

**Irish Sea MCZ – Stakeholder group
workshop 5**
27th – 28th January 2011

Workshop outputs
Word for Word Report

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Workshop Facilitator | Diana Pound | dialogue matters | |
| | Kathryn Hardcastle | dialogue matters | |
| | Kath Winnard | volunteer | |
| | Jo Hardstaff | Volunteer | |
| | Justina Southworth | Volunteer | |
| | Greg Whitfield | ISCZ | |
| | Francesca Moore | ISCZ | |
| | Matthew Sutcliffe | ISCZ | |
| | Kieran Bell | ISCZ | |
| | Chris Egan | ISCZ | |
| | Steve Manning | ISCZ | |
| | Tom Higginbottom | ISCZ | |
| | Processed and sorted by: | Diana Pound | dialogue matters |
| | | Kathryn Hardcastle | dialogue matters |
| Outputs typed by: | Tom Higginbottom- | ISCZ | |

Comment [ms1]:

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| About the workshop and this report..... | 5 |
| ▪ Purpose of the workshop..... | 5 |
| ▪ Acronyms that occur in this report | 5 |
| 1 Mapping session for particular locations..... | 6 |
| 1.1 pMCZ 1/11..... | 6 |
| 1.1.1 Group 1 Discussion Map | 6 |
| 1.1.2 Group 2 Discussion Map | 7 |
| 1.1.3 Group 3 Discussion Map | 7 |
| 1.1.4 Group 4 Discussion Map | 8 |
| 1.2 pMCZ 2 | 8 |
| 1.2.1 Group 1 Discussion Map | 8 |
| 1.2.2 Group 2 Discussion Map | 9 |
| 1.2.3 Group 3 Discussion Map | 9 |
| 1.2.4 Group 4 Discussion Map | 9 |
| 1.2.5 Group 5 Discussion Map | 10 |
| 1.2.6 Group 6 Discussion Map | 10 |
| 1.3 Smelt and Eel | 10 |
| 1.3.1 Group 1 Discussion Map | 10 |
| 1.3.2 Group 2 Discussion Map | 11 |
| 1.3.3 Group 3 Discussion Map | 11 |
| 1.3.4 Group 4 Discussion Map | 11 |
| 1.3.5 Group 5 Discussion Map | 12 |
| 2 Sea Users – speak for yourself | 13 |
| 2.1 Management suggestions..... | 13 |
| 2.2 How do you suggest others from this interest are involved in management decisions?..... | 13 |
| 3 Reference Sites..... | 13 |
| 4 Review of tentative pMCZ and the different boundaries..... | 14 |
| 4.1 Boundary options | 14 |
| 4.2 Comments on Boundary Options..... | 14 |
| 4.2.1 PMCZ 1/11 | 14 |
| 4.2.2 pMCZ 2 | 14 |
| 4.2.3 pMCZ 3 | 15 |
| 4.2.4 pMCZ 4 | 15 |
| 4.2.5 pMCZ 5 | 15 |
| 4.2.6 pMCZ 6 | 16 |
| 4.2.7 Pmcz 10 | 16 |
| 4.2.8 pMCZ 13 | 16 |
| 4.2.9 pMCZ 14 | 17 |
| 5 Working towards consensus over boundary shapes and locations..... | 18 |
| 5.1 pMCZ 1/11..... | 18 |
| 5.2 pMCZ 2 | 19 |
| 5.3 pMCZ 3 | 19 |
| 5.4 pMCZ 4 | 20 |
| 5.5 pMCZ 5 | 20 |
| 5.6 pMCZ 6 | 21 |
| 5.7 pMCZ 10 | 21 |
| 5.8 pMCZ 13 | 21 |

| | | |
|---------|---|----|
| 5.9 | pMCZ 14 | 22 |
| 6 | How do you think stakeholders should be involved post this process? | 23 |
| 6.1 | How do you think stakeholders should be involved after this process?..... | 23 |
| 6.2 | The RSG continuing after this process - What do you like about the idea?..... | 23 |
| 6.3 | The RSG continuing after this process - What do you think are the challenges of the idea? | 24 |
| 6.4 | Any suggestions you would like to make? | 24 |
| 7 | Parking place comments | 24 |
| Annex 1 | List of Attendees..... | 25 |
| Annex 2 | Agenda | 26 |
| Annex 3 | Commentary from Consensus Building Session..... | 28 |

About the workshop and this report

- **Purpose of the workshop**

This is the fifth 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.

This workshop ran over two days.

- **Acronyms that occur in this report**



| Acronyms used in this report | Meaning |
|------------------------------|--|
| pMCZ | potential/tentative Marine Conservation Zone |
| ISCZ | Irish Sea Conservation Zones |
| RSG | Regional Stakeholder group |
| BAI | Broad Area of Interest |
| IFCA | Inshore fisheries conservation authorities |
| MMO | Marine management organisation |
| FOCI | Features of conservation importance |
| SSSI | Site of Special scientific interest |
| SAC | Special area of conservation |
| EA | Environment agency |
| BSH | Broadscale Habitat |
| MOD | Ministry of defence |
| CFP | Common fisheries policy |
| SAP | Science advisory panel |

1 Mapping session for particular locations

Take a look at the information and draw lines where you suggest a boundary for a pMCZ. Discuss benefits and disbenefits for this location. If the group think that location should go on the map ask the facilitator to transfer it to the master map for your group.



1.1 pMCZ 1/11

1.1.1 Group 1 Discussion Map



| Line code | Reasons for suggesting this change | Benefits of this location and why here?  | Disbenefits of this location why not here?  | C Other comments | Put on master map ? |
|-----------|--|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Includes birds' nests and offshore foraging area, Contributed to a package for pMCZ can view MCZ for St Bees Head | Need to view pMCZ from shore shouldn't dictate decision if peoples activities displaced Main area for Nephrops fishing off the Cumbrian coasts | – | – | – |
| | Hugh Atkinsons work suggests that the foci-yellow on pink is unique also sea pen condition included in this work | Number of vessels vital to the Cumbrian economy, have declined by half in the last 2 decades | – | – | – |
| | Nationally important seabird area, Historical surveys show then compared with new data a decline in number of species represented, | In the middle of a firing range risks to operations and management works well with fishing industry | – | – | – |
| | Protection of discrete areas, support fisheries by migration out into the fishing grounds | | – | – | – |
| 2 | no pMCZ in this area. | To protect the important fishing fleet and their economic contribution, | Does not provide replication for these habitats or the species present there. | – | – |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|-----|
| | | Just because something is not protected by law does not mean it will be destroyed, | | | |
| 3 | | Captures the most important area representative | Smaller boundary allows fishing effort in more important grounds. | - | YES |

1.1.2 Group 2 Discussion Map

| Line code | Reasons for suggesting this change | Benefits of this location and why here?  | Disbenefits of this location why not here?  | C Other comments | Put on master map ? |
|-----------|---|--|--|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Existing | Off St bees Head Engages with public | Prawn fisheries can we move? Management complexity need to be on a lat/long line IFCA/MMO enforcement more complex | - | - | - |
| 1 | Extends further offshore Captures more foci Ecological value. | - | - | - | - |
| 2 | Compact site ease of management follows lat/long captures foci | Prawn ground need to look at management measures | - | Depends on management | YES |

