

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

Marine Conservation Zones: Consultation on proposals for designation in 2013

Annex B – F

Annex B – Consultation site summary explanatory note

Consultation Site Summary: *Name of site is found here*

Additional Information for this site can be found in the SNCB Advice and Impact Assessment.

Table 1 - General Information on site and all features recommended by Regional Projects

In the table below, all the basic information about the recommended site and features is included.

Regional Project: <i>Either Finding Sanctuary, Net Gain, Balanced Seas or Irish Seas Conservation Zones</i>	Site surface area: <i>Total surface area of the site in km²</i>	Biogeographic Region: <i>JNCC: OSPAR Region: The Biogeographic Region within which this site sits is listed here.</i>	
Site Location: <i>Coordinates for the centre of the site</i>			
Inshore/Offshore: <i>Whether the site is located inshore (0-12nm), or Offshore (12- 200nm)</i>			
Feature type	Feature name	Area/no. of	Conservation Objective –

		records	
<p><i>These are all the features that have been recommended by the Regional Project, and not a list of all features being proposed for designation within this site.</i></p> <p><i>Either Broad Scale, Habitat Feature of Conservation Interest (FOCI) or Species Feature of Conservation Interest (FOCI)</i></p>	<p><i>The name of the feature located within this site and recommended by the Regional Project.</i></p> <p><i>For the Sea Snail (<i>Paludinella littorina</i>) a foot note is shown at the bottom of the page explaining its removal as a feature for designation.¹</i></p> <p><i>For Balanced Seas where Non-Eng features have been derived from the REC habitat classification and recommended by the regional project this is shown in a footnote at the bottom of the page.²</i></p> <p><i>For features that the SNCBs have recommended a feature is removed a footnote is shown at the bottom of the page explaining its removal.³</i></p>	<p><i>For habitats the total area of the feature is provided in km². For Species the total number of records of that specie within the site.</i></p>	<p><i>The conservation objective recommended for this feature by the Regional Projects is listed here.</i></p> <p><i>Where the conservation objective for this feature has changed following advice from the SNCBs this is shown in a footnote at the bottom of the page.⁴</i></p>

¹ The sea snail (*Paludinella littorina*) has been removed from Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act. This means that it is no longer a Feature of Conservation Importance (FOCI) so has been removed as a feature for designation.

² This is a non ENG feature derived from REC habitat classification put forward by the Regional Project. For the purpose of assessing the site's ecological contribution against the ENG this feature will be back-translated to Subtidal mixed sediments.

³ Following advice from the SNCBs the following feature has been removed due to

⁴ Following advice from SNCBs, the Conservation Objective for this feature has changed from the original Regional Project recommendation.

Table 2 - Sector Impacts and Associated Best Estimate Costs

In the table below, the sectors impacted and the best estimate costs for these sectors and total cost for the site are set out

Sectors Impacted	Best Estimate Costs (£ per year)
<i>The sector impacted will be set out here</i>	<i>The best estimate will be set out here. This cost is the best estimate of the likely impacts to that sector per annum. If the cost is quantified then the best estimate cost will be expressed as a number. If the cost is not site specific then it is not possible to express this in numerical terms and will be flagged up as a non-site specific cost. If there is no quantified cost for the sector, then this will be flagged up as unquantified,</i>
	Best Estimate Total Cost = <i>The Best estimate cost for all sectors collectively per annum is shown here.</i>

Table 3 - Designation Status of Site and Rationale

Decision	<i>How the minister is minded to treat the site is set out here. This will be expressed as either designation in 2013 tranche (2013 tranche sites are being proposed for designation in 2013), requires further consideration (requires further consideration sites will require further work prior to the site potentially being designated in a future tranche) or not suitable for designation (sites that are not suitable for designation will be removed from the process and will not feature in any potential future tranches).</i>
Rationale for Decision:	

Site Advantages

In this section the ecological advantages for this site will be explained with the ecological importance of the site for the wider network highlighted. Further information on the ecological advantages of all the sites can be found in the SNCB advice.

Socio-Economics

In this section the socio-economic costs and benefits are explained with stakeholder support and concerns, main sectors impacted, and economic benefits highlighted. Further information on the socio-economic costs and benefits can be found in the Consultation Impact Assessment.

Data Certainty

In this section the data certainty levels for this site are explained. The total numbers of sites with acceptable data certainty are listed, and high risk features with acceptable data certainty will also be named. The total number of features with unacceptable data certainty are listed and named, and these features will require additional work prior to future designation. A feature is deemed to have unacceptable data certainty if it fails to meet the minimum data certainty level for presence, extent or conservation objective confidence.

Conclusion

In this section the reason for the decision is stated. If Non-ENG features have been recommended by the regional project then these will be stated here as well.

Table 4 - Features Proposed for Designation in 2013

The table below is only for sites proposed for designation in 2013. This table will set out those features that are being proposed for designation in 2013 and those features that require further improvement in data certainty prior to designation.

Features for designation in 2013	Features requiring improvement in data certainty prior to designation
<i>Features for designation in 2013 will be stated here</i>	<i>Features requiring further improvement in data certainty prior to designation will be stated here</i>

Maps

Boundary maps are provided for all sites, including boundary co-ordinates. The site boundaries are as recommended by the Regional Projects.

For sites proposed for designation in 2013, feature maps are provided. Note that the feature maps only include the features proposed for first designation in 2013, using data available to Natural England and JNCC during the MCZ advice process.

