

## Meeting Minutes

Meeting title: Moray Firth Regional Advisory Group (“MFRAG”) – Start up meeting

Date: 9<sup>th</sup> March 2015

Time: 11:00 – 13:45

Venue: Marine Scotland, Marine Laboratory Conference Room, Aberdeen.

Attendees:

MS - David Palmer (Chair), Jim McKie (JM), Daniel Pendrey (DP), Nicola Bain (NB), Kate Brookes (KB), Alexander Ford (AF), Paul Smith (PS).

SNH - Erica Knott (EK)

JNCC - Karen Hall (KH), Enrique Pardo (EP)

MORL - Sarah Pirie (SP), Catarina Rei (CR)

RH - Benjamin King (BK), MORL ECoW

BOWL - Jonathan Wilson (JW)

RPS - Sarah MacNab (SM), BOWL ECoW

RSPB - Charles Nathan (CN)

WDC - Fiona Read (FR)

ASFB - Keith Williams (KW)

Apologies - Catriona Gall (SNH), Brian Davidson (ASFB), Sarah Dolman (WDC), Aedan Smith (RSPB), Ian Davies (MSS), Lis Royle (BOWL)

| Item | Agenda Item  |
|------|--|
| 1    | <b>Introduction</b><br>Chair extended a welcome to all to the Marine Laboratory.   |
| 2    | <b>MFRAG ToR Sign-off</b><br><p>The Chair opened up the meeting by asking those present for any comments on the ToRs that were issued prior to the meeting.</p> <p>JW requested clarity on the purpose of the MFRAG in terms of the relevant consent conditions and stated that it be made clear that the MFRAG is not there to add anything extra to the consent. JW sees the MFRAG as a group that can streamline and/or align methods for monitoring in the Moray Firth. In terms of ToR-12 the function of the MFRAG is to provide advice and recommendations on research, monitoring and mitigation programmes, not to dictate. JW tabled the view that each organisation, although represented by two people, only has one casting vote in any ballot.</p> |

SP commented that the introduction section of the ToRs was good, but the relationship to the PEMP and EMP is not so clear. SP suggested a further section be inserted in the ToRs to clarify the roles given to the MFRAG to tie in with the wording of the conditions.

The Chair, in consensus with those in the room, the voting position for the MFRAG (in connection with ToR-14) is one vote per member organisation.

SP queried whether a developer is allowed to vote on their own plans. SP proposed that the developers should not be voting on each other's or their own plans. JW in agreement with the proposal.

The quorum for decisions being made by the MFRAG was discussed. As membership of the MFRAG includes 10 organisations, 5 was proposed. (Post the meeting it is thought that MS-LOT should not be allocated a vote). The vote will be carried if it is supported by more than 50% of the members.

EK is concerned that as the EMPs and PEMPs are not developed yet, specifics of the role of the MFRAG cannot be developed at present. EK would still like to see the developers continue the on-going discussions on each other's monitoring proposals as scientific uncertainty remains as to how to monitor predictions made in the ES's. EK would like the MFRAG to help solve those problems and to ensure method(s) is/are developed that allow for learning from the monitoring.

SP agrees, and would like to achieve it in the context of developing a renewables industry in Scotland. The MFRAG, where possible can prevent sub-groups from duplicating work/monitoring. JW is happy with the work of smaller sub-groups to date. EK was asked by the Chair if the current ToRs reflect this. EK replied, the ToRs are not quite there but can evolve to capture it and the individuals in the MFRAG are currently on the correct path to do so.

The Chair asked if the ToRs need to better reflect the work of the sub-groups. EK indicated that this would be better carried out once the final PEMPs and EMPs are submitted for approval. The sub-groups may disband/meet less often once the PEMPs and EMPs are approved. CR/SP stated the function of the MFRAG is to provide final advice to the Scottish Ministers, gathered and discussed from the results of the sub-groups. SP/JM/JW all in agreement that the MFRAG is the body who is responsible for determining an appropriate resolution to any arguments from within the sub-groups and to decide on the best way forward. JW reminded the MFRAG that there is still the issue of MORL and BOWL being developed on different timelines therefore, neither development should slow down or hinder the other. A joint programme of monitoring can only happen if both projects occur at the same time. If the two developments occur at different timescales, monitoring scopes may need to reflect this.