1.1.3 Group 3 Discussion Map

| Line code | Reasons for suggesting this change | Benefits of this location and why here?  | Disbenefits of this location why not here?  | C Other comments | Put on master map ? |
|-----------|--|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | To include some lost areas of sand habitats which would benefit foraging birds from St Bees Head | Would gain some pink to make for what has been lost in pMCZ2 | Maybe some opposition if this is a fishing area, Depends on what restriction were put in place | - | YES |
| 2 | To avoid good fishing grounds for static gear | Would be happy to leave the line further inshore but only if it didn't impact static gear, they currently fish on SSSI | - | - | - |
| | - | If regulations kept the beam trawlers and dredgers out this | - | - | - |



| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | would be a benefit of retaining the original line further inshore | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|

1.1.4 Group 4 Discussion Map



| Line code | Reasons for suggesting this change | Benefits of this location and why here?  | Disbenefits of this location why not here?  | C Other comments | Put on master map ? |
|-----------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------|
| 1 | | Less impact on fishing still had habitats as areas 1 compliments area 2 | Still impacts on fishing | Need to see accurate mapping with relation to other activities | YES |

1.2 pMCZ 2



1.2.1 Group 1 Discussion Map

| Line code | Reasons for suggesting this change | Benefits of this location and why here?  | Disbenefits of this location why not here?  | C Other comments | Put on master map ? |
|-----------|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---------------------|
| 1 | More Mud habitat | Will be a lost resource to fisheries due to presence of windfarms, | Potentially impact the developer of windfarms | Potential to designate MCZ past windfarm development | YES |
| | – | Covers more of the pink | Specifically risks linked to management measures no certainty about the pressures that MCZ's may impose on wind farm construction, operation and maintenance | Preference not to extend pMCZ boundary in this area As time scale for implementation /designation | – |
| | – | Mobile gear cant fish in a windfarm area-not fishing not excluded from a windfarm | May add to the pressure of getting consent, could make it even harder to get permissions does not affect the same potential for a reference site as a pMCZ to the north | – | – |
| | – | Balances a reduction in geographic extent of pMCZ 1/11 also discussed. | – | – | – |



1.2.2 Group 2 Discussion Map

| Line code | Reasons for suggesting this change | Benefits of this location and why here?  | Disbenefits of this location why not here?  | C Other comments | Put on master map ? |
|-----------|---|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| Existing | Loses sand component, includes windfarm area- Walney which would restrict fishing anyway. | Poor shape for management, Includes windfarm area | Displacement need to be considers, Prawn grounds in the middle will be increased in terms of effort. | - | - |
| | Squared off management, still includes foci leaves more of the foci mud as a prawn ground | - | - | - | - |



1.2.3 Group 3 Discussion Map

| Line code | Reasons for suggesting this change | Benefits of this location and why here?  | Disbenefits of this location why not here?  | C Other comments | Put on master map ? |
|-----------|--|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Includes existing oil and gas infrastructure . | Reduces southern extension to open it up for fishing and shipping | - | - | - |
| | - | Co-location with oil and gas, Retains co-location with windfarms still covers important bird habitats and coarse sediment. | - | - | - |



1.2.4 Group 4 Discussion Map

| Line code | Reasons for suggesting this change | Benefits of this location and why here?  | Disbenefits of this location why not here?  | C Other comments | Put on master map ? |
|-----------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------|
| 11 | Incorporates FOCI | Protecting FOCI, minimum impact on fishing incorporating bird colonies ect, | If more than 500m would interfere with fishing | Recommend 500 from mean high water mark. | - |

1.2.5 Group 5 Discussion Map



| Line code | Reasons for suggesting this change | Benefits of this location and why here?  | Disbenefits of this location why not here?  | C Other comments | Put on master map ? |
|--------------------|---|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| C | Adjusting boundaries "willy nilly" could have huge unnecessary impact on fishing and industry, Needed acetates to overlap suggested straw man to compare against iteration 2 boundaries | | | | |
| Proposed boundary, | Very nervous due to massive impact on fishing and renewable, Remove mud habitats in deep water/ seapens from proposed 2 and add to north of proposed 1/11 | | | | Yes |
| ? | If keeping pmcz 1/11 do we even need proposed area for pMCZ2? | | | | |

1.2.6 Group 6 Discussion Map



| Line code | Reasons for suggesting this change | Benefits of this location and why here?  | Disbenefits of this location why not here?  | C Other comments | Put on master map ? |
|-----------|------------------------------------|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| 5 | Leave as it is over windfarm | – | – | – | – |
| 6 | Extents towards morcambe bay SAC | Better ecologically, more features | Fishing (Barrow) not been considered, | – | – |

1.3 Smelt and Eel



1.3.1 Group 1 Discussion Map

| Line code | Reasons for suggesting this change | Benefits of this location and why here?  | Disbenefits of this location why not here?  | C Other comments | Put on master map ? |
|-----------|------------------------------------|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| | – | Dee has strongest breeding population of smelt. | Some uncertainty about where the smelt are. | – | – |
| | – | – | Critical to work with the welsh fisheries to ensure protection as it is a shared fishery, | – | – |
| 1 | | Propose a pMCZ for whole of Dee for smelt and eel as an option, existing management offers good levels of protections offers a win-win | – | – | YES |



1.3.2 Group 2 Discussion Map

| Line code | Reasons for suggesting this change | Benefits of this location and why here?  | Disbenefits of this location why not here?  | C Other comments | Put on master map ? |
|-----------|------------------------------------|--|--|---|---------------------|
| No line | | Solway, Mersey, ribble, as areas of interest for these species | - | Modify existing EA management, don't need MCZ here,-Dee estuary | - |
| | - | - | - | Could be easily regulated in community,, | - |
| | - | - | - | No need for RSG | - |
| | - | - | - | Data-poor quality | - |
| | - | - | - | No new management needed | - |
| | - | - | - | Insufficient to comm. Fisheries | - |

1.3.3 Group 3 Discussion Map

| Line code | Reasons for suggesting this change | Benefits of this location and why here?  | Disbenefits of this location why not here?  | C Other comments | Put on master map ? |
|-----------|------------------------------------|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| | - | - | Need to have time in future to consider eels and smelt as ran out of time in this workshop | - | - |



1.3.4 Group 4 Discussion Map

| Line code | Reasons for suggesting this change | Benefits of this location and why here?  | Disbenefits of this location why not here?  | C Other comments | Put on master map ? |
|-----------|------------------------------------|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| | - | | | | - |
| | | | | | - |
| 3 | Appears to be the same | Evidence of some population | Challenge of welsh/ English parts of dee | - | - |
| 4 | Appears to be the same | Evidence of some population | - | - | |

