

Stakeholder Reference Group Meeting 03 April 2018 Notes and Actions

Attendees:

Rachel McCall (RM) SUDG, Mark Russell (MR) BMAPA, Lisa Philips (LP) NRW, Emma Barton (EB) RYA, Rosie Kelly (RK) Crown Estate, Robert Carington (RC) UK CoS, Neville Rookes (NR) WLGA, Wendy Dodd (WD) Tidal Lagoon Power, Clare Reed (CR) MCS UK, Stephen Jay (SJ) Liverpool UNI, Lucy Taylor (LT) SEP, David Jones (DJ) PCF, John Hamer (JPH) WG (Chair), Sarah Bound (SB) WG, Phil Coates (PJC) WG, Lee Murray (LM) NRW, Adrian Judd (AJ) CEFAS

Welcome and introductions

Sarah Bound introduced as project manager.

Item 2 Notes and actions from last meeting Paper 7

Action 1 - **JPH** to chase Julia Hunt in respect of Actions from last meeting (**AD** to circulate ICZM mtg feedback when finalised.)

Action 2 – Completed. AJ did not receive any comments on his Evidence paper

Item 3 – Progress update Paper 2

An update was provided on the local engagement events and national conference.

DJ – Very pleased with turnout.

JPH – Impressed with Slido, very useful sessions, WG to respond to questions raised.

CR - Workshops were very good, well facilitated. Suggested that we could have condensed the introduction to allow longer panel discussions as the group were well informed. Acoustics were not good during workshop sessions.

NR – The Implementation T&F Group, Conference and Senedd debate highlighted several issues which the planning team may need to respond to and make their responses available.

DJ - PCF have submitted report to WG including feedback from conference.

Action 3 – **SB** to ensure T&F group report and WG response are available on webpage.

Conference slido questions and WG responses (as update) to be added in due course.

Action 4 – Patrick Cowdy (**PC**) WG to circulate PCF report to SRG.

AJ – Reassured everyone that the questions asked at the workshops would be taken forward and actioned.

JPH – Senedd debate on the 9 Jan was a useful discussion, all encouraged to read the record.

WD – CCERA Committee held a closed session where they invited experts to brief them on Marine Planning. Committee then held a workshop for stakeholders in order to gather specific feedback on the WNMP draft to report back to Cabinet Secretary.

MR – Found the committee workshop very useful and was encouraged as to how much knowledge the committee had on the subject. **MR** has forwarded the Implementation T&F document onto the clerk of the committee to make them aware of work going on in the background.

CR – The discussion in the group **CR** was involved in could have been more structured.

SJ – Commented that the MMO run a number of Public events and asked have we contacted them for lessons learnt.

AJ – Confirmed WG having regular catch ups with MMO.

DJ – We should extend this to catch ups with Scotland.

Action 5 – WG to ensure learning shared with MMO on effectiveness of engagement events. Ongoing.

Item 4 Consultation responses

SB - Confirmed in the region of 100 responses received, many of which were substantive.

NR – The plan sets out its intentions for guiding activity for different user groups (eg developers / decision makers). Suggest to run targeted sessions focused on particular needs to help make the plan real.

CR – Response form was hard to use.

JPH – The draft response form was circulated for comment. It was agreed that it will be important to capture subtleties when considering consultation responses rather than simple statistics of ‘agree’ / ‘disagree’.

Action 6 - EB – to send through specific editorial comments on the draft plan to supplement general response.

Item 5 Working with Strategic Resource Areas Paper 1

JPH – Introduced paper and suggested it is used as consultation responses are considered and taken forward in plan development.

CR – **PC** presented SRA subject very well at the Conference. Would welcome inclusion of key messaging in SRA papers.

WD – Agreed, there is value in returning to SRA papers in light of consultation responses.

LP – We need to think about roles and responsibilities, who needs to run through the process, the process needs to be concise and clear.

Action 7 JPH/LS – Bring 2 SRA papers (Key messaging “what are SRAs” and working guidance on SRAs) to future discussions.

Item 6 Valuing Wales’ marine area - Blue growth & Understanding wellbeing

AJ – Highlighted the need to use and follow legislation set out in the WFG Act and Env Act. Proposed group discussion on applying wellbeing goals and SMNR.

All – In agreement.

NR – There is merit in using the 5 ways of working under the WFG Act to shape the approach instead of being referred to as a tick box exercise based on the goals. These 5 ways of working will help to deliver the goals.

CR – Future Generation commissioner recently stressed the need to meet the 7 wellbeing goals equally.

WD - Good overlap with 8 ICZM Principles.

Action 8 AJ to refine the scope of the paper and circulate to; **CR, WD** and **NR** to consider the paper on incorporating Blue growth and wellbeing values by 2nd week of June.

