



Marubeni



Appendix 5.1: Consultation Responses

Array EIA Report

2024

Revision	Comments	Author	Checker	Approver
FINAL	Final	RPS	RPS	RPS

Approval for Issue		
For and on behalf of Ossian OWFL	Fraser Malcolm	28 June 2024

Prepared by:	RPS Energy
Prepared for:	Ossian Offshore Wind Farm Limited (OWFL)
Checked by:	Caitlin Donald
Accepted by:	Ed Maxwell
Approved by:	Fraser Malcolm

© Copyright RPS Group Plc. All rights reserved.

The report has been prepared for the exclusive use of our client.

The report has been compiled using the resources agreed with the client and in accordance with the scope of work agreed with the client. No liability is accepted by RPS for any use of this report, other than the purpose for which it was prepared. The report does not account for any changes relating to the subject matter of the report, or any legislative or regulatory changes that have occurred since the report was produced and that may affect the report. RPS does not accept any responsibility or liability for loss whatsoever to any third party caused by, related to or arising out of any use or reliance on the report.

RPS accepts no responsibility for any documents or information supplied to RPS by others and no legal liability arising from the use by others of opinions or data contained in this report. It is expressly stated that no independent verification of any documents or information supplied by others has been made.

RPS has used reasonable skill, care and diligence in compiling this report and no warranty is provided as to the report's accuracy.

CONTENTS

1. Consultation Log1

TABLES

Table 1.1: Consultation Log Outputs from Tractivity1

1. CONSULTATION LOG

Table 1.1: Consultation Log Outputs from Tractivity

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Array Pre-Scoping					
Ornithology introduction meeting	15/06/2022	Marine Directorate – Licencing and Operations Team (MD-LOT), NatureScot, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	Virtual meeting	<p>To provide statutory consultees with an overview of the ornithological work to date, understand what they would expect to see within the Array Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Report, and to present the methods/tools proposed to be used in the EIA for their comment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NatureScot recommended that the Sectoral Marine Plan (SMP) information on population sizes is reviewed. RSPB noted that some species at sites north of the Pentland Firth have different foraging ranges and would circulate these details. NatureScot/RSPB noted they would provide advice on what is required for the ornithology interim survey report. Ossian Offshore Wind Farm Limited (Ossian OWFL) (hereafter referred to as 'the Applicant') noted they will be organising Pre-Scoping Workshops and would circulate details. 	Since receiving the Ossian Array Scoping Opinion, the offshore ornithology technical reports (volume 3, appendix 11.1 to 11.5, including annexes) and EIA chapter (volume 2, chapter 11) have been prepared following advice provided by statutory consultees.
Shipping and Navigation introduction meeting	20/06/2022	Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) and Northern Lighthouse Board (NLB)	Virtual meeting	<p>The purpose of this meeting was to provide statutory consultees with an overview of the current understanding of shipping and navigation risks in the area and present the approach to the Navigational Risk Assessment (NRA) for comment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCA and NLB were content with the approach proposed for the NRA and did not raise any differences or changes to be taken account of considering that Ossian is a floating offshore wind farm. NLB noted that additional lighting or aids to navigation were not expected considering that Ossian is a floating offshore wind farm. NLB noted that they would not advise use of the gap between the Array and the Morven Offshore Wind Farm. NLB noted that if stop/start phasing was under consideration, lighting would need to be considered. 	The NRA has been undertaken following Marine Guidance Note (MGN) 654 requirements (see volume 3, appendix 13.1). Cumulative routeing has been considered within the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1) and the Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) is presented in volume 2, chapter 13. An outline Lighting and Marking Plan (LMP) and outline Aids to Navigation Management Plan (ANMP) have been provided in volume 4, appendix 26 and volume 4, appendix 26, annex A, respectively. In addition, an outline Navigational Safety and Vessel Management Plan (NSVMP) has been presented in volume 4, appendix 24. These plans will be further developed and agreed with stakeholders to take account of the final Ossian design and construction programme.
Commercial Fisheries Introductory Meeting	21/06/2022	Scottish Fishermen's Federation (SFF) and Scottish White Fish Producers Association (SWFPA)	Virtual meeting	<p>The purpose of this meeting was to provide fisheries stakeholders with an overview of the current understanding of commercial fisheries risks in the area and present the approach to the EIA. The SWFPA and SFF raised concern related to historic 'small haddock' fishery in the area.</p>	Baseline commercial fisheries activity, including demersal otter trawl activity from 2011 to 2022, is presented in volume 2, chapter 12, section 12.7 and volume 3, appendix 12.1.
Pre-Scoping Workshop - Biological topics (Physical Processes, Benthic Subtidal Ecology, Fish and Shellfish Ecology, and Offshore Ornithology) and Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA)	14/11/2022	NatureScot, MD-LOT, Marine Directorate-Science, Evidence, Data and Digital (MD-SEDD, formerly Marine Scotland Science (MSS)) and RSPB	Virtual workshop	<p>This Pre-Scoping Workshop was held to inform statutory consultees and advisors of the progress of the Array EIA Scoping Report, with regard to biological topics and SLVIA, with the following aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> update on Ossian project and stakeholder engagement plan; approach to undertaking proportionate EIA; agreeing baseline datasets to be used to inform the Array EIA Scoping Report and Array EIA Report; setting out preliminary scoping determinations and agreeing scope of the Array EIA Scoping Report; identifying information requirements to support scoping determinations; and agreeing Likely Significant Effects (LSE²) screening criteria. 	Responses outlined in the rows below and taken into consideration within the relevant topic chapters as detailed.