1.3.5 Group 5 Discussion Map

Wider Discussions,

- Why are we discussing smelt and eel?, what does it mean to ____ them?
- Helps identify areas of ecological importance linked to fish nursery area,
- People should think about impacts/relationships prior to where, cart before horse,
- Dee and ribble stand out in tern of functioning for a range of species
- Mersey is a recovery estuary ,
- But eels are migratory,
- But do demonstrate residency in some estuaries,
- Existing management on estuaries some are licensed eel fisheries,
- Proposing additional levels of potential protection for wet areas in estuaries to protect nursery fish areas.
- Agreed to priorities areas based on eel and smelts then need to ask port to comment on existing and expected growth,
- Refuse to designate areas based on poor understanding of impacts management and existing controls ... I will leave to process

| Line code | Reasons for suggesting this change | Benefits of this location and why here?  | Disbenefits of this location why not here?  | C Other comments | Put on master map ? |
|-----------|---|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Estuary wide, Dee, Ribble and Solway for conservation of smelt and eel on estuary wide bases include bit that are always wet, not just intertidal when is already covered in N2K. | | | | |

2 Sea Users – speak for yourself

2.1 Management suggestions

Information about management has been added to the sea use/ activity tables

2.2 How do you suggest others from this interest are involved in management decisions?

| Sea Use | Engage at strategic level | Engage at pMCZ level | Other suggestions for engaging people in management | Explain your reasons for this view |
|---------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| Recreation | | yes | | |
| Fishing | yes | yes | Local people discuss issue | RSG to big and too many people not local |
| fishing | | yes | | |
| fishing | Yes | yes | After final recommendations sea users should verify Stakeholder group | Transparency, accountability |
| fishing | | | | Bottom up approach best |
| MOD | | | Table written letter to MOD | Minister is responsible |
| Aggregates | yes | | | |
| cables | yes | | | Already involved with SNCB on national level |
| research | yes | | scientific community already provide evidence | |
| Oil and gas | yes | | Need dialogue with DECC and oil and gas to be clear+ | |
| Renewables UK | | Yes | Allows local developers to be involved | |
| Crown Estates | | | Organisation can provide valuable information | |
| Diving | | yes | Distribute information through umbrella organisation | Can reach more people this way |

3 Reference Sites

The natural environment RSG members worked hard to develop their thinking on reference areas both during the workshop and in an extra evening session. However there is more work to do before their proposals are ready to be put before the rest of the RSG for discussion and shortlisting.

4 Review of tentative pMCZ and the different boundaries

4.1 Boundary options

This session was to enable people to select the boundary options that they wanted shortlisted as the basis for further discussion and consensus building. The results are on a separate spreadsheet and updated live in the workshop.

4.2 Comments on Boundary Options

4.2.1 pMCZ 1/11

Option 1

- Ok for mud but only if St Bees Head is included, needs to extend south
- Main issues are missed opportunities for greater protection for intertidal fish species
- Too small
- Ignores St Bees head, birds, geology
- MCZ in MOD firing range, is manageable, as firing has little impact on features
- Depends on management
- Unable to agree to pMCZ in 1 to 11 as they are incompatible with to continuing of Nephrops fishing from Maryport to Barrow including Whitehaven and will lead to decimation of the fleet.
- None are acceptable from a commercial fishing point of view
- All options may seriously impact on Nephrops fishing which are vitally important to Cumbrian fishing communities

Option 2

- Could be bigger
- Includes Geodiversity foci, plus includes estuary, is the best option

Option 3

- Colony extension off St Bees head key area for birds
- Covers inshore areas

Option 4

- Too Small, potential conflict with cables

Option 5

- Robin Rigg cables

Option 6

No comments received

4.2.2 pMCZ 2

Option 1

- Includes good portion of mud
- All miss out on the opportunity for connected protection and none give any protection for Geodiversity
- Until we know what management measures will be cannot accept any option as feasible, if measures do no effect then I will strongly support
- Co-location is too much risk for developers revert back to option a from last iteration
- No option to consider input from emerging Renewables, option A the best option, focus meeting preferred option and we have not been allowed to consider it WHY?
- Good coverage of a wide range of habitats
- Contains cables but in international waters

Option 2

No comments received

Option 3

- Not enough mud

Option 4

No comments received

Option 5

No comments received

Option 6

- Hooray at least a pMCZ that gives protection to Walney Island, complex ecosystem and Holocene sediment
- Covers good range of habitats including Walney island

4.2.3 pMCZ 3

Option 1

- Eastern extension is good
- Displacement of scallops a problem

Option 2

- Larger area more habitats covers more front and birds
- Geodiversity features, drumlin field
- Good mix of habitats
- Inclusion of Subtidal sands
- Northwards inclusion of thermal fronts
- Extends further north to include more habitats and sea bird areas could go further north still

Option 3

- Potentially restricts round 3 windfarm areas
- Overlaps with round 3 windfarms
- Much less habitat diversity

4.2.4 pMCZ 4

Option 1

- Good representation

Option 2

- Modiolus beds, good geomorphology.
- Good, if accepted that will not conflict with MOD firing range
- Good Geodiversity features
- Difficult to manage, but good habitats
- Can we not join 3 separate ones, would like extension to south and east
- Join the component parts
- Best option due to foci
- Diversity of species

4.2.5 pMCZ 5

Option 1

- Good, provided no conflict with MOD range activities
- Good as no cables
- Good due to modiolus conservation
- Support the most as abrupt welsh boundary the most.
- Larger boundary, more habitat
- Inclusion of modiolus

Option 2

- Includes additional seabird areas
- Most logical site, should consider bordering finding sanctuary possible combines site

- Should consider areas in Manx, Welsh ect waters
- Biggest range, includes seabirds
- More variation of BSH

Option 3

No comments received

4.2.6 pMCZ 6

Option 1

- Geological features
- Up to national boundaries makes sense
- Larger covers more BSH
- Geographical productivity
- Would like to extend south missing an opportunity for biodiversity
- Good mix of habitats, good area for birds
- Acceptable considering no impact on MOD activities

Option 2

No comments received

4.2.7 Pmcz 10

Option 1

- Needs to be continuous with Solway Firth SAC capture best sab reef good area of Subtidal gravels
- Does not achieve Geodiversity as well as other
- Protects coastal habitats
- Good sabalerialia
- Dependent angling not affected

Option 2

- Some benefits for birds
- Very good area for birds
- Broad area of protection

4.2.8 pMCZ 13

Option 1

- Condition angling and bait digging not affected
- Landing area for cables, within 12nm, assumes freedom to maintain cables needed
- Would protect more areas is move southwards
- Both options protect key areas
- Key coastal habitat
- Incorporated more foci

Option 2

- Should zone be around Formby Point
- Refer to comments about flood risk
- I question need for MCZ here at all
- Evidence weak overlaps with SPA
- Good diversity of habitats
- Would prefer bigger and more offshore
- As per sap feedback would prefer this site moved seawards for bivalves interests regarding SPA
- Depends on proposed management plans
- Requires extension south to include features.

