

Marine Spatial Planning Pilot Project Management Group Meeting

**Note of Meeting held on 1st February 2005
Conference room 5 Ashdown House, Victoria, London.**

Attendees

Robert Canning	Defra/MWD (Chair)
Paul Leonard	Defra/MWD
Matt Carden	Defra/MWD
Sharon Thompson	Defra/MWD
Sonia Gharyal	Defra/MWD
Colin Morris	DfT
Brian Marker	ODPM
Richard Mellish	DTI
Leila Alkazwini	DCMS
Alayna Imlah	Scottish Executive
Tony Murray	Crown Estate
Carol O'Boyle	DOE Northern Ireland
Steve Atkins	JNCC
Ian Townend	ABPmer
Steve Hull	ABPmer
Jim Claydon	Terence O'Rourke
Stephanie Massie	Terence O'Rourke

Welcome, introduction and apologies

1. Robert Canning welcomed colleagues to the first full meeting of the project management group. Apologies were received from Anthony Hynes, Defra/Fish; Ian Barrett and Dominic Whitmee, Defra/EWD; Jill Thomas, Welsh Assembly Government; Richard Bowles and Pippa Morrison, MOD and Carolyn Heeps, Crown Estate.

Literature Review

2. Steve Hull gave a presentation on emerging conclusions from the literature review. This is attached at Annex A. It included consideration of the legal context of MSP as well as the drivers behind it and whether plans should be statutory or non statutory. This also included political constraints but some of these were not so much barriers but could create extra steps to be taken.

3. In discussing the results of the literature review to date and on possible lessons and recommendations for the pilot, it was noted that:

- It is for the Government to take decisions on political issues relating to MSP (eg whether MSP should have a statutory basis). These would be considered in a separate but related exercise. The pilot would need to consider what we hoped to achieve from a MSP and the practicality of preparing a plan.
- It was apparent that the literature review is going to throw up a lot of choices but there is no clear-cut consensus on the way forward is not likely to emerge. The contractor would need to identify the options.

- The literature review is showing that existing MSP evidence is very success biased. Although all approaches seem to have achieved successful outcomes, in practice it is too early to declare any definite success or failure.
- The purpose of the pilot is to explore some of the options and report the findings. ABPmer would require guidance from the Management group on which of these we want to test in the pilot.
- Lessons on monitoring/updating and enforcing the plan would also need to be assessed (to ensure the framework is being implemented).

4. **Action:** ABPmer to finalise the draft literature/evidence report by 11 February¹ and circulate it to stakeholders for comment. This would seek to draw out the most relevant lessons learned and options for the MSP pilot. Stakeholder responses would be incorporated by the end of March.

Engaging stakeholders in the Stakeholder Advisory Group

Lists of stakeholders to engage

5. It was noted that the concept of a project board had been superseded by a Stakeholder Advisory group. Copies of three different stakeholder lists had been circulated prior to the meeting to ensure that no stakeholders had inadvertently been omitted from any lists. The lists were (i) the Project Management Group - Government departments, relevant agencies and the devolved administrations; (ii) the Stakeholder Advisory group - those in group (i) plus industry and green NGOs whose input would be essential to the pilot's success; and (iii) a wide range of stakeholders with an interest in the project and who will be kept informed of developments.

Letter to contact stakeholders and stakeholder engagement

6. A draft letter and questionnaire had been prepared by the contractor to send to the Stakeholder Advisory Group to obtain their requirements, policies, needs and data etc for the plan. In discussion it was noted that this letter would need to make it clear exactly what was required from stakeholders and to what timescale (it was agreed that stakeholders should be given 4 to 6 weeks to submit their replies).

7. **Action:** Any comments/amendments/additions regarding the three stakeholder lists are to be sent to Defra by 11 February.

8. **Action:** Defra/MWD would contact Defra's Data Protection experts to check on any requirements covering passing on name and details of stakeholders to ABPmer. (It has been confirmed that we will need permission from the stakeholders before passing on their details to ABPmer. We will also need to include a stipulation in the contract restricting the use that the contractors can make of the data to the MSP pilot only).

