



## STEERING GROUP MEETING 1 - MINUTES

**Date:** Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> June 2019 - **Location:** Cameron House, Oban - **Time:** 1400

---

### **Present:**

Adam Lewis – Northern Lighthouse Board (AL)  
Alastair McNeill – West Coast Inshore Fisheries Group (WCIFG) (AMN)  
Annabel Lawrence – Coastal Communities Network (CCN) (ALA)  
Anne Anderson – Scottish Salmon Producers Organisation (SSPO) (AA)  
David Adams-McGilp – Visit Scotland (DAM)  
Elaine Whyte – Communities Inshore Fisheries Alliance (CIFA) (EW)  
Esther Brooker – Scottish Environment LINK (EB)  
Fergus Murray – Argyll and Bute Council (FM) (by telephone)  
Harriett Rushton – Military of Defence (MOD) (HR)  
Jane Dodd – Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) (JD)  
Janet Khan – Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) (JK)  
Joanne Holbrook – Marine Scotland Compliance (JH)  
Philip Robertson – Historic Environment Scotland (HES) (PR)  
Sarah Brown – Royal Yachting Association (RYA) (SB)  
Stewart Clark – Argyll and Bute Council (SC)  
Councillor Roderick McCuish – Argyll and Bute Council (RM)

### **In Attendance**

Amie Williams – Project Officer (AW)  
Andrew Campbell – Chair (AC)

### **Apologies:**

Alan Kettle-White – Argyll District Salmon Fisheries Board (DSFB)  
Finlay Bennet – Marine Scotland Policy

---

### 1. Welcome, Introductions and Apologies

AC welcomed the steering group and apologies were given. AC then invited individuals to introduce themselves, highlighting their role.

### 2. Presentation 1 – An Introduction to MarPAMM

AW gave a presentation on the MarPAMM project emphasising the following points:

- The work packages within MarPAMM and the project partners
- The MPA Management Plans work package
- The Argyll Marine Region and the Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) within it
- What MPAs are scoped in and scoped out of the project

### 3. Questions and Answers

- EB asked if the Hope Spot in Argyll should be included in the project scope.
  - ALA gave a brief overview of what the Argyll Hope Spot is.
  - AMN highlighted that the hope spot is not designated under legislation and we had to be cautious of what should be scoped into the project.
- EB asked if AW could clarify why the otter sites were excluded.
  - AW replied that when considering the scope of the project, sites were only included if the features were exclusively marine. However, this is something that can be discussed by the Steering Group (SG), whether they should be included in the project scope or not.
  - JD highlighted that otters are a European Protected Species (EPS) and so were not included in the project scope as they are protected everywhere, not just in MPAs.
  - EB disagreed and did not think that otters being a EPS was enough to achieve the Conservation Objectives of a site in the context of the wider ecosystem but for now just wanted to clarify why they were not initially included in the project scope.
- SB asked about membership outside of this group, and if we were going to have a wider distribution of information, e.g. the discussions above about otter sites.
  - AW replied that the minutes would be posted online and that members of the SG would also disseminate information to their relevant organisation, corporate body or sector. RM noted that it is vitally important to communicate with groups that are interested and raise awareness in groups that are not.

**ACTION POINT:** ALA (with support from AW) to write a summary of the Argyll Hope Spot and justification for its inclusion in the project scope for discussion at the next SG meeting.

#### **4. Presentation 2 – Remit and Administration of Steering Group**

AW summarised each key section of the document “Remit and Administration of Steering Group” and highlighted how the steering group had changed since the origin of the document. AW then invited the SG to comment on what points had to be agreed/amended.

#### **Voting**

AC asked the group their thoughts on introducing voting onto the SG. Everyone agreed voting should not be introduced, instead we would come to a general consensus and if a disagreement occurred it would be noted.

#### **Sector Representation**

AW asked if everyone thought the SG composition adequately represented all organisations/sectors.

- RM asked if shipping would be affected by this project.
  - SC and AL both mentioned that they liaise with the other organisations (e.g. CMAL, CalMac) and therefore would be able to feed their views into the SG. AW stated that we could have a separate shipping group to discuss if necessary and invite CalMac and CMAL.
- JK asked if the Crown Estate should be included in the SG.
  - AW responded that she would discuss with SNH colleagues and get back to the SG.
- EB asked if recreational sea angling had been considered when determining the members of the SG.
  - AW replied that the project had been discussed with individuals who were recreational sea anglers and it was envisioned they would liaise with the recreation SG liaison. However, as discussed in Presentation 2 the need for topic/subgroups to be formed is anticipated, particularly for recreation as this sector covers a wide range of activities. DAM also noted that he reports on leisure, recreation and tourism and that he is happy to help users understand their responsibility within MPAs in line with the National Marine Plan.
- EW highlighted that CIFA have a number of shellfish growers and would be happy to engage with them as shellfish aquaculture is not represented on the SG.
- AW explained how the liaison for commercial inshore fishing was decided and that it had become clear that fisherman at a local level may not feel represented solely by the West Coast Inshore Fisheries Group (WCIFG) chair; this was highlighted at the MarPAMM-

Argyll community drop in events held back in May. The group agreed the addition of EW from CIFA onto the SG as a local liaison for commercial inshore fishing.

