps are incomplete in part because information is missing in terms of foreign fishing activities, legislative process, wind farms etc.
- Could suggest that the stakeholder group has more information than they have
- Not scientific - don't have enough data available
- No confidence limits for data - based on best available information, not necessarily most accurate.

**Raises concerns about MCZ management and restrictions**

- Assumes the stakeholders have the information on management and what the zones will be. It needs to be clear that this has been based on limited information.
- Raises questions what MCZs are and how they are managed what are the implications on individual.
- Going to raise a lot of questions that you can't answer, therefore need more data and info on management measures.
- Perceived economic impact – cost to industry, loss of livelihood etc.
- Creates uncertainty and fear for socio-economic industries

**Misunderstanding around how early stage this still is – leading to tension/conflict**

- People will potentially perceive maps are final if there is not enough explanation – scare mongering (open to misinterpretation)
- Debates become political too early.
- Misleading people
- Risk that its premature – final outcome may be very different
- Can be misinterpreted or misconstrued

**Managing the information that comes in**

- Who is going to manage the information coming in?
- Challenge for project team to filter the info and distribute to the group member/s.
- Raises massive concerns in the broader community. Could potentially lead to a lot of extra work for ISCZ team and SG representatives
- Level of feedback /comment becomes unmanageable – not a consultation

**EU sates engagement**

- Lack of engagement of other European fleets – they were not included

**Process needs to be understood**

- Governance issue – people need to understand the process issue

- Process needs to be clearly stated – otherwise may be misinterpreted
- Process needs to be clearly defined, also what have we done to arrive at this point

#### **Too much information**

- Too much information for people to take on board

#### **Disengagement**

- Some stakeholders will believe they have been misrepresented: they may not want to be involved because they will become disillusioned

#### **Media**

- Media attention can make certain sectors appear less desirable

#### **Raising expectations**

- Can raise expectations from other groups

#### **Displacement**

- Displacement concerns e.g. increase pressure on industries

#### **Compensation**

- Opens government to legal challenge – specifically compensation
- Raises questions about compensation – how much and where?

#### **Suggestions:**

- Should not use bold lines to help reduce misinterpretation.
- Need to clearly explain how people can have an input
- People must have the opportunity to comment: 2-way dialogue
- People interpret it as set in stone – needs clear use of language
- People are more inclined to look at the maps not the supporting text
- Wording is very critical – could create ambiguity

### **3.1.3 What guidance do you want, to help deliver the benefits but overcome the risks and challenges?**

#### **Guidance for the Stakeholder Group**

##### **Reduce work load and pressure on SG members**

- Point of contact nominated within ISCZ so that SG representatives are not overwhelmed

##### **A single consistent message**

- One consistent message to reduce the risk of confusion etc.
- A 'boiler plate' is needed to accompany any/all information. This must be brief and to the point and include: who we are, what we are hoping to achieve, timeline and where we are in that timeline, caveat saying that this is not the opinion of an individual

##### **Clear message for SG members to pass on**

- Vital that members of the regional stakeholder group pass on a consistent message to wider stakeholder. Need lines to take and FAQs. Guidance to give clarity of process i.e. FAQs on the process – past and future.

##### **Explain lack of data/information**

- Inaccuracy or limited data needs to be addressed – explanatory note needs to be made

##### **Ensure it is clear that RSG members may disagree with outputs to date**

- RSG members must be able to explain the process but also point out they may personally disagree with some specific outputs to date.

##### **Clarity of role of SG members**

- Need clarity on the role of the stakeholder group members in feeding back information to wider stakeholders

##### **Confidentiality**

- Nothing that is said within this room is to be attributed to individuals – 'Chatham House Rules'

#### **Guidance for the ISCZ**

##### **Warning of the publication date**

- Must have several weeks warning of the publication date (RSG)

##### **Caveats to include**

- Need the title to be considered the first word should be tentative.
- Make it clear that new information is going to be available for future iterations – help refine thinking

- Ensure everyone gets the full picture about marine activities, not just the location of MCZs. Give the whole picture i.e. other data
- Key messages on maps defining the process – short, key messages need to be next to the map
- Sufficient documentation with caveats to make it clear it is provisional
- Big caveat – work in progress
- Clarity about the process and information given to the group
- Caveats about how the group have come to the 1<sup>st</sup> iteration
- Needs caveat on all information that leaves this group. Needs a health warning that individuals who attend do not necessarily agree with the information released, or even the process
- Set out what the requirements of the zones are clearly

#### **Ensure the map can not be read with out caveats**

- People are more inclined to look at the maps not the supporting text
- Need a draft watermark on documents i.e. subject to complete revision.
- The order that information appears on the website is important – map should go last
- No one document should be able to be taken out of context – ensure through embedded caveats

#### **Clear statement about the process**

- Need clarity: simple, clear statements to explain the process etc.
- Use of language – consensus should not be used – show it as negotiation

#### **Keep communication low key**

- Make sure communication is low key

#### **Handle press v carefully**

- Manage national communication e.g. prepare press communication
- Big press enquiries should be handled centrally using expertise of Natural England and JNCC (supported by regional projects)

#### **Co-ordinate with other governments so Ministers can be briefed**

- Must coordinate with government policy officials in the relevant devolved and foreign governments because it will provoke comments and questions. Ministers must be briefed.

#### **Consistency across 4 projects**

- Consistence across 4 regional projects – need to have

#### **Clarity on reasons?**

- Clarity required on the purpose of releasing the iterations. Is it to get comments, data or what?

#### **Format the map carefully and tentatively**

- Map presentation needs to have good cartography i.e. shading, dotted lines. Explanatory notes. Circular shapes. No defined lines
- Should not use bold lines to help reduce misinterpretation.

