

## AGENDA

### MCZ Social & Economic Sub Group

**10 September 2010**

**Dining Room 1, Welsh Assembly Government, Cathays Park, Cardiff**

**11:00am - 3:00pm**

Time	Item	Title	Lead
11:00	1	Welcome, introductions & apologies	Chair
11:10	2	Actions from last meeting	Chair
11:20	3	Update from WAG	Louise George, WAG
11:30	4	How to use social and economic considerations in the site selection process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• social and economic aspects of site selection – paper 1</li> <li>• Site selection methodology – paper 2</li> </ul>	Chair Group discussion
12:30		<b>Buffet lunch</b>	
13:15	5	Presentation of data collated to date: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extractive activities – paper 3</li> <li>• Depositional activities – paper 4</li> <li>• Potentially damaging &amp; disturbing activities – paper 5</li> </ul>	Louise George, WAG
13:45	6	Consideration of data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other activities and sources of data – are there any?</li> <li>• Prioritisation of data needs – any more important than others?</li> <li>• How do will fill data gaps?</li> </ul>	Group discussion
14:50	7	AOB	Chair
14:55	8	Date of next meeting	Chair
15:00	9	End	

## **NOTES OF MEETING**

### **TAG – SOCIAL & ECONOMIC SUB GROUP**

**10 SEPTEMBER 2010 - CATHAYS PARK, CARDIFF**

#### **Present**

Dr Mike Christie – Chair, Aberystwyth University

Luke Davies – Countryside Council for Wales

Mark Gray – Seafish

Andrew Finlay – The Crown Estate

Susan – Rousak – The Crown Estate

Nigel Adams – Visit Wales, WAG

Mike Jones – Fisheries Unit, WAG

Louise George – Marine Branch, WAG

#### **Apologies**

Mike Cummings, Andrew Hobden, Phil Wensley, Mary Lewis, Jamie Moore, Mike Kaiser, Keith Thomas, Julia Williams

#### **Welcome and introductions**

1. Mike Christie welcomed members to the 2nd meeting of the Social and Economic Sub Group.

#### **MCZ Project Update**

2. Louise George provided an update on the work of the MCZ Project since the last Sub-Group meeting in May. Work on developing the ecological guidance has progressed and at a recent TAG meeting it was agreed to refine the guidance further and develop a scoring system to support the prioritisation of areas according to their contribution to the key reasons for designating MCZs in Welsh inshore waters - that is contributing to ecosystem function and recovery, improving our understanding of marine ecosystems and contributing to a UK network of sites.
3. The ecological guidance will be applied in 2 phases - Phase 1 where 'focus areas' will be identified based on the extent to which they incorporate broadscale habitats, important habitats and areas of high productivity. The focus areas will then be ranked with the high ranking focus areas going forward to Phase 2.
4. Phase 2 involves a holistic assessment of the areas and expert assessment of the degree to which each of the areas fulfil the ecological criteria for site selection. The output from Phase 2 will be a prioritised list of potential sites with advice on the different combinations and options to deliver the desired ecological goal. It is at this stage that the social and economic considerations will come into play.

5. The next step is for the TAG to agree its recommendations for a full package of site selection guidance, incorporating ecological, social and economic considerations (including the outcome from this meeting) and for the recommendations to be presented to the Steering Group on 7 October.

### **Social and Economic Considerations in the Site Selection Process**

6. The Sub-Group considered paper 1 and supported the ecosystem services framework approach which is consistent with what is being proposed under WAG's new Natural Environment Framework. It was agreed to include reference to the regulating services and it for intrinsic values to be recognised under cultural services rather than as a separate issue.
7. It was agreed to produce a more comprehensive list of the social and economic activities/issues within an ecosystem services framework using a similar format to the data evidence tables as provided at papers 3, 4 and 5. This list would form a good basis for considering the likely impacts (benefits and costs) of a HPMCZs designation on each activity.
8. The Sub-Group considered the merits of scoring or weighting the activities and associated impacts of designation. A scoring system similar to that developed for the ecological criteria was discussed but discounted as unsuitable for the social and economic considerations; the ecological criteria and scoring system has been developed to identify the potential sites, the social and economic considerations are different as they will be used essentially as a filter to help decide between sites.
9. The Sub-Group decided that weighting the social and economic consideration would be a complex and time consuming exercise. An alternative approach was proposed and accepted to look at each activity in turn and assess the likely impact a designation would have on the activity – there would be a hierarchy of considerations ranging from incompatible where an activity is know to be incompatible with a HPMCZ and therefore of high importance in the decision making process, conflicting where any activity is likely to be damaging and may need to be mitigated/managed to be compatible with HPMCZ, and negligible where an activity is likely to be compatible with HPMCZ and of lesser importance in the decision making process.
10. It may be possible to undertake a more quantitative analysis and assessment of activities later in the process, on a site by site basis.
11. It was agreed that in order to fully understand the likely impacts on the conflicting and to some extent the negligible activities that conservation objectives for each potential site should identify, where possible, the likely management measures and likely restrictions. Louise agreed to raise this issue with CCW.

