

Wales Marine Strategic Advisory Group MINUTES November 2014

Title of Meeting	Marine Transition Programme (MTP) – Wales Marine Strategic Advisory Group (WMSAG)			Date	24.11.2014
Meeting Number	2	Start Time	11.00	End Time	15:15
Attendance	MR (BMAPA Trade Association), JE (Welsh Fishermen's Association), DL (Welsh Ports Group), CC (Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum), MP (Chair Pwllheli Partnership), GC (RSPB Wales), IB (WWF and WEL), GB (Marine Conservation Society) RS (Wildlife Trusts Wales), NR (Welsh Local Government Association), RC (Welsh Federation of Sea Anglers), DG (Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historic Monuments of Wales), JW (Welsh Aquaculture), RJ (Natural Resources Wales (Strategic Partner), GR (Welsh Government), RG (Welsh Government), CJ(Welsh Government), PC (Welsh Government), RA (Welsh Government), AC (Welsh Government), PB (Seabed Users), PH (Cragen Llyn a Mon), EB (Royal Yachting Association Cymru), NO'S (Wales Marine Fisheries Advisory Group), DR (Director of Welsh Yachting), ER (Dwr Cymru), MH-E (Countryside Council for Wales) TR (BASC), RB (Severn Estuary Partnership), AM (Chair British Marine Federation Wales),				
Apologies	BG-S (Wind & Marine Energy), EP-D (National Trust), TJ (National Parks), DA (Welsh Association of Sub Aqua Clubs), JG (Joint Nature Conservation Committee), DT (The Crown Estate)				

#	Item
1.	Welcome, Introductions and Apologies
2.	Minutes and Outstanding actions from last meeting
3.	Programme, Stakeholders & WMSAG update
4.	Focus on MTP Evidence Project
5.	Marine Planning Event Feedback
6.	Natural Resource Management, Marine Planning and the Future Generations Bill
7.	MTP Marine Protected Areas: options paper
8.	Discussion & Questions
9.	Any Other Business (AOB)

1. Welcome, Introductions & Apologies:

- 1.1 PD opened the meeting, welcomed the group members, and gave apologies for those who were not able to attend.
- 1.2 RG noted that they had yet to receive a response from One Voice Wales to the invite to attend WMSAG
- 1.3 **Action 1:** PD to chase One Voice Wales on their absence.

2. Minutes and Outstanding actions from last meeting:

- 2.1 PD confirmed that all actions from the previous meeting had been completed.
- 2.2 PD explained that action 4 had been to revise the Terms of Reference, to be more specific about the groups purpose and function. He explained that he was aware that following the meeting there had been some further discussions with stakeholders around the clarity and the purpose of the group.
- 2.3 PD went onto provide additional clarity of the role of the group members. This being to look across all areas of marine policy change and development and advise WG on how best to interact and communicate with marine users to ensure communication is effective, representative and attuned to their needs. To advise and input into the task and finish group projects, and to use their own communications mechanisms to share key communication messages from the groups discussions.
- 2.4 EB noted that a correction was required in terms of reference: the Welsh Yachting Association is now named the Royal Yachting Association Cymru.
- 2.5 GB stated that the terms of reference does not make clear how the Marine and Fisheries' day-to-day work joins up with the work of the Marine Transition Programme (MTP) and how the group can question the day-to-day work.
- 2.6 GR explained that the work of the Group had been set out in the previous meeting and that the purpose of WMSAG was to help manage the change process brought about by the MTP and share meaningful information more widely with their stakeholder networks.
- 2.7 It was noted that at the last meeting, that it had been agreed that both the Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum and the Severn Estuary Partnership were to be represented at each meeting. TR noted that he represented BSAC and not Mineral Products as previously stated. DL noted that he was in attendance and had not sent apologies as previously noted.
- 2.8 PD asked the group for any final comments on the terms of reference.
- 2.9 The group then spoke about the minutes of the previous meeting they requested some clarification in relation to the acronyms used and PD agreed that a glossary of acronyms should be produced.
- 2.10 A number of points within the previous minutes were also raised for clarity. At 6.8 the group asked how the WMSAG members could be both independent and support the programme. The group requested that this wording be reviewed. GR outlined the group's purpose as providing meaningful advice to WG from a broad marine stakeholder perspective, whilst maintaining an effective level of communication.