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Pre-Scoping Workshop - Biological topics (Physical Processes, Benthic Subtidal Ecology, Fish and Shellfish Ecology, and Offshore Ornithology) and SLVIA (cont.)	As above	As above	Virtual workshop	Physical Processes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MD-SEDD raised their concerns that floating wind turbines could affect seasonal stratification and requested that this was included as a potential impact. 	Physical Processes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact to seasonal stratification scoped in and assessed under volume 2, chapter 7, section 7.11.
Pre-Scoping Workshop - Biological topics (Physical Processes, Benthic Subtidal Ecology, Fish and Shellfish Ecology, and Offshore Ornithology) and SLVIA (cont.)	As above	As above	Virtual workshop	Benthic Subtidal Ecology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping out effects to benthic subtidal ecology due to Suspended Sediment Concentrations (SSCs) and associated deposition, changes to physical processes, and Invasive and Non-Native Species (INNS) were discussed. No objection was raised to scoping these out subject to presentation of the information within the Array EIA Scoping Report. Scoping out effects to benthic ecology due to Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) was also discussed, with further evidence to support this provided in Table 6.5 of the Array EIA Scoping Report. Concern that the regional benthic subtidal ecology study area presented in the Array EIA Scoping Report was not sufficient to account for indirect effects was raised. 	Benthic Subtidal Ecology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts to benthic ecology due to SSCs and associated deposition, INNS, and EMFs have since been scoped into the assessment (see volume 2, chapter 8, Table 8.12). Impacts due to changes in physical processes continue to be scoped out (see volume 2, chapter 8, Table 8.13). The regional benthic subtidal ecology study area was extended southwards to take into account potential indirect effects (see volume 2, chapter 8, Figure 8.1).
Pre-Scoping Workshop - Biological topics (Physical Processes, Benthic Subtidal Ecology, Fish and Shellfish Ecology, and Offshore Ornithology) and SLVIA (cont.)	As above	As above	Virtual workshop	Fish and Shellfish Ecology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping out effects to fish and shellfish ecology due to SSCs and associated deposition, and underwater noise during operation and maintenance was discussed. MD-SEDD and NatureScot advised that these impacts should be scoped in. 	Fish and Shellfish Ecology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts to fish and shellfish ecology due to SSCs and associated deposition, and underwater noise during the operation and maintenance phase have been scoped into the assessment (volume 2, chapter 9, section 9.11).
Pre-Scoping Workshop - Biological topics (Physical Processes, Benthic Subtidal Ecology, Fish and Shellfish Ecology, and Offshore Ornithology) and SLVIA (cont.)	As above	As above	Virtual workshop	Offshore Ornithology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for NatureScot preferred use of MRSea over design-based abundance estimates where possible. NatureScot advised to follow their published guidance regarding seasonality. RSPB raised the need to consider the impacts of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI). 	Offshore Ornithology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MRSea abundance estimates have been used for assessment where available. Details on MRSea modelling are presented in volume 3, appendix 11.4. Abundance estimates based on MRSea modelling are presented in volume 3, appendix 11.1, annex B. For Collision Risk Modelling (CRM) and displacement analysis, the approach to calculating densities or abundances for assessment are described in volume 3, appendix 11.2 and volume 3, appendix 11.3, respectively. The seasons used are presented in Table 3.1 in volume 3, appendix 11.1. It should be noted that the seasons used differ slightly from the NatureScot guidance. This was discussed and agreed with NatureScot via email correspondence and a virtual meeting (see line items below from 16 February, 20 March and 27 March 2024). NatureScot advised that guidance was still being developed. The approach to HPAI taken in this report is further discussed in volume 2, chapter 11, section 11.7.6.
Pre-Scoping Workshop - Biological topics (Physical Processes, Benthic Subtidal Ecology, Fish and Shellfish Ecology, and Offshore Ornithology) and SLVIA (cont.)	As above	As above	Virtual workshop	SLVIA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the distance of the Array from the coast, no significant SLVIA effects were anticipated, therefore it was proposed that SLVIA was scoped out of Array EIA Report. NatureScot confirmed they were content with approach but expected the Array EIA Scoping Report to present justification for scoping out this impact. 	SLVIA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLVIA was presented within the Array Scoping Report (volume 3, appendix 6.1) and proposed to be scoped out of the Array EIA Report following feedback given at the pre-Scoping workshop. This topic has been scoped out of the Array EIA Report following agreement outlined within the Ossian Array Scoping Opinion (volume 3, appendix 6.2).

