

Meeting Minutes

Meeting:	Moray Firth Commercial Fisheries Working Group
Date/Time/Venue:	22 January 2020 13.00 – 16.00 The Station Hotel (Ballroom), 78 Guild St, Aberdeen AB11 6GN Peter Moore, Carlotta Gradissimo (EDPR - Moray East), David O’Sullivan, Sarah Edwards (EDPR - Moray West), Joe Deimel, Martin Sutherland (SSE-BOWL), Reidun Erland (Equinor – Hywind) Alex Winrow-Giffin, John Watt (BMM – Secretariat, Moray East, BOWL FLO). Bruce Buchanan (CHAIR), Roger May, Kirsty Wright, Diane Buchanan (Marine Scotland) Femke de Boer (SWFPA); Malcolm Morrison, Andrew Third (SFF) Charles Milne (Moray East, Moray West /Creels- FIR), Robert Souter (Squid FIR), Helen Macdonald (Caithness coast FIR)
Apologies:	Rhys Potter, Jim Watson (Marine Scotland); Sandra Turnbull (Under 10m Assoc.); Monica Fundingsland (Equinor – Hywind); Gordon Patterson (BOWL FIR); Annie Breaden (Crown Estate Scotland)

Item	Agenda Item	Time
*	<i>Fishing Sector Pre-meeting (fishing sector only)</i>	11:30-12:30
*	<i>Lunch</i>	12:30-13:00
1	Welcome and Introductions	13:00-13:10
2	Review of previous minutes and actions	13:10-13:20
3	MS-LOT FMMS Guidance update	13:20–13:35
4	Fisheries presentation and discussion	13:35–14:15
5	SFF – Final Wind Farm Mitigation document	14:15-15:00
6	Project Updates by Developers	15:00-15:40
7	AOB & Next Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FIRS (if not included in main agenda) • Developer FMMS (if not included in main agenda) 	15:40-16:00

1. Welcome and introductions

Welcome and introductions, including safety moment.

BB confirmed that no one had any comments on the previous minutes and that the minutes were agreed.

2. Review of previous minutes and actions

BB confirmed acceptance of BB as Chair.

BB confirmed that CFWG ToR was agreed and adopted CFWG members. BB thanked everyone for their contributions.

BB raised that Hywind had 3 outstanding actions from previous minutes (4.1, 4.2, 4.3).

RE confirmed that over trawl surveys were not required as part of their consent, closing out 4.2.

RS queried why there was no consent condition for overtrawl if Hywind have installed an export cable, and have rock protected parts of it as that is a hazard to fishing.

RM stated that overtrawl surveys were dependent on area and fishing activity. For Hywind, no consultation responses were received requesting overtrawl surveys.

RE noted that for action 4.1 the report with subsea survey results for Hywind Scotland were forwarded to Marine Scotland 10.04.2019. The survey did not observe any scouring of the seabed around the anchor chains or anchors. No part of the export cable was exposed. Equinor would be happy to share more detailed survey results with SFF if this would be of interest.

MM stated that it was of interest as the information was key for scallop vessels and creelers, and that scalloping will not be able to coexist where there are areas of rock dump.

DB stated that Marine Scotland would be happy to receive any survey data.

RE stated that in regards to 4.3 initial contact was made with Inshore Fisheries lead Diane Buchanan 20.05.2019 with a view to consider inviting local fishermen to a workshop to discuss the findings of the operations survey. We have yet to confirm whether there would be an interest for such a meeting, and/or whether a workshop is the best approach. We are currently considering how we can most usefully share the survey results with the fishing industry e.g. through FLOWW. In addition to the issue of sharing survey results we will liaise with the Inshore Fisheries group via Diane prior to the next survey as per the wording of this action.

MM stated that consent conditions don't give a timeline for providing cable survey data.

RM queried if the SFF was requesting such a timeline to be a new license condition.