4.2.9 pMCZ 14

Option 1

Comments/reasons

- Provided no impact on angling
- No implication for windfarms
- Possible future mariculture
- Extensive comments from consultations
- Some activities compatible with FOCI
- More ecological benefit
- New boundary to include smelt
- Useless for our assets only pMCZ that contains a geological asset,

Option 2

Comments/reasons

- Large , more viable
- Includes geology
- Intelligent location
- Good geology and Geodiversity
- Encompasses a good area and more habitats

5 Working towards consensus over boundary shapes and locations

5.1 pMCZ 1/11

| Issues with shortlisted boundary | Potential solutions | Selected solution |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Mud BSH/FOCI primary Nephrops fishery. Any loss is a loss of key ground,</p> <p>Displacement of fishing</p> <p>MOD interests,</p> <p>Too far offshore static gear implications.</p> <p>main concern over St Bees Head, no problem on particular rocky habitats inshore</p> | <p>High biodiversity in the most cohesive mud zone possible reference area</p> <p>Concerns: need to move further north- return to that put forward for last progress report.</p> <p>“don't move too fast into a boundary, need to make sure we get it right”.</p> <p>It is an important ecological area birds and biodiversity, needs to be spot on”</p> | <p>Put forward as area of search only without reference area.</p> <p>Need to hold focus group meeting</p> |
| <p>Must be aware of the impact inappropriate zones off the West Cumbrian coast would have on the Axis 4 European Fishery Funding application that had been made.</p> <p>The area involved is from Silloth south to Ravenglass.</p> <p>This project is one of six that has been accepted by the Marine Management Organisation around the English coast and is intended to financially assist coastal fishing communities that are in decline. Twelve applications of interest were made by different areas, eight were considered by a panel and fortunately the area between Silloth and Ravenglass was one of the six.</p> <p>Considerable financial aid is available if we are successful in meeting the next stage, which involves putting a business strategy forward to regenerate the fishing communities in the area referred to.</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| It is imperative that we do not harm the prospect of success by having Marine Conservation Zones in areas which would impede this process. | | |
|--|--|--|

5.2 pMCZ 2

| Issues with shortlisted boundary | Potential solutions | Selected solution |
|--|---|--|
| Oil and gas disagree with SNCB matrix, need to ensure clarity this is a start-up point. Encourages refinement of matrix and discussion with ISCZ, Additional stress on windfarm industry 10 years to reach climate change targets, major implications economically UK and Europe | Oil and gas industry can do no more environmentally than it does currently. Windfarms need clear guidance on impacts and costs of co-location. | pMCZ covers oil and gas, windfarms covered as Area of Interest |

5.3 pMCZ 3

| Issues with shortlisted boundary | Potential solutions | Selected solution |
|---|--|---|
| Loss of habitat Subtidal mixed and sand, Not taking advantage of thermal front - key for biodiversity and birds, North western tip is key haddock fishing ground (BSH- Subtidal sand) Misses features of geological importance | Too much sand in network could miss haddock ground with ease, Can't extend NE into round 3 windfarm as it would heavily impact major scalloping ground. AF-Impacts on round 3 wind farms-not favourable, Haddock fisheries gear used is seine netting and semi-pelagic trawling, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Type of fishing may be compatible with habitats and birds possible compatibility Proposal accepted by Natural | Agree to include new area as a caveated site (north west) |

| | | |
|--|--------------------|--|
| | Environment sector | |
|--|--------------------|--|

5.4 pMCZ 4

| Issues with shortlisted boundary | | Selected solution |
|--|--|--|
| <p>1. MOD Activity will need to manage additional restrictions,</p> <p>2. Semi-pelagic activity takes place here, target cod/haddock does not impact benthic zone so potentially compatible.</p> | | North satellite box deleted, main body extended south-east, No objections raised |

5.5 pMCZ 5

| Issues with shortlisted boundary | Potential solutions | Selected solution |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Welsh Fisheries concern on boundary,</p> <p>MOD firing range-need assurances about management (no additional restrictions =happy)</p> <p>Welsh concerns over Belgians fisheries and scalloping (Scotland)</p> | <p>Need to ask Belgians/Irish – invited but not attending,</p> <p>Need to go forward to CFP process very long winded(to enforce international law),</p> <p>Identifying whether the gear types used impact on the sea floor,</p> <p>Voluntary management measures anti-foreign fleets.</p> <p>need to consider displacement of the fisheries</p> <p>Isle of Man concern if scalloping is main use, pro-active management agreements,</p> <p>Belgians and Irish do not wish to be included.</p> | No changes to be made to current boundary, No objections |

5.6 pMCZ 6

| Issues with shortlisted boundary | Potential solutions | Selected solution |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|
| <p>Various fishing interests,</p> <p>MOD</p> <p>Doubts on accuracy of the data on north end of zone, remove sand element in the east.</p> <p>Major Nephrops fishing , trawl E-W, W-E Portavogie boats, size of the zone (project boundary)</p> | | |

5.7 pMCZ 10

| Issues with shortlisted boundary | Potential solutions | Selected solution |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Small MCZ any ecological benefit, Shape of MCZ difficult for management, May be room for bigger site (option 2) for ecological value and management,</p> | <p>More ecological benefit if in line with Solway SAC, Ease if management if border straightened</p> | <p>Group accepted the proposed boundary changes- straightening the boundary but just including the FOCl as not big enough to include BSH,</p> |

5.8 pMCZ 13

| Issues with shortlisted boundary | Potential solutions | Selected solution |
|---|--|---|
| <p>conservation value questioned</p> <p>Designation of site oyster/quahog-not present</p> | <p>to move further south for peats, footprints/submerged footprint Crosby, Formby footprints, superb examples of peat bogs key Geodiversity area.</p> <p>Focus group meeting could address movement seawards to 10 -15m depth in line with SAP feedback.</p> | <p>Site moved southwards Focus group meeting could address movement seawards to 10-15m depth in line with SAP feedback.</p> |

5.9 pMCZ 14

| Issues with shortlisted boundary | Potential solutions | Selected solution |
|---|--|--|
| Small MCZ any ecological benefit, Shape of MCZ difficult for management, May be room for bigger site (option 2) for ecological value and management | More ecological benefit if in line with Solway SAC, Ease if management if border straightened | Group accepted the proposed boundary changes- straightening the boundary but just including the FOCl as not big enough to include BSH, |

6 How do you think stakeholders should be involved post this process?

6.1 How do you think stakeholders should be involved after this process?

Maintain the RSG

- Maintain this RSG group, established communication and line of understanding
- Should RSG be involved in on-going administration and management?
- Continue liaison with activities so they can observe management and advise

Involve other stakeholders

- Outside stakeholders bring additional knowledge and need the opportunity to have equal weight
- Devolved admins should have say in final decision making process
- Stakeholders outside RSG are very important need to be involved
- Should all developers of renewable projects be involved
- Build on existing regulatory framework in inform management of MCZ by involving key player who already have significant management in by ie EIA EMP for windfarms
- Ask Mike Kaiser

Adapt and change

- Composition of group should change over time
- Whole process has to be dynamic and continuity

pMCZ involvement

- Only those affected should be involved relevant to the site
- Right to appeal to management suggested by this RSG outside stakeholders,
- Already partnerships ie Morecambe bay next stage could be focussed group for each pmcz
- user groups for each site
- Steering group for each pmcz

Continued liaison

- Relevant authorities should contact stakeholders as needed

Make use of local forum

- Make use of local forum - make more local

Proper consultation process

- Proper consultation process on final MCZ support from defra

New subgroups and targeted workshops

- Opportunities for certain subgroups, targeted workshops extended out to bigger groups

6.2 The RSG continuing after this process - What do you like about the idea?

Continued role?