Annex C – Cost quartile distribution of sites

Below the cost distribution for 107 MCZs(the information for Markham’s Triangle has been removed as the costs are commercially sensitive and provided in confidence) recommended by the Regional MCZ Projects are expressed in four quartiles. The costs were calculated by summing up the best estimate costs over a 20 year period (sourced from the consultation Impact Assessment) for each recommended MCZ and then discounted to give the present value for each site.

Lower Quartile Sites - £0 – 9,000 over 20 years

Regional Project	Site Name
Balanced Seas	Pagham Harbour
Finding Sanctuary	Broad Bench to Kimmeridge
Finding Sanctuary	Erme Estuary
Finding Sanctuary	Otter Estuary
Finding Sanctuary	South of Portland
Net Gain	Rock Unique
Net Gain	Swallow Sand
Net Gain	Fulmar
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	Mid St. George’s Channel
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	North of Celtic Deep
Finding Sanctuary	North-West of Jones Bank
Finding Sanctuary	East of Celtic Deep
Finding Sanctuary	Camel Estuary
Finding Sanctuary	Devon Avon
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	Solway Estuary
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	Ribble Estuary
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	Fylde Offshore
Finding Sanctuary	Dart Estuary
Finding Sanctuary	The Manacles
Net Gain	Aln Estuary
Finding Sanctuary	Mounts Bay
Finding Sanctuary	Taw Torridge Estuary
Finding Sanctuary	Morte Platform
Finding Sanctuary	Skerries Bank and Surrounds
Finding Sanctuary	East of Jones Bank
Balanced Seas	Offshore Foreland
Balanced Seas	Selsey Bill and the Hounds

Lower Middle Quartile Sites - £9,000 – 62,000 over 20 years

Regional Project	Site Name
------------------	-----------

Finding Sanctuary	Tamar Estuary Sites
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	Allonby Bay
Balanced Seas	Wight-Barfleur Extension
Finding Sanctuary	South of Falmouth
Finding Sanctuary	Lands End
Finding Sanctuary	Newquay and the Gannel
Finding Sanctuary	The Canyons
Finding Sanctuary	South-East of Falmouth
Finding Sanctuary	South of Celtic Deep
Finding Sanctuary	Celtic Deep
Finding Sanctuary	Axe Estuary
Finding Sanctuary	Isles of Scilly
Finding Sanctuary	North-East of Haig Fras
Finding Sanctuary	Torbay
Balanced Seas	Kentish Knock East
Finding Sanctuary	Hartland Point to Tintagel
Finding Sanctuary	South Dorset
Finding Sanctuary	East of Haig Fras
Net Gain	Compass Rose
Balanced Seas	Fareham Creek
Balanced Seas	Hythe Bay
Balanced Seas	Medway Estuary
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	Cumbrian Coast
Finding Sanctuary	Upper Fowey and Pont Pill
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	Hilbre Island Group
Balanced Seas	Thames Estuary
Finding Sanctuary	South of the Isles of Scilly

Upper Middle Quartile Sites - £62,000 – 780,000 over 20 years

Regional Project	Site Name
Finding Sanctuary	Greater Haig Fras
Balanced Seas	Folkestone Pomerania
Finding Sanctuary	South-West Deeps (East)
Finding Sanctuary	South-West Deeps (West)
Finding Sanctuary	Bideford to Foreland Point
Finding Sanctuary	Chesil Beach and Stennis Ledges
Net Gain	Farnes East
Finding Sanctuary	Padstow Bay and Surround
Finding Sanctuary	North of Lundy
Balanced Seas	Utopia
Balanced Seas	Thanet Coast
Finding Sanctuary	Western Channel
Balanced Seas	Dover to Deal
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	Sefton Coast
Balanced Seas	Dover to Folkestone
Finding Sanctuary	Whitsand and Looe Bay

Balanced Seas	Beachy Head West
Balanced Seas	Inner Bank
Balanced Seas	East Meridian Eastern Side
Finding Sanctuary	Poole Rocks
Balanced Seas	Kingmere
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	Potential Co-location Zone (PCLZ)
Finding Sanctuary	Cape Bank
Balanced Seas	Stour and Orwell Estuaries
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	Slieve Na Griddle
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	South Rigg
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	Mud Hole

Top Quartile Sites - £780,000 + over 20 years

Regional Project	Site Name
Balanced Seas	The Needles
Balanced Seas	Yarmouth to Cowes
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	Wyre-Lune Estuary
Balanced Seas	Beachy Head East
Balanced Seas	The Swale Estuary
Balanced Seas	East Meridian
Balanced Seas	Goodwin Sands
Net Gain	Runswick Bay
Net Gain	Orford Inshore
Balanced Seas	Offshore Brighton
Balanced Seas	Norris to Ryde
Finding Sanctuary	Studland Bay
Net Gain	Holderness Inshore
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	West of Walney
Balanced Seas	Offshore Overfalls
Net Gain	Castle Ground
Net Gain	Alde Ore Estuary
Net Gain	Lincs Belt
Balanced Seas	Bembridge
Net Gain	Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds
Net Gain	Silver Pit
Balanced Seas	Blackwater, Crouch, Roach and Colne Estuaries
Irish Sea Conservation Zone	North St. George's Channel
Net Gain	Coquet – St. Mary's
Net Gain	Holderness Offshore
Net Gain	Wash Approach

Annex D – Marine Protected Areas

1. Existing marine protected areas network

1.1 At UK-level the existing marine protected areas network consists of MCZs (called Marine Protected Areas in Scotland), European Marine Sites, and there are also marine components to some Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Ramsar sites (the Ramsar Convention protects wetlands).