#### **Explain where the scientific benefit**

- Needs to give the scientific benefit of the zones/network (not just where the zones are)

#### **Clarity on how any comments will be handled**

- Need to clearly explain how people can have an input
- People must have the opportunity to comment: 2-way dialogue
- If comments are being sought they need to be going to a central repository rather than via individuals. One nominated point of contact
- Clear guidance on how the group will take account of the comments
- Hold back on publishing the limited data. Should be explained that info provided by external sources is not the responsibility of the stakeholder

## **3.2 Generally for inclusion in the Guidelines for working together:**

### **3.2.1 What solutions or guidance can you think of?**

#### **What stays in the room**

- Saying who said what (except what you say yourself)
- Any stories or happenings
- Explanatory discussions and brainstorming that is not firmed up
- Views and opinions

#### **What can be communicate outside the room to others**

- Effects of sea use on broadscale habitats

- Who is involved
- Human use and activity tables
- Workshop outputs
- The process
- Iterations – with guidance from today

**Other suggestions**

- The ability to accurately represent the position of different industries further down the line is vital to reflect negotiations to our constituents

### **3.3 People communicating with you – email and contact information**

The results of this are not included here

## 4 Mapping session 2 - Look at the common ground and make additions and refinements

### 4.1 Discussion about how to do the mapping

#### Method

1. Following workshop two, a map was prepared showing where several of the working groups had suggested the same location.
2. In the earlier mapping-session in this workshop, five groups worked up their ideas from this base map.
3. After that session, the results were digitised to show where groups had suggested the same locations
4. It was planned that this session would start from where three or more groups had suggested the same locations

#### SG members suggestions to amend the method

- It was suggested that rather than expand out from where three or more groups had suggested the same location, it would be worth seeing what two or more groups had suggested, how well it met the ENG adequacy targets
- The results showed areas that significantly exceeded the ENG targets.
- It was suggested that the group then start with this and look to amend boundaries to reduce the area.
- Before starting work, some people wanted to discuss the situation more.

#### Questions and Answers

- Q: Is this just a lottery? – mapping is based on information that is sketchy at best. Also, if everything is based on the amount we have here then we are going to impact fishermen and fleets**
- A:** Defra are providing information/data, but for the offshore habitats there is far less known than everyone would like. For Broadscale Habitats, the SG is looking for percentage of each.
- Q: Would it make more sense to have all of the information first?**
- A:** It is frustrating that it is not all available - but also it may well have been overwhelming to have it all at once –the group has to work with what is available. Much more will be available for the next workshop

#### Stakeholder discussion about proceeding

- Facilitator:** - The IT shows that the 'two or more map' has double the amount of subtidal mud than is required to meet the adequacy target for that habitat.
- SG** - Suggest that that it is left as it is and it is refined later when more detailed information is available at the next meeting.
- But it does have to go to the Science Panel as a progress report
- Is it worth reducing the area or do we leave it as it is?
- Facilitator:** - If it is left as it is, SG members will need to be willing to explain to others from their interest, why the map sent to the Science Advisory Panel has much more p MCZ than needed. This may be difficult for some SG members to explain - perhaps this is a particular problem for SG members for commercial fisheries?
- SG** - There is no real knowledge of how much impact fishing activities are actually having or what the management of MCZs will actually be - so people don't yet know how MCZs' management will impact on various activities.
- Facilitator:** - I want to do a quick check of the fisheries representatives in the room to see how they feel about leaving the map as it is showing double the area of the key Nephrops fisheries habitat and more than is needed of other key fisheries habitats
- SG** - Suggest that potential MCZs be changed to 'areas of search' so that it is clear in communication that these are not the actual zones, just potential areas in which MCZs could be located further down the line
- It was suggested that co-location with industries that already affect fishing could be a good solution eg co-location with oil and gas given their environmental track record (given the BP situation this prompted some amusement)

- The fisheries interests initially thought to leave the map as it is but then one suggested a change in one particular area that he wanted.
- Other people then made further suggestions.

The group continued to work from the larger area of coverage resulting from the work of two or more groups by reducing them to the percentage area required by the ENG and to refine the boundaries for particular reasons (See 4.2 below).

## 4.2 Group discussion on potential MCZ locations



**Please note:** This session was fast and not recorded completely at the time. Text has been added since the workshop and this indicated by different colour fonts.



**Black text = notes made during the session by K Hardcastle (dialogue matters)**

**Blue text= notes made afterwards by D Pound (dialogue matters)**

**Green text = notes made afterwards by Kieran (ISCZ)**

(Note: the acronym ‘p’ is used before MCZ to indicate that it is a possible or potential MCZ - not a definite size or location at this early stage)

Location Number	 Benefits of this location and why here?	 Disbenefits of this location why not here?	C Other comments
pMCZ1	- Only hard rock sea bird nesting area in the Irish Sea	- Remove some of the pink habitat because many commercial ports would be affected	-
	- Suggest to leave boundary over the oil and gas field because the area is already closed to fishermen	- Suggest that the boundary may be moved to avoid the Morecambe Bay oil/gas fields	-
	- Suggest that whole northern boundary be lowered (south) as it would capture the yellow habitat also - Synergy between oil and gas and conservation as they, as an industry, have a good record of environmental management (!? the BP oil leak doesn't back this up)	-	- Refinement of boundaries to reduce the pink habitat, as a primary habitat for fishing value, down.
pMCZ 2	-	-	- Reduce the boundary from the east so that there is an area of this habitat available for inshore fisherman all down this coast
pMCZ3	-	-	- Move south slightly and rationalise boundaries - Incorporate the shipping channel

Location Number	 Benefits of this location and why here?	 Disbenefits of this location why not here?	C Other comments
			between Holyhead and Dublin – Group have seemed to avoid the entire round 3 windfarm area since the proposal is that fishing might be excluded but conservation isn't compromised
pMCZ4	–	–	– Suggest remove one whole area off the Welsh coast – Refine the shape to enable easier management – No need for straight lines as this won't make it easier to manage (VMS) – Perhaps let the final shape be dictated by the FOCI
	–	–	– Suggestion for future iterations to focus on seeking more co-location opportunities such as with round 3 wind farm proposal
pMCZ5	– This is an important area for geodiversity	– This is a large area near Wales – It is part of the fishing ground used by fishers from other countries eg Belgium	– Leave it as it is
PMCZ 0	–	–	– Removed one possible location altogether because it was felt that there was too much around Wales.

- Decision was made to combine small areas that were close together into single larger areas, this applied to areas off North Anglesey, Morecambe and the Llyn Peninsular.
- Discussion over the rock outcrop on the Northern Ireland offshore area, will be left out of the iteration until the area is discussed further.