Must be continual role for RSG-lessons learnt from Ribble WFD

Submission of recommendations by stakeholders not end of process

Ongoing discussion must be had

Future partnerships between stakeholder must be had

Transition stage, monitoring of change will need continued stakeholder group

After pmcz designated task change significantly, current make up not applicable

Flexibility in stakeholder group

Local level groups with RSG overview

There is merit in pmcz level groups but need the strategic overview of the regional group

Benefits for MSP

In anticipation of marine spatial planning- it is critical that the understanding of this groups is not lost.

Broaden who is involved

Stakeholders with inshore management under represented and need to be involved

Local authorities to be involved
Consultation much broader than current group
The different MCZ projects working together
Different MCZ projects work together

6.3 The RSG continuing after this process - What do you think are the challenges of the idea?

Membership and structure kept under review

Membership must be kept under review dependent upon need,
This may not be the right structure

Avoid duplication of effort

Outside forums discuss same thing, should avoid duplication of effort,

Clear purpose

Clarity of role/purpose/position in government structure
Who services the RSG who are the group serving,
Is this about management, could groups support MMO,

Resources

Funding of logistics event and funding of individuals to participate?

Role of regulators?

Potential multiple regulators ? who is relevant, where meeting, how do they relate?

6.4 Any suggestions you would like to make?

Data from key industries

Lack of representation from key industries that could add data/knowledge management techniques.

Independent data held by consultants could be used

More groups included

Telecoms sector to be involved

Devolved admins need to be included

Mixed stakeholder groups at pMCZ level

Mixed stakeholders groups at pmcz level-grass routes

Questions

Q- will the IFCA board have a role in management of zones?

Q- is there an international convention?

Q- will there be duplication of RSG due to IFCA operations?

Q-When the Final decision made who from RSG is involved,?

7 Parking place comments

- Whole Process is "cart before horse",
- Can't "willy nilly" move boundaries around when so much at stake- I will leave process,
- Centrica should be on RSG,
- FOCI data has been lost from pMCZs why?
- Too much yellow can we lop some off
- Is there a hidden agenda for designating sites where there is a lack of scientific data. Fishing and scientific
- 1 Renewables rep on six tables 5 tables will have no consideration
- 10 mins to discuss-important issues this is not enough
- For future consideration can socio-economic maps be prepared showing- each industry turn over, direct number employed

Annex 1 List of Attendees

| Name | Interest |
|----------------------------|---|
| Andrew Newlands | <i>Marine Management Organisation</i> |
| Julie Drew | Marine Renewables |
| John Watson | Oil and Gas |
| Andrew Bellamy | Sand and gravel extraction |
| Peter Jamieson | Sub sea cables |
| Dave Dobson | Sea Fisheries Committee |
| Ron Graham | Mobile Whitefish Gear |
| Tom Bryan Brown | Manx Fisheries |
| Garry Pidduck | Static Gear |
| Chris Woods | Inshore Shellfisheries |
| Dick James | Producer Organisation |
| Jerry Percy | Welsh Fisheries |
| Kelsey Thompson | Mariculture |
| Chris Lumb | <i>Natural England</i> |
| Sarah Peet | <i>Environment Agency</i> |
| Cristina Herbon | <i>JNCC</i> |
| Cheryl Nicholson | NGO Habitats and marine species |
| Andrew Gouldstone | NGO Birds |
| Cynthia Burek | Geodiversity |
| Kay Foster | NGO Marine environment |
| Chris Frid | Ecosystem/ecological scientist |
| Replacement for John Amery | Sea Angling |
| Ruth Thurstan | Diving |
| Geoff Meggitt | Recreational/Leisure Craft |
| Sue Stalibrass | <i>English Heritage</i> |
| Tony Wyld | <i>MOD</i> |
| Andrew Finlay | <i>Crown Estate</i> |
| Matthew Palmer | Marine research activities |
| Dave McAleavy | Local Government Association - Coastal Issues Special Interest Group. |
| Paddy Campbell | Northern Ireland |
| Fiona Gell | Isle of Man |

Annex 2 Agenda

ISCZ Regional stakeholder Group Workshop 5

Day 1

(please note the agenda has been updated to what happened on the day)

From 9:15 Registration, coffee and tea will be available

Briefing for those new to the process, who missed this presentation before, or who just want a recap. (NB This session also happened at workshop 4.)

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

Start for All

10:00 Facilitators welcome and briefing **Diana Pound**
Quick briefing on the SAP feedback **Greg Whitfield**

10:10 Mapping session for particular locations

- pMCZ 1 and 11
- pMCZ 2
- FOCl (mobile species) not considered to date

11:00 Tea and coffee (If you would rather keep working we can get tea and coffee for you and bring it to your group)

11:15 Parallel sessions:

A. Sea users – speak for yourself - work up information and ideas on management

Consider key information:

| | |
|-----------|--|
| RSG work: | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Your 'human activity table' updated from previous work• A compatibility matrix based on the groups work |
| ISCZ | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Information collated together by pMCZ |
| SNCB* | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sensitivity Matrix |

*Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (JNCC and NE)

In light of all this and your own knowledge please provide your views on:

- Management of your activities on the sheet provided.
- The Sensitivity Matrix in relation to your activity. (ISCZ staff will be on hand to help you with this).
- Please bear in mind that effects need to be managed but the Government wants the least regulatory methods necessary so think about 'ease of management'.

B. Others start thinking about possible options for reference sites

- Please work on the maps provided.
- Work as a group to identify a number of alternate locations you would like to suggest to the whole group for consideration.
- Do this for the features and FOCl.
- Your priority is to find the optimum locations for nature – but please bear in

mind what you know about the level and type of human use at different locations so that where possible, you suggest reference areas that are also easier to manage.

Review information about each tentative pMCZ and the different boundaries

- Please review the information for each pMCZ and each of the shortlisted boundaries.
- Please fill in the feedback form for all the boundaries under consideration.
- When you have finished a location, hand in your form to the member of the ISCZ team collecting the results.

If you finish early there are two other activities you may want to do:

- Check the SNCB matrix if you haven't already done so.
- Speak to Mathew from the ISCZ about how they can help you communicate to others from your interest

1:00 Lunch

2:00 How do you think stakeholders should be involved post this process?

Consensus Building

The boundaries with the most support will be discussed further to see if the levels of support can be increased.

