

**MINUTES**

Attendees: Ed Rollings (ER) MeyGen Date: 28/01/2014  
 David Collier (DC) MeyGen  
 Prof. Ian Bryden (IB) Chairman – UHI  
 David O’Sullivan (DOS) MSLOT  
 Ian Davies (ID) - MSS  
 Kate Brookes (KB) MSS  
 Jared Wilson (JW) MSS  
 Ross Gardiner (RG) MSS  
 Chris Eastham (CE) SNH  
 Erica Knott (EK) SNH  
 George Lees (GL) SNH  
 Elaine Tait (ET) MS Marine Environment Branch

Chaired by: Prof. Ian Bryden Time: 16:00  
Location: SNH, Battleby

**SUBJECT: MeyGen Advisory Group (AG) Meeting 2**

**Agenda**

No.	Subject	Time (min)
1	Minutes of last meeting	
2	Terms of Reference	
3	Discussion paper – Monitoring Objectives	
4	Workshop summary and discussion	
5	Next Steps	
6	AOB	

No.	Subject	Action
<b>1</b>	<b>Minutes of last meeting</b>	
1.1	Minutes of the last meeting approved	
1.2	DOS One outstanding action regarding the ToR	
<b>2</b>	<b>Terms of Reference (ToR)</b>	
2.1	CE SNH recommended that the ToR and AG should include an additional member with a scientific background that would provide the AG with additional resource when scrutinizing monitoring outputs (someone like Beth Scott or Ben Wilson). ID the only difficulty is that it is very likely that many of the respected and authoritative academics may also be directly involved in the monitoring in a contractor role. KB there is the flexibility in the ToR to bring in appropriate help ad-hoc if a member of the group feels it is necessary. EK that is fine in terms of arbitration but is the AG comfortable that the output of this group could be open to challenge from outside. IB I think this can be done on a case by case basis and the AG is capable of understanding the correct time to use such resource.	
2.2	GL Still unclear as to the added value that the AG would provide above that of the normal consultation process that would be followed by MeyGen. ID ultimately the AG is a consent condition and therefore it has to function. EK it does give SNH a structure to help with resources.	
2.3	DC MeyGen has talked to The Crown Estate about their possible involvement in the AG. They may provide an independent opinion and it would help keep them informed about the progress of the project. Toby Gethin is the suggested member. <b>AG in agreement that The Crown Estate should be added.</b>	
	<b>ACTION – ER to invite Toby Gethin to the AG and bring him up to speed</b>	<b>ER</b>
2.4	DOS to produce a final draft of the ToR for the AG to approve	
	<b>ACTION – DOS to send out a final draft of the ToR to the AG (31<sup>st</sup> Jan)</b>	<b>DOS</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Monitoring Objectives</b>	
3.1	DOS to make changes suggested prior to the workshop into the next draft of the objectives and send out. The AG members should review in light of the workshop	
	<b>ACTION – DOS to send out Monitoring Objectives (5<sup>th</sup> Feb)</b>	<b>DOS</b>
	<b>ACTION - AG to review monitoring objective (12<sup>th</sup> Feb)</b>	<b>ALL</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Workshop and next steps</b>	
4.1	General agreement that the workshop was a success and the outputs should be valuable to the AG	
4.2	Scribes to write up their notes and send these to DOS for collation and distribution to the AG	
4.3	DOS/EK noted that there was a comment that some attendees had noted their interest in being involved in the monitoring process which highlights that the AG and monitoring will be under scrutiny from outside the AG.	
4.4	JW how will the outcomes of each receptor group discussion be brought together to produce a single monitoring proposal? Suggested that MeyGen (ER) will produce a draft from the workshop outputs to be distributed and discussed at the next AG meeting. DOS will have to check that this approach is ok for MSLOT	
	<b>ACTION – DOS to check that having MeyGen draft the monitoring plan is ok with MSLOT (Roger May)</b>	<b>DOS</b>
4.5	Timescales for producing a plan. DC MeyGen need to have an idea about the monitoring proposal by April to ensure it is included in detailed design with contractors. JW for pre-construction surveys this may be too tight, especially for any bird tagging work which would require the tagging to start in March.	

4.6	Agreed that the next meeting will need to be in the first week of March to discuss the monitoring proposal.	
	<b>ACTION – Scribes to send workshop notes to DOS for collation (31<sup>st</sup> Jan)</b>	<b>Scribes</b>
	<b>ACTION – DOS to send out notes from the workshop (5<sup>th</sup> Feb)</b>	<b>DOS</b>
	<b>ACTION – AG to review notes from the workshop (12<sup>th</sup> Feb)</b>	<b>ALL</b>
	<b>ACTION – ER to send out a doodle poll for the next meeting.</b>	<b>ER</b>
5	<b>AOB</b>	
5.1	ET – Demonstration Strategy project is out to tender at the moment, tenders are due by the 13 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2014. Expect to have between 3-5 weeks to make a decision on the tenders.	

**ACTION REGISTER**

No.	Action	Responsibility	Complete
1	ER to invite Toby Gethin to the AG and bring him up to speed	ER	✓
2	DOS to send out a final draft of the ToR to the AG (31 <sup>st</sup> Jan)	DOS	✓
3	DOS to send out Monitoring Objectives (5 <sup>th</sup> Feb)	DOS	✓
4	AG to review monitoring objective (12 <sup>th</sup> Feb)	ALL	✓
5	DOS to check that having MeyGen draft the monitoring plan is ok with MSLOT (Roger May)	DOS	✓
6	Scribes to send workshop notes to DOS for collation (31 <sup>st</sup> Jan)	Scribes	✓
7	DOS to send out notes from the workshop (5 <sup>th</sup> Feb)	DOS	✓
8	AG to review notes from workshop (12 <sup>th</sup> Feb)	ALL	✓
9	ER to send out a doodle poll for the next meeting	ER	✓