## 5 What is your view of the map and each possible MCZ location?

The map is available on the progress report on the ISCZ website

### 5.1 The Whole Map

To what extent do you support the 'first iteration' map?				
I am completely opposed	I have strong concerns	I could live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
	26 (elements)			
	25			
	22			
	20	28		
	19	26 (most)		
	18	21		
	17	15		
	14	11		
	12	7		
	10	6	23	
	9	4	16	
	8	2	13	
24	3	1	5	

What do you like about what you see? Note that this is for the whole map, not individual sites.	
<b>Manageable Areas</b>	
4	– Generally manageable area have been identified
6	– Split into manageable areas
<b>Fewer Larger Areas -well spaced – natural network</b>	
8	– Smaller numbers of larger areas as opposed to numerous small areas
9	– Large sites, well spaced. Seem to form a natural network
12	– Mostly large areas as to lots of smaller areas. Offshore which is not where mariculture operations usually go
11	– Good spatial distribution of potential sites with mixed habitats. Like relatively few, large areas
13	– Large areas which will cover larger geodiversity features
17	– Few large scale 'areas of search'
22	– There is a reasonable geographical spread. Most of the sites are quite large, which should make them less vulnerable
<b>Well balanced across area</b>	
20	– Pretty well-balanced in terms of location
21	– Good distribution north-south, east-west. Reasonable distance in-between proposed sites. Await application of FOCI information and other areas of biological value (high productivity, high biodiversity, etc)
27	– A good spacing
<b>Multi Habitat Areas</b>	
7	– Consolidated into 5 multi-habitat areas
<b>Offshore</b>	
18	– Many sites are offshore
<b>Seems to have minimised impact on activities</b>	
3	– The map shows some limited common ground in areas where the impact on fishing is less than first feared
10	– It is supported by the fishing representatives in the SG, which appears of primary importance
	– The MCZs will not significantly prevent marine research
1	– Balances coverage of the offshore habitats without potentially sterilising future known marine



	aggregates resources
23	– It takes into consideration all stakeholder concerns
<b>Pragmatic solution given current info</b>	
15	– It is probably the most pragmatic solution which can be found, <u>on the basis of current information</u>
5	– I could live with it
<b>It meets the (Ecological Network Guidance) ENG and project delivery guidance</b>	
16	– I think the approach is working well. Obviously more data or information in FOCI will help to ***** or corroborate the proposed sites
	– The ENG and project delivery guidance have been followed
26	– Meets ENG minimum guidance for <u>area</u> of listed broad habitat areas – as a <u>minimum</u> for starters
<b>Need to see how it changes</b>	
2	– I would like to see how the next stages/further info will influence the zones
28	– At present it has relatively little impact on N Ireland interests (but realise that further versions likely to have more impact once we get feedback from SAP)
<b>No Comment</b>	
19	– -
25	– -
<b>Don't like the map – due to lack of information</b>	
24	– Opposed to process largely due to poor and incorrect data
14	– Not much – attempting to base important decisions that will have significant effects on 'best guess' information is unfair

**What would need to happen for you to increase your support?**

**More information needed**

9	– They should be based on better information – currently seem to be based on very little factual information, and more on remembered anecdotal information and random placement by people who don't know the details. The information to underpin this stage of the process exists and must be used. I do not feel that this new map is any progress from meeting 2 because we didn't have any more information
14	– Info re confidence limits of sites
14	– More site information and evidence of effect of impact.
20	– Main concern is that not enough data was available for rational decisions to be taken
24	– Much more evidence-based and not based on pre-decreed standard
25	– More time and information. It is hard to make any choice when we're not in view of all information to make a choice

**More ecological and environmental data and information**

1	– Acquisition and use of higher resolution data from the habitats concerned to increase confidence in site selection. Better JNCC/ NE justification for habitat selection
10*	– The SG requires more accurate and detailed information on the allocated regions
	– An informed appraisal is required on the ecological and environmental benefits of choosing the designated areas as MCZs
15	– More information must be built into the decision-making process on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ FOCI</li> <li>▪ Pressure matrix and expected management measures</li> </ul>
21	– Await application of FOCI information and other areas of biological value (high productivity, high biodiversity, etc)
22	– I would need to have a clearer grasp of the local quality of each broad habitat – currently we only have data on location
26	– Needs to include FOCI
	– Specifically needs to cover FOCI communities of muddy habs – doesn't at present
27	– Evidence for positive benefits/special features present in areas as opposed to sites were chosen by least resistance

**More information about the effect on activities and socio -economics**

26	– Better information on activities taking place in these areas
4	– PMCZ2 is over the Morecambe Bay gas fields development. If this area is not excluded from

	MCZs the PMCZ2 could impact the gas fields operations
11	– Need much more information on activities within areas and possible alternative locations
17	– Exclusion of areas already licensed for R1 & R2 windfarm areas and licensed aggregate extraction areas. Presents problems for pre-existing applications process. Further complicates MCZ designation process and existing licenses
19	– More science and further consultation with fishermen. Guarantee that traditional fishing grounds remain open
28	– Consider that further iterations are likely to have more impact therefore retaining present position would be good, if not perhaps realistic – Need more information on socio-economic importance in various areas in order to defend selections to stakeholders
<b>More efforts at co-location</b>	
7	– Missed opportunity to designate a less controversial area around phase 3 windfarm proposals.
26	– Consider co-location opportunities with round 3 windfarms and other activities
<b>More information about commercial fishing</b>	
19	– More science and further consultation with fishermen. Guarantee that traditional fishing grounds remain open
14	– <15m fishing data
18	– Much more information i.e.. Data from local fisheries
14	– Input from French/Irish/Belgian fish interests
<b>Need to know management restrictions</b>	
6	– Specify exact restrictions with respect to each MCZ
8	– More information on the impact of MCZs on submarine cables. At present I cannot meaningfully support or oppose the area as I do not know whether it would impede future installation/maintenance of cables
12	– Would need info about restrictions
<b>Test against ENG requirements and other principles</b>	
7	– Suspect some broad scale habitat protection has been lost, e.g. Low energy circalittoral rock.
7	– Proposal does not meet ENG for 2 of each broad scale habitat, e.g. only one area of sub tidal mixed sediments
26	– Needs to be tested against other principals e.g. repl'n, ( <i>replication</i> ) conn. ( <i>Connectivity</i> )
26	– Better information on conservation interests – from Defra data review
<b>Inshore needed</b>	
11	– Primary interest is inshore and that is missing so far!
<b>Too much around Wales</b>	
7	– Would like to see slightly more areas in northern part of Irish sea covered – at the moment it is disproportionately sited off Wales
<b>Linkages with other national plans</b>	
11	– Need to see linkages to other national plans – i.e.. Overall picture for Irish Sea not just the English bit.
<b>More areas with high geological interests</b>	
13	– Larger and more diverse seabed <u>processes</u> and smaller landfarms to be conserved which have been omitted
<b>Must take into account maritime safety</b>	
15	– Maritime safety must be a primary concern i.e.. Not forcing difficult sectors together e.g. Fishing vessels into shipping lanes
<b>No Comment or NA</b>	
5	– -
16	– -
23	– NA
<b>Issues with the process</b>	
2	– Consistent approach across the whole day. Towards the end of the day the workshop was dominated by one stakeholder group. Changes were made because of this
3	– Our group did not complete the mapping task and therefore was not fully represented. In addition 2 or 3 individuals with the loudest voices or interest could then delete or move the democratically agreed areas i.e., those areas where 2 groups suggestions overlapped.