3:30 Tea and coffee

Consensus Building continues

No later than 5.00 Finish

Please note:

ISCZ staff will be on hand after the formal end of the workshop for those who wish to look at and comment on the SNCB matrix

ISCZ Regional stakeholder Group Workshop 5

Day 2

Please note the timings of the day are very fluid due to uncertainty about how long the consensus session will take.

From 9:15 Registration, coffee and tea will be available

9:30 – 4:30 **Consensus Building continued**

Annex 3 Commentary from Consensus Building Session

Notes taken during live GIS plenary session

Notes Written by Greg Whitfield

Typed By Tom Higginbottom

Day 1 (Afternoon)

1. SITE pMCZ4

Issues raised:

1. MOD Activity will need to manage additional restrictions,
2. Semi-pelagic activity takes place here, target cod/haddock does not impact benthic zone so potentially compatible.

(Both refer to north satellite box, designated for Modiolus modiolus beds)

Discussion over Modiolus beds

- Do we have other examples?
- Many other areas of modiolus bed so why bother?
- NE-Understanding of offshore modiolus beds is poor in Irish sea need to understand data - Bangor University,
- Welsh Fisheries-records are grab samples from 30 years ago, is protection necessary low confidence in data?
- NE question over whether we need this depends on conservation objective are we trying to reintroduce species?
- Manx government - if there is a Modiolus bed then we need to protect it,
- Are they relict beds? No longer present

Discussion

- If restrictions placed on semi-pelagic fishing big impact on Northern Ireland,
- Crown Estates - if low confidences in data then no need to stick to ENG i.e. 3-5 examples of FOCI,
- NE /ISCZ. Team should liaise with Bangor University, to obtain up to date understanding of Modiolus Modiolus Beds.
- ISCZ-Already underway visited Bangor University last Friday meeting with Prof Mike Kaiser and School of Ocean Sciences.

Agreement- Top satellite box to be deleted.

- Wildlife Trust -Extend main site south and east to include thermal front,
- RSPB - Consider Wildlife Trust's point new data introduced AAEL, strong argument for extending site need to use new data and amend accordingly, thermal front high productivity and biodiversity for water column and birds need to extend site

CONCLUSION:

- North satellite box deleted, main body extended south-east, No objections raised.

2. pMCZ 5 - option 1

Issues raised:

1. Welsh Fisheries concern on boundary,
2. MOD firing range - need assurances about management (no additional restrictions =happy)

3. Welsh concerns over Belgians fisheries and scalloping (Scotland) (Welsh Fisheries-I'm not here to represent Belgian fisheries just wanted issue noted).

Solutions sought from the room:

- Need to ask Belgians/Irish – invited but not attending,
- Need to go forward to CFP process very long winded (to enforce international law),
- Identifying whether the gear types used impact on the sea floor,
- Voluntary management measures antforeign fleets.
- Need to consider displacement of the fisheries
- Isle of Man concern if scalloping is main use, pro-active management agreements,
- Belgians and Irish do not wish to be included.

CONCLUSION:

- No changes to be made to current boundary, No objections.

3. pMCZ 3 (option 3)

Issues Raised:

1. Loss of habitat Subtidal mixed and sand,
 2. Not taking advantage of thermal front - key for biodiversity and birds,
 3. North western tip is key haddock fishing ground (BSH - Subtidal sand)
 4. Misses features of geological importance
 5. Manx fisheries - Too much sand in network could miss haddock ground with ease,
- Manx fisheries – Can't extends north east into round 3 windfarm as it would heavily impact major scalloping ground. (ISCZ- show scalloping data to view)

Solutions sought from room:

- AAEL data requested
- NE-proposes moving Boundary to the North East,
- Crown Estates-Impacts on round 3 wind farms-not favourable,
- Haddock fisheries gear used is seine netting and semi-pelagic trawling,
 - Type of fishing may be compatible with habitats and birds possible compatibility
 - Proposal accepted by Natural Environment sector
- JNCC-depends on conservation objectives,
- Crown Estates-Suggests protection of thermal front, but not including BSH in designation. – Site to protect AAEL but not BSH,
- SNCB's do not accept, this site needs to include BSH,
- Discussion over management-more emphasis on AAEL,
- Concern over lack of evidence for management, making decisions without full understanding.
- Thermal Fronts need to be included new areas to North and West
- Wildlife Trust - Why can't wind farms – why not co-location.
- Management is the key-Stakeholders can't make informed decisions
 - Conservation objective step is being missed out
 - Support consultation of SNCB matrix on wall and laptop,

Discussion

- Conservation objectives suggested recover so management would include restrictions.
- Thermal front data variable on time, questions need for protected area just for front
- Welsh Fisheries-questions the need to include anything other than BSH/FOCI
- RSPB raised issue of AAEL component of ENG
- Diana Pound -suggests that new additions to site put forward but caveated on fishing management and not part of the boundary put forward

- Wildlife Trust- co-location?
- Crown Estates - Need to take into account energy and climate change targets.

CONCLUSION:

- Group Agree to include new area as a caveated site.
- Subsea Cables - Centrica should be on RSG agreed by 2 others on based on size of their interest.(1/5 of project area)
- Request that concerns over AAEL be put forward to the SAP.

4. pMCZ10 (Smallest site)

Issues Raised:

1. Small MCZ any ecological benefit?
2. Wildlife Trust-concern over consensus docketts,
3. Shape of MCZ difficult for management,
4. May be room for bigger site (option 2) for ecological value and management,
5. Justification of shape and boundary - relic from earlier workshop - agreement to straighten the boundary,
6. Not a problem area for fishing,
7. Modern navigation equipment sufficient to avoid area.

Discussion

- MMO - avoid curvy lines like the plague,
- Mussel gathering hand picking of blue mussels,
- NE - needs to be continuous with Solway SAC amend boundary to line up – big advantages
- Boundary aligned
- NE - high biodiversity at Maryport Roads so site should extend further offshore (Jim Perkins work) in mixed sediment BSH.
- Seems to be little in term of management issues possible to extend seawards viable size for BSH
- Concern over whether FOCL or BSH, important for site to meet minimum requirements.
- Commercial fishing - Concern over how to reach consensus and said he would walk away from process, can't debate over peoples ideal options as they are so far opposed.

CONCLUSIONS:

- Group accepted the proposed boundary changes - straightening the boundary but just including the FOCL as not big enough to include BSH,
- Agreed to re-look at the boundary tomorrow as the pMCZ 1/11 boundary is fundamental to this zone.

Day Two

5. pMCZ 3

New discussion about additional site:

- Compatibility with wind farm and scallop fisheries,
- Can we protect thermal fronts?
- Further discussion needed and more work done by ISCZ team,
- Put forward as tentative boundary subject to further ???deliberation goes to the SAP.
- NE - this is the starting of a focus group for this pMCZ - need to open up to outside stakeholders.-best available science.
- Diana Pound - process considerations – focus meetings need to be equitable and accessible to those with a direct interest.