2. English inshore and English and Welsh Offshore

2.1 Table 1 shows the breakdown of the 205 existing marine protected areas in English inshore and English and Welsh offshore waters. In some of these sites these designations may overlap.

Table 1 – Existing marine protected areas within English inshore waters and offshore waters adjacent to England and Wales

Marine Protected Area	Number of Sites
Special Area of Conservation	Inshore - 37 ⁵ Offshore - 9
Special Protection Area	Inshore - 42 ¹⁰ Offshore - 1
Site of Special Scientific Interest ⁶	113
Marine Conservation Zone	1

3. Marine protected areas in Scotland

3.1 There are a total of 100 European Marine Sites in Scottish inshore waters and offshore waters adjacent to Scotland: see table 2 for summary details.

⁵ Includes England/Wales and England/Scotland cross-border sites

⁶ Known to contain specific broad scale habitats or features of conservation interest listed within the Regional Project MCZ Ecological Network Guidance

Table 2 – Existing Marine Protected Areas within Scottish inshore waters and offshore waters adjacent to Scotland.

Marine Protected Area	Number of Sites
Special Area of Conservation	Inshore – 39 ⁷ Offshore – 11
Special Protection Area	50 ¹¹

3.2 SSSIs occurring within the Scottish coastal area also protect marine features. As part of the Scottish Marine Protected Areas Project a number of SSSIs have been identified as contributing to the Marine Protected Areas network in Scotland. Ramsar sites are also designated in Scotland for internationally important wetlands; all Ramsar sites in Scotland are either SACs or SPAs and many are also SSSIs.

4. Marine protected areas in Wales

4.1 There are a total of 21 European Marine Sites in Welsh inshore waters: see table 3 for summary details.

Table 3 – Existing Marine Protected Areas within Wales inshore area

Marine Protected Area	Number of Sites
Special Area of Conservation	11 ⁸
Special Protection Area	10 ¹³

4.2 SSSIs occurring within the Welsh coastal area also protect marine features. Ramsar sites are designated in Wales for internationally important wetlands, all Ramsar sites in Wales are also SSSIs.

5. Marine protected areas in Northern Ireland

5.1 There are a total of 17 European Marine Sites in Northern Ireland's inshore waters: see table 4 for summary details.

⁷ Includes England/Scotland cross border sites

⁸ Includes England/Wales cross border sites

Table 4 – Existing marine protected areas within Northern Irish inshore area

Marine Protected Area	Number of Sites
Special Area of Conservation	8
Special Protection Area	9

5.2 Areas of Special Scientific Interest (ASSI) occurring within the Northern Ireland coastal area also protect marine features. Ramsar sites are also designated in Northern Ireland for internationally important wetlands, and coincide with intertidal SPAs.

Annex E - Sector Issues

1. Consultation Impact Assessment

1.1 The Impact Assessment (IA) includes details of concerns raised by industry that are higher than the costs presented in the summary IA impacts. This is because:

- The summary impacts in the MCZ IA are based on costs provided by industry. Assumptions about MCZ management used in the IA drive the differences in the costs between those provided by some industry representatives and summary estimates used in the IA. For example, industry costs have sometimes assumed a far greater restriction on activity than JNCC and Natural England have assessed as likely.
- Importantly, costs to industry must be 'additional' to costs that would have been incurred anyway in the absence of MCZs (i.e. baseline). Costs provided by industry included some costs that were not additional (i.e. not due to MCZ designation, for example, environmental obligations stemming from other regulations) and therefore these costs have appropriately not been included as an impact of MCZ designation.
- IA costs were revised throughout the MCZ designation process to take account of concerns from industry that these were likely to be underestimated. An extensive process was set up to test assumptions with JNCC, Natural England and regulators which led to refining the assumptions further. For further information please see section 3.4 of the Impact Assessment.
- The costs provided in the summary IA are not net of the anticipated benefits, which were not possible to monetise. If they could be monetised, it is anticipated that the designation of MCZs would be likely to incur net economic benefits in the long term.

1.2 Further information on costs and industry concerns can be found in the Consultation Impact Assessment.

2. Individual sector concerns

2.1 The following sections summarise the main concerns expressed by industry sectors during the process to date for identifying possible MCZs.

3. Aggregates

3.1 Industry stakeholders expressed concerns about the impact that MCZs could have upon the UK supply of marine aggregate during the 20 year period of the IA, but also upon the future supply beyond this period. They consider that it is likely that an additional level of survey effort would be required during the term of any licence

permission, even if this was simply to demonstrate 'no adverse effect' for any MCZ covering a marine aggregate interest.

3.2 There is uncertainty regarding future applications for aggregate dredging and the likely mitigation required as this will be determined in future licensing decisions. The additional cost of assessing impacts on MCZ features for future licence applications may differ depending on the nature of the aggregate extraction activity and the MCZ in question.

3.3 To address these uncertainties high and low cost estimates illustrate the potential range of impacts upon the marine aggregate extraction sector.