Therefore the whole process was almost meaningless. The map represents the wishes of a few individuals only

## 5.2 Each possible MCZ location as a whole

IN the levels of support tables, people were given the option of showing their level of support based on the extent to which they thought there sea use or interest was compatible with the habitat types within the MCZ. The font colours have the following meaning:

**Green (your sea use or interest is compatible or doesn't occur here)**

**Yellow ((your sea use could be compatible with good management)**

**Red (Your sea use is not compatible)**

**Black means that the green, yellow and red categories were not relevant**

**\* indicates that someone put the same comment in relation to all the pMCZ locations**

### 5.2.1 Location 1

Possible MCZ location map reference: pMCZ1

#### To what extent can you support each possible location?

I am completely opposed	I have strong concerns	I could live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
		28		
	9	6		
	22	24		
	12	21	5	
	8	17	27	
	3	11	23	
	25,25,25	10	13	26
	19,19,19	2	5	20
	18,18,18	1	4	7

#### What do you like about what you see?

##### Nature conservation benefits

3	Very little fishery science occurs here so there would be limited impact on my interest. It also may help to protect the black guillemot population here
7	Solway Firth is important mud habitat with broad range of species, supporting whole food chain, up to porpoises and large bird populations
21	Off St Bees Head, project areas most important (only) cliff seabird colony – 15,000 sea birds
26	Strong support for MCZ off St Bees Head – to link marine biological interest of shore, with communities of deep mud FOCI and potentially many port roads sub tidal reef plus bird Area of Ecol Importance
27	Links to S. Scottish waters, realised conservation benefits for bird life

##### It may not be or is not detrimental to my interests

8*	If there will be less fishing activity there will be a lesser risk of damage to the numerous cables in the area
10*	Not detrimental to marine research

##### If possible look for ways to reduce impact on inshore fishers

11	Nothing in particular other than spatial distribution. Could easily be moved south to St Bees area if that assists commercial interests
----	---

##### Where it is

18*	Most are offshore
24	Far away
20	Inshore location
22	It's not that far from the better location

**Coherent network**

17 Good distribution of MCZs creates coherent network/necklace

**It has been decided by stakeholders**

6\* Decided by stakeholder

13 General agreement, large area. Not of great interest to geodiversity

**No comment**

1 No comments

2 -

4 -

5 -

9 I don't know anything about it

12 -

15 -

16 -

19 -

23 -

25 -

28 -

**What would need to happen for you to increase your support?**

**Change the shape to increase its conservation benefit**

3 I would support the area more if it was stretched North/South and made thinner and that it hugged the coast more. Also need to know what activities would be banned e.g. trawling would not adversely affect the birds, whereas netting may, but trawling can affect the seabed when netting doesn't. So how do we make a decision without knowing what will be banned and why?

21 See area shift south, to sit directly off St Bees Head and increase in size

24 Move north

22 It would need to relate more clearly to the quality deep mud communities I understand live south of St Bees Head. It is too small. I would need to know more about its quality relative to other locations with similar broad habitat type

26 Area needs to include St Bees shoreline – some of mud FOCI and might include area of reef off work – Mayport. Should include Area of Ecol Int for birds – also porpoise pupping area off Mayport

**Information**

25\* Full information

14 More information

**Information on conservation benefit**

27 Have benefits for focal features

10 Supporting scientific evidence for selection of given areas

9 I would like to see the detailed information on features of conservation interest

15\* (our) Interest occurs everywhere, but compatibility is not yet known and will not be until FOCI and better habitat data are available. At the moment all we are protecting is colours on maps, not actual habitats or ecosystems.

No comments as yet (re increased support) All MCZs must be justified by sound conservation need proven by reliable and peer-retrieved source. They should be selected so as to have the minimal possible impact on use of those. This cannot even be begun until more meaningful habitat information is available

**Information about management and restrictions on my interests**

8\* Confirmation that maintenance of existing cables can still be carried out unrestricted and installation of new cables will be possible.

8\* The fact that territorial waters and exclusive economic zones/fishing zones are not distinguished between is also of concern, as at present submarine cables enjoy certain maintenance freedoms, which are critical to international communications.

12 Need to know what would be restricted. This is the closest PMCZ to the shore therefore only site of possible future mariculture operations

10\* Definition of the possible extent of control of MCZs on each area

**More information about effect on fisheries**

9	I would like to see the detailed information on fishing effort and gears and value of fishing
18*	More fisheries data locally
19*	Consultation with local fishermen
14*	Not my area <u>but</u> don't like close inshore zones because forces local small scale vessels to have to go further = more danger/increase in carbon etc

**More information on activities in the area**

11	More info on activities in area
----	---------------------------------

**No comment**

1	No comments
2	-
4	-
5	-
7	-
13	-
16	-
17	-
20	-
23	-
28	-
6*	MOD will remain neutral, but reserve the right to enforce gov't legislation

**5.2.2 Location 2**

Possible MCZ location map reference: pMCZ2

**To what extent can you support each possible location?**

I am completely opposed	I have strong concerns	I could live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
		17		
		24		
		8		
		4		
		3	2	
		21	6	
		12	27	
	9	11	26	
	25,25,25	2	23	20
19,19,19	18,18,18	1	7	13