MM confirmed a timeline in the licence conditions would be welcomed by the fishing industry. MM stated that they feel the conditions are being ignored by BOWL.

RM stated that BOWL has satisfied their consent conditions in regards to their cable plan submission.

RS raised that rock dumping occurred on parts of the cable at BOWL, and while it may not be a problem for bigger boats, it will be an issue for smaller vessels. RS also noted that there are no cables on FishSafe, which shows oil and gas pipelines but not electricity cables. RS stated that he had asked all the developers how many times he could tow over cables with rock protection before all the rock protection was cleared from the cable and had received no response.

RM stated that there is an expectation from FLOWW that scallop dredging is not able to take place over rock armouring. See FLOWW draft document on cables. MS to raise with FLOWW when draft will be published.

RS stated that he couldn't say for scallops.

MM raised that the BOWL export cable does not appear to be on KISORCA.

JD stated that BOWL were aware and had chased KISORCA on this.

ACTION: JD to find out when BOWL EC will be published on KISORCA

BB stated that in regards to Action 5, while the CFWGs were not running MS set up the Bringing the Offshore Wind & Fisheries Sectors Together Meeting (BOWFST) in Dundee to try and balance good communications between sectors and concerns with stakeholder fatigue. BB suggested that the Dundee meeting may not be required and could be reviewed at the next meeting.

PM queried that as there was quite a bit of repetition with the two CFWG meetings there could be the potential to amalgamate the CFWGs and the Dundee meeting into one meeting.

RM stated that there were some issues that were site specific and that MSLOT would suggest keeping the CFWGs separate.

MM noted that if the CFWG was working there was no need for Dundee.

BB raised concerns with increasing the group size and potentially reducing the local input from FIRs.

ACTION: CFWG to review if Dundee meeting is required at next meeting

KW provided an update on ScotMer

- Research programme is aimed at filling knowledge gaps
- Specific fisheries sector
- Evidence maps are publicly available
- 12 evidence gaps identified that are ranked by priority
- Updates to the evidence maps planned to be published in March 2019
- There is potential for stakeholders to identify knowledge gaps

RM stated that this was a good opportunity to liaise with developers as one gap is identifying fishing taking place around wind farm sites. RM noted that guard vessels are on sites for extensive periods of time recording information on activity in the area. This could then potentially be supplied to MS for mapping. RM suggested that ScotMer is an item for discussion by CFWG.

DB agreed with RM's suggestion that guard vessel skippers may appreciate contributing further to raising awareness of fishing activities whilst at sea.

AT stated that guard vessels were doing work and that they are guarding assets.

MM stated that daily progress reports are issued which has a list of vessels recorded during the last 24 hours.

MS noted that fishermen have not appreciated their locations being shared previously.

ACTION: KW to email ScotMer link to CFWG members

ACTION: Developers to review potential to provide data obtained by vessels on site to ScotMer

3. MS-LOT FMMS Guidance update

RM stated that MSLOT have produced guidance to help developers produce their CFMS/FMMS. The revised draft guidance will be issued in Feb 2020 to rIFGs and the CFWG.

MM queried how MSLOT will incorporate their comments regarding the legal advice SFF obtained on how the CFWG ToR should be interpreted.

RM stated that if the CFWG cannot reach final collective agreement of the FMMS, that any disputed matter will be presented to ministers for a final decision.

MM queried who was giving the ministers advice.

RM stated that MSLOT provided advice and guidance to the ministers.

MM stated that they had serious concerns that fisheries did not have sufficient weighting in the decision making process.

DOS queried if the FMMS guidance had gone through full public consultation.

RM stated that it was not the full public consultation of three months and was available to the public for 28 days on their website. Marine Scotland will ensure that all interested parties including the membership of the CFWGs will be included in the consultation.

4. Fisheries presentation and discussion

FDB went through the SFF/SWFPA fisheries presentation and has emailed the presentation slides.