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Pre-Scoping Workshop - Commercial Fisheries	15/11/2022	SFF, SWFPA, North and East Coast Regional Inshore Fisheries Group (NECRIFG), MD-LOT, MD-SEDD, and NatureScot	Virtual workshop	<p>This pre-Scoping Workshop was held to inform statutory consultees and advisors of the progress of the Array EIA Scoping Report, with regard to commercial fisheries, with the following aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • update on Ossian project and stakeholder engagement plan; • approach to undertaking proportionate EIA; • agreeing baseline datasets to be used to inform the Array EIA Scoping Report and Array EIA Report; • setting out preliminary scoping determinations and agreeing scope of the Array EIA Scoping Report; and • identifying information requirements to support scoping determinations. <p>The following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration should be given to effects on the whole fleet when considering displacement. • Queried whether data from international pelagic vessels would be considered. • Noted that there has been a historic 'small haddock' fishery in the area and recommended 10 years of baseline data is considered to capture this activity. • Agreed that historically there has been potting activity in the vicinity of the Array but currently there is not much activity, and this is unlikely to resume. • Content with the consideration of long term loss or restricted access as an impact and emphasised the importance of coexistence between industries. 	<p>The CEA within volume 2, chapter 12, section 12.12 is based on geographical area and includes all International Council for the Exploration of the Seas (ICES) divisions in the North Sea. It was agreed within this Pre-Scoping Workshop that this scale was sufficient for assessment.</p> <p>Commercial fisheries data for Norwegian registered vessels was requested and presented within volume 3, appendix 12.1. In addition, surveillance data (2017 to 2022) was sought from the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) which indicated vessel activity by nationality in the vicinity of the Array. This is also presented within volume 3, appendix 12.1. Landing statistics for United Kingdom (UK) registered vessels have been considered as part of the baseline and assessment in volume 2, chapter 12 for a period of 10 years from 2011 to 2022.</p> <p>Designed in measures outlined in volume 2, chapter 12, section 12.10 consider fisheries liaison, the development and adherence to a Fisheries Mitigation and Management Strategy (FMMS) (outline provided in volume 4, appendix 23) and membership of and engagement in a Regional Commercial Fisheries Working Group in order to facilitate continued engagement and coexistence between the Applicant and commercial fisheries stakeholders.</p>
Pre-Scoping Workshop - Shipping and Navigation	15/11/2022	NLB, MCA and MD-LOT	Virtual workshop	<p>This Pre-Scoping Workshop was held to inform statutory consultees and advisors of the progress of the Array EIA Scoping Report, with regard to shipping and navigation, with the following aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • update on Ossian project and stakeholder engagement plan; • approach to undertaking proportionate EIA; • agreeing baseline datasets to be used to inform the Array EIA Scoping Report and Array EIA Report; • setting out preliminary scoping determinations and agreeing scope of the Array EIA Scoping Report; and • identifying information requirements to support scoping determinations. <p>The following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MCA confirmed that the list of hazards to be included in the NRA and methodology proposed was appropriate and acceptable. • MCA recommended that the approach to the NRA and CEA were included in the Array EIA Scoping Report. • MCA recommended MGN654 guidance should be considered for when determining appropriate width of navigational corridors. • NLB noted importance for lighting and marking at the perimeter of the Array. 	<p>The NRA has been undertaken following MGN 654 requirements (see volume 3, appendix 13.1). The methodology for the NRA, EIA and CEA was outlined in the Array EIA Scoping Report and is further discussed in volume 3, appendix 13.1, and volume 2, chapter 13, sections 13.9 and 13.12.</p> <p>Cumulative routeing has been considered within the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1) and the CEA is presented in volume 2, chapter 13.</p> <p>An outline LMP and outline ANMP has been provided in volume 4, appendix 26 and volume 4, appendix 26, annex A, respectively. In addition, an outline NSVMP has been presented in volume 4, appendix 24. This outline LMP and ANMP will be further developed and agreed with stakeholders post consent.</p>