**What do you like about what you see?**

**Nature conservation benefits**

21	Off important seabird colonies (terns) at Walney
17	Includes 2 diff habitat types and sits within area of much activity
9	Possibly includes some of Isle of Man Sandy Mound(?) feature

**It's a large simple site**

4	Large area
22	It is large
20	Large area with little impact on existing usage
27	Large simple site

**It may not be or is not detrimental to my interests**

1	It avoids the licensed aggregate extraction area to the north, but is in an area of potential future prospecting
---	--

10	Not detrimental to marine research
8*	If there will be less fishing activity there will be a lesser risk of damage to the numerous cables in the area
<b>Potentially less effect on fisheries than other options</b>	
24	Far away, minimal fishing
3	It allows at least some of the pink area to be fished
9	Seems to be avoiding high fishing density.
18*	Most are offshore
26	Includes muddy sand areas within MB gasfield/windfarm area – co-location opportunity
11	Large area of mixed habitat incorporating windfarm areas and other restricted zones
<b>It has been decided by stakeholders</b>	
6*	Decided by stakeholder
13	General agreement, large area
<b>No comment</b>	
2	-
5	-
7	-
12	-
15	-
16	-
19	-
23	-
25	-
28	-
<b>What would need to happen for you to increase your support?</b>	
<b>1.Change the shape - and co-locate if possible</b>	
2	Should include gas field or windfarm area
4	Refer to my earlier comments (about the map as a whole). Conflicts with Morecambe Bay gas field development. Could it be moved east? (to be east of Morecambe Bay fields)
24	Align to gas field
3	Should be stretched East/West in a long thin line from it's southern area to cover green/blue/yellow areas in phase 3 of the windfarm between Holyhead and Isle of Man. That way the floating windfarms and MCZ will share an exclusive area
21	Move to include areas nearer inshore
22	It would be better moved northward to include the best quality deep mud communities
26	Should be aligned to include some of mud community FOCI at south end of Nephrops ground
<b>Exclude round 1 and 2 windfarms</b>	
17	Round 1 & 2 windfarm sites to be excluded. If they were removed – would support this area of search
<b>Information</b>	
25*	Need more information
14*	More information
<b>2.Information on conservation benefit</b>	
1	Acquisition and use of better data to increase confidence in the designation and assist management and stewardship
8*	The process of locating pMCZs seemed back to front. To much done with too little info
9	I would like to see more information on the features of conservation interest
15*	Interest occurs everywhere, but compatibility is not yet known and will not be until FOCI and better habitat data are available. At the moment all we are protecting is colours on maps, not actual habitats or ecosystems. No comments as yet (re increased support) All MCZs <u>must</u> be justified by sound conservation need proven by reliable and peer-retrieved source. They should be selected so as to have the minimal possible impact on use of those. This cannot even be begun until more meaningful habitat information is available
27	Ecological basis for selection identified. Pink more equally balanced with PMCZ1

**Information about effects on human activities**

11	More info on activities in the area
8*	Confirmation that maintenance of existing cables can still be carried out unrestricted and installation of new cables will be possible.
8*	The fact that territorial waters and exclusive economic zones/fishing zones are not distinguished between is also of concern, as at present submarine cables enjoy certain maintenance freedoms, which are critical to international communications.
7	More information on conservation impact of oil/gas terminal included in area
10*	Supporting scientific evidence for selection of given areas Definition of the possible extent of control of MCZs on each area
19*	Traditional fishing grounds to remain open

**More information about effect on fisheries**

9	I would like to see more information on the fishing effort, gears and value
14*	As 1 (Not my area but don't like close inshore zones because forces local small scale vessels to have to go further = more danger/increase in carbon etc)
18*	More fisheries data locally

**7. No comment**

5	-
12	-
13	-
16	-
20	-
23	-
28	-
6*	MOD will remain neutral but reserve the right to implement gov't legislation

**5.2.3 Location 3**

Possible MCZ location map reference: pMCZ 3

**To what extent can you support each possible location?**

I am completely opposed	I have strong concerns	I could live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
		26		
	14	21		
	13	12		
	9	11		
	2	3		
	24	1	27	
	8	28	23	
	25,25,25	17	4	
19,19,19	18,18,18	6	7	20

**What do you like about what you see?**

**Nature conservation and geodiversity benefits**

7	Includes important area of high energy circalittoral rock
9	Protects a number of different habitats within one site. Large with small are to boundary ratio
11	3 different habitats giving multiple interfaces
13	Good area, which will safeguard patterned ground but misses the other Quaternary Ice Age features. Once lost, never regained!
17	Area incorporating at least 3 broad scale habitat types and of sufficient size to have impact
21	Suitable for longer distance foraging spp., eg Manx Shearwater

**Could link ecological network of different countries**

27	Capacity to link in with network through Irish, Welsh and Manx sites
<b>Good coverage of substrate but with low impact</b>	
3	There is some fishery science here but it may be allowed. I like that it covers different substrate but with low impact
<b>Co-location with shipping lanes</b>	
15	Overlap with Bangor – Dublin shipping route and unprotected spaces avoids fishing activity into shipping lane
20	Offshore site. Includes shipping lanes
<b>It may not be or is not detrimental to my interests</b>	
1	It avoids licensed aggregate extraction areas and likely future prospecting areas
4	No oil or gas production or exploration
8*	If there will be less fishing activity there will be a lesser risk of damage to the numerous cables in the area
10*	Not detrimental to marine research
<b>Large size - offshore</b>	
22	It is large
26	Large size, which is likely to enhance benefits it could provide
24	Nothing much
18*	Most are offshore
<b>It could be changed</b>	
2	It can be expanded/changed due to its proximity to Round 3 area
<b>It has been decided by stakeholders</b>	
6*	Decided by stakeholder
<b>No comment</b>	
5	-
12	-
14	-
16	-
19	-
23	-
25	-
28	-
<b>What would need to happen for you to increase your support?</b>	
<b>Change the shape to increase its conservation benefit</b>	
13	Needs to extend more to the east to cover the drumlin field – a unique Ice Age feature and the melt water features
17	Northern/eastern corner scaled back to avoid contact with R3 windfarm zone
<b>Information</b>	
25*	Need more information
11	More info
14*	Need more information
<b>Information on conservation benefit</b>	
9	I would like to see more information on the features of conservation interest
10*	Supporting scientific evidence for selection of given areas Definition of the possible extent of control of MCZs on each area
22	I would need to know more about its quality relative to other locations
8*	And the process of locating PMCZs seemed back to front. Too much done with too little info
15*	Interest occurs everywhere, but compatibility is not yet known and will not be until FOCI and better habitat data are available. At the moment all we are protecting is colours on maps, not actual habitats or ecosystems. No comments as yet (re increased support) All MCZs <u>must</u> be justified by sound conservation need proven by reliable and peer-retrieved source. They should be selected so as to have the minimal possible impact on use of those. This cannot even be begun until more meaningful habitat information is available
<b>More information about effect on fisheries</b>	