- AW highlighted that the MOD had not been included in the initial SG member list but had been invited to the meeting following discussions with the MOD. The SG agreed the addition of HR from the MOD onto the SG, taking the total membership of the group to 18.

### **Locations of Meetings**

- AC asked if everybody agreed on the location of meetings, Oban or Lochgilphead, and the group agreed it was adequate.

### **Change in Terminology**

AW highlighted at the end of Presentation 2 that the word representative may not be the appropriate term to describe the role of the SG members. AC asked the group if everyone was happy for the word “representative” to be replaced by the word “liaison” and everyone agreed.

### **Other**

- SB asked about the community events that were held. What happened, how many people attended and who attended?
  - AW gave a brief overview of each event and highlighted that one of the primary concerns at the events was commercial inshore fishing representation on the group. A full report of the community events can be found on the MarPAMM website (MarPAMM-Argyll Community Drop-in Events Report 2019)
- RM asked if there was an opportunity to hold these events again.
  - AW replied yes and that there was a concern that the project needed to engage more with the island communities such as Coll, Tiree and Islay. RM agreed and noted that he would like the islands communities to be informed prior to him visiting the islands.

**ACTION POINT:** AW to update the “Remit and Administration of Steering Group” document to reflect agreed changes.

**ACTION POINT:** AW to confirm with colleagues about the absence of the Crown Estate on the SG.

## 5. Activity 1 – Opportunities and Challenges of MPAs

SG members were asked to write their views on the opportunities and challenges of MPAs onto sticky notes and place them under the relevant flip chart heading. AW then grouped the views into common themes and highlighted the common themes under each heading (below the three most common themes for each is stated, a full list can be found in **Annex 1**):

Opportunities	Challenges
Management opportunities	Negative impacts they potentially have on industry/development
Well managed MPAs have the potential to support communities	Issues surrounding monitoring and enforcement
Awareness of Argyll and our marine environment	Knowledge gaps (as well as confusion/complexity)

## 6. Activity 2 – Places that are Important to Me

The purpose of this activity was to annotate maps to show areas that are important to each organisation, corporate body or sector and highlight where overlap or conflict occurs. However, during the activity it became clear that many organisations had this information digitally and it may be better to collate and display this information on a digital platform instead.

**ACTION POINT:** All to provide AW with digital information on where activities occur.

**ACTION POINT:** AW to collate digital information of where activities occur.

## 7. Presentation 3 – MarPAMM-Argyll Survey Results

AW gave an overview of the MarPAMM-Argyll survey results to start discussions about the tasks that could be taken forward. The take home messages of the survey was that most people agree that no MPA in the Argyll Marine Region is more important/iconic than another and that the dissemination of information needs to be improved as there is no central location for information, confusion exists about the overlap and designation type of sites and the management measures in place.

## 8. MarPAMM-Argyll Tasks

AC introduced the discussion session, asking the SG what they would like to see produced from MarPAMM-Argyll and emphasised the need for the development of clear aims and outputs for the project.

- FM highlighted that we need to know what we want to achieve and how we are going to measure what we achieve. Can we develop industries like seaweed farming and offshore renewables sustainably to benefit/profit from natural capital and keep people in Argyll/islands?
- ALA highlighted that we need to know if marine protection is effective and also emphasised the need to monitor the state and what happens in the area so we can see what the cumulative impacts are.
  - SB asked if that should be already happening under the MPA process. ALA asked if that was measurable. SB asked if the network of MPAs is cohesive. ALA took the skate MPA as an example, wanting to know if the population of skate is declining or increasing and that measuring that is difficult.
- JD said that for this first meeting we had assumed a level of knowledge and asked if the SG wanted a presentation on each of the MPAs in Argyll, including another level of information, e.g. the data that was used to designate the MPAs such as the data confidence assessment. JD also highlighted that determining the cumulative impacts was difficult and asked if it was really needed.
  - AA noted that we needed to know the baseline and that a whole range of work helps to inform gaps that need to be filled.
- PR highlighted that everyone is working in their own silos and thinking about the measures that affect them.
  - EB proposed the idea that we need a data management exercise that maps everyone's data/coverage.
  - AC suggested that we give a presentation on one MPA in Argyll, talking through the selection process and what data does exist for that site. AC said that the sites were not designated because they were declining or at risk but because they were examples of features.
  - EB disagreed and gave the common skate being a critically endangered species on the IUCN Red List as an example, highlighting that the Loch Sunart to the Sound of Jura MPA was the last stronghold for the species and that the consequences was bigger than the MPA.
  - JD highlighted that the SACs were designated to protect examples of habitats and species representative of Scotland under criteria established by the EU; however the NC MPAs were based on the presence of multiple search features. JD also highlighted that the Loch Sunart to the Sound of Jura MPA was unusual as it was proposed by a third party and only one search feature was present. However it went through the same process as the other NC MPA designations.