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Pre-Scoping workshop - Marine Mammals and Subsea Noise	17/11/2022	NatureScot, MD-LOT, and MD-SEDD	Virtual workshop	<p>This Pre-Scoping Workshop was held to inform statutory consultees and advisors of the progress of the Array EIA Scoping Report, with regard to marine mammals and subsea noise, with the following aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • update on Ossian project and stakeholder engagement plan; • approach to undertaking proportionate EIA; • agreeing baseline datasets to be used to inform the Array EIA Scoping Report and Array EIA Report; • setting out preliminary scoping determinations and agreeing scope of the Array EIA Scoping Report; • identifying information requirements to support scoping determinations; and • agreeing LSE² screening criteria. <p>The following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NatureScot queried inclusion of an assessment of impacts as a result of operational noise from cables and EMFs from the floating array. • MD-SEDD advised that primary and secondary entanglement should be scoped in for the operation and maintenance phase. • NatureScot advised that scoping in the Southern Trench Nature Conservation Marine Protected Area (ncMPA) should be reconsidered when noise contours are available. • NatureScot advised that in relation to foraging distances, 20 km distance should be used for grey seals <i>Halichoerus grypus</i> for Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) because these are classed as breeding sites. • NatureScot advised that a dual metric approach is used in underwater noise modelling but also that the unweighted peak sound pressure level (SPL_{pk}) metric is used to inform the Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS) assessment and appropriate mitigation range. 	<p>The responses to issues raised are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment of impacts as a result of operational underwater noise from cables and mooring lines, primary and secondary entanglement and EMFs from dynamic cables are presented in volume 2, chapter 10, section 10.11. • Given the overlap of the modelled noise contours with the Southern Trench ncMPA, it is considered in the assessment in volume 2, chapter 10, section 10.11. • The foraging distance of 20 km has been considered in the assessment of impacts for grey seal with relation to the Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast SAC in volume 2, chapter 10, section 10.11. • Both SPL_{pk} and cumulative sound exposure level (SEL_{cum}) are considered, with the assessment of significance with regards to PTS presented in volume 2, chapter 10, section 10.11 based on SPL_{pk}.
Array Application					
Quarterly Meeting March 2023	06/03/2023	MD-LOT and NatureScot	Virtual meeting	<p>Meeting to provide updates from MD-LOT and NatureScot to the Applicant. The Applicant also delivered a project update to MD-LOT and NatureScot.</p> <p>The Applicant noted that applications for surveys/future cable consents may require licencing in Scottish and English waters and queried how this could be captured in EIA and European Protected Species (EPS) licences.</p> <p>MD-LOT noted that workshops for the Cumulative Effects Framework (CEF) tool would be held at the end March 2023. Following these it is expected that tool should be applied in project EIAs. In addition, they noted that ScotMER 2023 presentations were available on the MD-LOT YouTube channel. MD-LOT provided an update on licencing timeframes: 14 weeks for Marine Licences, 6 to 8 weeks for EPS, 4 months for Scoping Opinions. MD-LOT highlighted concerns raised over placements of Metocean and Flidar buoys by SFF/SWFPA.</p> <p>NatureScot noted updates on Guidance with 11 notes published on the NatureScot website.</p>	<p>The Applicant has acknowledged advice given at all quarterly meetings and has considered new guidance and tools where appropriate in the preparation of this Array EIA Report.</p>