18*	More fisheries data locally
9	I would like to see more information on the fishing effort, gears and value
27	Ecological basis for selection identified
14*	As 1 (Not my area but don't like close inshore zones because forces local small scale vessels to have to go further = more danger/increase in carbon etc)
<b>Avoid areas of importance to fishing</b>	
24	Area of much seine net and semi pelagic trawl need exception
2	This area should take into account windfarms ( Round 3) area
3	Avoid scallop grounds
19*	Traditional fishing grounds to remain open
<b>Information about management and restrictions on my interests</b>	
23	Consideration needs to be given to windfarms, especially cable routes. The zone for the farms needs to also take into account zones that cable routes may cross
8*	Confirmation that maintenance of existing cables can still be carried out unrestricted and installation of new cables will be possible. The fact that territorial waters and exclusive economic zones/fishing zones are not distinguished between is also of concern, as at present submarine cables enjoy certain maintenance freedoms, which are critical to international communications.
<b>Need to consider further</b>	
21	Will need to consider further to fully determine level of support
<b>Make the most of opportunities to co-locate</b>	
26	Should explore opportunities to co-locate MCZs for these broad habitat features with round 3 windfarm areas
26	Should explore with scallop industry whether there are opportunities to co-locate MCZs with possible closed areas for scallop fishing, as conservation/enhancement measure
<b>No comment</b>	
1	No comments
4	-
5	-
7	-
12	-
16	-
20	-
28	-
6*	MOD will remain neutral but reserve the right to implement gov't legislation

5.2.4 Location 4

Possible MCZ location map reference:

pMCZ 4

**To what extent can you support each possible location?**

I am completely opposed	I have strong concerns	I could live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
		28		
		6		
		26	3	
		21	27	
	24	17	23	
	8	12	13	
	14	11	4	
	25,25,25	9	2	
19,19,19	18,18,18	1	7	20

**What do you like about what you see?**

Nature conservation benefits and geodiversity data

21	Suitable for longer distance foraging spp., eg Manx Shearwater
11	Good mixed habitat zone
3	It's fine. Some science in this area
9	Large with small boundary to area ratio. Possibly corresponds with a basking shark deep water habitat (revealed by recent satellite tagging data) <u>could</u> benefit from protection of Benthic habitat
13	Covers glacial till and tunnel valleys and its blue location
<b>It may not be or is not detrimental to my interests</b>	
1	Avoids licensed aggregates extraction areas and areas of likely future search
4	No oil or gas production or exploration
8*	If there will be less fishing activity there will be a lesser risk of damage to the numerous cables in the area
10*	Not detrimental to marine research
18*	Most are offshore
20	Outside area of high commercial fishing effort
24	At limit of fishing from NI
<b>Large size</b>	
22	It is large
26	Large size
27	Big enough to encompass a very patchy set of habitats
<b>It has been decided by stakeholders</b>	
6*	Decided by stakeholder
<b>No comment</b>	
2	-
5	-
7	-
12	-
14	-
15	-
16	-
17	-
19	-
23	-
25	-
28	-
<b>What would need to happen for you to increase your support?</b>	
<b>Need another area of same habitats</b>	
13	I would have liked to have seen more blue off the coast of N Wales and Anglesey
7	Needs to be balanced with another area of sub-tidal mixed sediments, which could be co-located with proposed phase 3 wind farms north of Wales
26	Doesn't have good replication/connectivity of PMCZs for this habitat – i.e. Should look to include areas of 'blue' habitat within proposed round 3 windfarm area also
<b>Information</b>	
11	More info
14*	As 3 – need more information
<b>Information on conservation benefit</b>	
9	I need to see more details on the features of conservation interest
15*	(our) Interest occurs everywhere, but compatibility is not yet known and will not be until FOCI and better habitat data are available. At the moment all we are protecting is colours on maps, not actual habitats or ecosystems. No comments as yet (re increased support) All MCZs <u>must</u> be justified by sound conservation need proven by reliable and peer-retrieved source. They should be selected so as to have the minimal possible impact on use of those. This cannot even be begun until more meaningful habitat information is available
8*	And the process of locating PMCZs seemed back to front. To much done with too little info
10*	Supporting scientific evidence for selection of given areas

	Definition of the possible extent of control of MCZs on each area
22	I would need to know more about its quality relative to other locations
27	Ecological basis for selection identified.
<b>Information about management and restrictions on my interests</b>	
8*	Confirmation that maintenance of existing cables can still be carried out unrestricted and installation of new cables will be possible. The fact that territorial waters and exclusive economic zones/fishing zones are not distinguished between is also of concern, as at present submarine cables enjoy certain maintenance freedoms, which are critical to international communications.
<b>More information about effect on fisheries</b>	
18*	More fisheries data locally
9	I need to see more details on the fishing effort, gears and value
14*	As 1 (Not my area but don't like close inshore zones because forces local small scale vessels to have to go further = more danger/increase in carbon etc)
<b>Avoid areas of importance to fishing and get in international buy-in</b>	
19*	Traditional fishing grounds to remain open
27	That sites would get international fisheries buy-in
24	Semi pelagic exemption
<b>Need to consider further</b>	
17	Would need to consider against own GIS data to check
21	Will need to consider further to fully determine level of support
<b>No comment</b>	
1	No comments
2	-
3	-
4	-
5	-
12	-
16	-
20	-
23	-
25	-
28	-
6*	MOD will remain neutral but reserve the right to implement gov't legislation

### 5.2.5 Location 5

Possible MCZ location map reference: pMCZ 5

#### To what extent can you support each possible location?

I am completely opposed	I have strong concerns	I could live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
		21		
		17		
	8	12		
	24	11		
	14	1		
	9	28	27	
	4	6	26	
	25,25,25	3	23	20
19,19,19	18,18,18	7	2	13