4. Cables

4.1 The IA makes assumptions regarding the number of cables, their locations, the likely additional cost of licence applications and the likely management given the uncertainty. Most significantly, while it is assumed that cables outside 12nm are not required to mitigate impact on MCZ features (due to provisions under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea), if a regulator consented to a cable within 12nm that then also adversely affected MCZ features outside 12nm, the regulator could be in breach of its duties under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009. Should this situation arise, legal advice would be sought by regulators before final decisions were made. It has not been possible to quantify this possible impact in the IA due to the uncertainty.

5. Fisheries

5.1 A key concern raised by fisheries stakeholders was displacement where management measures put in place to achieve the conservation objectives of a MCZ may restrict or prevent fishing activities which took place previously on this site, resulting in the fishing activity being displaced to another location possibly incurring greater costs. For smaller fishing vessels with more limited range, as well as increased costs there may also be potential health and safety issues with vessels having to travel further from port and possibly further out to sea.

5.2 For the consultation IA it was not possible to obtain information for each individual fisherman at each site so assumptions were made about the impacts of displacement when estimating the costs for the fisheries sector. These were informed by analysing the level of overlap between recommended MCZs and core fishing grounds. Fishing grounds are often comprised of intensively fished core areas that account for the majority of fishing effort or value and the less frequently fished margins. If MCZs fall within core grounds, it is less likely that displacement will be possible and this activity is more likely to be lost. The analysis suggested that many of the landings are likely to be displaced rather than lost as the overlaps are relatively low. In estimating costs to the fishing sector, as most proposed MCZs are outside core fishing, we have made an assumption that 75% of the value of fishing

that has to stop in an MCZ will be displaced elsewhere and only 25% of the value will be lost (this applies to our best estimate costs but the high cost scenario assumes 100% of the value will be lost). Fisheries stakeholders affected by possible displacement with the designation of the site proposed for the first tranche should provide information in a response to this consultation indicating how they will be affected.

5.3 A second issue of concern was the relationship with foreign fishing interests. Under the Common Fisheries Policy, regulatory authorities can take measures to restrict fisheries activities to protect features in marine protected areas. Within 0-6nm these are solely the responsibility of the regulatory authority, within 6-12nm where measures will affect the historic fishing rights of another EU member state the regulatory authority has to engage with that member state and measures agreed with the European Commission. Between 12 and 200 nm fisheries measures have to be demonstrably non-discriminatory and agreed through the European Commission and implemented through a European Council Regulation if they are to restrict all fishing activities. Between 6 and 200nm Member states can take measures affecting their own fleets however Ministers have made it clear that they will not take measures beyond 6nm which only affect UK fishermen.

5.4 Another aspect of the concern about foreign fishing interests was whether they had been sufficiently engaged in the Regional MCZ Project process. The consultation IA does not include a detailed analysis of the impacts on foreign fleets but recognises that potentially there will be impacts. We welcome responses from foreign fishermen including evidence of the impacts on their interests of the MCZs proposed for designation in the first tranche.

6. Aquaculture

6.1 Two management scenarios (i.e. no additional management and compulsory use of triploid stock for Pacific oyster cultivation) have been considered which reflect the uncertainty about the need for Pacific oyster cultivators to use triploid rather than diploid stock. Insufficient information was obtained to be able to assess any potential reduction in the impacts that may result from operators switching to other species in response to possible management measures for MCZs. The calculated costs are likely to be overestimated. This issue affected three sites within the Finding Sanctuary Regional MCZ Project; Camel Estuary, Dart Estuary and Devon Avon. Further work will be required to improve the certainty of socio-economic impacts within these sites prior to potential designation in a future tranche.

7. Renewables

7.1 Concerns raised by stakeholders from this sector have mainly been around impacts on offshore wind-farms. MCZs may have an affect either where the MCZ is co-located with the site of an existing or future windfarm, or where a windfarm's energy cables may cut across an MCZ.

7.2 There is a high degree of uncertainty about the possible costs to wind-farm developers arising from MCZs. This includes uncertainty over the potential additional costs arising from having wind-turbines co-located with MCZs, in terms of alternate methods of construction and maintenance that might be required; uncertainty over whether additional costs might be incurred where cable routes cut across MCZs, in terms of alternative methods of cable protection and considerable uncertainty around potential cable routes for future wind-farm developments, i.e. whether they will cut across the various proposed MCZ sites.

7.3 Both low and high cost estimates have been made. For the low cost estimates it is assumed that no additional mitigation of impacts upon features protected by MCZs will be required compared to the mitigation of impacts that would be required anyway in the absence of the MCZ.

7.4 High cost estimates were developed in response to concerns raised by renewable energy developers that any additional cost that they might incur should not be underestimated. For these estimates it was assumed that yet-to-be-consented renewable energy cables (export and inter-array) and possible transmission cable routes as illustrated in the Offshore Development Information Statement (ODIS) (National Grid, 2011) will be required to use alternative methods of cable protection (frond matting) when installed in MCZs. It has not been possible to publish all anticipated additional costs to specific MCZs recommended by the Regional MCZ Projects and developments in the IA because of the commercial sensitivity of some of the data. Site-specific costs provided by developers have been used where possible in order to account for the differences in renewable energy developments and their costs.

7.5 In addition, representatives of the renewable energy sector are concerned that MCZs could incur even greater costs. To reflect this uncertainty, the sector has made its own assumptions about how it could be impacted upon by MCZs. These have been presented in the evidence base but have not been included in the summary assessments.