- 2.11 PD said that in his view the wording worked well, in terms of supporting the process, the group would do so going forward, and in this sense provide challenge to support its delivery.
- 2.12 At point 6.11 the word 'role' was missing from the sentence and 4.6 the term 'Integrated Coastal Zone Management' needed to be included. PD committed that the amendments would be made and then the final draft would be published on the Web.
- 2.13 PD then explained the format of the day. He noted that GR would be giving a programme update on the MTP projects, and there would be a number of presentations through out the day.
- 2.14 The group ask if there was a way to monitor the effectiveness of the communication from the group: it was agreed that the M&F web group would help monitor the effectiveness of publishing, sharing and linking information on the M&F website. It was noted that communication with stakeholders especially around the historic environments was limited as further work would need to be undertaken to identify historic environments in the first place.
- 2.15 It was agreed that membership of the group would be shared on the WG website along when the minutes of the meeting were uploaded to the site.

Action 2: Glossary of acronyms to be produced

Action 3: Amendments to terms of reference as set out in 2.10 and 2.11 of the minute.

Action 4: Membership list to be placed on the internet alongside WMSAG minutes.

3. Programme, Stakeholders & WMSAG update

- 3.1 GR presented information on the projects within the MTP; within this he gave overview of current limitations including budgetary constraints. GR explained that the financial position mean the MTP would need to be diligent in how it scoped the projects and would need to take a realistic view of how affordable they were to fit within the financial constraints.
- 3.2 GR went onto provide an update on the Marine Planning project. (Slides 4 – 6: WMSAG presentation meeting 2). GR explained that the consultation on the draft scope, vision and objectives for the plan had closed on the 10th November and there had been 45 responses to date which the team were now working their way through.
- 3.3 GR went on to explain that a draft version of the Marine Plan would be ready by February, for ministerial view and that in the period between May and July 2015 a full public consultation on the Marine Plan would be launched.
- 3.4 GR sated that this was an ambitious target particularly in consideration of the wider implication of the Smith Commission and the potential impact further devolution could have on WG duties, with this in mind the dates set for delivery were best endeavours.
- 3.5 The group asked what the difference was between stakeholder events such as Marine Planning workshop and WMSAG, and whether any duplication was happening. GR explained that the Marine Planning events were focused on the delivery of the Welsh National Marine Plan and was, in effect, an informal task and finish group of the WMSAG. Whereas the WMSAG was more strategic and cut across all the MTP.
- 3.6 GR outlined the purpose of Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) project, describing stages of completion (Slides 7 –10: WMSAG presentation meeting 2). He explained that WG is aiming to consult on the Programme of Measures, in January 2015 and that an MSFD animation would be released at this stage, to

present information in a simple and understandable way, as was seen with the Marine Planning and Marine Protected Areas animation earlier in the year.