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Shipping and Navigation Regular Operators Consultation	27/04/2023	Aurora Offshore, DOF Group, Dohle Group, Framar, Havila Shipping, Island Offshore, Langship, Longship, Maersk Supply Service, North Star, Reederei Gerd Ritscher, Rem Offshore, Samskip, Scotline (Intrada), Sentinel Marine, Simon Mokster Shipping, SMT Shipping, Smyril Line, Solstad Offshore, Ulstein Group, Vroon, Wilson Ship	Email sent (Document(s) issued)	Emails sent by Anatec on behalf of the Applicant to Regular Operators of the Array. Emails included a copy of a letter, produced by Anatec, requesting information/comment on how operators will navigate in the vicinity of the Array and adjacent cumulative projects during the operational phase of the project. Feedback requested by 11 May 2023.	Responses to the Regular Operators letter were received from Aurora Offshore, Scotline (Intrada), Smyril Line, Tidewater and Wilson Ship Management and are detailed in the relevant rows below. These have been considered within volume 2, chapter 13, Table 13.3, and volume 3, appendix 13.1.
Shipping and Navigation Regular Operators Consultation - Response	04/05/2023	Tidewater	Email received	Tidewater vessels within the area would be on transit and navigate well clear of any works.	Commercial route deviations and cumulative routeing are assessed in the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1). Associated impacts are assessed in volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.11.
Shipping and Navigation Regular Operators Consultation - Response	05/05/2023	Tidewater	Email received	Noted most likely route taken for vessels in transit would be north/south between the Array and Seagreen 1 Offshore Wind Farm.	
Shipping and Navigation Regular Operators Consultation - Response	09/05/2023	Scotline (Intrada)	Email received	It was noted that the presence of the Array would “ <i>affect [Scotline’s] vessel trading patterns due to reduction of sea room and on the passage from Inverness – Rochester, Inverness – Humber, Inverness – Thames and the reverse routes</i> ”.	Post wind farm routeing and adverse weather routeing have been assessed in the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1), with deviation impacts assessed in volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.11.
Shipping and Navigation Regular Operators Consultation - Response	10/05/2023	Scotline (Intrada)	Email received	Feedback on specific routes that may be taken by vessels could not be provided as this is dependent upon weather and traffic density.	
Shipping and Navigation Regular Operators Consultation - Response	10/05/2023	Smyril Line	Email received	Smyril Line noted that during poor weather they would most likely navigate around the Array. Smyril Line requested more information on coordinates and excursion limit to provide informed response. Smyril Line Cargo Company currently operate two Roll on/Roll-off (Ro-Ro) vessels that transit this area two times every week all year round, with a total of four transits for both vessels every week. Route for both vessels is Faroe Islands-Iceland-Rotterdam.	Commercial route deviations and cumulative routeing are assessed in the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1). Associated impacts are assessed in volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.11.
Shipping and Navigation Regular Operators Consultation - Response	15/05/2023	Aurora Offshore	Email received	Aurora Offshore noted that their usual stance is to avoid navigating within wind farms. “ <i>As Ossian is a floating field with a 1000m spacing distance, Aurora Offshore would have no objections sailing internally within the array – as long as the ENC charts and sailing directions in the area allows it. Capt. Eugene also noted that it is clear that sailing within the array is something Aurora Offshore would have to do in order to avoid additional voyage lengths as this would be extra cost and extra emissions on behalf of their clients.</i> ”	Post wind farm routeing has been assessed in the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1), with deviation impacts assessed in volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.11.
Shipping and Navigation Regular Operators Consultation - Response	15/05/2023	Wilson Ship Management	Email received	Wilson Ship Management responded noting general feedback that there would be minimal impact for Wilson Ship Management. Wilson Ship Management also noted “ <i>we would ask our navigators to plan voyages around the area, not sailing in between, while transiting. While entering ports in the area, we would prefer sailing between cumulative arrays</i> ”. Queries raised around development of emergency preparedness and emergency anchoring.	Commercial route deviations and cumulative routeing are assessed in the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1). Associated impacts and the risk related to interactions between anchors and subsea cables are assessed in volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.11.
Shipping and Navigation Regular Operators Consultation - Response	16/05/2023	Wilson Ship Management	Email received	Wilson Ship Management noted that the gaps between the Array and Morven Offshore Wind Farm, and the Array and Bellrock Offshore Wind Farm “ <i>would not be their preferred transit route through the area to the reduce the risk</i> ”. Based on Wilson Ship Management’s normal routes in the area, “ <i>sailing through the Morven-Ossian-Bellrock will be limited while transiting in normal trade</i> ”.	