JD stated that it was very useful and queried what kind of plotters could be used to help navigate within windfarms.

FDB stated that no specific ones are suggested although there are some military plotters that are effective.

DOS noted that specific locations of turbines and cables are provided, and how would this be different to any other structure.

JW noted that the slide FDB showed a radar screen at possibly 12nm resolution, and that the image from radars can get blurry depending on seastate and weather, but that the exact locations would be seen on the vessel's plotter.

RS noted that they can get false echoes on the radar but it is clear on the plotter.

PM stated that similar issues were faced by MOD.

JW stated that some metmasts had AIS transmitters which should help determining location.

SE stated that positions for infrastructure should be available to fishermen.

JW noted that the biggest concern with KISORCA is that there was too big a gap between updates as only updated annually.

JD queried if there was potential for the group to follow up with KISORCA on obtaining more regular updates.

JW stated that FishSafe was a programme developed by OGUUK in 1997 which shows O&G infrastructure on a standalone unit and receives updates every six months.

AT stated that version 3 of FishSafe would be going live soon which would have live update capabilities, with a test unit available next week. AT stated it would be helpful if Renewables and O&G could work together to provide live updates of cables and O&G infrastructure.

SE queried why this hadn't been able to be progressed before.

JW stated that funding from OGUK had set it up and there were issues with ownership and maintenance and responsibility.

JD suggested that developers take an action to try and explore options of progressing the FishSafe with OGUK.

RS queried how often will updates be in regards to the construction of the wind farm.

PM stated that a WNoO is issued weekly for Moray East with updates on construction works.

JW stated that Kingfisher issue a fortnightly newsletter to bridge the gap between the annual update but these are not checked or read by fishermen as often as they should be.

AT stated that he heard back from Seafish regarding the status of BOWL's EC and that the information should be online next week.

JW asked MM if there has been any progress with the FishSafe systems showing cables through the SFF attendance at the ESCA group meetings.

MM stated that the issues mentioned earlier, regarding ownership and responsibility, were stumbling blocks. Because OGUK had invested and funded the work so far, they were reluctant to accept new sources of data without any contribution to the cost. This idea has not gained much traction with cables or renewables developers.

SE queried if the fishermen's safety concerns would be allayed by the FishSafe, if the developers worked to get the cables included. SE stated that the developers would be looking for middle ground with the fishermen as it would require a lot of time and investment.

MM noted that OGUK had understood that as the newest arrivals in the area it was their responsibility to ensure their presence was not a danger to others.

AT stated that it would be beneficial to all if cables and renewables were included on the FishSafe system, particularly where burial is an issue.

Action: JD to seek further information on FishSafe

RM stated that it was worth MSLOT investigating the system as well, as there is potential to change consent conditions if a pressing need is identified.

Action: RM to consider how MS-LOT could progress FishSafe

MM stated that there are different interpretation of co-existence and displacement and that co-existence should be between people and the environment. MM stated that given the current climate change emergency, fishing would be increasingly important in meeting the protein demands of the population. MM stated that providing food through fishing was probably as necessary as electric power and it was wrong that despite the precautionary principle the fishing industry had to prove that wind farms would disrupt them.

PM stated that coexistence is something that the developers are striving for and if that is not achieved, mitigation is the next step.

FDB stated that their members were looking for proof that fishing can continue within a wind farm and they were looking for confirmation that it was safe for fishing to continue inside.

RS queried how Moray East was going to prove that fishing can carry on over cables and that the fishermen needed proof that they can work in the area. RS stated that squid boats do not have the quota or gear to target other species.

PM stated that Moray East have produced the Cable Burial Risk Assessment and Cable Plans.

RS stated that any disturbed ground was a concern and reiterated that the fishermen were looking for proof that it is safe. RS noted that O&G did trawl sweeps over some of the berms

from pipeline installation, and reiterated that he still wanted to know how many tows it would take to clear the rock protection off of any cable.