- JK said that the sites are already in place and we are now onto monitoring and managing but doesn't see what it is MarPAMM is trying to monitor or manage and that we need to perhaps have a coalition of all the Conservation Objectives and management goals.
  - JD stated that the monitoring side of the MarPAMM project is not for the SG to decide and that is being dealt with in other work packages, however, the SG can feed into those other work packages. JD also highlighted that today we had to decide what needed to be done after this initial meeting and that SNH had some ideas but we would like the SG to bring forward ideas that we can develop.
  - SB asked if JD could share some of the ideas SNH had discussed.
  - JD indicated that she was hesitant to do so but suggested that an interactive map of all the designated sites and features including information on where people could go to see species such as whales and dolphins as an example. JD mentioned that longevity was something that we were concerned about and how such a map would be hosted after the end of the project.
  - DAM stated that his sector would be interested in an interactive map resource and that another organisation could be found to host such a site post MarPAMM.
- SB noted that in the marine planning agenda across Scotland there is a lack of connectivity between terrestrial and marine planning and that this could be something we could start to address.
- JD said traditionally if we were doing MPA management we would write a plan for each MPA and then then work up the way to a regional strategy. However under MarPAMM we are asked to begin working regionally. One way we could do this would be by basing our management on sensitives such as a strategy for all the seabed habitats that are sensitive to seabed abrasion.
  - SB asked if we could write regional plans based on blue carbon, carbon sequestration and climate change.
- EW asked how the project links with the work Marine Scotland do with regards to evaluating MPAs. EW said she was concerned that what we produce may not be in line with Marine Scotland's findings. AMN added that he is on the committee reviewing the Marine Scotland Science [Scottish Marine Protected Areas Socio-economic Monitoring 2016 Report](#) and some sites are included in the MarPAMM project and stated that we should reflect on their findings.
  - JD and AW highlighted that this project was totally separate however Marine Scotland were a partner on the project and so no confusion should occur.

- JK suggested using the 17 UN Sustainable Development Goals as a frame for delivering what we want to achieve. AC suggested that JK communicate to AW in writing how that might work.
- AA highlighted that we needed to draw the line at what was realistic.

**ACTION POINT:** JD to develop an example of the MPA process using an existing MPA, showing the data that exists for the site and any monitoring that has been/is in place.

**ACTION POINT:** JK to write an explanation of how the 17 UN Sustainability Development Goals would fit into the context of MarPAMM-Argyll.

### 9. Next Steps

- AC drew the discussions to a close and stated that we were heading in the right direction and summarised some of the action points to be undertaken.
- Everyone agreed that a doodle poll would be the best way to determine the dates of the next three meetings. PR indicated meetings on a Monday or Friday maybe a good idea so members could make the most of Argyll as many travelled a fair distance.
- Everyone agreed AC as the chair.
- JH asked if the presentations would be available.
- AA asked that the contact details of the SG members be shared so that discussions could take place between members.

**ACTION POINT:** AW to see if the presentations can be shared to the website.

**ACTION POINT:** AW to share contact details of the SG members to one another.

**ACTION POINT:** AW to distribute a doodle poll to scope possible dates for the next three SG meetings.

**ACTION POINT:** AW to confirm of the date, time and location for next three SG meetings.

**10. Summary of Action Points**

<b>Action Points</b>	<b>Person</b>
Write a summary of the Argyll Hope Spot and justification for its inclusion in the project scope	ALA
Update the "Remit and Administration of Steering Group" document to reflect agreed changes	AW
Confirm with SNH colleagues about the absence of the Crown Estate on the SG	AW
All to provide AW with digital information on where activities occur	ALL
Collate digital information of where activities occur	AW
Develop an example of the MPA process using an existing MPA, showing the data that exists for the site and any monitoring that has been/is in place	JD
Write an explanation of how the 17 UN Sustainability Development Goals would fit into the context of MarPAMM-Argyll	JK
Think about projects that could be developed as a result of MarPAMM-Argyll and work with AW to develop the project ideas in written format	ALL
Enquire if the presentations can be shared to the website	AW
Share contact details of the SG members so that discussion can take place between members	AW
Distribution of doddle poll to scope possible dates for the next three SG meetings	AW
Confirmation of the date, time and location for next three SG meetings	AW