## **Action**

- Louise George to revise the paper on social and economic considerations and develop activities/impacts matrix for recommendation to TAG for inclusion in the site selection guidance package.
- Louise George to contact JNCC to obtain a copy of the pressure activity matrix that has been developed for the Regional Projects.
- Louise George to discuss requirements for conservation objectives with CCW.

## **Data collection and collation**

12. Louise George provided an update on the data collated to date. Activity data was presented within 3 categories depending on whether the activity is extractive, depositional or damaging/disturbing with regards to a HPMCZ. Data collated for the extractive and depositional activities have been mapped on a Wales wide basis and these were shared with the group.
13. Commercial Fishing data – as discussed at the last meeting there are concerns about the accuracy and completeness of the existing data. VMS indicates that a vessel is in an area but it does not provide any information on the activity taking place. Existing data provides a broad indication of activity only. WAG Fish and Marine agreed to explore options for building up the data layers including information from under 10m vessels and any available SFC data.
14. Tourism – is another activity that is not restricted to a particular area, however unlike fishing, tourist related activities will not necessarily be incompatible with a HPMCZ designation. Further detail on activities is likely to come forward when we know more about the location of the potential sites. Nigel Adams agreed to provide contact details for the Pembrokeshire Coastal Audit.
15. Future activities – it was agreed to include, where possible, information on potential future activities for example an area may be identified as future potential for marine aggregates.
16. The Sub-Group agreed that the Wales wide maps provide a broad indication of the location of the extractive and depositional activities. WAG would continue to collate existing data layers, however it was noted that the opportunity for more focused data collection/collation would arise once the potential site have been identified. The iterative stages will provide an opportunity to gather more area specific data. Depending upon the source of additional data Q/A and validation would need to be built into the process.

## **Action**

- Louise George and Mike Jones to look at commercial fishing data needs.
- Nigel Adams to provide Louise George with contact details for the Pembrokeshire Coastal Audit.

### **Date of next meeting**

17. It was agreed to that the next meeting should coincide with the timetable for developing the list of potential sites. Louise George to discuss with CCW and wider TAG on timeframes.

### **Summary of Actions**

<b>Meeting 28.5.10</b>		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
WAG Marine to clarify the position of the All Wales coastal path and co-location with MCZs.	Louise George	Complete
Mike Kaiser to send Koen data from Bangor University work for collation and comparison overlap for clarify.	Mike Kaiser	WAG to discuss with MK
Phil and Koen to prepare (one page) proposal on data collection protocols for consideration by the Group before submitting to MCZ project.	Phil Wensley & Koen Vanstaen	WAG Marine and Fish to discuss
WAG to provide a policy statement re marine renewable energy.	Louise George	Ongoing
WAG Marine to confirm the required format of GIS data layers and advise members.	Louise George	Complete
WAG Marine to arrange series of maps for consideration at next meeting.	Louise George	Complete
WAG marine to discuss membership with Chair of SCEG.	Louise George	Complete
<b>Meeting 10.9.10</b>		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Louise George to revise the paper on social and economic considerations and develop activities/impacts matrix for recommendation to TAG for inclusion in the site selection package.	Louise George	Complete – circulated to TAG 20.9.10
Louise George to contact JNCC to obtain a copy of the pressure activity matrix that has been developed for the Regional Projects.	Louise George	
Louise George to discuss conservation objective requirements with CCW.	Louise George	
Louise George and Mike Jones to look at commercial fishing data needs.	Louise George Mike Jones	
Nigel Adams to provide Louise George with contact details for the Pembrokeshire Coastal Audit.	Nigel Adams	Complete

## PAPER 1

### THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF HPMCZ SITE SELECTION

#### Purpose of Paper

For the Sub-Group to consider the paper with view to discussing and agreeing:

- the key social and economic considerations for identifying HPMCZs in Wales
- Whether the social and economic impacts (benefits and costs) of a potential designation should be prioritised/weighted, and if so how
- how the social and economic impacts (benefits and costs) of a potential designation are to be considered in the overall process
- that this paper (or an amended version of it) is put to TAG as recommendation towards the package of site selection guidance

#### Background

The Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009<sup>1</sup> provides that when considering whether it is desirable to designate an area as a MCZ the appropriate authority (Welsh Ministers in Wales) may have regard to the economic and social consequences of doing so.

The Welsh Assembly Government has stated its intention to give full consideration to social and economic consequences throughout the process of selecting HPMCZs in Welsh waters. “Protecting Welsh Seas,” (September 2009) set out the Welsh Assembly Government’s approach to selecting HPMCZs in Wales: to develop a robust site selection process that incorporates ecological, social and economic considerations and is informed by stakeholder dialogue. The aim is to ensure that HPMCZs are chosen to maximise benefits (ecological, social and economic) while minimising any conflicts with the different uses of the sea, as far as possible.

Explanatory note 335 of the Act states:

*“Subsection (7) allows Ministers to take account of the economic or social consequences of designation. This ensures MCZs may be designated in such a way as to conserve biodiversity and ecosystems whilst minimising any economic and social impacts. Where an area contains features that are rare, threatened or declining, or forms a biodiversity hotspot, greater weight is likely to be attached to ecological considerations. Where there is a choice of alternative areas which are equally suitable on ecological grounds, socio-economic factors could be more significant in deciding which areas may be designated as an MCZ.”*

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 117(7)

The Welsh Assembly Government considers that its approach to social and economic considerations is in line with the explanatory note.