- 3.7 The group expressed a need for a balanced approach to economic, social and environmental consequences of delivering the MSFD.
- 3.8 GR provided an update on the MPA project, he explained that he would feed back on coherent networks and that MH-E of Natural Resources Wales (NRW) would be attending later in the day to discuss the management options with the group. (Slides 11 –13: WMSAG presentation meeting 2)
- 3.9 Deanna Groom (DG) asked if a stock take of the historic environment had taken place. GR responded to say that this had not happened yet, but it had been discussed at the Governance Board meeting where it had been recognised that there was further work that needed to be undertaken in this area.
- 3.10 PH asked if this work was separate too, or the same as the Natura 2000 work and if there were any Life+ funding available for this work. GR said that the work to assess the network of Marine Protected Areas is being taken forward by JNCC initially and is separate.
- 3.11 GR concluded the programme update by updating the group on the NCFP and Si Fii projects (Slides 14 –15: WMSAG presentation meeting 2)
- 3.12 PH asked why the contract had been called off, PC explained that he was developing a call off contract framework, to reduce time to contract pieces of work; he assured the group that the work was not stopping. JW said that it would have been useful to of had more notice of the tender period for the call off contract to allow more time to tender.
- 3.13 DR noted that within the evidence that had been presented to date there was little or no economic or social evidence presented. DR went onto say that more worryingly the Marine Leisure Sector information used by WG was incorrect and out of date.
- 3.14 DR noted that there was a lot of environmental evidence. He asked what WG would do to ensure that marine leisure and tourism were appropriately reflected. GR explained that data collection within this area was not as strong, as it sits outside of his portfolio, but the MTP worked closely with Visit Wales and would ask them to check the relevance of the evidence provided. DR reaffirmed the point that delivering MSFD stipulates that we must take into account the economic and social consequences. PD said that this was a point well made.
- 3.15 The group asked what work had been undertaken in relation to the land sea interface area. GR explained that this would be picked up via the marine planning project via the work on integrated coastal zone management. Also working with the NRM team should provide the necessary interfaces and synergies. The group thought that it was important not to import terrestrial planning processes into the marine planning.
- 3.16 The group raised the MPA steering group project and noted that this steering group had met three times. WMSAG members asked if they should be part of this steering group discussion. GR said that MH-E would be attending the meeting later in the day to discuss the well-managed element of the MPA project. GR concluded that the MPA steering group is formed from those organisations who have a direct management responsibility for Marine Protected Areas. WMSAGs involvement within the work should be more strategic.

- 3.17 RS made note of the fact that the MTP had started to look the financial constraints the programme was facing. She asked if this was a project in itself. GR explained that the financial position of the project was being considered by MTP programme board, the next meeting of this board was the 19th December. A paper was being prepared for this looking at the present position and the future implications.
- 3.18 RC referred to the questions raised in relation to the MSFD project:
- Should we consider hosting something similar in Wales or is this already in place through Celtic Sea Partnership (CSP) work? Other questions include: Could other stakeholder groups be asked for views on the direction. Were Welsh stakeholders being asked to focus on the effects, rather than a wider audience?
 - What elements of MSFD would be meaningful and useful to marine users?
- 3.19 IB asked the group what level of understanding they had of the CSP and where they are in terms of MSFD. GR explained that CSP was European wide, led by WWFUK and it covered all of the Celtic Seas. DR noted that there were still gaps in the understanding. GR confirmed that WG sit on the partnership at present. DG asked if English heritage or CADW were involved with the CSP, GR responded to say that they were on the steering group and were also an observer on the board.
- 3.20 RB suggested that Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum (PCF) and Severn Estuary Partnership (SEP) are currently updating the Coastal Directory and could include a question in the survey, subject to available space, about the level of understanding of MSFD amongst marine stakeholders.
- 3.21 PD concluded that the group agreed that was a need for a Welsh focus and a potential workshop in relation to the consultation on MSFD. PD also noted that WG should work with CSP, to ensure that factors specific to Wales were captured. It was concluded that in terms of timing this workshop should take place during the consultation period and that WMSAG had a role in promoting this.

Action 5: PCF and SEP to include question in relation to the MSFD consultation in the work they are doing on the directory.

Action 6: Workshop to be considered during the MSFD consultation period on the programme of measures, project leads to work with CSP to deliver this effectively.