#### What do you like about what you see?

Nature conservation benefits and geodiversity data

21	Suitable for longer distance foraging spp., e.g. Manx Shearwater
13	The fact it will conserve a large scale geodiversity feature in it's entirety
<b>Avoids or low impacts on activities</b>	
27	Simple single habitat of low conflict location within the SG
1	Ditto - Avoids licensed aggregates extraction areas and areas of likely future search
3	Some science in this area but low impact
24	No NI fishing of importance
8*	If there will be less fishing activity there will be a lesser risk of damage to the numerous cables in the area
10*	Not detrimental to marine research
<b>Large area, small boundary, replication and connectivity</b>	
9	Large area, small boundary
11	Good large area
26	Large size, replication and connectivity with other areas
<b>Offshore</b>	
18*	Most are offshore
20	Offshore site. Outside main commercial fishing area. Includes main shipping lane
22	It is large
<b>It has been decided by stakeholders</b>	
6*	Decided by stakeholder
<b>No comment</b>	
2	-
4	-
5	-
7	-
12	-
14	-
15	-
16	-
17	-
19	-
23	-
25	-
28	-
<b>What would need to happen for you to increase your support?</b>	
<b>Information</b>	
11	More info
14*	Need more information
<b>Information on conservation benefit</b>	
7	Only 1 habitat type. Less value than a mixed habitat area
9	Evidence that this site is not just the result of putting sites as far away from everyone's interests (on the group).
9	I need to see more details on the features of conservation interest
15*	(our) Interest occurs everywhere, but compatibility is not yet known and will not be until FOCI and better habitat data are available. At the moment all we are protecting is colours on maps, not actual habitats or ecosystems. No comments as yet (re increased support) All MCZs <u>must</u> be justified by sound conservation need proven by reliable and peer-retrieved source. They should be selected so as to have the minimal possible impact on use of those. This cannot even be begun until more meaningful habitat information is available
8*	And the process of locating PMCZs seemed back to front. To much done with too little info
10*	Supporting scientific evidence for selection of given areas Definition of the possible extent of control of MCZs on each area
22	I would need to know more about its quality relative to other locations
27	Ecological basis for selection identified.

**More information on fisheries**

18*	More fisheries data locally
9	I need to see more details on the fishing effort, gears and value
14*	As 1 (Not my area but don't like close inshore zones because forces local small scale vessels to have to go further = more danger/increase in carbon etc)

**Avoid traditional fishing grounds and get international buy-in**

19*	Traditional fishing grounds to remain open
27	International fisheries buy-in

**Avoids or low impacts on activities**

1	Ditto - Avoids licensed aggregates extraction areas and areas of likely future search
---	---

**Should not prevent development of oil field**

4	MCZ should not prevent future development of the Dragon oil field, located close to the median line with Irish waters. Discovery well drilled 1990's
---	--

**Information about management and restrictions on my interests**

8*	Confirmation that maintenance of existing cables can still be carried out unrestricted and installation of new cables will be possible. The fact that territorial waters and exclusive economic zones/fishing zones are not distinguished between is also of concern, as at present submarine cables enjoy certain maintenance freedoms, which are critical to international communications.
26	Better information on other activities taking place in this area

**Need to consider further**

17	Would need to consider against own GIS data to check
21	Will need to consider further to fully determine level of support

**No comment**

13	NA
2	-
3	-
5	-
12	-
16	-
20	-
23	-
24	-
25	-
28	-
6*	MOD will remain neutral but reserve the right to implement gov't legislation

5.2.6 Copy of levels of support for each potential/possible MCZ for comparison

1. To what extent can you support possible location1.?				
I am completely opposed	I have strong concerns	I could live with it	I support it	I strongly support it
		28		
	9	6		
	22	24		
	12	21	5	
	8	17	27	
	3	11	23	
	25,25,25	10	13	26
	19,19,19	2	5	20
	18,18,18	1	4	7
2. To what extent can you support possible location 2.?				
		17		
		24		
		8		
		4		
		3	2	
		21	6	
		12	27	
	9	11	26	
	25,25,25	2	23	20
19,19,19	18,18,18	1	7	13
3. To what extent can you support possible location3.?				
		26		
	14	21		
	13	12		
	9	11		
	2	3		
	24	1	27	
	8	28	23	
	25,25,25	17	4	
19,19,19	18,18,18	6	7	20
4. To what extent can you support possible location 4.?				
		28		
		6		
		26	3	
		21	27	
	24	17	23	
	8	12	13	
	14	11	4	
	25,25,25	9	2	
19,19,19	18,18,18	1	7	20
5. To what extent can you support possible location 5 ?				
		21		
		17		
	8	12		
	24	11		
	14	1		
	9	28	27	
	4	6	26	
	25,25,25	3	23	20
19,19,19	18,18,18	7	2	13

## 6 Short term Actions following the workshop

WHO	WHAT	Aiming for:
ISCZ	Type up	
dialogue matters	Emergent processing to sort all comments out	
ISCZ	Mail out to participants	

## 7 Parking Place

- Who will construct the report which will go to the public domain?
- Pre briefing needed for any new people
- The British Geological Survey published offshore Quaternary geology maps in 1974 and solid geology in 1991. Why wasn't this used to support the original map?
- In relation to sub sea cables how far will the MCZ process comply with UNCLOS and the principles of certain freedoms outside the territorial waters to which the UK is signed and ratified?
- RACs consult with them?