7.6 Due to the potential for some recommended MCZs to incur high cost for the renewable sector it was considered that these sites required further consideration ahead of possible designation in a later tranche pending clarifications of likely costs.

8. Ports and Harbours

8.1 Two management scenarios are presented in the IA to estimate the range of likely impacts of MCZs recommended by the Regional MCZ Projects upon ports, harbours, shipping and disposal sites. Scenario 1 (the low cost scenario) assumes that future licence applications will incur additional costs for navigational dredging and disposal at sea activities and only known port developments which take place within 1km of a MCZ. Scenario 2 (the high cost scenario) assumes that additional costs are incurred for future licence applications for navigational dredging, disposal

at sea activities and port developments proposed within 5km of a MCZ. This scenario includes the costs of incorporating MCZ features into existing and planned Maintenance Dredging protocols (MDPs). To reflect uncertainty about how many ports will collaborate and implement joint MDPs (for example, within an estuary) in the future, two estimates (a low cost estimate and a high cost estimate) are provided for Scenario 2 (to provide a sensitivity analysis; see Annex H11 of the Impact for an explanation).

8.2 Representatives of the ports, harbours and shipping sector are concerned that MCZ management could incur greater costs than those represented by the scenarios. They are concerned that as a result of MCZs, operators could also be required to undertake additional environmental surveys, monitoring of environmental impact and mitigation measures, in particular with regard to management of sediment dispersal. Natural England has indicated that the additional costs outlined by the eight ports and harbour operators are unlikely to be incurred as a consequence of MCZs (JNCC and Natural England, 2011c⁹).

8.3 The management scenarios included in the IA were chosen based on the best available information. The management scenarios for these activities included in the IA may result in overestimates or underestimates of the true impact. For example, for future activities, estimates of the costs of the mitigation of impacts on MCZ features are based on relatively limited details of both the activity and the mitigation to provide an indication of what the costs would be.

8.4 The Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) has advised that updating charts and informing mariners about MCZs and the management required for them could incur four types of costs (please see page 20 of method paper H120). These costs have not been quantified in the IA but have been qualitatively described in the Evidence Base. It has been difficult to quantify the costs because of considerable uncertainty including: the number and location of MCZs that impact on shipping activities, the level of information that mariners choose to obtain concerning MCZs (beyond the legal requirement), whether provision of information concerning MCZs coincides with other information that mariners require. Radio navigation warnings and notification to mariners would be additional costs incurred which has not been possible to quantify.

8.5 The MCA and Department for Transport (DfT) (pers. comm. 2012) have outlined concerns regarding the impact of MCZs on the safety of navigation. However, as the transit of vessels is not anticipated to be affected by any MCZs, the IA does not include such safety concerns. It is assumed that anchoring restrictions may be placed on recreational vessels in some recommended MCZs; please refer to the Consultation IA and method paper in the annexes to the IA for further information.

⁹ http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/MCZ_ImpactofMCZsonMarineLicensing.pdf

8.6 Similarly, the MCA and DfT (pers. comm. 2012) have outlined concerns regarding the impact of MCZs on the safety of navigation for recommended MCZs for which the IA assumes that mitigation of other vessel activity may be required, such as navigational dredging and disposal of dredge material. Very little change in vessel activity is anticipated in the proposed MCZs and more detail on possible impact is provided in the IA and method paper.

8.7 Due to the potential for some recommended MCZs to incur high cost for the ports and harbours sector it was considered that these sites required further consideration ahead of possible designation in a later tranche.

9. Recreation

9.1 The management scenarios for many of the MCZs recommended by the Regional MCZ Projects are expected to have negligible or no costs to the recreation sector. This is because levels of the activity are low, alternative locations are available and mitigation can be (or is already) provided through adoption of good practice.

9.2 Mitigation may be required for recommended MCZs with features that are sensitive to the impacts of anchoring of recreational vessels. For sites where little anchoring occurs, a management scenario of closure of the site to anchoring of recreational vessels (except in emergency) and racing marks was used. For those sites with sensitive features where there are significant levels of anchoring, a second scenario of closure of the site to anchoring of recreational vessels (except in emergency), racing marks and installation of permanent eco-moorings (if there is an appropriate site for the moorings in the vicinity) was also used. The two scenarios are included in the analysis to reflect uncertainty about how the mitigation might be provided.

9.3 There is very limited secondary information on recreation activities at a local level. Some interviews were conducted with a sample of participants from which some data was extracted. Where evidence was not available on which to base adjustments for substitution between activities, assumptions based on an understanding of the nature of the activity being affected were used. In some instances it was not possible to obtain sufficient information about potentially damaging and disturbing activities on which to establish potential management scenarios. In such cases it has not been possible to assess the potential costs if additional management is required. These challenges and limitations in data only allow the IA to provide an indication of costs, and these estimates are likely to be an over or under estimate.

10. Oil and Gas: Exploration and production, gas interconnectors and storage, carbon capture and storage (CCS)

10.1 Modelling of costs to this sector looks at additional costs of future licence applications in order to assess the impact of future oil and gas (including CCS) developments upon MCZ broad-scale habitats.

10.2 It is assumed that no additional mitigation actions will be required because:

- habitats and species on the OSPAR and BAP lists are already mitigated for outside of MCZs; and
- the footprint of oil and gas (including CCS) developments are unlikely to significantly impact upon the area of broad-scale habitat protected within an MCZ.