- Wildlife Trust-Need to hug boundary for ecological benefit.
- MMO - agree for ease of management.
- This would address SAP feedback,
- Manx Fisheries - this would increase area-so need to delete some in other borders,
- need to look at hotspot data when making the choice, shown on laptop screen
- Hotspot value to the north so need to keep the north part
- Discussion over deletion of south border,

Additional area to north/west put forwards for further discussion,

- Extensions over round 3 wind farms
- Crown Estates - remarks over their non involvement in RSG,
- Focus meeting needed, NE, Crown Estates strong support,
- Subsea cables-need to have calculation about targets so RSG know where they stand JNCC agrees,
- JNCC - need to know about E/A requirements,
- Welsh Fisheries - Greater impact on fisheries is a step too far.
- Crown Estates - Remember ENG targets are BSH/FOCI then additional ecological importance, so not so critical.
- RSPB can the additional box go forward to the SAP?
- Diana Pound gives group options - include or not on publicly facing documents?

CONCLUSION:

- All happy to put forward as long as Management assumptions are clear.

6. pMCZ 14

Summary of wider stakeholder feedback, 60% of feedback about this pMCZ

Issues Raised:

1. Oyster/quahog data unreliable,
2. Existing management already in place,
3. Inshore Shellfisheries: commentary on management and sustainable fisheries.
4. Incorrect data,

Discussion:

- Existing balance between bird food availability and fisheries needs- no more restrictions!
- All cockle gathering done by hand, to minimise environmental impact,
- Shrimping has very little impact; young shrimps put back not taken, no impact on sea bed very sustainable.
- Cables for Burbo Bank Windfarms,
- NE - SPA/SAC already designated mudflat, smelt-very good in this estuary so need to recognise this feature, probably additional management measures, will need discussions with the Welsh, existing SAC/SPA sufficient but does not cover rock features on Hilbre Island-so would need additional protection/designation if put forward.
- Post it notes generated for people who have concerns about option 1 - encouraged management solution to uncertain support,
- clarified boundaries around Hilbre Island
no oyster or quahogs, smelt and rocks yes!
- Geodiversity features not included-very important area,

Solutions Sought/discussion:

- Geodiversity features discussed peat/till glacial features,
- Can we designate but not restrict fishing? Key concern is quad bikes 4x4 which will erode peat, automobile access would need to be restricted.

- Inshore Shellfisheries - no access to anyway so no issue about peat erosion, additional restrictions on fishing huge psychological impact.
- Welsh Fisheries-practical element, very well protected, huge volume of feedback indicates Hilbre Island would be ok,
- Inshore Shellfisheries - sustainable fisheries already and activities are compatible (Welsh Fisheries agree)
- Hilbre Should be MCZ,
- Discussion about additional features in the area, are they beyond RSG remit?
- Smelt/estuary issue is impossible without Wales, need to know WAG's intentions,
- Inshore Shellfisheries - chance of MCZ on Welsh side very slim due to heavy industry – Mostyn docks, cables etc .
- SSSI/SPA/SAC sufficient protection but not for geology.
- RSPB - can we not have a tentative MCZ that doesn't introduce new management additional to the existing.
- Inshore Shellfisheries - would have a huge fear factor for the industry, very pro conservation at the moment could revert
- NE - suggests liaising with CCW/WAG to identify additional need for smelt,
- Welsh Fisheries notes that Geodiversity features are intertidal so would not have an impact on fishing fleet in general.
- Although very sensitive area for fishing fleet.
- Wildlife Trust - SAP suggest that pMCZ 14 be made larger but were making it smaller
- NE - Suggest discussions take place over additional need for smelt in the Dee estuary before putting this site forward.
- RSG agree.

CONCLUSIONS:

- Option 1 (Hilbre Island) goes forward but need to review need for smelt and eel discussions to take place

7. pMCZ 2-Option 1

Issues Raised:

1. Oil and gas activity,
2. Gas storage system,
3. Lots of fishing interests (local and national)

Diana Pound suggested given low support for all options 1 is the least worst,

Discussion:

- Oil and gas disagree with SNCB matrix, need to ensure clarity this is a start-up point.
- Encourages refinement of matrix and discussion with Fran,
- Additional stress on windfarm industry 10 years to reach climate change targets, major implications economically UK and Europe
- Developers need to be interviewed in pMCZ focus meeting to refine the matrix,
- Procedure of local group in balanced sea would be critical - not enough time in the RSG meetings.
- Oil and gas-already having stakeholder meeting in oil and gas sector discussion MCZ, liaising with sea users.
- Commercial fishing-positive comments about co-location reference to guidance by NE provided that conservation objectives met,
 - Always going to upset someone
 - Co location = win/win for fishing industry,
 - Query over navigation to fishing grounds over new windfarms.

- Concern of additional stress in the confined nature of the project area
- Concern over changing the mud habitats,
- Fishing and crown estates dialogue about fishing and renewable.

- Overall uncertainties about the management of the renewable industry
- Telecoms cables not compatible within 12nm limit.
- Need to refine the matrix
- All need to be refined for individual activities
- NE - good rationale for focus meeting, should help refine the matrix

- Fisheries - windfarm completely opposed
- Crown Estates - efforts to use habitats that don't impact fishing, almost all areas outside of windfarm proposals would not be accepted by fishing industry
- Oil and Gas propose MCZ over Morecambe Bay oil and gas field.
- Crown Estates-questions guidance over 3-5 FOCl for ISCZ its size especially more FOCl
- SAP remit on ecology – can we ask, do we need 3-5 examples of FOCl,
- Need to reinforce economic impact of MCZs on industry,
- Windfarms very important so we need to take into account that politics may not designate the MCZ,

- Live total shows 28% mud at this point-so we have excess mud but depends on the sites.
- Commercial fishing-reinforces that the fishing industry need to take a hit over all available mud zones, not a case of one area taking all of the mud.
- NE - focus on FOCl,
- split into two - with the windfarm in the middle,
- Calculations are done
- Cables - cant agree to MCZ over a cable within 12nm
- Include in site built/consented windfarms, as these are least likely to be put in jeopardy
- Commercial fishing - need to be careful that we don't lose too much mud, very difficult to reduce afterwards
- Boundaries put forward,
- Acknowledged that this is significant progress.
- NE acknowledged that we this has moved forward but suggest we stick with co-location,
- Don't have experts-developers in the room to make concrete decisions so assume that co-location would be possible.
- stick with boundary that misses windfarm due to political clout of industry,
- need to consider cables could be back to square 1 if 2 miles is lost

- Renewables UK-still risks over MCZ over consented windfarms but acknowledges that it is less risk,
 - MCZs would still border other areas-undesigned
 - Crown Estates suggested 1km - 500m buffed done in other projects, need to be considered in management decisions
 - Renewable industry reps discussion over coffee proposed

- Proposal that satisfies renewable interest (2 sites) seems to reach consensus across room,
- Wildlife Trust - questions ecological benefits or having 2 separate sites - leave windfarm in the zone.
- Manx Fisheries Do not accept new proposal
- Boundary Shifts to the East
- Questions over the new boundary as it looks messy

- Difficult for management,
 - Questions over ecological benefit,
 - MMO-simplicity of boundaries is the key.
- Crown Estates - difficult to sign up to site without knowing exactly what impact it will have on the windfarm industry. Renewables concurs.
 - Subsea cables/Oil and gas windfarms have been given preference but not oil and gas - need to know the impact of the industries.
 - Commercial Fishing - process is a "dog's dinner" could argue for days over where to go,
 - Commercial Fishing - Unfair for people to make a noise if there is only the minimum targets, don't feel like there is any negotiation.
 - JNCC - use as an area of search not a pMCZ,
 - Crown Estates - needs to be driven by the ENG targets,
 - Angling - can't go back to original area-would have wasted hours of discussion are windfarms in or out,
 - Subsea cables - can't put forward as a pMCZ, don't know the impact of cables, oi/gas/windfarms - caveat that so unsure about management that can't be put forward as a MCZ.
 - Concern about plaice fishery on Barrow,
 - Concern about extra licensing cost for cable and other industries.
 - Boundary to avoid Barrow Fishing grounds.

