



STEERING GROUP MEETING 4 (VC) - MINUTES

Date: Thursday 19th March 2020 - **Location:** Video Conference (VC) - **Time:** 1200

This meeting took place by Video Conference (VC).

Present in Oban:

Amie Williams – Project Officer (AW)

Present through external video link:

Claire McSorley – MarPAMM MPA Data Management and Mapping Advisor (CMS)

Esther Brooker – Environment LINK (EB)

Finlay Bennet – Marine Scotland Policy (FB)

Graham Russell – Royal Yachting Association (RYA) Scotland (GR)

Harriett Rushton – Ministry of Defence (MOD) (HR)

Janet Khan – Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) (JK)

Joanne Holbrook – Marine Scotland Compliance (JH)

Nicole Anderson – Community Inshore Fisheries Alliance (CIFA) (NA)

Philip Price – Coastal Communities Network (CCN) (PP)

Sarah Cunningham – Chair (SC)

Simon Macdonald – West Coast Inshore Fisheries Group (WCIFG) (SMD)

Apologies:

Adam Lewis – Northern Lighthouse Board (AL)

Alan Kettle-White – Argyll District Salmon Fisheries Board (DSFB) (AKW)

Andrew Campbell – Chair (AC)

Anne Anderson – Scottish Salmon Producers Organisation (SSPO) (AA)

David Adams-McGill – Visit Scotland (DAM)

Fergus Murray – Argyll and Bute Council (FM)

Jane Dodd – Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) (JD)

Philip Robertson – Historic Environment Scotland (HES) (PR)

Councillor Roddy McCuish – Argyll and Bute Council (RM)

1. Welcome and apologies

SC welcomed the Steering Group (SG) and apologies were given. SC then invited individuals to introduce themselves, highlighting their role. The following attended in place of the lead liaison for their respective organisation, corporate body or sector:

- Graham Russell in the absence of Sarah Brown (SB) from RYA Scotland
- Nicole Anderson in the absence of Elaine Whyte (EW) from CIFA
- Philip Price in absence of Annabel Lawrence (ALA) from CCN

2. Confirmation of minutes from meeting 3

SC asked the SG if anyone had any comments about the draft minutes from meeting 3. The minutes were approved and will now be posted on the MarPAMM website as the final version rather than draft.

ACTION POINT: AW to request that SAMS publish the confirmed minutes from meeting 3 and the draft minutes from meeting 4 onto the MarPAMM website.

3. Updates from previous meeting (including action points (AP))

- An update was given on the progress of the APs from the previous meeting (see **Appendix 1**).
- AW said that the timeline for the distribution for the minutes was working well and thanked the SG for their cooperation with this.

4. Presentation 1: Conservation and Management Advice Documents

SC gave a presentation on the Conservation and Management Advice (CMA) documents that are being developed by SNH. During the presentation SC discussed: the background of the documents and the statutory responsibility SNH have for producing these, what they will be replacing (Conservation Objectives and Regulation 33 packages for SACs and management options papers for Nature Conservation MPAs), the template the documents will follow, where the documents will be available, the timescales for rolling out the documents and their possible uses (e.g. to understand how activities affect sites, for Habitats Regulations Assessments (SACs) and assessments under Section 82 and 83 of the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010, or for research).

There was some discussion on how frequently the documents will be revised and how species that are data deficient will be dealt with. SC told the SG the CMA documents will be revised as and when needed and the condition of the feature will be determined by the evidence

available. The conservation objectives and feature condition will also be considered as part of the 6 yearly review of the MPA network as part of the report to Parliament.

Q: SMD said there was growing concern over the presence of the carpet sea squirt in Loch Creran and asked why there had been no mention on how to mitigate the spread of this with respect to mobile and static gear.

A: SC said that Marine Scotland are the lead organisation on this and they are monitoring the distribution of the carpet sea squirt within Loch Creran. SC and JK also highlighted that there are biosecurity measures in place for the oyster farms on the loch. JK was concerned that people may not be aware of the community biosecurity plan in place and will feedback to the Marine Invasive Non-Native Species Scotland group. JH said that Marine Scotland Compliance are aware of the biosecurity issues and that there is ongoing work. GR noted that invasive non-native species on any site should be included in the CMA documents.