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Shipping and Navigation Regular Operators Consultation - Response	16/05/2023	Smyril Line	Email received	<p>"For us to go between the Windmill parks or we have to adjust our route a bit to the west, is no big deal [sic]."</p> <p>It "will not make any big different [sic]."</p>	Commercial route deviations and cumulative routeing are assessed in the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1). Associated impacts are assessed in volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.11.
Shipping and Navigation Regular Operators Consultation - Response	17/05/2023	Smyril Line	Email received	<p>Smyril Line noted on review of coordinates the Array will have "no impact on vessel movements and the vessels will navigate as normal with no changes in route network".</p> <p>It was also noted "the Morven north and south, is right on your [sic] current routes. But when this project starts the vessel will sail in between the two wind farms and it will not be necessary to go inside the wind farms themselves".</p> <p>Smyril Line provided a chart showing Smyril Line routes, noting that vessels will only change routes slightly when using the gap between the Array and Morven Offshore Wind Farm to avoid the Morven project boundary - "Little to no extra distance will be added to our routes".</p> <p>"Bellrock – Ossian – Morven S N. Will have very minimal to no impact on the Smyril Line Cargo Company's ships".</p>	Commercial route deviations and cumulative routeing are assessed in the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1). Associated impacts are assessed in volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.11.
Introduction and Approach to EIA	14/06/2023	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	Virtual meeting	<p>Meeting held to introduce the Array and the wider Ossian project to HES, provide a project update and discuss cultural heritage considerations for the Array EIA Report. Advice was sought from HES on whether they would review marine archaeology technical reports in order to advise whether marine archaeology can be scoped out as an EIA chapter.</p> <p>HES noted that, as standard, it is the expectation of HES that a marine archaeology chapter would be included as part of the Array EIA Report.</p>	The procedure for scoping out marine archaeology was clarified and the marine archaeology technical report and outline Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (PAD) were provided to HES for consultation (see correspondence on 16 October 2023). The final decision was taken that marine archaeology should not be scoped out of the Array EIA Report on the basis of further correspondence received 19 December 2023; therefore, this has been provided in volume 2, chapter 19.
Ossian Project Update Meeting with MCA	25/07/2023	MCA	Virtual meeting	<p>Virtual meeting with the MCA to provide an update on the Ossian project, the shipping and navigation EIA and NRA, and discuss key points from their Scoping representation. Key issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General discussions were held on the cumulative scenario, in particular around distances to nearby developments. • Confirmed limited concern with use of High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) interconnector cables in the Array in terms of potential EMF effects. • Confirmed content with study areas and data collection. 	<p>The approach to data collection, shipping and navigation study areas and NRA approach is as agreed with the MCA and is detailed in volume 2, chapter 13, sections 13.3 and 13.6, and volume 3, appendix 13.1.</p> <p>Summary of the outputs from the Hazard Workshop are discussed within the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1) and volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.5.</p>
Ossian Project Update Meeting with UK Chamber of Shipping (UKCoS)	31/07/2023	UKCoS	Virtual meeting	<p>Virtual meeting with the UKCoS to provide an introduction and update on the Ossian project, the shipping and navigation EIA and NRA, and discuss key points from their Scoping representation.</p> <p>Key issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General discussions were held on the cumulative scenario, in particular around distances to nearby developments. • Confirmed content with study areas and data collection. 	The approach to data collection, shipping and navigation study areas and NRA approach is as agreed with the UKCoS and is detailed in volume 2, chapter 13, sections 13.3 and 13.6, and volume 3, appendix 13.1.
Ossian Project Update Meeting with NLB	08/08/2023	NLB	Virtual meeting	<p>Virtual meeting with the NLB to provide an update on the Ossian project, the shipping and navigation EIA and NRA, and discuss key points from their Scoping representation.</p> <p>Key issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General discussions were held on the cumulative scenario, in particular around distances to nearby developments. • Indicated preference for consistency in width of any navigable areas between wind farms. • Noted that a scenario where a turbine with a marine light was towed away from the Array for maintenance would need further discussion through the LMP process. • Confirmed content with study areas and data collection. 	<p>The approach to data collection, shipping and navigation study areas and NRA approach is as agreed with the NLB and is detailed in volume 2, chapter 13, sections 13.3 and 13.6, and volume 3, appendix 13.1.</p> <p>Cumulative routeing has been considered within the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1) and the CEA is presented in volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.12.</p> <p>Lighting and marking in agreement with NLB has been included as a designed in measure (see volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.10). An outline LMP has been provided in volume 4, appendix 26.</p>

