

Socio-Economic Sub Group responses to email 16 September 2010

From: Jones, Michael Welsh Government Fisheries Unit
Sent: 16 September 2010 15:30
To: George, Louise (ESH - ECM)
Cc: Wensley, Phil (RA - FMDD)
Subject: RE: MCZ Project Wales - Social and Economic considerations

Hi Louise,

I've had a quick look through your documents.

Socio economic suggestions.

Comment G1 - I'm happy with the use of **incompatible, conflicting or negligible**. This seems to capture what you are after.

Comment G2 - the use of **high, medium and low** is a standard gauge of risk assessment for management and enforcement so I'm happy with this too.

In the definition for incompatible perhaps the use of 'material' rather than 'non-living resource' would be better. I'm thinking of such things as capital dredge waste.

Comment G3 - I think your paragraph captures what you mean quite accurately. No need to write too much on the point.

The MATRIX

Neo says "Commercial fishing and aquaculture contribute extensively to local economies, employment in coastal communities and in the wider context food security. Several fisheries have room for wider development and the Welsh fisheries strategy is based on an eco-system approach to management. Recognising that fishing is relevant to all Welsh waters the need to minimise the impact on fishing will be considered at all stages of site selection"

Consideration needs to include:

- a) The number of dependant fishers from a proposed HPMCZ – may also want to consider the size of the fishery yield.
- b) food production chain, food security and availability of alternative fisheries to pursue
- c) displacement – are there alternative fishing grounds? 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. Implications for safety of life at sea.
- d) Whether 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 HPMCZ will benefit local fisheries although may lead to greater conflict.
- e) the impact on isolated/dependant communities where there is little alternative income or employment.
- f) impact on heritage fisheries - fishing may have been historically carried on for many years and over many generations

Where a Several and/or Regulating order exists for the right to fish or cultivation fish in a specific area then the impact of a potential HPMCZ on these areas will be considered while developing the first iteration where areas are likely to be excluded. Welsh Minister's can amend or revoke an Order. But it must be borne in mind that this is a very lengthy process (probably taking years) and compensation could be payable to the grantee for loss of earning for the outstanding period of the Order.

Site Selection Methodology.

This seems fine to me.

Mike

From: Mary Lewis CCW
Sent: 16 September 2010 20:03
To: George, Louise (ESH - ECM)
Cc: Kirsten Ramsay; Luke Davies
Subject: Re: MCZ Project Wales - Social and Economic considerations

Louise,

A few quick thoughts, sorry no time for track changes:

Categories for activities and practical considerations I agree in general with the two categories - incompatible, conflicting and negligible (although see further comment on use of the term negligible) for activities, and high medium and low importance for practical considerations as I agree with your comment that they are different and can't really be categorised in the same way. My main comment is that I wouldn't use the word 'negligible' as even low impact non-extractive, non-depositional activities will need to be considered as most would need some form of management to ensure they are compatible with a highly protected MCZ designation (as per advice in Thurstan (2009) report on activities in HPMCZs). If it is not too much of a mouthful, I would suggest changing to 'potentially compatible' and I would re-phrase the description of this in the paper as follows:

"Potentially compatible - an activity that is likely to be compatible with HPMCZs, but may still require management measures to avoid negative impacts. Designation will have minimal impact on this activity. It is therefore considered of lesser importance in the decision making process in terms of siting of highly protected MCZs, but it will still be important to consider appropriate management."

I would see this as applying to, for example, low impact forms of recreation and tourism- and would therefore add it alongside 'conflicting' as a second entry in the 'impact' column for 'recreation other' and 'tourism'.

Matrix

I can see what you are trying to do (it is quite difficult!) and think it is better to list the main activity categories and the one or more ecosystem services they provide in a separate column. I would suggest listing the activity column first, and grouping extractive rows together, followed by depositional, followed by the potentially damaging and disturbing, as far as possible (I know some overlap and occur in extractive and depositional). then the 'impact' column, then the 'ecosystem services' column etc.. I would also call the ecosystem service column 'ecosystem service links' as many of the activities are supported by an ecosystem service, but are not in themselves delivering and ecosystem service so the current presentation is still a little misleading and confusing I think?

Ports, Boats & Shipping, Cables, dredge disposal and military all relate to a degree to provisioning services (if any) in that the environment provides the means for these things to occur - but they are not, in themselves provisioning services.

Fishing should certainly be linked to supporting services as well, as primary production (an element of supporting services) is the base of the food chain that provides the fishery.

I think water management should link to provisioning and regulating services.

At some point I think a table or summary describing the four ecosystem service categories will be needed (provisioning, regulating, cultural and supporting) the table I added in comments on last version of socio-economic guidance ahead of last weeks meeting might be enough?

Mary

From: Cummings, Michael (ESH - SE&ID)
Sent: 17 September 2010 15:06
To: George, Louise (ESH - ECM)
Cc: Griffiths, Rhodri (ESH - SE&ID); Harrington, Paul (ESH - SE&ID)
Subject: RE: MCZ Project Wales - Social and Economic considerations

Hi Louise

You have rightly identified Renewable Energy as an activity which is incompatible with HPM CZ. However, there are potential ecological benefits to installing marine energy devices. Marine renewable developments may create artificial reefs which could increase invertebrate biodiversity and attract fish and shellfish species. The creation of 'no catch' zones around developments may also benefit fisheries by protecting nursery grounds and aid conservation programmes by limiting disturbance to vulnerable species.

In your matrix you mention areas already under wind farms are likely to be excluded from further consideration. As stated above, the foundations supporting the monopiles, including any rock armour to prevent scour, could act as an artificial reef naturally attracting biodiversity.

Can I just remind you that all the data, ecological, environmental and socio-economic collected for the MRESF is at your disposal for the MCZ work.

Kind regards

Mike

Michael Cummings

Sustainable Energy & Industry Wales/Ynni a Diwydiant Cynaliadwy Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government/Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru

From: Adams, Nigel (DH - T&M)
Sent: 17 September 2010 14:56
To: George, Louise (ESH - ECM)
Subject: RE: MCZ Project Wales - Social and Economic considerations

Louise,

Just a few points:

- The reference to ecological tourism I assume includes wildlife tourism. Aspects of wildlife tourism may need to be managed to avoid harm, boat trips to watch the dolphins may require restrictions on numbers,

operations and seasonality. Similarly wildlife watching may require controls regarding the nesting season. Better visitor information and interpretation will be required to minimise the negative impacts. I believe there could be both direct impacts in terms of promoting wildlife tourism, but also indirect because Wales becomes associated with a quality environment which makes it more attractive to visitors, there may also be a impact in making Wales appear to be a more attractive place to live and work. The effective development and interpretation of wildlife tourism may also strengthen the appeal of Wales for study visits from the schools and HE sector.

- I have added the Coastal Tourism Strategy as a WAG strategy to the list of policies in the methodology paper. We do need some research to identify the tourism and recreational activities that could be harmful, apart from fishing, and motorised craft, there is a high degree of uncertainty.

Regards

Nigel

Nigel.M.Adams
Head of Policy and Regeneration,
Strategy & Partnerships
Visit Wales
Department for Heritage
Welsh Assembly Government