Q: SMD asked why in the summary of the management options, the fishing industry was the only industry being suggested for restriction.

A: SC said all activities that have the potential to impact features are considered. However the management advice will vary depending on the feature and its sensitivity. The documents have been developed to be more public facing with all the information in one place for each site.

Q: PP asked why the objective would be to maintain a feature if it was in less favourable condition and that as a community group they would be aiming restore.

A: SC highlighted that when setting maintain or restore objectives the best possible evidence is used for the feature in the site. Information on the wider status is included in the document. The wider status of the feature and the site specific status of the feature may not be the same. EB added that Scottish Environment LINK would like to see the advice and SNH should consider the wider status of the feature.

ACTION POINT: SC to feedback comments on the CMA documents from the SG to colleagues at SNH.

5. Presentation 2: Update on the PMF review

SC gave an overview of the fisheries management measures for mobile demersal fishing gear that are currently being proposed for the Phase 2 MPA sites and for 11 PMFs outside the MPA network. During the presentation SC discussed: the MPA and PMF management process, the 11 PMFs included in the scope, the management options for both MPAs and PMFs, the criteria for defining the PMF management areas and how industry and stakeholders have been

engaged throughout the process (i.e. pre consultation events, workshops and RIFG meetings).

Q: SMD said there has been discussions over the boundaries of the MPA and PMF areas and that fishery skippers don't tend to work from line of sight but by depth and that buffers needed to be incorporated for boats to turn.

A: SC said that Marine Scotland are running the events and asking for plotter data to see where there can be a compromise.

Q: SMD raised a concern that wintering fishing grounds were being taken away from the industry and as a result boats are going into waters that they are not designed for. SMD said that in the Loch Sunart to the Sound of Jura MPA, the skate tend to use deeper waters where scallops aren't found and so fishers want to know why they can't fish in the shallower waters. There are also concerns that fisheries that are about to open will remain closed due to Covid-19.

A: EB highlighted that the latest studies ([Neat et al, 2014](#) and [Thorburn et al, 2018](#)) show that skate do in fact use all depths for different purposes including feeding, breeding and nursery areas.

Q: PP said that their community are struggling to see why only part of an ecosystem is protected and that not enough is known about the distribution of PMFs or how they interconnect. PP asked if any socio-economic assessments had been done to assess the potential economic benefits of tourism, as although jobs may be lost due to fishing industry closures there could be potential gain with appropriate protection. PP also asked if assessments considered historical information.

A: FB said that broadly socio-economic assessments do look at positive and negative impacts but look at the current understanding of current impacts and there are many different factors that may or may not be covered by the assessment. SC said that what was being suggested by PP was some wider research in this area which would be helpful.

Q: EB said that during the workshop back in October, there was discussions to look at another option that fitted between options one and two (a more spatial approach). EB said that while they are sympathetic with the fishing industry with the current situation and it is positive that data are being supplied, there is concern that options are being drawn from current fishing patterns and that these may not be appropriate for all features.

A: FB said a lot of data has been provided to Marine Scotland for them to go through and there is still information coming in. Unfortunately the meetings were not completed so there is still more work to do in due course. FB said he is confident in saying the options are going to change considerably and that there are a number of different options being considered. Those

options are going to be better informed by the evidence provided. However, Marine Scotland don't know how the options are going to change yet.

6. Feedback session 1: MarPAMM-Argyll MPA leaflet

AW told the group that the designer had completed the first draft of the MPA information leaflet and gave the SG a brief look and shared some initial thoughts. AW will provide the designer with some feedback and distribute a draft of the leaflet to the SG for comment once the design has been developed further.

ACTION POINT: AW to provide the designer with feedback on the MPA information leaflet.

ACTION POINT: AW to distribute the draft MPA information leaflet to the SG for comment once the design has been developed further.