9. **Action:** Defra/MWD will send out an e-mail to all stakeholders seeking agreement for their details to be passed on to ABPmer in light of above. ABPmer will

¹ At ABPmer's request this will now be finalised on 18th February.

include a sentence in their covering letter asking if the stakeholder/s agrees to be added to the circulation list.

10. ABPmer would also set up a dedicated web site at www.abpmer.co.uk/mspp to provide information on the project for stakeholders, provide information on the project and provide an interactive discussion forum.

11. On follow up meeting with key stakeholders, ABPmer have been liaising with Bob Earll regarding stakeholder events. The meeting favoured an initial workshop in mid to late April to present the outcomes of the literature review to the Stakeholder Advisory group and to answer any questions or queries stakeholders had on the letter/questionnaire request for information. Later workshops to discuss the draft plan and apply scenarios to test the plan's robustness would be held, probably within the pilot project region, in the summer.

12. **Action:** Defra/MWD will arrange the initial stakeholder workshop for mid to late April to take place in London (Room 808, Nobel House from 2 pm to 4.30 pm) and invite stakeholders.

Magnitude of the study area

13. The issue of the MSP study area was also raised. The meeting proposed that the boundaries should be increased from that proposed by ABPmer to include Northern Ireland waters in the Irish Sea and waters in the Irish Sea to the limit of UK jurisdiction towards the Republic of Ireland. Extending the area to include Northern Ireland would bring out any administration issues and therefore test administrative boundaries. DOENI also confirmed that Northern Ireland would like to be included in the pilot following on from the RMNC Irish Sea Pilot. It was also thought that extending the area would provide the best opportunity to include shipping and fishing activity in the scope of the plan.

14. **Action:** ABPmer would amend the pilot study area to the west encompassing Northern Ireland and west of Anglesey up to the western limit of UK waters in the Irish Sea.

15. It was noted that the territorial sea around the Isle of Man had been excluded from the pilot. The contactor asked whether the Isle of Man boundaries should be 12nm or whether the plan should include the territorial seas of the Isle of Man. **Action:** Defra/MWD would check with the Isle of Man to what extent the territorial waters of the Isle of Man should be included in the scope of the pilot.

16. There was some discussion over stakeholder expectations that the whole of the Irish Sea should be included in the pilot, reflecting the area that was used in the RMNC Irish Sea pilot. The meeting noted that it is not for a UK marine spatial plan to allocate sea space in the Irish half of the Irish Sea (although the Irish will participate in the Stakeholder Advisory Group as an opportunity to exchange information between Ireland and the UK on marine spatial planning). The meeting felt that the proposed study area (approximately half of the UK Irish Sea) was adequate for the purpose of a pilot.

Regional stakeholders and representatives

17. The issue was raised of whether the stakeholders to be consulted should be at regional or national level. It was commented that both groups of stakeholders have different priorities and often different viewpoints. There was a trade-off between national stakeholder groups representing the views of their regional stakeholders and engaging a manageable number of stakeholders. It was also noted that some regional stakeholders did not always appreciate (and possibly resented) being shoehorned into a national view and that regional viewpoints could end up being suppressed if they did not fit in to the national policy of the organisation. It was agreed that the views of stakeholder groups at both levels would be sought to ensure that all views would be received.

Any other business

Finalisation of the Communication Strategy

18. It was agreed that the Action Plan (the timetable to ABPmer's Communication Strategy table) would be made available to stakeholders. **Action:** ABPmer to make the Action Plan available on their website.

Feedback from presentation at Coastal Futures 2004

19. It was noted that positive feedback had been received from the presentations at Coastal Futures 2004.

Wavelength article

20. A draft article on the pilot project for Defra's *Wavelength* newsletter had been circulated in advance of the meeting. No comments were made on the draft.

Date of next meeting

22. The next Stakeholder Advisory group meeting will be held in April at 11am on the same day as the initial stakeholder meeting in London. **Action:** Defra/MWD to finalise arrangements.

**Marine and Waterways Division, Defra
7 February 2005**