### **Social and Economic Considerations**

The consideration of the social and economic aspects of selecting an area as a HPMCZ is an important step in the process. At the TAG workshop for developing the ecological guidelines for selecting HPMCZs it was suggested that HPMCZ selection needed to include the social and economic aspects of ecosystem services that are of benefit to humankind. These services include the *provisioning services* of providing food and raw materials, *cultural services* such as cultural heritage, leisure and recreation, education value and safeguarding marine ecosystems for future use, as well as the *intrinsic values* of marine ecosystems. The need to consider the practical considerations of a designation such as ease and ability to manage a site has also been identified.

To date 17 potential social and economic considerations have identified, based on a report by Roberts et al<sup>2</sup> (2008). These considerations have been listed under four headings: provisioning services, cultural services, intrinsic values and practical approaches. Further information on each of these considerations is provided at Annex 1.

<b>Provisioning services</b>	<b>Cultural services</b>	<b>Intrinsic values</b>	<b>Practical approaches</b>
Compatibility with existing users  Economic Effect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Importance to commercially important species</li> <li>• Importance to fisheries</li> </ul> Social Effect  Public Health	Archaeological/Cultural Significance and Heritage  Recreation  Aesthetics  Education  Value for Tourism	ANY?	Ability to manage and enforce  Research & monitoring  Safety  International/National/Regional Significance  Public/Political Acceptance

### **For discussion:**

Q1. Is this approach and list appropriate for HPMCZs in Wales?

Q2. Are there any other considerations to be added to this list?

### **Should social and economic considerations be prioritised – is so how?**

<sup>2</sup> Selecting and implementing Highly Protected Marine Reserves in Wales (CCW Policy Research Report 08/17)

The weight given to social and economic considerations will depend on the circumstances that apply in each case but we expect to give them less weight where a potential site is considered a 'hotspot' in terms of ecosystem recovery, resilience and functioning and greater weight where there is a choice of alternate potential sites which are equally suitable on ecological grounds. This is directly in keeping with Explanatory Note 335 of the Marine Act 2009.

This weight given to these considerations could be based on expert judgment/opinion on a site by site basis, or a weighting system could be developed relating to the level of an activity in an area, or the importance of an activity in an area, and the impact a potential designation would have on that activity. The weightings would be based on available evidence/data (where not available expert judgement) on a site by site basis. Such a weighting system would be comparable across all social and economic considerations. An example has been provided below.

#### PROVISIONING SERVICES

Overall impact score	Compatibiitlity with existing users	Importance to commercially important species	Economic effect	Public health
10			high	high
9			med	med
8		high	low	low
7		med		
6		low		
5				
4	high			
3	med			
2	low			
1				
0				

Advantages of such an approach:

- The scoring of individual social/economic considerations would be easier since we only need to consider the social/economic considerations by itself without initially worrying about how it compares to the other criteria.
- It is explicit how we weight the different social/economic considerations against the impact scores. Also the weighting scores can be changed in the future if need be.



- It allows flexibility to use an overall impact scores to identify hotspots, without losing the data on the individual criteria.

**For discussion:**

Q3. Is it appropriate to develop a weighting system?

Using a system akin to that outlined above, the difficulty will be in allocating an individual score to the overall impact scores.

Q4. what number of impact points would be most workable: the example uses 10, but a smaller number might be more workable?

Q5. How many impact points should an individual social/economic consideration cover? In the example, most SE considerations cover 3 point, but it might be appropriate for SE considerations to cover 6 points (or more). Would a flexible approach (which would be harder to implement) to a fixed approach (where each criteria is assignment to 3 points) be more preferable?

**Incorporating social and economic considerations into the site selection process**

The social and economic aspects of selecting sites will be considered after the first round of potential sites have been identified on the basis of the ecological guidance - but before the first iteration of sites is issued for public view and comments.

The reason for this is because, although we do not yet know what sites will emerge from the ecological guidance, the MCZ Project might consider that a certain option is unsuitable to be put forward as a potential site due to the strength of the social and economic implications associated with the site when compared to its ecological importance (its ability to contribute to recovery, resilience, ecosystem functioning). If any site is considered unsuitable for the first iteration due to the weight of the social and economic implications, the MCZ Project will as part of the stakeholder engagement package identify the site(s) that have been eliminated and the reasons for the elimination.

Stakeholders will be able to respond as they think fit on all aspects of the package of information. The MCZ Project will take the comments into account in progressing to the next iterations.

For further information on the key stage of site selection see section under Site Selection Methodology.

## **Annex 1**

### **SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS**

#### **PROVISIONING SERVICES**

##### **Compatibility with Existing Users**

This is the degree to which a potential designation would affect the activities of existing users. The designation of HPMCZs should aim to minimise conflict with and among existing users therefore potential sites that are compatible with existing users/activities will be more desirable. Consideration should be given to the likely effects of activities displaced from the candidate HPMCZ.