4. Focus on MTP Evidence Project:

- 4.1 PC opened with Effective Evidence Base (EEB) presentation. (Slides 19 –24: WMSAG presentation meeting 2). He explained that by Identifying the value of data this will allow effective prioritisation. It was seen as very important to establish the best possible evidence base so that it could be revisited for evaluation and monitoring purposes.
- 4.2 PC stated that due to the high data collection costs, marine evidence should be shared. He explained that we were all working within high financial constraints, but we need data and balancing the two requirements was a challenge.
- 4.3 Some members of the group enquired whether incentives could be offered in exchange for data collection.
- 4.4 PC gave brief explanation of the Marine Portal.

- 4.5 PC asked group: Which stakeholders should be involved in the marine evidence pilot?
- 4.6 DR asked if anyone had been to the marine leisure sector, he noted that at this stage data was either missing or incorrect which was a risk and needed to be corrected to ensure that the balance was correctly reflected.
- 4.7 GC suggested that if the portal could identify knowledge gaps and what these were, then WMSAG may be able to identify ways to help fill these gaps. He also noted that the NRW benefits work might feed into this.
- 4.8 JW noted a specific gap in terms of the chemical status data collection, which currently went out to the 1nm, but not beyond. He asked if there was potential for users to be involved in the collection of data.
- 4.9 PD noted that this raised a good point in terms of whether collection of data should include stakeholder knowledge/local knowledge and how would this be drawn up.
- 4.10 DL asked what the position was in terms of adding to the data base and if it were possible for individuals to update the information and add GIS layers. PC responded to say that WG don't own the data all WG do is host this. So if others can provide then WG can host and populate the portal. He noted that when the evidence becomes more comprehensive WG would be in a better position, but there were a lot of gaps to fill.
- 4.11 The group concluded that gaps exist in current knowledge. Balanced data gathering must take place. The group asked whether it should be involved in the decision process when determining viable sources of data.
- 4.12 JW asked what WG definition of 'Governance' is. GR outlined definition of 'Governance' as effective control over a programme involving a single responsible officer, a programme board which directs the resource and manage the risks through a range of control measures. In the case of the Marine Governance Board this is about providing joined up policy and decision making for our seas and the group is chaired by AS, who is the Director for Agriculture, Food and Marine.
- 4.13 PC noted that the socio economic data was potentially not fully represented. He noted that the portal focussed on fisheries and doesn't look at Tourism per se; he did however note that this was covered by the Tourism policy framework, which aimed to be as broad and as flexible as possible. DR responded to say that it needed to include Marine businesses. GR reiterated that Tourism was not in his area but the two areas do link up. GR concluded that they should be better represented within the Marine Plan, with representation from Visit Wales at future WMSAG meetings.
- 4.14 PD concluded that a similar line needed to be taken with the Renewable energy sector and Crown Estates. RG commented to say that DT of Crown Estates had been due to attend but sent his apologies earlier that morning.

Action 7: GR/PD to liaise with Visit Wales to seek their input and attendance at next meetings.

5. Marine Planning Event Feedback:

- 5.1 PW introduced the item and explained that WG had taken an open approach to engagement on the development of the draft Marine Plan. PW said that she was aware from the discussion within the room today and from within the workshops and drop in session that she had held across Wales during October that there was a need to ensure that more socio economic evidence was needed and that it was important to achieve a balanced approach.

- 5.2 PW went on to describe the drop in sessions and the QA and session which taken place within the Marine Planning workshop, which had been jointly facilitated by Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum (PCF).
- 5.3 She explained that a summary of the consultation on the Vision and Objectives, the scoping exercise and the basic structure of the marine plan would be placed on the internet early in the New Year.
- 5.4 CC of the Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum (PCF) ran through the workshop delivery (WMSAG PCF Marine Planning Workshop).
- 5.5 CC evaluated the event, describing the top three priorities reached through each of the five workstations.
- 5.6 GB asked whether future events of this nature could be held outside of work hours, as it would allow maximum engagement to occur.
- 5.7 RS suggested that the WMSAG prepares for fruition of Marine Plan in March. Communications on this must begin now.
- 5.8 WG advised to 'spoon feed' information to stakeholders around the March period. This will keep engagement simple.
- 5.9 The WMSAG suggested that a separate communications group would be of benefit to stakeholders.
- 5.10 RJ suggested that a communications plan should be put in place.
- 5.11 RG explained that she had set up a Task and Finish group to look at the Marine and Fisheries web site and the work of this group was also considering the divisions Stakeholder and Communication approach. The group agreed that it would be useful for representatives from WMSAG to be involved with this T&F work and RG confirmed that she would arrange a meeting of the T&F group and invite WMSAG members to attend in the New Year.
- 5.12 PW asked the group for their views and or contacts to be sent as soon as possible, in time to influence the consultation on the draft Plan in March. PW emphasised that the advice and input of the group was sought and all input was welcome.