CONCLUSION:

- Put forward as pMCZ but need for detailed discussions at pMCZ focus level. Consensus from across the room.

8. pMCZ 1/11-option 3?

Concerns from various sectors outlined,
Calculations of BSH - 23.5% mud at this stage.

Issues raised:

1. Mud BSH/FOCI primary nephrops fishery. Any loss is a loss of key ground,
2. Displacement of fishing,
3. MOD interests,
4. Too far offshore static gear implications.

Discussion:

- required explanation of new boundary put forward by project team (south of St Bees Head).
- Commercial Fishing - main concern over St Bees Head, no problem on particular rocky habitats inshore,
- 2 km cordon for St Bees Head to Ravenglass used for skate/plaice fishing where nephrops is down, not suitable.
- Concern that this will destroy Workington/Maryport/ Whitehaven fisheries, and destroy local communities.
 - Nowhere else to go for fishermen,
 - Major area for Cumbria and Northern Ireland
 - Negotiation is needed
- Solutions over amendment to boundaries
- Move boundaries to low water mark.
- NE - rock and reef = intertidal so move just off the low water mark (artificial boundary) move just seaward to include Subtidal rock.

- Through viability (500m)
- Commercial Fishing/NE/ work with ISCZ to define the boundaries for consideration of the site,
- Thick part of site.
- Concerns: need to move further north- return to that put forward for last progress report.
- NE - High biodiversity in the most cohesive mud zone possible reference area. 2 pMCZs?
 - Mud area cohesive
 - Honeycomb reef - 500m diameter would be acceptable for RSG.
 - Rock features around St Bees Head.
- Move back to original boundary, would satisfy fishing but would exclude FOCI/ high biodiversity area.
- RSPB don't move to fast into a boundary, need to make sure we get it right. Need focused discussion, pmcz focus group. It is an important ecological area birds and biodiversity, needs to be spot on.
 - Compromise sought between various areas put forwards
- BSH percentages confirmed.
- NE - proposes focus group with individual SH for this pMCZ
- New boundary put forward to include a small box of NE's mud,
- South Ireland has access to this area.
- Nephrops fisheries are still very important in the new zone, does not matter where it goes.
- RSPB - need to highlight that the ecological concerns/ area of search a big compromise, not an MCZ in any way.
- Proposal to submit 2 boundaries as areas of search - new area and Kieran's,
- NE - highlight need to redesign the large boundary as an area of search to be refined down.
 - Are north of St Bees Head less quality habitat.
- Commercial Fishing hugely important for socio economic - if it is closed it will kill communities.
- RSPB-need to have focussed discussion (Northern Irish Fisheries also to be included)
 - Zone of management within an MCZ a solution to address all interests need to put this forward to SNCBs/SAP.
- Northern Irish Fisheries option 6 is ? suitable for fishing industry
- Go back to iteration 2 boundary.
- Put the boundary forward ie both,
- RSPB fully understand issues, need focused discussions,
- Northern Irish Fisheries Put Forward option 6-reference areas.
- NE - best areas for mud conservation correlate exactly with fishing effort = large conflict.
- Trawling is having a detrimental impact on sea pens and borrowing mega fauna,
- Benefits from an agreed closed area (reference area) for laval distribution = benefits to fishing. Nephrops fishing lie with SAP advice - proposed reference area.
- Boundary 6 = too big caveat to be trimmed down
 - Put forward as an area of search
 - Put forward - really important for conservation/ ecological boundary.

CONCLUSION:

- Put forward as area of search only without reference area.

9. pMCZ 6

New proposed SAC-Pisces Reef –considered,

Issues Raised:

1. Various fishing interests,
2. MOD
3. Doubts on accuracy of the data on north end of zone, remove sand element in the east.
4. Major Nephrops fishing , trawl E-W, W-E Portavogie boats, size of the zone (project boundary)

Discussion

- Proposal to change the BSH in line with the data for fishermap - should be mud not rock. Fishing would not happen if it was rock
- Agreement in the group that the area is mud with elements of rock,
- Remember that its modelled data,
- There is mud trawled and this is rock
- Peaks of rock all the way down the North channel, but predominantly is a mud zone.
- Agreement to change boundary of habitat
- VMS shows where mud is use it as a proxy.
- CS - suggest to MCZ /overlap with pSAC,
- Northern Irish Fisheries: Boundary changes – south boundary further north, compatible with management instead of completely incompatible.
- Boundary hotspot/thermal front-data consulted.
- North eastern corner of pMCZ used by other fleets (Isle of Man) since there is a curfew in the territorial waters.
- Can't trawl on Pisces Reef
- Option to put pMCZ on reefs but is an equally bad option from a fishing perspective,
- Wildlife Trust - advocated that existing site=highest hotspot of biodiversity,
- Northern Irish Fisheries - ensure that it's compatible with management to be discussed with pMCZ focus meeting-not going forward as not being compatible.
- SAP feedback consulted, good agreement with ecologist for existing site
- Northern Irish Fisheries, existing management (no rock hoppers) gear restrictions is sufficient to make it compatible.

CONCLUSION:

- Changes to boundary digitised smaller in north east-scalloping grounds.
- Additional arm to south east in line with Pisces Reef.

10. pMCZ 13

Issues raised:

1. Heritage- conservation value questioned
2. Designation of site oyster/quahog-not present

Discussion

- Geodiversity/ Inshore Shellfisheries site need to move further south for-peats, footprints/submerged footprint SS/CS
- Remains conflict with cables.
- SAP advice to move site southwards to 10 - 15 m depth for bivalve protection very important for birds.
- Angling - need to start from scratch if new area is proposed
- Geodiversity grounds are significant move to the south

- Bird interests
- Agreement for moving area south,
- Modified as an area of search
- Crosby, Formby footprints, superb examples of peat bogs key Geodiversity area.
- Focus group meeting could address movement seawards to 10-15m depth in line with SAP feedback.
- But designated for Geodiversity not BSH/FOCI so is there a need to do so?
- Many people in the room strongly support
- Noted that management assumption is that anchoring will be permitted

CONCLUSION:

- Boundary to go forwards – strongest support