Level of importance: *for discussion*

##### **Economic Effect**

What will be the economic effects (short and long term) following designation? The economic effect (positive and negative) of a HPMCZ designation should be considered carefully. HPMCZs may have short and long term disruptive effects to the economy and these needs to be considered in the assessment. There may also be impacts on various uses of marine areas such as marine energy, aggregates etc. Also see commercially important species and importance of fisheries.

Level of importance: *for discussion*

##### **Importance to commercially important species**

The intention is not to designate HPMCZs for fisheries purposes but the designation of a HPMCZ may in turn benefit fish stocks. Is the proposed site critical for important life-history stages or vulnerable life history stages of commercially important species? Choosing such areas will increase the likelihood that an MPA network will benefit local fisheries although may lead to greater conflict.

Level of importance: *for discussion*

##### **Importance to fisheries**

The number of dependant fishers from a proposed HPMCZ should be considered – may also want to consider the size of the fishery yield. If an area that is very important to local fisheries is included in HPMCZ, it is likely that fishing activity will be displaced to other previously less exploited areas that may not be as productive or may prove difficult to fish or be more costly to reach. Displacement will need careful consideration.

Level of importance: *for discussion*

##### **Social Effect**

How does a potential designation affect/impact upon the community? What will be the social effects (long and short term) following designation?

Level of importance: *for discussion*

### **Public Health**

If a proposed HPMCZ serves to diminish pollution or other disease agents that may contribute to public health problems it may be more desirable. However, heavily contaminated areas may be of little use ecologically speaking. In such cases a broader suite of management measures may be more appropriate. Also need to consider contribution to provision of clean air and water systems.

Level of importance: *for discussion*

## **CULTURAL SERVICES**

### **Archaeological/Cultural Significance and Heritage**

This refers to the existing or potential value a site has because of its archaeological, religious, historic, artistic or other cultural values. Natural areas that contain important cultural features (e.g. submerged wrecks) may be more desirable as they are likely to benefit from greater support. By protecting such areas the integrity of adjacent ecosystems will also be protected. The value of such features can be regarded at a local/regional/national/international scale, with increasing importance given at each level.

Level of importance: *for discussion*

### **Recreation**

Is the site currently or could it potentially be used for public recreation? Areas that have high use value in terms of public recreation may or may not be compatible with the HPMCZ. Such areas should be considered carefully in view of other criteria, but excluding recreational activities may be controversial and meet with resistance from the local communities.

Level of importance: *for discussion*

### **Aesthetics**

An area with exceptional scenic beauty may be rated highly as safeguarding such features usually requires the integrity of adjacent ecosystems to be maintained. Aesthetic appeal is often important for sites used for tourism.

Level of importance: *for discussion*

### **Education**

HPMCZs have a role to play in improving our understanding of the marine environment so may want to consider the importance/usefulness of the site for education and interpretation purposes? See also research and monitoring.

Level of importance: *for discussion*

### **Value for Tourism**

Areas that lend themselves to forms of tourism that are compatible with conservation goals may be considered a priority. Areas that have existing infrastructure may be preferable over areas where high levels of development are required. Consideration should also be made on the number of visitors a given HPMCZ can support.

Level of importance: *for discussion*

## **PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Ability to Manage and enforce**

This refers to the ease of managing and enforcing a potential area. The more straightforward the management and patrols requirements the more likely they are to succeed. Areas that are difficult to manage and enforce may be less likely to succeed in achieving HPMCZ goals. Also consider access to the area. Consider the use of voluntary management agreements and whether they are likely to be supported in an area. Also an assessment of the likely risk of damage to an area alongside minimum enforcement input.

Level of importance: *for discussion*

### **Research and Monitoring**

Is it the site the subject of existing research or ongoing ecological monitoring programme? This may be desirable and an area that is already a part of a long-term monitoring program may be given priority for this consideration. Also consider access to the area for researchers and students, it should be relatively easy although greater accessibility may also mean greater pressure from users. Remote areas will receive fewer visitors and as such may be more likely to achieve their ecological goals

Level of importance: *for discussion*

### **Safety**

Consider the principal users of the area after designation and the degree of danger to people from strong currents, surf, submerged obstacles, waves and other hazards. Also consider those displaced by HPMCZ designation where alternative areas may be more difficult or dangerous to access e.g. alternative sites for fishers displaced by HPMCZ may be more difficult or dangerous to fish.

Level of importance: *for discussion*

### **International/National/Regional Significance**

If an area contains proposed or possible features for international protection (e.g. on the World Heritage List) or has an existing designation (e.g. Special Area of Conservation), or forms a link with a cross boundary MPA network it should rate highly for this criterion.

Level of importance: *for discussion*

**Public/Political Acceptance**

This criterion refers to the amount of social and political acceptance and the degree of community support for the creation of an HPMCZ in a particular area. HPMCZ success (and more broadly MPA success) has been shown to often be reliant on compliance and support from local communities. Therefore every effort should be made to obtain social support and acceptance throughout the planning stages. An area that is already protected through tradition or practise could represent a favourable site for inclusion in the network under this criterion.

Level of importance: *for discussion*

**INTRINSIC VALUE**

## PAPER 2

### SITE SELECTION METHODOLOGY

#### **Purpose of Paper**

For the Sub-Group to consider the suggested 4-stage process for selecting HPM CZs in Wales. The paper is provided mainly for information purposes however there will be the opportunity to discuss and provide feedback at the meeting.