7. Update on other project proposals

- **MPA information package.** AW said that most of the progress made towards the MPA information package has been for the MPA information leaflet (see **Section 6**). AW will begin planning the other components of the package in April.
- **Familiarisation Day.** Unfortunately the familiarisation day that was due to take place in Oban on 30th March 2020 has been cancelled due to Covid-19. We hope this can be rescheduled for later on in the year.
- **Argyll and Bute Council Guidance.** No progress has been made towards this since the last meeting. AW will follow up with MCC about providing a briefing for the SG.
- **NLB infrastructure.** AL has now provided AW with a statement that describes what existing NLB infrastructure can be used for. AW will distribute the brief to the SG and provide AL with feedback.
- **Management measures workshop.** This project is still in the discussion stages, more information on this will be given when the project develops further.
- **Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).** AW explained that she had been in discussions with JK and EB on how to incorporate the SDGs into MarPAMM-Argyll. It has been suggested that the targets of the SDGs could be used to guide the development of each of the projects. This will initially be trialled for the MPA information package project to see if it is applicable. JK gave a short presentation to the group on the SDGs and directed the group to One Stone Resources for examples on how they can be applied.

ACTION POINT: MCC to write a brief about the framework Argyll and Bute Council is interested in developing and, along with AW and SC, arrange a follow up meeting to discuss the project further.

ACTION POINT: AW will distribute the NLB infrastructure statement to the SG and provide AL with feedback.

ACTION POINT: AW, JK and EB to look at how the SDGs can guide the development of the MPA information package project.

8. AOB

- AW proposed that every other SG meeting could be hosted by VC, as availability tends to be reduced during summer and winter months. However, due to COVID-19, SG meetings will be held by VC for the foreseeable future.

ACTION POINT: AW to redistribute Doodle Poll to scope possible dates for SG meeting 5.

9. Summary of Action Points

| Action Points | Person |
|--|--------------------|
| Request that SAMS publish the confirmed minutes from meeting 3 and the draft minutes from meeting 4 onto the MarPAMM website. | AW |
| Feedback comments on the CMA documents from the SG to colleagues at SNH. | SC |
| Provide the designer with feedback on the MPA information leaflet. | AW |
| Distribute the draft MPA information leaflet to the SG for comment once the design has been developed further. | AW |
| Write a brief about the framework Argyll and Bute Council is interested in developing and, along with AW and SC, arrange a follow up meeting to discuss the project further. | MCC, AW & SC |
| Distribute the NLB infrastructure statement to the SG and provide AL with feedback. | AW |
| Look at how the SDGs can guide the development of the MPA information package. | AW, JK & EB |
| Redistribute Doodle Poll to scope possible dates for SG meeting 5. | AW |

Appendix 1 – Summary of action points from meeting 3

| Action Points | Person | Update |
|---|--------------------|--|
| Revise the minute from meeting 2 and add an action point to follow up with the SG member that raised the concern of creel entanglement. | AW | Completed This was completed on 31 st January 2020. |
| Request that SAMS publish the confirmed minute from meeting 2 and the draft minute from meeting 3 (VC) onto the MarPAMM website. | AW | Completed This was uploaded to the website on 28 th February 2020. |
| Speak to SAMS about having a banner placed on the MarPAMM website's homepage so stakeholders can navigate to the Argyll page more easily. | AW | Completed This was added to the website on in February 2020. There is also a new tab "MPA plans". |
| Look at other engagement opportunities | AW | Completed Given the current situation with Covid-19 face-face engagement cannot be undertaken at this time. |
| Communicate feedback from the SG on the familiarisation day to SNH Tourism Officer, Theresa Kewell, who is helping to coordinate the day. | AW | Postponed Given the current situation with Covid-19, this event will hopefully be rescheduled when Covid-19 restrictions are lifted. |
| Talk to MarPAMM comms team SAMS about the development of content for the launch of the leaflet that would encourage engagement. | AW | Completed AW will progress this with the SAMS comms team. |
| Write a brief about the framework Argyll and Bute Council is interested in developing and arrange a follow up meeting to discuss the project further. | MCC, AW & SC | On going |
| AL to draft a statement that raises the awareness of existing NLB infrastructure and the possible uses. | AL | Completed AW will distribute this to the SG along with the draft minutes for meeting 4. |
| Distribution of a Doodle Poll to scope possible dates for SG meeting 5 | AW | Completed This was distributed to the group on 14 th February 2020. |