**Annex 1 – Results from Activity 1 – Opportunities and Challenges of MPAs**

<b>Opportunities of MPAs</b>
<b>Management</b>
Opportunities to introduce sustainable management measures (e.g. scallops by increasing minimum landing size of hand caught animals e.g. diving)
Integrating management of cultural and natural heritage
May help create protection
Delivering practical management which delivers biodiversity improvements
Opportunities to manage access to sensitive sites/sites under pressure
Features x no of MPAs managed in more co-ordinated
Creation of development guidelines in accordance with marine plan
Other plans and projects (shared goals: community goals, national objectives)
Connecting marine protection across species ranges: connectivity
Better integration of terrestrial and marine planning policy and procedure
Key guidance and clarity
Guidance on assessing the cumulative effects
<b>Support local communities</b>
Healthy ecosystem supports local communities
Possible positive impacts to tourism should be monitored
Good for tourism
Promoting sustainable tourism
Boost to local economy (with increase ESBs)
Effective MPA management will result in sustainable marine environment which will be able to support communities
Effective MPA management can support diverse sectors. Tourism -> aquaculture
Safeguarding/improve ecosystem service benefits (e.g. recovery of fish stocks)
Enhancement of our seas which ensures the ecosystem services function well
Advantageous to some fishing seasons (e.g. commercial diving who can access MPAs etc.)
May change fishery positively but only if well managed
<b>Awareness</b>
Recognition, raising awareness, raising appreciation of the marine environment
Promotion of local area
Public awareness of marine conservation
A brilliant way to promote our marine environment
Helps people understand why Argyll is so special
Increase local guardianship of MPA area
<b>Monitoring</b>
Monitored MPAs potentially benefit to stocks/protected features
Monitoring (what, why, how, cost) (shared resources)
Opportunities for increase in science and monitoring
<b>Knowledge</b>

Research work and increase knowledge of MPA features
Single location for info on MPA
Better understanding of eco-systems
<b>Other</b>
Enhance marine environment
Ecosystem recovery
Embed conservation messages in regional marketing
Opportunity to improve stakeholder relations/collaboration
Increase regulation
Utilise existing NLB sites
Addressing the challenges
<b>Challenges of MPAs</b>
<b>Industry</b>
Risk of associating the MPA(s) with things you can't do, rather than the things you can
Loss of safe fishing ground
Possible negative impacts to local socio-economics of fishing industry
Non monitored MPAs potentially having negative impact on stocks/feature
Local impacts of management (on sectors/users/environment)
Potential to stifle development based on misinterpretation of designations
Are they too restrictive i.e. stopping sustainable development
Unintended negative impacts for various sectors e.g. removal of access etc.
Displacement of fisherman from historic ground, i.e. loss of fishing areas impacts communities
May change fishing negatively to stocks
Designations can appear (and can be) restrictive
Access to sites
Cost and uncertainty in develop.
Increase exclusion from MPA areas
Perception vs. reality of what an MPA does re develop
Increased regulation
<b>Monitoring &amp; Enforcement</b>
Very little effective monitoring or enforcement
Monitoring (what, why how, cost?)
Resourcing monitoring and compliance enforcement (including education)
Monitoring and enforcement – limited evidence
Compliance to management measures and enforcement capability
Enforcement/compliance
Enforcement of clear set objectives and subsequent assessment to determine effectiveness
Expectation management
<b>Knowledge</b>
Any decision must be based on evidence. Where are the knowledge gaps?
Is data correct?
Lack of data or research re distribution and sensitivity of designated features
How do we know how effective MPAs are without baseline data and monitoring

Does MPA designation based on single species provide appropriate protection for the wider habitat
What is the cumulative impacts of all the sectors activity on the MPA
May weight research focus in more narrow area
<b>Complexity and confusion</b>
Lots of different designations – complexity and confusing
The complexity of the overlapping designations – do ordinary residents understand them
Difficulty understanding designations and legislation
Spatial extent is extensive in Argyll – clarity on type
<b>Management</b>
Stakeholder agreement on management
Carrying out works- revenue/capital - clear guidance – what is expected
Join up/integration of management
Other methods (Ray Holburn) such as rotational management may be more effective
<b>Other</b>
Changing environmental goal posts (e.g. climate change impacts)
'Buy in' of marine users
Beyond three years – sustainable?
Political will (in challenging climate change)
Refurb project (NLB)
Suitable area defined
Conservation or restoration? What should we aim for?