JM made it clear that the MFRAG is for wind developers only and would not expect any MF port developers to join the MFRAG at this present time. JM

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
|                 | <p>gave an update on the Scottish Offshore Renewables Research Framework (“SpORRAn”) for clarity to the MFRAG members present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SpORRAn will focus on research priorities in specific areas e.g. marine plans, sectoral plans;</li> <li>▪ SpORRAn will not be directly involved in post consent management or the discharge of consent conditions; and</li> <li>▪ A person from SpORRAn could attend MFRAG in the future, but only as an observer.</li> </ul> <p>KH noted that the mention to SpORRAn in the ToRs is quite clear. SP is happy for a SpORRAn observer to attend MFRAG and that the function of the MFRAG is to provide advice up to Marine Scotland Licensing Operations Team (“MS LOT”) and across to SpORRAn. JW sees SpORRAn as quite distinct from the MFRAG – MFRAG is there to discharge conditions and SpORRAn in there to plug any discrete gaps in the research.</p> <p>The Chair asked if there were any further questions on the ToRs.</p> <p>SP queried the wording in the costs section around the independent chair. It appears a typo exists and it should read “any independent chair”, or suggested by JM as “and an independent chair (should one be appointed)”.</p> <p>EK would prefer that under ‘Secretariat’, point b. be altered to two weeks prior, rather than one. The Chair agreed this can be changed to two weeks prior.</p> <p>MS LOT will amend and re-issue the ToRs to reflect all of the above.</p> |
| <p><b>3</b></p> | <p><b>Discussion around moving towards a Scottish group</b></p> <p>The Chair asked those present for their thoughts around moving towards a Scottish group. JM would like to gauge the thoughts of the MFRAG along with those of the Forth &amp; Tay RAG (“FTRAG”), who will meet for the first time on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2015, for considerations around moving to a Scottish group.</p> <p>EK stated SNH does not want to move to a Scottish group straight away. SNH first wants clarity on what is happening in the F&amp;T and have the opportunity to discuss their PCM proposals. KW is in favour of EK suggestions as local issues for diadromous fish require to be tackled first before working out how to fit into a National strategy for diadromous fish.</p> <p>JW generally agreed and foresees there may be joint working with the F&amp;T at some point in the future. If it was to happen at this stage in the process, the addition of other developers into the equation would only hamper the good progress that has been made in the Moray Firth. SP agrees the momentum in the Moray Firth should be maintained and sees that momentum would be lost if a move into a joint group with the F&amp;T developers occurs at an early stage. SP highlighted that even though MORL lost out in the current round of CfD allocation, MORL are still committed to the project and that MORL’s</p>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>timelines are broadly aligned with BOWL's. MORL's main driver is now to improve the project for the next round of CfD applications which is likely to take place later this year.</p> <p>EK suggested that ToR-4 should be extended to include the addition of other RAGs. CN sees an overlap of the work carried out by the RAGs and SpORRAn. The Chair suggested that any issues can be sought at a Scottish level via a Scottish group and the work of SpORRAn be separate to that.</p> <p>KB indicated that the formation of a Scottish group would be beneficial if similar issues are present in different areas of development; e.g. mammals or birds. JM suggested that the sub-groups that already exist could act to cover the issues that are common to different areas. KH queried this, as the function of the sub-groups is to feed to the RAGs. The Chair stated the issue is that there are not enough specialised people in Scotland to cover participation in all of the proposed groups. The focus should be to minimise the number of groups as much as possible. JW is in favour of minimising the number of groups for efficiency and due to the fact that a lot of uncertainties still exist; i.e. no projects are through the FiD process yet.</p> <p>EK queried whether a sub-Scottish group could exist in the meantime as the preference of the MFRAG is lending towards no early set up of a formal Scottish group due to all projects being developed at different timescales. KH highlighted that the JNCC don't want the current issues to be lost, but are still somehow fed into the process.</p> <p>JM indicated that MS LOT would send to MFRAG members the brief that exists for the current thinking around SpORRAn. A hand-out was provided to participants at the meeting.</p> <p>As no further comments were received on the topic of moving towards a Scottish group, the Chair summarised the discussion in that the preference of the MFRAG is to not move towards a Scottish group quickly but for some receptors maintain a national level thinking until when/if a Scottish group is set up. Sense check with FTRAG at meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> April.</p> |
| 4 | <p><b>Appointing a Chair</b></p> <p>The Chair asked those present for suggestions as to who could be appointed chair of the MFRAG.</p> <p>SP has no immediate person in mind but suggested if Marine Scotland Science ("MSS") is considered independent enough from the MFRAG, could Ian Davies be an option? JM would prefer that neither MSS nor MS LOT be appointed but consideration could be given to someone else in MS. PS believes there may be an issue with Scottish Government ("SG") advising SG. NB was also of the opinion that MSS should not be appointed chair.</p> <p>EK gave no name but indicated that whoever is chosen is someone who has a clear interest in the projects proceeding and must be very clear on their</p>   |