10.3 However, DECC is concerned that additional mitigation costs could be incurred for future oil and gas installations, new pipeline routes and decommissioning obligations if for example, the footprint of the Broad Scale Habitats is small or if additional importance is given to BAP or OSPAR listed features within an MCZ compared to those outside of an MCZ. These costs are not quantified but acknowledged in the IA.

10.4 MCZs proposed for designation in 2013 are likely to have minimal impacts due to the limited number of significant discoveries found near the sites and low likelihood that these will be developed. However, this does not take into account future exploration which could lead to new discoveries and requirement for development.

11. National Defence

11.1 Only one management scenario has been developed for this sector. The costs comprise a one-off cost for adjustment of electronic tools and charts and annual costs to ensure that the electronic tools and charts are up to date and that MCZs are factored into all operations. The Ministry of Defence (MoD) is of the opinion that designation of the recommended MCZs will have little direct impact on current MoD activity but that there is a possibility that future mitigation requirements for specific sites could have a greater impact. Due to a lack of information about where future MoD activity could take place, and about the scale and type of future activity, this possible impact is not quantified in the IA.

12. Coastal development (excluding ports and harbour development)

12.1 It has not been possible to quantify these impacts which have been identified and described qualitatively in the IA. For example, for the three developments in the Balanced Seas project area, it is likely that the developers will incur additional costs for future licence applications as a result of MCZs. However, this is subject to uncertainty as proposals are at very early stages and the nature and scale of potential impacts are unknown. The impacts are likely to be lower for option 2 as fewer of the sites are designated.

13. Flood and coastal erosion risk management (FCERM)

13.1 It is assumed that the potential impact of FCERM activities on features protected by MCZs will be managed under the existing marine licensing framework.

13.2 One management scenario has been developed for the IA. Natural England and the Environment Agency identified sites where future FCERM activity (as defined by the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) policy) is not likely to be compatible with the conservation objectives of the features proposed for protection and the IA makes the assumption that the MCZs would not be designated to protect these features. This has been assumed for those SMP policies which have a strong socio-economic driver to protect life, property and important assets, and are considered to have 'imperative reasons of over-riding public interest'.

13.3 Operators may be required to implement measures of equivalent environmental benefit to the damage which the proposal will or is likely to have in or on the MCZ (as is the case for Natura 2000 sites). However, in the absence of information about where and how such compensatory measures would take place, and even if they would be required, this possible impact has not been quantified. Where there is uncertainty about whether FCERM activities will impact on the MCZ's features, the IA assumes that FCERM activities will not impact on the MCZ's features

Annex F – Commentary on SNCB Advice

SNCBs Advice:	Action
Advice on the MCZ Project Process	
We recommend that Defra ensures that the public consultation is widely advertised to all sectors with a clear invitation to comment on the proposed MCZs and associated Impact Assessment	All key sectors and stakeholders have been alerted to the consultation.
We suggest that the consultation material is translated into other EU languages to help stakeholders in other member states engage	The executive summary and consultation questions have been translated into French, German and Welsh.
We advise that any changes from the conservation objectives identified by the regional stakeholder groups may lead to a requirement for management that differs from stakeholder expectations	We note this advice and have covered this issue in the management section of the consultation document. See section 2.11
We advise public authorities that once it is confirmed that sites are to be designated they should consider initiating a programme of stakeholder engagement to identify management measures that will deliver the conservation objectives of designated MCZs and ensure they are understood and as widely supported as possible.	This advice is not for Defra. However Defra will be working with public authorities to ensure good stakeholder engagement.
We advise that due to risk of challenge regarding equity in MCZ decision making, an assessment of the risks associated with achieving site management through the Common Fisheries Policy is undertaken.	We note this advice. The impact upon both domestic and foreign fishing fleets have been considered in the decision making process. We expect both domestic and foreign fishing fleets to raise any issues they may have in response to this consultation. This information will be taken into account in making final decisions on site designation.
Advice on the regional MCZ Project Recommendations	

- Assessment of recommendations against the Ecological Network Guidance

<p>We advise that overall the recommendations submitted by the Regional MCZ Projects , when combined with the contribution of existing MPAs, have met many of the network design principles and represent not only good progress towards the achievement of an ecologically coherent network but also a balance between the ecological requirements for the network and minimising impact on socio-economic interests.</p>	<p>We note this advice. The Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 require Government to designate MCZs to contribute to a network of MPAs at UK level. Section 2.5 and 2.7 set out our thinking on this matter.</p>
<p>We suggest that Defra should further consider whether geological or geomorphological features are adequately incorporated in rMCZs for geo-conservation in the marine area and that geological stakeholders should be involved in any further process</p>	<p>All features recommended by the Regional MCZ Projects were considered as part of the decision making process for the first tranche in the same manner as habitat and species. Geological and geomorphological feature will be further considered during discussions on future tranches.</p>
<p>We advise that some features or site may appear to have less information than other in terms of contribution to the network design principles and ecological benefits; however this may be a reflection of limited data and evidence rather than an indication of their importance</p>	<p>We note this advice. For more information on network considerations and future tranches see sections 2.7 and 4.1.16 of the Consultation Document.</p>
<p>Natural England advises that Defra and Natural England agree an approach to deal with the issue of overlapping designations between SSSIs and MCZs and then apply this approach to the relevant features.</p>	<p>We note this advice. See section 2.3 of the consultation document for more information.</p>
<p>We advise that an approach will need to be agreed with Defra to deal with the issues of overlapping designations between MCZs and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) in particular to assess of the alteration of the SAC boundaries is the best way forward for the protection of the relevant features and the simplification of the designation process</p>	<p>We note this advice. See section 2.3 of the consultation document for more information.</p>
<p>We advise that an approach for the assessment of MCZ proposals in relation to potential gaps on the SAC network will need to be agreed with Defra</p>	<p>We note this advice; JNCC is currently undertaking work to look at the sufficiency of the SAC network. We will review this issue in light of their assessment.</p>
<p>We propose a further assessment is undertaken on all features</p>	<p>In response to recommendations from the Science Advisory</p>