Action 8: RG to invite WMSAG members to the next meeting of the T&F group that are looking at the Marine and Fisheries web site and the Stakeholder engagement and communication approach.

6. Natural Resource Management, Marine Planning and the Future Generations Bill

- 6.1 AC gave a presentation on the Well-being and Future Generations Bill. (WMSAG Future Generations Bill slides)
- 6.2 GR then spoke about marine planning in the context of European, and UK legislation and how this then drilled down into Welsh Policies. GR noted the read across between a range of policies, acts and bills being delivered by WG which included the Well-being and Future Generations and the Environment Bill. (Slide 39: WMSAG presentation meeting 2)
- 6.3 RA concluded the item by introducing the Environment Bill, explaining that the aim of the bill was to provide a clear approach to sustainable management in the context of legislation which in some cases dated back to the 19th century. This was at best complex as the legislation and put in place in reaction to issues as they came up.

He went to on to explain that there was case for change and that we needed to find holistic solutions. This needed to be done by understanding key risks to our natural resources and bound by the context of our environment.

- 6.4 RA noted that the EU level frameworks work to multiple deadlines the first of which is only 5years away, with next coming up in 2030 and then 2050.
- 6.5 RA explained that the Environment Bill will put in place a frame work to illustrate the risks and opportunities and what these look like for Wales. He explained that it needed a clear evidence base that was clear and transparent to identify issues and ensure the planning happened in the right place.
- 6.6 TR noted that the language used in presentation was clear and sensible and set out the three pillars of sustainability. The group noted that this should have been featured in the MCZ consultation and the language should be used in the future consultation rounds.
- 6.7 PD noted that this agenda item had given an informative overview of each of three areas of work. He noted however that more could be done to identify the synergies between these and requested tat a narrative be provided to the group provided clarity on this for sharing with the wider stakeholder community.

7. MTP Marine Protected Areas: options paper

- 7.1 MHE gave a presentation on Marine Planning Areas (MPAs). (WMSAG MPA Management in Wales) in which she provided an overview of the spatial options for managing the MPA's. She explained that an approach needed to be developed to manage the 128 sites and the steering group would welcome input from WMSAG on the options before this went out to consultation.
- 7.2 MHE asked WMSAG to consider what other stakeholders may be interested in the management of the sites and what the best way to get feedback to the steering group would be. Finally she asked what stakeholders might need to make an informed choice.
- 7.3 The group concluded that there needed to be a balanced approach, and presumptions should be based on socio economic and environmental considerations in balance.
- 7.4 The group also noted that there was a need to set out what the problem is now and what the changes will do to make things better. They also noted there would be benefit in highlighting the pros and cons of each option.
- 7.5 RC asked about the composition of the steering group and suggested that it may be of benefit to bring a user group such as the WFA to draw on the knowledge of its members as a key consultee. GR said that if the group went with a regional approach then discussions would engage with WFA. The group noted that it appeared to be a top down approach. The group was also keen to know who was consulted in these cases. They felt that it was important to use the networks represented by WMSAG members and that any gaps in networking generally should be identified by investigation.
- 7.6 DL noted that MPA consultation sounded temporal, and the steering group should be aware not to overlap with other initiatives. Generating conflicts with what emerges from M2K review. Consistent themes must tie in with local areas. An overlap of parallel initiatives, this was seconded by ER. The group noted that they were trying to

bring the two pieces of work together through the Water Framework directive and the M2K and that these Parallel initiatives had potential to generate conflicts with what emerges from MPA review.