The process will contain the following key stages:

- **Stage 1:** First Iteration
- **Stage 2:** Second Iteration
- **Stage 3:** Third Iteration
- **Stage 4:** Formal Consultation and Designation

Whilst some of the detailed aspects of individual stages may be refined as the MCZ project develops it is envisaged that the key stages will progress as outlined below.

#### **Stage 1: First iteration of HPM CZs**

CCW will develop the first iteration of potential site options using the agreed ecological site selection guidelines and best available evidence and data. CCW will also begin to draft conservation objectives for the site options – at this early stage in the process the focus will be on developing draft generic conservation objectives.

CCW will then present the first iteration of sites [including draft conservation objectives] to the TAG. The role of the TAG will be to consider the site options in light of the agreed ecological guidance. It will also consider and refine the site options where necessary alongside the practical, social and economic considerations.

For the 1st iteration these are likely to be the major physical and legal constraints:

- Ports/harbours (areas where maintenance dredging is required)
- Areas licensed for aggregate extraction
- Fisheries several orders
- Major cables and/or pipelines

The TAG will then agree the sites to be recommended to the Steering Group.

The role of the Steering Group will be to endorse the first iteration of candidate sites and agree that they be shared with stakeholders and the wider public for comment and feedback. However beforehand the Steering Group may consider it necessary to refine the site options further in light of conflicts or any potential positive associations with the following Welsh Assembly Government policies:

- WAG's future renewable energy agenda [should know more Sept/Oct]
- WAG's sustainable fisheries policy
- *may be others*

Once the Steering Group has agreed to the first iteration of site options the Welsh Assembly Government will commence a period of stakeholder engagement. The Welsh Assembly Government will issue a package of information outlining how the site options have been selected/determined, those sites eliminated on social and economic grounds and the reasoning behind this and any draft conservation objectives that have been developed.

This stage will take place over a period of [3] months; the information will be available on WAG's website and will be shared with SCEG and wider group networks. Welsh Assembly Government may also hold public meetings with regional communities and key sector groups.

During this phase the Welsh Assembly Government will be looking to stakeholders to provide:

- information of known current and planned human activities in an area within or adjacent to a potential HPMCZ,
- information of activities that are compatible with a HPMCZ proposal,
- information of activities that may be incompatible with a HPMCZ proposal,
- make available any data and evidence to inform the process and
- highlight where there are potential data/evidence gaps.

Spatial information about activities of interests will be most useful to the MCZ Project.

The Welsh Assembly Government will also engage with UK Government departments, the Irish Sea Conservation Zone Project, the Finding Sanctuary Project and the National and International Stakeholder Forum established by JNCC. This will ensure wider government and stakeholder input to the process.

The information collected and collated during this stage will be used to inform the next iteration of sites at stage 2.

## **Stage 2: Second Iteration of HPMCZs**

It will be the role of the TAG to consider the feedback and information (including any new or emerging ecological data) received from the first iteration exercise and make recommendations for refining the site options. Where social and/or economic issues incompatible with a HPMCZ have been identified the TAG will consider refining the site options in order to minimise the conflict – however this will only be possible where there are ecological options to choose between. There may be situations whereby there is no viable ecological option and therefore the TAG will be unable to refine its recommendations in such a way as to minimise issues of incompatibility. In

such circumstance it will be for the Steering Group to decide how these sites are taken forward.

TAG will also identify any outstanding issues that require further consideration, for example the need for further research may have been identified to inform the next stage in the process.

Alongside this work CCW will continue to develop draft conservation objectives for the site options for consideration by the TAG.

TAG will then present its recommendations to the Steering Group with full details of how the site options have been modified and refined since the first iteration, issues of incompatibility that remain unresolved by the TAG, draft conservation objectives and other issues that require a steer from the Steering Group.

The Steering Group will consider the TAG's recommendation for the second iteration of sites. It may decide to refine the sites further, before deciding to publish the second iteration for stakeholder and wider public comments.

As with the first iteration the Welsh Assembly Government will be responsible for sharing this information with SCEG and wider stakeholder networks. The process as outlined above for the first iteration will be repeated, although as the site options here, having been refined, are likely to focus on specific areas we expect the stakeholder engagement to involve more detailed deliberations in relation to the social and economic [costs/ benefits].

### **Stage 3: Third Iteration of HPMCZs**

The outputs from the second iteration will be used by the TAG to inform its final recommendations for the location of HPMCZs in Welsh waters. TAG's recommendations to the Steering Group will include details of any outstanding conflicts, advice on the management of any displaced activity plus site management, monitoring and enforcement requirements.

The role of the Steering Group is to consider the package of information alongside the proposed HPMCZs and agree its recommendation to Welsh Ministers.

Final recommendations to Welsh Ministers will include for each site:

- a map of the recommended site
- proposed name for the site
- description of the features of the site
- suggested conservation objectives
- pressures associated with any ongoing/planned activities
- outstanding objections

### **Stage 4: Formal Consultation and the Designation Process**



On receiving recommended HPMCZ options Welsh Ministers will consider how they meet, and are consistent with, the relevant statutory considerations<sup>3</sup>, Welsh Assembly Government policy objectives, the advice and recommendations of the MCZ Steering Group and any international commitments before deciding whether to proceed with formal consultation.