within MCZs and existing MPAs before the public consultation to account for any new information.	Panel Defra commissioned an in depth review of the evidence base supporting the Regional MCZ project recommendations. The report will be available on the Defra website in the new year
We suggest that further work is undertaken to fill the remaining gaps in recommended MCZs taking into account biogeographical considerations and to inform the progress towards the development of an ecologically coherent network	We agree with this comment. Further work will be carried out with the Devolved Administrations to meet commitments to a UK contribution to an ecologically coherent network.
Advice on the Regional MCZ Project recommendations - Advice on Conservation Objectives	
We advise that for 61 features their conservation objectives are changed from what was recommended by the Regional MCZ Projects.	The conservation objective changes for the 61 features have been incorporated in the Consultation Site Summaries in Annex A. For more information on Conservation Objectives see section 2.11 of the consultation document.
SNCBs advise that greater clarity is made in future documentation between the actual conservation objective (of achieving favourable (or reference) condition) and the action (maintain or recover) as part of the objective.	The conservation objectives for all features recommended by the Regional MCZ Projects have been stated in the individual site summaries included in Annex A. The SNCBs' role in ensuring clarity on this issue will be important.
SNCBs advise stakeholders and management authorities that a 'maintain' objective does not necessarily mean that no management of activities will be required.	This advice is for stakeholders and management authorities. More information on putting management measures in place can be found in sections 2.11 and 3.3 of the Consultation Document.
SNCBs advise that the implication of any conservation objectives are site specific and dependent on a number of variables, for example how the sensitivity of sub-features varies	We note this advice. More information on Conservation Objectives can be found in sections 2.11.13 and 3.3
Advice on available scientific evidence to support recommended MCZ - Advice on the evidence for the presence and extent of features	
SNCBs advise that moderate and low confidence features should not necessarily prevent sites being progressed for designation, particularly if there is confidence on the presence of the feature, and a suitable rMCZ boundary can be	We note this advice. The sites proposed for designation in the first tranche are those where there is good supporting evidence for the presence and extent of the features proposed for designation, with exceptions made for features

<p>delineated around the observed feature.</p>	<p>identified as being at high risk in certain sites. More information on the process used to identify sites for designation in the first tranche can be found in section 4.1</p>
<p>SNCBs advise that evidence on the extent of the feature might be more accurately determined after designation to support the development of management measures.</p>	<p>We note this advice</p>
<p>SNCBs advise that the evidence assessment presented in their advice was based on the best available information at the time of the assessment. We advise that the information from datasets referred to in section 5.3 and any other information should be incorporated into the assessments of confidence in the presence and extent of features in the future, and that any updates to the assessments should follow the agreed protocol, in order to improve the evidence base underpinning MCZ recommendations and designation.</p>	<p>The evidence base supporting sites proposed for designation in the first tranche will be updated with any evidence provided in the Consultation and new evidence that has become available after the SNCBs completed their assessment before final decisions are made on designation. Over a longer timescale, the evidence base for candidate sites for future designation will be updated to support identification of sites for designation in future tranches.</p>
<p>SNCBs advise that site selection assessment documents should be updated to incorporate the latest information from the evidence assessment and to reflect the increased knowledge and understanding of the features and site.</p>	<p>See the response above</p>
<p>Advice on available scientific evidence to support recommended MCZ - Advice on the evidence for the condition of features</p>	
<p>SNCBs advise that the vulnerability assessments that supported the development of the majority of draft conservation objectives only provide a proxy indication of the likely condition and therefore are limited in their ability to provide confidence in actual condition.</p>	<p>We note this advice. SNCBs have now provided advice on confidence assessments for conservation objectives. More information on conservation objectives can be found in Section 2.11</p>
<p>For all but 19 features SNCBs advise that there is a low confidence in the assessment of condition.</p>	<p>SNCBs have now provided additional advice on confidence assessments for conservation objectives.</p>
<p>SNCBs advise that low confidence in condition should not prevent features and sites being progresses to consultation and designation.</p>	<p>SNCBs have now provided additional advice on confidence assessments for conservation objectives.</p>
<p>Advice on available scientific evidence to support recommended MCZ</p>	