- 7.7 WP noted that focus on the end user should be a continuous endeavour. He noted that the PCF works well and it would be beneficial if this could be duplicated elsewhere as there was nothing in place at present but that this would obviously be subject to funding.
- 7.8 The group then discussed funding for the options and MHE said that steering group had committed to fund the approach. MHE agreed that finance must be addressed as this could impact on the area approaches considered. It may be that only one, pan-Wales area may be possible. DL noted that if it were possible to take an area based approach, lower level groups must include communities.
- 7.9 The group recommended that Shoreline Management Plans (SMPs) be linked to MPAs. RB suggested that North East Wales border management could be used as examples of current practise in terms of cross-border approach and any cross border site should look carefully at this. The group noted that Natural Resource Management and marine plans should be aligned.
- 7.10 DG recommended that CADW be involved in the MPA steering process, as historical wrecks are abundant in Welsh waters.
- 7.11 DR returned to the earlier comments about the value of an approach such as the PCF and said that beauty of a model such as this, was that where local experts know to the area, this was however needed to be affordable and in the current climate cost had to be the key driver.
- 7.12 GC asked when MHE needed responses on the option paper from WMSAG by. MHE said that they would like to consult in February if possible and asked if the group felt there would be benefit in meeting again to engage directly. GC concluded that a key role of the WMSAG group was to have some information ready in January to the steering group time to digest this. MHE committed to put something together come back to group with some dates in January,
- 7.13 The group asked if there were likely to be any new designations MHE responded to say that this strand of work was focused on management rather than new designations. She explained that the approach being taken would aim to be future proof.

Action 9: MH-E to circulate vision and objectives to WMSAG.

8. Discussion & Questions

- 8.1 PD asked if there were any other points anyone wished to discuss, the group concluded that the points made and questions posed to the group had been addressed within the wider discussion against the agenda items.

9. Any Other Business (AOB)

- 9.1 PD concluded the proceedings and thanked all for attending, he noted that he had to make a change to one of the dates for future meetings and confirmed that RG would confirm the dates of the next meeting when the minutes were issued.

Action 10: RG to arrange date of next meeting with PD.

DO NOT COPY

Number	Description	Owner	Status
WMSAG: 24/11/14 (1)	PD to chase One Voice Wales on their attendance	PD	completed
WMSAG: 24/11/14 (2):	Glossary of acronyms to be produced	RG	completed
WMSAG: 24/11/14 (3)	Amendments to terms of reference as set out in 2.10 and 2.11 of the minute of the 18 July 2014 meeting.	RG	completed
WMSAG: 24/11/14 (4)	Membership list to be placed on the internet alongside WMSAG minutes.	RG	pending
WMSAG: 24/11/14 (5)	PCF and SEP to include question in relation to the MSFD consultation in the work they are doing on the directory.	PCF & SEP	completed
WMSAG: 24/11/14 (6)	Workshop to be considered during the MSFD consultation period on the programme of measures, project leads to work with CSP to deliver this effectively.		completed
WMSAG: 24/11/14 (7)	GR/PD to liaise with Visit Wales to seek their input and attendance at next meetings.	GR/PD	completed
WMSAG: 24/11/14 (8)	RG to invite WMSAG members to the next meeting of the T&F group that are looking at the Marine and Fisheries web site and the Stakeholder engagement and communication approach.	RG	completed
WMSAG: 24/11/14 (9)	MH-E to circulate vision and objectives to WMSAG.	MHE	completed
WMSAG: 24/11/14 (10)	BG to arrange date of next meeting with PD.	RG	completed