Welsh Ministers will also take account of the draft impact assessment outlining anticipated costs and benefits of proposed sites including, where appropriate, information on individual or groups of sites, and identifying the nature conservation, sustainable development, and environmental, social and economic implications.

Formal public consultation is expected to take place from [XXX] onwards, for a period of 12 weeks. The impact assessment will be consulted on simultaneously with the MCZ designation order(s) to which it relates. The designation order will identify the boundaries of the MCZ, list the protected feature(s) and set out the conservation objectives for the MCZ. Care will be required to frame the objectives so that public authorities and other stakeholders are clearly able to understand the implications in terms of restrictions which result.

If the MCZ project has worked as intended, new issues or objections are unlikely to be raised at this stage – this can not be guaranteed and any unresolved concerns are likely to be reiterated as formal objections. Welsh Ministers will consider objections and representations received from the formal consultation before deciding whether to make a designation order. The Welsh Assembly Government may correspond, discuss or seek further information before reaching a decision, and Welsh Ministers may decide to hold a hearing.

Welsh Ministers will designate MCZs by orders, in line with Part 5 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act.

It may be necessary to involve Welsh Ministers at each and every stage of this process. The Steering Group will be responsible for deciding when it is necessary to obtain a steer or decision from Welsh Ministers.

### ***INSERT FLOW CHART OF PROCESS***

---

<sup>3</sup> Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 Sections 117-118 and Section 123

## PAPER 3

### MCZ PROJECT WALES - DATA/EVIDENCE

#### EXTRACTIVE ACTIVITY (likely to be incompatible with HPMCZ)

Acts that involve the temporary or permanent removal, or attempted removal, of any living organisms or non-living materials or natural features from the marine environment. An exemption to this is the removal of man-made debris or litter.

Activity	Data / Evidence	Confidence	Data Gap	Mapped
<b>Fisheries and Aquaculture</b>				
Commercial fishing	<p>Generated by Cefas - The data on estimation of fishing activity are derived from Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data and are available for 2006 and 2007. Represents activity from all vessels (both UK and non-UK registered vessels) of at least 15-metre length.</p> <p>VMS data for UK vessels have been linked to skipper logbook information in order to determine the fishing gear being employed. For non-UK registered vessels where logbook information is not available information on fishing gear employed has been obtained from 'primary gear' listed on the EU vessel register.</p> <p>For trawled gears, the values indicate estimated hours fished. For non-trawled gears this <u>cannot</u> be taken as being fully representative of the intensity of fishing as no indication is given of the time that set nets/pots etc. remain <i>in situ</i>. Rather it gives an indication of the spatial extent affected by these gears and the likely intensity based on time spent setting and retrieving gear.</p> <p>The estimated fishing hours for individual gear codes are summarised to provide information on the fishing activity for gear groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demersal trawls</li> <li>• dredges</li> <li>• hooks &amp; lines</li> <li>• nets</li> <li>• pelagic trawls</li> <li>• seines</li> <li>• traps/pots</li> </ul>	Low – Sub Group has concerns about validity of some of the data	<p>WAG fish to work with Cefas to develop protocol for data collection (action from meet 28.5.10)</p> <p>Bangor Uni data (action from meet 28.5.10)</p> <p>Data from vessels &lt;15m</p>	✓

	Economic value inshore shellfish landings also available			
Recreational angling				
Catch and release angling				
Bait Collection	CCW Phase One Intertidal Survey: 10 year intertidal survey of Wales (2007). Data provides some knowledge of uses/impacts but not a fully comprehensive list.	Data limited to survey sites and may be time limited		
Shellfish farms	Shellfish farms within Welsh territorial waters (Cefas 2007): Anglesey – mussels Menai Straits – mussels and pacific oysters Swansea – mussels  Also see several orders and regulatory orders - awaiting coordinates from WAG Fisheries Unit	High		✓
Finfish farms (marine )	None in Wales - check			
Finfish Farms (freshwater)	Any in Wales likely to have an impact upon coast/marine?			
<b>Licensed activity</b>				
Dredging – port maintenance	MCU – hold some data			
Dredging – aggregates extraction	Location of active dredge areas as of 31 July 2008 ( Data Accessed October 2008 <sup>4</sup> ) taken from the Crown Estate Electronic Monitoring System	High		✓
<b>Other</b>				
Military activities  Inc firing ranges	The boundaries of military practice areas : SeaZone data  MoD Marine Conservation Zones Coordinator:			

<sup>4</sup> Data are available for biannual update. The data are supplied as a series of pdf files and require significant processing prior to being useable within the GIS. Time constraints meant that data supplied in this project may not be the most recent available.