PM stated that where rock protection will be applied there are commitments in relation to overtrawl surveys in the wind farm and cable route Cable Plans.

RS stated that he had spoken to PM before Moray East started their surveys, and they were looking for continued cooperation with wind farms. RS stated that the biggest issue was safety.

Action: Discussion of overtrawl surveys to be kept on agenda

FdB stated that they don't feel that there is enough science with an insufficient baseline that does not assess how things could be affected in the area after 25 years. FdB stated that having this could work in the developers favour by showing amazing effects, however, they had their doubts.

MM stated there were two levels of assessment; fish stocks and ecosystem effects.

SE stated that both are assessed in EIAs separately.

MM stated that squid is the key species in the Moray Firth and no surveys have been carried out for them.

PM stated that post-consent survey requirements are defined by the regulator.

MM stated that this is an important fishery and has not been assessed.

SE stated that surveys were required where an impact was assessed through the EIA process. SE stated all relevant species were assessed, and if no impacts were identified (as was the case for squid) further assessment is not required. SE noted that the SFF and SWFPA were requesting things that were outside of the highly standardised and widely accepted EIA process.

MM noted that these species were pointed out as early as the scoping report for the EIA, so were only trying to follow due process.

DB queried if squid surveys could be part of a community benefit project.

MM disagreed with that approach, and stated that surveys should be seen as mitigation, not as compensation¹.

RM stated that the surveys that Moray East had carried out were in relation to potential impacts on spawning cod and herring.

MM queried if there were consent conditions in relation to the cod and herring.

PM stated they had a potential herring restriction on piling activity and had to undertake surveys to provide more information on spawning cod.

MM questioned why this has not been taken forward for all species, particularly squid. MM stated that he had specifically told PM that the seine net fishing and squid fishing were key fisheries in the Moray East area.

PM responded that he recalled the discussion with Malcolm regarding squid but that surveys of squid populations was not something that had ever been requested.

SE stated that fish species are assessed separately by species and this is separate from commercial fisheries assessments.

¹ MM's revisions to draft minutes challenged by Moray East in email sent by PM on 26/02/2020: "*In EIA terms, mitigation is the implementation of measures which will reduce the severity of an identified adverse impact. Surveys simply inform baseline conditions or form part of a monitoring programme but they are not in themselves mitigation.*"

FdB stated that they wanted the developers to undertake surveys on all the key commercial fish species even if they are not consent conditions as it would improve the science baseline for all those species.

PM acknowledged that the fishing industry are keen to get more information on the squid fishery.

CM stated that there were two MS Research Vessels sitting in the harbour and is there not scope for them to carry out squid surveys?

RM queried what information can be available in regards to survey scopes for the RVs.

Action: KW to contact other colleagues in regards to survey trips

Action: Marine Scotland to review if feasible for squid surveys to be carried out as part of their survey scope

BB stated that Scotmer had no funding for surveys but that TCE have an Enabling Action fund which could be investigated. BB noted that the fund is not just for the fishing sector but potential to raise this to feed into ScotMer.

MM noted that he did not think this was available in Scotland.

PM asked if that was part of the Coastal Communities fund.

BB stated that the TCE and CES funding were separate pots

Action: BB to check funding streams for commercial fish studies

JW stated that squid fishing is a developing fishery and was started relatively recently, approximately 15 years ago. The fishery used to be predominantly nearshore, towing 100m off the shore while Smith Bank was predominantly a scallop ground.

RS stated that they had been fishing out at Smith Bank every year and probably spent around 35 days in that area.

JW asked if that had been standard throughout the 15 years or if the fishery had been moving further out each year.

RS stated that it was probably 50% effort, with probably 30 days in Moray area.

MM stated that they had details of tows of 5 vessels in the area.

JW acknowledged that there had been several vessels fishing in the Moray East area last year.