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
|           | <p>role as chair. SP agreed with EK. EK proposed a wildcard suggestion of the Marine Management Organisation (“MMO”). JM indicated the MMO may be keen but having the time to fulfil the role could be an issue.</p> <p>As chair was not appointed at this meeting, JM offered that MS would chair the next meeting. The Chair set an action that the MFRAG members supply a list of persons for proposed chair for future MFRAGs by the 17<sup>th</sup> of April (to have an indication prior to the initial FTRAG meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of April as the FTRAG will also be required to appoint a chair).</p> <p>EK proposed the possibility of having the same chair for both the MFRAG and the FTRAG.</p>   |
| <b>5</b>  | <p><b>Date of next meeting and frequency</b></p> <p>The Chair asked for member’s thoughts on date of next meeting and frequency.</p> <p>JM proposed the next meeting of the MFRAG be set to discuss the actual business of the MFRAG, therefore SP &amp; CR indicated it would be best to set the next and further meetings in-line with project timescales; mainly BOWL as BOWL is contracted to meet FiD deadlines.</p> <p>JW indicated BOWL would have a draft PEMP by the end of April, therefore the Chair proposed the week beginning 11<sup>th</sup> May. Due to other commitments, the 11<sup>th</sup> or the 12<sup>th</sup> was proposed.</p> <p>JM suggested the frequency of the MFRAG meeting should initially be established around the BOWL timelines as BOWL is the project leading the way. JW informed the MFRAG that the BOWL Board is looking to discharge as many conditions as possible prior to FiD. The frequency of the meeting is outstanding pending a review of the BOWL timelines.</p> <p>SP stated the MORL project is still proceeding even though losing out in the recent CfD allocation and has now an imperative reason to de-risk the project for the next round of CfD applications (which is currently scheduled for late 2015) and should therefore be considered in all aspects of the MFRAG.</p> |
| <b>6</b>  | <b>AOB</b>  |
|           | None.   |
|           | <b>ACTIONS</b>  |
| <b>A1</b> | MFRAG members are to compile their suggestions for the person to be appointed chair of the MFRAG and submit those to MS LOT by 17 <sup>th</sup> of April.   |
| <b>A2</b> | MFRAG members to confirm date of next MFRAG meeting; 11 <sup>th</sup> or 12 <sup>th</sup> May.  |
| <b>A3</b> | MS LOT to issue revised ToRs to MFRAG members   |
| <b>A4</b> | MS LOT to distribute current information on SpORRAn to MFRAG members  |
|           |   |