Collection of flora and fauna e.g. seaweed	CCW Phase One Intertidal Survey: 10 year intertidal survey of Wales (2007). Data provides some knowledge of uses/impacts but not a fully comprehensive list.	Data limited to survey sites and may be time limited		
Collection or use of natural materials/substrates e.g. peat, gravel	CCW intertidal scientists re data			
Marine curio collection and beachcombing	CCW intertidal scientists re data			

*Extractive activities considered elsewhere in the process:*

- *Construction of structure – activity involves some degree of extraction but is considered under depositional activities for purposes of this process. Current structures will be considered under the ecological guidance as recovery potential.*
- *Oil/ gas exploration and operation – activities involves some degree of extraction but is considered under depositional activities for purposes of this process.*

## PAPER 4

### MCZ PROJECT WALES - DATA/EVIDENCE

#### DEPOSITIONAL ACTIVITY (activity likely to be incompatible with HPMCZ)

Acts that involve the laying down, movement or discharge of living or non-living materials or substances into the marine environment. This includes deposit of materials such as rocks, gravel or sand, building of structures, and release of any polluting or toxic or chemical substances, as well as discharge of ballast, untreated human waste, biodegradable and industrial waste and the discard of fish offal and by-catch.

Activity	Data/ Evidence	Confidence	Data Gap	Mapped
<b>Fisheries and Aquaculture</b>				
Commercial fishing	<p>Generated by Cefas - The data on estimation of fishing activity are derived from Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data and are available for 2006 and 2007. Represents activity from all vessels (both UK and non-UK registered vessels) of at least 15-metre length.</p> <p>VMS data for UK vessels have been linked to skipper logbook information in order to determine the fishing gear being employed. For non-UK registered vessels where logbook information is not available information on fishing gear employed has been obtained from 'primary gear' listed on the EU vessel register.</p> <p>For trawled gears, the values indicate estimated hours fished. For non-trawled gears this <u>cannot</u> be taken as being fully representative of the intensity of fishing as no indication is given of the time that set nets/pots etc. remain <i>in situ</i>. Rather it gives an indication of the spatial extent affected by these gears and the likely intensity based on time spent setting and retrieving gear.</p> <p>The estimated fishing hours for individual gear codes are summarised to provide information on the fishing activity for gear groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demersal trawls</li> <li>• dredges</li> <li>• hooks &amp; lines</li> <li>• nets</li> <li>• pelagic trawls</li> <li>• seines</li> </ul>	Low – Sub Group has concerns about validity of some of data.	<p>WAG fish to work with Cefas to develop protocol for data collection (action from meet 28.5.10)</p> <p>Bangor Uni data (action from meet 28.5.10)</p> <p>Data from vessels &lt;15m</p>	✓

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>traps/pots</li> </ul> <p>Economic value inshore shellfish landings also available</p>			
Recreational angling				
Shellfish farms	<p>Shellfish farms within Welsh territorial (Cefas 2007):</p> <p>Anglesey – mussels</p> <p>Menai Straits – mussels and pacific oysters</p> <p>Swansea – mussels</p> <p>See also several orders and regulating orders - awaiting coordinates WAG Fisheries Unit</p>	High		✓
Finfish Farms (marine)	None in Wales - check			
Finfish Farms (freshwater)	Any in Wales of interest to MCZ project?			
<b>Licensed activity</b>				
Dredging – disposal sites	<p>From Cefas Regulatory Assessment Team</p> <p>Disposal data show the location and the wet tonnage for capital dredging and maintenance dredging and sediment for 2004 – 2008 inclusive, for all licensed disposal sites.</p>	High		✓
<b>Renewable Energy</b>				
Wind Farm	<p>Licensed in Round 1 – boundaries from SeaZone</p> <p>North Hoyle -operational</p> <p>Rhyl Flats – under construction</p> <p>Licensed in Round 2 boundaries from SeaZone</p> <p>Gwynt y Mor – consented, construction planned 2011</p> <p>Round 3 Wind Energy - latest round of potential lease sites for wind energy generation undergoing tendering process (from SeaZone).</p>	<p>R1&amp;R2 high as have been in existence for years.</p> <p>R3 less confidence as still in tendering process.</p>		✓

Tidal Range	Severn Tidal Power – awaiting outcome of feasibility study Conwy (proposed)	Low – uncertainty of future activity	Await findings of RPS work (Sept 2010)	✓
Tidal Stream	Ramsey Sound Anglesey off North and West coast Western coast Llyn peninsula	Low – uncertainty of future activity	Await findings of RPS work (Sept 2010)	
Wave	Pembrokeshire off south and west coast	Low – uncertainty of future activity	Await findings of RPS work (Sept 2010)	
<b>Oil and Gas</b>				
Platforms	Offshore hydrocarbon industry platform installations (SeaZone)	High		✓
Well heads	Offshore hydrocarbon industry wellhead installations (SeaZone)	High		✓
<b>Pipelines</b>				
Oil	connecting offshore hydrocarbon installations to the UK coast from SeaZone	High		✓
Gas	connecting offshore hydrocarbon installations to the UK coast from SeaZone	High		✓
<b>Cables</b>				
All undefined	From SeaZone	High		✓
Electric	Awaiting info from UK Cable Protection Committee			
Telephone	Awaiting info from UK Cable Protection Committee			
Data transmission	Awaiting info from UK Cable Protection Committee			
Fibre optic	Awaiting info from UK Cable Protection Committee			
Mooring	Awaiting info from UK Cable Protection Committee			
<b>Navigational Aides</b>				
Buoys	SeaZone			
<b>Other</b>				

Military areas	The boundaries of military practice areas : SeaZone data			
Inc firing ranges	MoD Marine Conservation Zones Coordinator:			
research facilities				

*SeaZone – marine data from UK Hydrographic Office, other Government Agencies, private sector and overseas sources. WAG has access to this data which is updated on annual basis.*



## PAPER 5

### MCZ PROJECT WALES - DATA/EVIDENCE

#### POTENTIALLY DAMAGING OR DISTURBING ACTIVITY

Acts that potentially result in permanent or temporary physical harm or injury to species, or cause permanent or temporary alteration to natural features within the marine environment. Acts that interfere with the normal functioning of populations beyond the natural variability of the ecosystem.