5. SFF - Final Wind Farm Mitigation document

MM stated that following the discussion of the SFF paper in the previous Forth and Tay CFWG, the SFF were reviewing it to outline exactly each requirement the fishing industry would need from the Developers and there was no point in wasting time going through the same issues without any actions.

Action: SFF/SWFPA to review the consultation paper and issue for consultation and then submit it to CFWG

6. Project updates

JD provided project update for BOWL:

- Operational last summer
- 2019 servicing campaign completed in November 2019
- Turbine servicing in November and December but has 18 weather days in relation to turbine works.
- Well established in quayside facilities in Wick.
- Spill response drills for spills from larger vessels carried out.
- Continuing with monitoring programme.
- Aerial bird survey showed little displacement so far.
- Benthic surveys planned for June 2020 in consultation with MSS and SNH.
- Currently producing marine growth and scour report following monitoring.
- Requirements for cod and sandeel survey in spring 2021

RM queried if BOWL were working on an update to their CFMS as had received some comments back.

JD stated that they can provide some updates on the CFMS to the CFWG.

RM asked for the updated CFMS to be distributed to the CFWG.

AT queried what was happening with the overtrawl survey

JD stated that approaches were going through internal review through SSE.

RS stated that it should be small local vessels that carry out overtrawl surveys and not large overpowered vessels.

RM stated that as per their consent condition BOWL have a commitment to post-construction surveys in the OFTO marine license and that these can only be changed in consultation with the fishing sector.

DB asked what issues there were with BOWL carrying out overtrawl surveys.

JD stated that BOWL could not comment at this stage as were taking legal advice.

MM commented that this underlined his earlier assertion that BOWL were ignoring the consent conditions and he would put it in writing to MS LOT.

PM gave the Moray East project update:

- Construction started May 2019
- 90% of piling completed.
- HDD at landfall now complete
- Consultation carried out in regards to transit routes to wind farm site and duct transit routes to the landfall
- Received CFMS response from MS on 9 January 2020
- Once submitted to MSLOT they will then be issued to the respondees
- Letter of intent has been sent to Mike Kaiser at Heriot-Watt University to undertake the scallop study

DB queried what the scallop study was, when the N-Viro dredge had been taken off the table and queried how much was the funding and that the IFGs hadn't been consulted. DB questioned how it was funded and if this was not money that should have been made available to the community.

MM noted that this was a consent condition and nothing to do with community benefit².

² MM's revisions challenged by Moray East in email sent by PM on 26/02/2020. The licence condition specifically states: "Should it be deemed necessary by the MFOWDG-CFWG, investigations into alternative gear for the scallop fishing industry in the Moray Firth must form part of the CFMS".

PM noted that the scallop study had been discussed at length with the SFF and SWFPA and had been brought to the CFWG since 2014 and that £200k was in place for the studies.

DB queried if Scottish Ministers were aware that this significant sum of money, volunteered by the Developer, had been allocated to a UK Project (Project UK) and questioned whether the CFWG had approved denial of local communities to benefit from such funding.

RM explained that there had been a licence condition in relation to the scallop industry, and that the proposed project went through the CFWG, which was set up to discuss these kinds of projects.

FdB repeated that the licence stated the money would be spent on the scallop industry, therefore the SFF and SWFPA, who represent the bulk of the Scottish scallop industry, had been engaging on this and consulted with the as their members were the most impacted in the area.

MM reiterated that scalloping was the main fishery affected by Moray East and that numerous discussions had been held between the scallop industry and Moray East since 2011 with the final outcome moving from gear trials to a scallop assessment.

PM expressed frustration that Marine Scotland Policy was going against fishing stakeholders and reiterated that this funding had been volunteered by Moray East to assist the scallop industry achieve the UKFIP objectives.

Action: DB and SFF/SWFPA to discuss history of scallop study

Action: PM to contact DB and SFF regarding scallop study

BB queried if another meeting would be needed for Moray East's CFMS.