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Ossian Project Introduction	16/08/2023	Scottish Pelagic Fishermen's Association Ltd (SPFA)	Email sent	Contact made with SPFA to introduce Ossian project, suggest a formal introductory meeting and provide invite to the Hazard Workshop.	Brief summary of project design provided. Noted that the application is for the Array only and highlighted submission date. Link to the Array EIA Scoping Report provided.
Hazard Workshop	31/08/2023	BP, Forth Ports, Port of Aberdeen, MCA, NLB, Royal Yachting Association (RYA) Scotland/Cruising Association, SFF, SPFA, SWFPA, UKCoS; and Wilson Ship Management, Morven Offshore Wind Farm.	In person workshop	<p>Hazard Workshop held in person at the Sheraton Grand Hotel, Edinburgh, and online via Teams. Workshop held to discuss key maritime hazards associated with the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning of the Array. The following key points were raised by consultees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of cumulative routeing would be important for the NRA. General consensus that on a cumulative basis, vessels choosing not to navigate in proximity to Ossian would likely pass further inshore. • Agreed minutes state that “vessels using potential corridors in the area formed on a cumulative basis are likely to be relatively low” and “large open areas are more important than multiple small cumulative corridors”. • General consensus that the gap between Bellrock Offshore Wind Farm and the Array would most likely be used by oil and gas vessels. • The importance of marine lights and addressing outages was noted. • The importance of marine coordination and Vessel Management Plans (VMPs) was noted. • Consideration should be given to future traffic. • Emphasised the importance of marking structures on Electronic Chart Display and Information Systems, including depths and sizes of subsea hazards. • The risk to transiting vessels was considered unlikely from catenary mooring lines given how close large vessels would need to be to turbines to risk interaction. • Fishing vessels up to 24 m would likely keep a clearance of around 250 m to 300 m, larger fishing vessels such as 70 m to 90 m pelagic vessels would likely keep a 500 m clearance and would be unlikely to transit through the Array. • Fishing vessel activity broadly well represented in the Automatic Identification System (AIS) datasets presented. • Non-AIS recreational vessels were considered unlikely to transit so far offshore, however, those on AIS were a good representation of overall activity. 	<p>The issues raised have been considered within the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1) and associated impacts are assessed in volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.11.</p> <p>Within volume 3, appendix 13.1, data sources are considered in section 5, the future case vessel traffic is considered in section 13, cumulative routeing is considered in section 14.2, the risk assessment in section 16 considers underkeel clearance and clearance distances between vessels and the Array infrastructure and designed in measures (embedded mitigation) is considered in section 18.</p> <p>In addition, an outline NSVMP and an outline LMP have been presented in volume 4, appendices 24 and 26, respectively.</p>
Digital Aerial Survey (DAS) 2 Year Survey Report	31/08/2023	NatureScot and MD-LOT	Email sent (Document(s) issued)	The Applicant issued the final 2 Year DAS Report (prepared by HiDef) to seek advice/comment from NatureScot. The Applicant noted the data presented would be applied to the wider EIA work, including application within the MRSea model.	NatureScot issued a response on 10 October 2023. Further consultation has been undertaken through the provision of Marine Mammal and Offshore Ornithology specific consultation notes (volume 3, appendix 5.1, annexes D, E and F).
Quarterly Meeting - September 2023	05/09/2023	MD-LOT	Virtual meeting	<p>MD-LOT Quarterly meeting agenda:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project update; 2. MS-LOT update; and 3. NatureScot update (where available). <p>Ossian project information form submitted to MD-LOT on 29 August 2023.</p>	The Applicant has acknowledged advice given at all quarterly meetings and has considered new guidance and tools where appropriate in the preparation of this Array EIA Report.