Activity	Data/ Evidence	Data Gap	Mapped	Mitigation measures or incompatible
<b>Water management</b>				
Sewage waste discharge outlets	Awaiting detail from EA			Presence of outfall may not preclude a site from designation, to be determined on site by site basis depending upon features and type/amount of discharge
Industrial waste discharge outlets	Awaiting detail from EA Q. does this include waste from fish farms?			As above
Agricultural waste discharge outlets	Awaiting detail from EA			As above
ANY OTHERS?				
<b>Port and Boat related</b>				
Fishing Ports	Location from MFA database			
Ports (non-fishing)	Location of Royal Navy bases Location of ports - Anatec UK Ltd from RPS			
Anchoring	Anchor points and lines from SeaZone (anchor berth, anchorage area, berth)			
Moorings	Are these different to anchor points?			
Shipping intensity	Automatic Identification System (AIS) is a collision-avoidance system for shipping. AIS is required for ships over 300GT that travel in international waters. Data are provided by Marine and Coastguard Agency for 2008 as the total number of vessels passing through			

	each 5km by 5km grid cell. Data are represented on a scale of 'low' to 'high'			
Ferry routes	SeaZone data			
Navigational routes	Hydrographic chart symbols identifying navigation lines and traffic separation schemes. No detail of intensity of use SeaZone data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Navigation line</li> <li>• Traffic separation line</li> <li>• Traffic separation scheme crossing</li> <li>• Traffic separation scheme lane part</li> <li>• Traffic separation scheme roundabout</li> <li>• Traffic separation zone</li> <li>• Two-way route part</li> </ul>			
Maintenance and operation of existing structures e.g. oil platform, cables,				
<b>Recreation</b>				
Water-related recreational activity areas	Source of data - Environment Agency ?			
Scuba diving and snorkelling	Marine and Coastal Recreation Audit 2009: Land Use Consultants (2009) CCW Policy Research Report No.09/02  <i>Pembrokeshire – recreational audit</i>			
Swimming	Marine and Coastal Recreation Audit 2009: Land Use Consultants (2009) CCW Policy Research Report No.09/02  <i>Pembrokeshire – recreational audit</i>			
Walking/hiking (on intertidal shore)	Marine and Coastal Recreation Audit 2009: Land Use Consultants (2009) CCW Policy Research Report No.09/02  <i>Pembrokeshire – recreational audit</i>			
Visitor amenities/ camping (existing and new)	Marine and Coastal Recreation Audit 2009: Land Use Consultants (2009) CCW Policy Research Report No.09/02  <i>Pembrokeshire – recreational audit</i>			
Wildlife observation	Marine and Coastal Recreation Audit 2009: Land Use Consultants (2009) CCW Policy Research Report No.09/02			

	<i>Pembrokeshire – recreational audit</i>			
Vehicular access (intertidal areas)	CCW Phase One Intertidal Survey: 10 year intertidal survey of Wales (2007). Data provides some knowledge of uses/impacts but not a fully comprehensive list.  <i>Pembrokeshire – recreational audit</i>	Data limited to survey sites and may be time limited		
Non-motorised raft  e.g. kayaking, canoeing	Sailing areas – RYA (via RPS) Yachting clubs – RYA (via RPS) Yachting training areas – RYA (via RPS)  <i>Pembrokeshire – recreational audit</i>			
Motorised craft	<i>Pembrokeshire – recreational audit</i>  Cruising routes – RYA (via RPS) Boat racing areas – RYA (via RPS)			
Other recreational	<u>Power and traction kiting</u> See details from South and West Association of traction kiting  <i>Pembrokeshire – recreational audit</i>			
<b>Science and Education</b>				
Archaeology & Wrecks	Seazone data  Contact Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments of Wales for further information			May create noise, physical and visual disturbance although non-invasive, observational research and education will usually be compatible – case by case assessment
Research and collection of data	CCW Phase One Intertidal Survey: 10 year intertidal survey of Wales (2007). Data provides some knowledge of uses/impacts but not a fully comprehensive list.	Data limited to survey sites and may be time limited		As above
<b>Misc</b>				
Low flying aircraft	<u>Hang gliding and paragliding</u> Marine and Coastal Recreation Audit 2009: Land Use Consultants (2009) CCW Policy Research Report No.09/02			
Military activity	The boundaries of military practice areas : SeaZone data			

Loud noise, sonar etc	MoD Marine Conservation Zones Coordinator:			
--------------------------	--	--	--	--

*SeaZone – marine data from UK Hydrographic Office, other Government Agencies, private sector and overseas sources. WAG has access to this data which is updated on annual basis.*