RM stated that Moray East's CFMS was already signed off but they are live documents and new iterations should come through CFWG and noted that updates can be made if areas are identified that are not fit for purpose.

MM asked RM if he was saying that MSLOT are happy with Moray East's CFMS.

RM stated that it was initially presented several years ago and signed off.

MM stated that he does not agree that it follows process and that it should not be considered signed off until the CFWG fishing stakeholders had defined and finalised it.

RM stated that the CFWG would be used to define and finalise the document but not to agree it.

RS queried if there was potential for Moray East construction to be phased around the squid season during July-September this year.

PM stated that he would have to revert to the project engineers on this and that they were happy to have a meeting with technical engineers to discuss phasing to reduce any disruption to the squid fishermen.

Action: PM to discuss phasing construction to accommodate squid fishermen with technical engineers.

Action: PM to contact RS in regards to phasing

RS queried where the boulders will be relocated to during the boulder relocation works and if their location is recorded and could be provided to the fishermen.

RM queried if locations could be put in the WNoO.

Action: PM to confirm boulder relocation methodology

Action: PM to provide boulder relocation information to FIR for distribution to fishermen

DOS provided project update for Moray West:

- This is their first CFWG meeting as successful in consent in June.
- Geophysical and geotechnical surveys in 2019
- Entered into cooperation agreements with local creelers
- Future surveys upcoming with dates to be confirmed
- Updating CFMS and converting to FMMS

RM raised that Moray West should also be bringing other plans through the CFWG e.g PEMP.

RS stated that there was a lot of local knowledge available in regards to siting the cable route, and they should be contacting local trawl skippers to identify the route that will avoid key squid grounds in that area. RS stated that the cable should come into Cullen and then along the shore.

SE stated that the final route siting had not been finalised.

DOS stated that they were happy to get feedback

RS stated that the BOWL cable cuts off the end of the tows but the Moray West cable would have a much greater effect on the squid tows and the fishermen would appreciate it being taken into account.

RE provided a project update for Hywind:

- High asset performance.
- Ongoing planned maintenance activity
- NTM out for a failed navigation aid on a turbine
- Planning a cable survey in 2020
- Scallop dredging marks observed across cable.
- Lots of lessons learned regarding communications with fishermen from last survey.
- Will soon be trialing battery storage solutions

7. AOB & Next Meeting

BB stated that the FIR ToR needs to be progressed across both CFWGs and noted that some parts will be generic and some parts specific to the individual CFWGs.

MM noted that the FIR ToR needs some review.

Action: Developers to provide comments on FIR ToR (Rosie Scurr from FTCFWG to progress)

BB requested confirmation of which FIRs were being proposed for the CFWG.

CM stated that himself and Gordon Pattison were FIRs for Moray East, Moray West and BOWL, covering creels along the Moray coast. CM covering from Macduff to Cullen and GP covering from Cullen West to Burghead.

RS stated that he was representing squid fishermen.

HM was put forward as an FIR for the Caithness coast as located at Lybster harbour.

MM noted that it was a large area and that there would ideally be some more FIRs to cover.

BB queried if there any others to put forward.

MM noted that Gordon Macnab had stepped down from being put forward as FIR due to a conflict of interest.

BB stated that he would like a table outlining each FIRs name, contact details, and area or species covered and that it should also show where else an FIR is needed e.g. Scallop and Nephrops FIRs.

CM stated that it would be useful to have someone in the area of Peterhead and Fraserburgh.

JW stated that John Alexander used to attend from there.

MM noted that JA had attended when Fraserburgh was identified as the potential landfall of the export cable. Once that was no longer the case JA quite clearly stated there was no need for him to attend any further.

Action: AWG to produce FIR table

Action: AWG and JW to contact MM, FdB and DB for potential FIRs for Caithness coast, Fraserburgh/Peterhead, scallops and Nephrops.