- Additional advice on evidence	
SNCBs advise that the information from the additional datasets identified here, and additional data sources identified in the Defra contact MB0116 entitled 'In-depth review of the ecological evidence supporting the recommended MCZs' should be incorporated into the evidence assessment in the future.	The evidence base supporting sites proposed for designation in the first tranche will be updated with any evidence provided in the Consultation and new evidence that has become available after the SNCBs completed their assessment before final decisions are made on designation. Over a longer timescale, the evidence base for candidate sites for future designation will be updated to support identification of sites for designation in future tranches.
We advise that the additional dataset should be used to update the evidence assessment for inclusion in the formal consultation documentation	Where additional information became available in time to include in the process for identifying sites for designation in the first tranche, this was included in the evidence assessment.
We advise that both the private and the public sectors should be made aware of the need to develop and maintain sound evidence bases for effective planning and management of MPAs.	We note this advice
We advise that further work is needed to collate metadata for regionally sourced data to inform the evidence assessment of the recommended features.	We note this advice. If the data is sourced through a Defra project the contractors will provide metadata to MEDIN.
SNCBs advise that future evidence will be quality assured before inclusion in site assessment work to keep the best available scientific evidence up to date	We agree with this advice and expect SNCBs to apply this advice to evidence use in all their activities.
Advice on prioritising MCZs for designation	
We suggest that Defra may wish to consider the value of a full prioritisation analysis against these criteria in order to understand how an individual rMCZ might contribute to each individual criterion.	We note this advice
SNCBs advise that designation of rMCZs should be prioritised to ensure sufficient representation and replication of broad-scale habitats and FOCI that are not protected within existing MPAs in the Defra marine area.	We note this advice. All sites that met have met the necessary principles for designation in the first tranche have been put forward. Defra expects to designate further MCZs to contribute to the meeting the objective of the ecologically

	coherent network of marine protected areas and expects that these will include protection of Broad-Scale habitats and FOCI that are not protected within existing MPAs.
<p>SNCBs suggest that the sufficient representation and replication of broad scale habitats and FOCI should take account of finer-scale biogeographic variation at the scale of the Charting Progress 2 regional seas to build additional resilience into the network.</p>	<p>The approach to the ecologically coherent network of marine protected areas at UK level is described in section 2.7. We expect to work with the Devolved Administrations to consider and assess sufficiency of representation and replication of broad scale habitats and FOCI.</p>
<p>Advice on recommended MCZs most at risk</p>	
<p>Natural England advises that 11 of the 33 inshore recommended MCZs have an overall higher risk of damage or deterioration to non-sensitive and sensitive features These sites are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ South of Falmouth ▪ Tamar Estuary ▪ The Isles of Scilly ▪ Chesil Beach and Stennis Ledges ▪ Hythe Bay ▪ Folkestone to Pomerania ▪ Norris to Ryde ▪ Bembridge ▪ Kingmere ▪ Sefton Coast ▪ Hilbre Island Group ▪ <p>Natural England advises that the remaining 22 inshore recommended MCZs are only high risk because they contain highly sensitive features which are subject to one or more pressures causing damage or deterioration. These sites are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cumbrian Coast ▪ Poole Rocks ▪ Lundy rMCZ 	<p>We note this advice. This was incorporated into the decision making process (see Section 4.1.8 of the Consultation Document).</p>

- The Manacles
- Studland Bay
- Torbay
- Skerries Bank and Surround
- The Isles of Scilly
- Padstow Bay
- Dover to Deal
- Dover to Folkestone
- Beachy Head West
- Beachy Head East
- Offshore Brighton
- Swale Estuary
- Yarmouth to Cowes
- Thames Estuary
- Stour and Orwell Estuaries
- The Needles
- The Medway Estuary
- Thanet Coast

JNCC considers that 15 fully offshore recommended MCZs are at higher risk of damage or deterioration and have a stronger case for earlier designation as MCZs. These sites are:

- The Canyons
- South-West Deeps
- North-West of Jones Bank
- Greater Haig Fras
- East of Jones Bank
- South of Celtic Deep
- Celtic Deep
- East of Celtic Deep
- Western Channel
- South East of Falmouth

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ East of Haig Fras ▪ Compass Rose ▪ Slieve Na Griddle ▪ South Rigg ▪ Markham's Triangle <p>JNCC and Natural England consider that 11 joint rMCZs are at a higher risk of damage or deterioration and have a stronger case for earlier designation as MCZs. These sites are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ East Meridian ▪ East Meridian – Eastern Side ▪ Mud Hole ▪ Cape Bank ▪ Holderness Offshore ▪ Inner Bank ▪ South of the Isles of Scilly ▪ Orford Inshore ▪ West of Walney ▪ West of Walney Extension ▪ South Dorset 	
JNCC and Natural England response to issues raised by the Science Advisory Panel	
<p>We advise that further development/better understanding of feature sensitivity to pressures should be a priority area for future research. Such improved understanding would significantly assist future revisions to conservation objectives and the implementation of proportionate and effective management measures</p>	<p>We agree. Defra has identified additional funding to support research in this area particularly related to fishing pressures.</p>
<p>We advise that marine biodiversity monitoring and surveillance strategies should be supported by and integrated with activity-specific monitoring undertaken by public authorities.</p>	<p>We note this advice.</p>
<p>We advise that the SAP and our assessments of the evidence base for recommended MCZs should be used together, and that any differences in results should be viewed as a reflection</p>	<p>We note this advice. Section 2.8 of the Consultation Document sets out the approach taken to evidence issues</p>

of the different methodologies adopted.	
Advice on the contribution of MCZs to a network of Marine Protected Areas	
SNCBs advise that the Eng was based on the Convention for the protection of the marine environment of the North-East Atlantic and other international guidance and complied with Defra Policy.	We note this advice. Section 2.7 of the Consultation Document sets out how Defra will be taking forward work to meet the Ministerial commitment to establish an ecologically coherent UK network of MPAs.