**\*\*these points were made about specific maps in the regional profile\*\***

- Map B.4.2.1 (commercial fishing: pelagic trawling): I strongly suggest that this is semi-pelagic whitefish trawl not pelagic herring
- Potting effort data for NI underestimated
- Map B.4.2.5 (commercial fishing: dredging): underestimates NI dredge effort
- Commercial data not up to date for area i.e. pots, nets, trawls (shrimps)

## Annex 1 List of Attendees

Interest	Name
MMO	Andy Newlands
Shipping	Adrian Lester
Ports and harbours	David Pendleton
Oil and gas	Robin Gilliver
Sand and gravel extraction	Andrew Bellamy
Sub sea cables	John Wrottesley
Mobile whitefish gear	Ron Graham
Manx fisheries	Tom Bryan Brown
Static gear fishing	Garry Pidduck
Scallop dredging	Glynne Roberts
Inshore shellfisheries	Chris Woods
NI fisheries	David Hill
Producers organisations	Dick James
Welsh fisheries	Jerry Percy
Mariculture	Kelsey Thompson
Fisheries scientist	Grant Course
JNCC	Cristina Herbon
Natural England	Chris Lumb
Environment Agency	Clive Gaskell
NGO habitats and marine species	Dave Dunlop
NGO birds	Andrew Gouldstone
Geodiversity	Cynthia Burek
NGO marine environment	Kay Foster
Sea angling	John Amery
Diving	Chris Sweeting
MOD	Tony Wyld
Seabed owners	Charles Green
Marine research activities	Matthew Palmer
Coastal issues special interest group	Dave McAleavy
Scottish government	Lorna King
NI Government	Paddy Campbell
IoM Government	Fiona Gell



## Annex 2 Agenda

### ISCZ Stakeholder Group Workshop 3

- From 9:15** Registration, coffee and tea will be available
- Those who arrive in good time have the opportunity to check the following and make comments:
- The Human Use Information Tables
  - The Human Use and Broadscale Habitat Compatibility Tables
- 9:45** **Presentations**
- Facilitators welcome and briefing **Diana Pound**  
dialogue matters
- Update on what emerged from the mapping at workshop 2 and things to think about when mapping today. **Kieran Bell**  
ISCZ
- 10:15** **Mapping session 1 – developing the next group maps**
- In groups, using the areas of common ground from workshop 2 and the other information and guidance, develop your suggestions for the location and size of possible MCZs. (Note: these will again be amalgamated to look for common ground)
- 11:15** **Tea and Coffee**
- 11:30** **Communicating progress**  
**Communicating with others**
- In your comments on the **Guidelines for working together**, it is clear that SG members want more clarity and guidance around what and how to communicate outside the workshops. There is a tension between needing to share information from meetings with others and the need for confidentiality and trust during sensitive negotiations.
- We are now at a critical stage with the first progress report/iteration being sent to SAP and being available in the public domain (on the SAP and ISCZ websites). Stakeholder Group members also now need to communicate effectively with people from their interest to collect their views and comments at this stage, but without causing unnecessary anxiety whilst things are still at such an early stage
- In relation to the first iteration/progress report**
- What are the advantages and benefits of making the progress report (iteration maps and information) available to others?
  - What are the risks and challenges?
  - What guidance do you want yourselves to help deliver the benefits but overcome the risks and challenges?
  - Who should be told the map is on the website?
- Generally for inclusion in the Guidelines for working together:**
- What solutions or guidance can you think of?
  - What guidance do you want to give ISCZ.
- In relation to people communicating with you:**
- Please fill in the questionnaire about email communication and your contact details
- 12:30** **Lunch**

**12:30 Lunch**

**1:30 Mapping session 2 - work on the map all together**

- Look at the common ground and make additions and refinements

**3:00 Tea and coffee**

**3:20 Mapping session 3 – Levels of support**

**Levels of support for the overall map**

- To what extent do you support what is shown on the map?
- What would need to happen to increase your support?

**Consider each possible MCZ**

- To what extent can you support each possible location?
- What would need to change for you to increase your support?
- If you do not support a location, what alternatives would you suggest?

**First thoughts on possible levels of protection**

- Indicate which possible MCZ/s you think could be considered for being 'highly protected'.

**Last things & What happens next**

**No later than 4.30 Finish**

**Brief 'Process Group' discussion if required**

**Finish**

**Please note well:**

This is still early days. The progress report resulting from today (ie the map and other information) is **NOT** definite or fixed. Many things may mean the location, size, shape or supporting information of possible MCZ change, including:

**Views from you and those you discuss this with:**

- When you have had time to reflect on the map
- When you have had a chance to speak to others within your sea use or interest about their views
- Any additions to the sea use/activity information tables you chose to provide
- Any additional comments or information on the effects of sea uses on the broadscale habitat

**From other stakeholders:**

- Views of other stakeholders who chose to comment - we will discuss who these people might be later

**From specialist input:**

- From the Science Advisory Panel who will consider the progress report in the light of the Ecological Guidance and feedback their thoughts
- From the ISCZ Socio-economic expert who will provide a view on the socio economic impact
- The Natural England table showing sensitivities of habitats to different effects and uses
- The data collected by the Liaison Officers from sea users (in particular fisherman and recreation users)

**From new elements of the tasks:**

- Considering inshore in more detail
- Including the Features of Conservation Importance (FOCI)
- Considering shapes of possible MCZ
- The levels of protection of possible MCZ
- Secondary consideration eg how well are area with a long research history included

## Annex 2 Discussion about whether or not some locations should be excluded.

### Note from facilitator:

- The map presented by the ISCZ (summarising the findings from workshop 2 and as the basis for working at this workshop) contained an error by excluding for consideration certain areas of windfarms and aggregate dredging.
- It turned out this was based on a misunderstanding of some information they had received by the ISCZ.
- It provoked considerable debate: people wanted to know why certain areas for certain marine industry activities had been excluded from the map because they modify the sea bed but commercial fishing had not.

The questions are contained here for the record only. **Please Note Well:** The situation was resolved when JNCC and NE went out of the workshop to ring key people and returned to clarify that **all areas should be considered** during the workshop.

### Questions asked at the time included:

**Q:** Who provided guidance that round 1 and 2 windfarms should be excluded from areas of search for MCZs? How is this consistent with the work by DECC and others to explore potential co-location of MCZs with windfarms?

**Q:** The information on wind farms not being put on the MPAs was not available at the last meeting and therefore we cannot agree with what was put on the mapping chart. The programme is designed as anti-fishing.

**Q:** Why are aggregates and other areas exempt from MPAs? How do MPAs fair with the removal of the sea bed by fishing?

### Questions put in the 'parking place' were

**Q.** Why is fishing not treated in the same way as extraction or windfarms? If logic is that wind and extraction have modified the seabed habitat then fishing has too over the period of 50 years or so. No consistency or logic in this decision.

**Q.** I would like to see the group shrink so that all the exempt industries are removed. If fishing is the only industry being affected then make it a fisheries meeting.