MM suggested that once the FIR ToR is finalised, and the positions filled there should be a workshop organised for all FIRs to ensure QA, consistency of approach and that all are aware of roles and responsibilities.

BB queried the location and date of next meeting.

FdB stated that it was helpful to have both CFWG meetings back to back in June.

CM stated that Fridays were preferable for him as less likely to miss out on fishing and stated that Aberdeen was the preferred meeting location.

HM stated that Inverness was preferred as coming down from Lybster.

RS, MM and FdB expressed preference for Aberdeen.

BB concluded that the next meeting would be in Aberdeen in June 2020 and would aim for it to be on a Friday, on the same week or the week following the Forth and Tay CFWG meeting.

Summarised actions from the Moray Firth CFWG meeting minutes

Item	Action	Responsible	Open/Closed
Actions from 23 March 2019 meeting			
Item 4 (Hywind)	4.1 MF to send the post-lay survey results to MM	Monica Fundingsland (Equinor)	TBC
	4.3 MF to liaise with DB on workshop / meeting prior to the next survey	Monica Fundingsland (Equinor)	TBC
Item 7 (BOWL)	7.1 discuss overtrawl surveys at next CFWG.	Joe Deimel (SSE)	Action for next meeting
Actions from 22 January 2020 meeting			
2.1	JD to find out when BOWL EC will be published on KISORCA	Joe Deimel (BOWL)	Closed – confirmed on KISORCA on 23/01/2020
2.2	To review if Dundee meeting is required at next meeting	CFWG	Action for next meeting
2.3	KW to email ScotMer link to CFWG members	Kirsty Wright, (MSS)	TBC
2.4	Developers to review potential to provide data obtained by vessels on site to ScotMer	Moray East, Moray West, BOWL, Hywind	TBC
4.1	JD to seek further information on FishSafe	Joe Deimel (BOWL)	TBC
4.2	RM to consider how MS-LOT could progress FishSafe	Roger May (MS-LOT)	TBC
4.3	Discussion of overtrawl surveys to be kept on agenda	Bruce Buchanan (MS) / Alex Winrow-Giffin (BMM)	TBC
4.4	KW to contact other colleagues in regards to survey trips	Kirsty Wright, (MSS)	TBC
4.5	Marine Scotland to review if feasible for squid surveys to be carried out as part of their survey scope	Kirsty Wright, (MSS)	TBC
4.6	BB to check funding streams for commercial fish studies	Bruce Buchanan (MS)	TBC
5.1	SFF/SWFPA to review the consultation paper and issue for consultation and then submit it to CFWG	Malcolm Morrison (SFF) / Femke de Boer (SWFPA)	TBC
6.1	DB and SFF/SWFPA to discuss history of scallop study	Diane Buchanan (rIFG) / Malcolm Morrison (SFF) / Femke de Boer (SWFPA)	TBC

6.2	PM to contact DB and SFF/SWFPA regarding scallop study	Peter Moore (Moray East)	TBC
6.3	PM to discuss phasing construction to accommodate squid fishermen with technical engineers	Peter Moore (Moray East)	TBC
6.4	PM to contact RS in regards to phasing	Peter Moore (Moray East)	TBC
6.5	PM to confirm boulder relocation methodology	Peter Moore (Moray East)	TBC
6.6	PM to provide boulder relocation information to FIR for distribution to fishermen	Peter Moore (Moray East)	TBC
7.1	Developers to provide comments on FIR ToR (Rosie Scurr from FTCTFWG to progress)	Rosie Scurr from FTCTFWG	Closed – v3 submitted as final on 24/03/2020
7.2	AWG to produce FIR table	Alex Winrow- Giffin (BMM)	TBC
7.3	AWG and JW to contact MM, FdB and DB for potential FIRs for Caithness coast, Fraserburgh/ Peterhead, scallops and Nephrops	Alex Winrow- Giffin / John Watt (BMM)	TBC