Item 7 Next steps - towards plan adoption Paper 3

JPH – Highlighted the high level of engagement and interaction we have been doing and will proceed to do. Is the group happy to pick out “key issues” as further topic groups for further discussion by the SRG?

WD – Yes although everyone on the SRG needs to be generally made aware of what is being discussed at group level even if they are not on that group.

LP – Yes, pull out key topics/themes from the consultation responses and then report back to SRG.

MR – Pointed out that this will be challenging as it is even challenging with small groups. Group members suggested holding sessions back to back on the same day to make the most of time; also to consider telephone conferencing as an alternative to meetings for small groups.

RM – Hold 1 to 1 discussions directly with policy leads before setting up any sort of group so that issues are ironed out first.

NR – Is there a way of getting more involved in other groups – WMAAG / WMFAG / Marine Litter / Coasts and Seas etc? Can you get a brief out before the meeting to engage members in order to be able to have a discussion at the meeting rather than an update?

PJC - Reports to these groups of necessity had to be general in nature, though they can join the WNMP SRG if they wished to contribute to detailed discussions.

CR – Stakeholders will be more interested in attending a specific workshop for a specific area of the WNMP.

JPH – The team does engage in wider and related meetings.

Action 9 JPH & SB – To consider the main themes that come out of the consultation and put paper together setting out proposals for workshops, T&F groups, engagement etc.

Deadline 25/04/2018

Action 10 SB – to identify the topics/themes. **Deadline 25/04/2018**

Item 8 Monitoring and evaluation Paper 4

JPH – Apologised that we were unable to share this at consultation stage. Julia Hunt and others had been considering options including reviewing what MMO and others have done.

NR – We need to monitor and evaluate exactly what needs to be monitored and evaluated, not just what we are able to monitor and evaluate.

Action 11 JPH – to add as a new principle to the paper.

NR – If we are currently gathering data which we don't need for the plan then do we need to carry on?

JPH - Yes as it may be needed under other legislation / policy drivers or in line with longer term aspirations.

CR – Can we set out long term aspirations in the paper which we know are not achievable short term? Keen to follow up with further comments on paper after the meeting.

Action 12 LS set out long term aspirations in paper.

EB – Need to clarify what you mean by licenced activities – All consenting activities or just marine licensed activities? We need to amend point d) in the paper by providing more focus on other consenting authorities, with more upfront on Planning. Swansea Lagoon is a good example.

WD – Would encourage consideration of wider consenting eg. under DCO and NSIP. Re Annex, comfortable with qualitative assessments of “softer indicators” as well as quantitative ones.

Action 13 LS – to action comments under Item 8, reflect on non marine licences and other consenting bodies. Contact **EB, WD, NR ports authority and other non marine licensing consenting**. No deadline as such but needs to be done in order that we can consult with SRG then publish the paper.

Item 9 Plan Implementation Paper 5

PJC - Introduced the item and talked the group through the areas of work necessary to support delivery.

JPH – Public Authority Group to be set up soon. Evidence work underway.

CR – Would like to feedback on paper as not had time to consider fully in advance of the meeting.

WD – Implementation Guidance – Post plan adoption – Is the intention not to draft guidance before adoption?

JPH – We anticipate that implementation guidance will be an emergent theme from the consultation eg possible need to consider in more detail what goes into the plan itself, what sits alongside it and the timing of production.

Action 14 All to Feedback on Plan Implementation Paper – **Deadline 25/04/2018**

Item 10 Sub-national planning update

JPH – Question in consultation regarding merit in sub national planning. A piece of work was contracted out to Iwan Ball (**IB**) to review best practice and make recommendations. Overall message from consultation was to see how the WNMP develops. WG minded to do so, however, if legislative opportunity arises CSEpra may take the opportunity to ensure the powers are appropriate.

Action 15 JPH - Circulate **IB** report to the group. Add the report to the next SRG Meeting Agenda **Deadline 25/04/2018**

Item 11 EMFF IMP project update

LM updated the group on the EMFF project progress as set out in paper 6. No comments.

Item 12 Future meetings and focus of group

Action 16 All To propose agenda items and consider how to make the most of meetings, including inviting representatives from other groups / organisations to present and also invite colleagues to speak and present at upcoming meetings.

AOB

EB – Will be leaving RYA mid June to take up a new role in DEFRA. **JPH** wished well on behalf of group.

CR – RSPB CYMRU have expressed an interest in sitting on the SRG.

MR – Noted that this meeting has highlighted just how much is going on and asked do we have enough capacity to deliver? We will need to work on a priority basis. Agreed.

Action 16 No objection from the group to adding RSPB CYMRU - **JPH** to send invite.