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Consultation letters issued to aviation stakeholders	05/09/2023	NATS, Ministry of Defence – Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD-DIO), Safeguarding – Aberdeen International Airport, MCA, Aberdeen International Airport helicopter operators (Bristow, OHS, NHV and CHC Helicopters)	Email sent (Document(s) issued)	Consultation letter sent to each aviation stakeholder providing a summary of the Array project description and aviation stakeholder responses on the Array EIA Scoping Report. Offered opportunity for further consultation with aviation stakeholders to discuss the Array if required.	Responses received from NATS, MOD-DIO and Aberdeen International Airport – Safeguarding requesting meetings for further discussion. These are detailed below, and the outcomes of these meetings have been considered in volume 2, chapter 14. The MCA highlighted that engagement with helicopter operators engaged in support of the hydrocarbon industry should be completed. This is considered in volume 2, chapter 14, Table 14.11 section 14.11. Bristow Helicopters also responded. The Array is located outside of the Helicopter Main Route Indicators (HMRI) offshore route structure, so operations supporting offshore oil and gas recovery are unlikely to be affected on a day to day basis. This is considered in volume 2, chapter 14, sections 14.7 and 14.11.
Introductory meeting with the Scottish Pelagic Fishermen's Association Ltd.	05/09/2023	SPFA	Virtual meeting	This meeting was held to provide the SPFA with an introduction to the Array and the wider Ossian project. The commercial fisheries baseline was also presented and discussed at this meeting and discussion of pelagic trawl fishing activity in and around the Array was held. SPFA confirmed that the Array is not considered to be key pelagic trawl grounds, although noted a short herring season in the summer that operates within the commercial fisheries local study area, but not specifically within the Array.	Baseline commercial fisheries activity, including pelagic trawl activity, is presented in volume 2, chapter 12, section 12.7 and volume 3, appendix 12.1. Potential impacts to pelagic fisheries including the seasonal herring fishery are assessed in the impact assessment in volume 2, chapter 12, section 12.11
Marine Mammals and Underwater Noise Consultation	13/09/2023	NatureScot and MD-LOT	Email sent (Document(s) issued)	The Applicant contacted NatureScot and MD-LOT to arrange a meeting to discuss marine mammals and underwater noise. The Applicant issued consultation materials (PowerPoint slide deck on marine mammals and underwater noise methodology) for information prior to arrangement of this meeting.	NatureScot issued a response on the Marine Mammal Methodology Note and Underwater Noise Note on 27 September 2023. Further consultation was undertaken through issuing of the Marine Mammal Consultation Note 1 and 2 (volume 3, appendix 5.1, annexes D and E; see below advice received 24 January 2024 and 08 March 2024). Feedback was taken into consideration within volume 2, chapter 10.
Marine Mammals and Underwater Noise Consultation	13/09/2023	NatureScot	Email received	NatureScot acknowledged the receipt of the consultation materials (PowerPoint slide deck on marine mammals and underwater noise methodology), noting that due to resourcing constraints, feedback would be provided in writing, rather than via a dedicated meeting.	The Marine Mammal Methodology Note and Underwater Noise Methodology Note can be viewed in volume 3, appendix 5.1, annex B and C, respectively.
Marine Mammal Methodology Note and Underwater Noise Methodology Note	19/09/2023	NatureScot and MD-LOT	Email sent (Document(s) issued)	The Applicant issued a Marine Mammal Methodology Note (volume 3, appendix 5.1, annex B) and Underwater Noise Methodology Note (volume 3, appendix 5.1, annex C) to NatureScot and MD-LOT in place of a dedicated meeting on consultees' request.	
Issue of Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)	27/09/2023	MD-LOT, NatureScot, Natural England, RSPB, MCA, NLB, UKCoS, RYA Scotland, Cruising Association, SFF, SWFPA, SPFA, NECRIFG, NATS, MOD-DIO, Safeguarding - Aberdeen Airport, HES, and Marine Analytical Unit (MAU)	Email sent (Document(s) issued)	The SEP was issued to various consultees and stakeholders to seek feedback on proposed consultation time frames.	Feedback was provided by stakeholders, as detailed in line items below (see 'SEP feedback' provided on 29 September, 02-04 October, and 11 October 2023).
Marine Mammal Methodology Note and Underwater Noise Methodology Note – NatureScot feedback	27/09/2023	NatureScot	Email received	NatureScot were broadly content with the methodology notes but advised that the most precautionary of the available species densities should be used.	Further consultation was undertaken through issuing of the Marine Mammal Consultation Note 1 and 2 (volume 3, appendix 5.1, annexes D and E; see below advice received 24 January 2024 and 08 March 2024). Feedback was taken into consideration within volume 2, chapter 10. The Marine Mammal Methodology Note and Underwater Noise Methodology Note can be viewed in volume 3, appendix 5.1, annex B and C, respectively.
SEP feedback	29/09/2023	RYA Scotland	Email received	RYA Scotland provided feedback on the SEP, noting that references to RYA should be updated to RYA Scotland throughout the SEP.	Incorporated in SEP.
SEP feedback	02/10/2023	NLB	Email received	The NLB provided feedback on the SEP, noting a typo in dates presented in section 2.1.1, para 22. However, NLB are content with the SEP, assuming the dates presented are within 2024, rather than 2023.	Incorporated in SEP
Project Introduction and Invitation to Engage	03/10/2023	Met Office	Email sent (Document(s) issued)	It was identified that the weather radar at Hill of Dudwick, Aberdeenshire is 96 km from the north-west of the Array. The Met Office were contacted to introduce the project and invite them to engage on the proposal.	Response received, refer to line item detailing response received on 05 October 2023.

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
SEP feedback	03/10/2023	Marine Directorate	Email received	MD-LOT acknowledged receipt of the SEP and provided feedback. MD-LOT noted that they were encouraged to see the level of engagement the Applicant are committing to and support the early level of engagement approach that the Applicant has undertaken. MD-LOT requested that they are copied into any relevant correspondences between the Applicant and stakeholders going forward to ensure MD-LOT are kept up to date with any developments.	Acknowledged; MD-LOT have been copied into communications as appropriate and progress updates provided at quarterly meetings.
SEP feedback	04/10/2023	Natural England	Email received	Natural England provided feedback on the SEP, noting that they would welcome engagement through their DAS contract regarding ornithology and subsea noise and marine mammal related matters. Specific questions or specific advice on other English impacts can be taken on a case-by-case basis.	Response acknowledged.
Project Introduction and Invitation to Engage – Met Office Response	05/10/2023	Met Office	Email received	The Met Office confirmed the proposal won't have any impact on the radar operations or data and products derived from it due to the distance and elevational difference between the radar equipment and turbines.	Response noted and acknowledged in volume 2, chapter 14. No further consultation undertaken.
Digital Aerial Survey (DAS) 2 Year Survey Report - Response	10/10/2023	NatureScot	Email received	NatureScot provided comment on the 2 Year DAS Report, noting that the feedback was in relation to ornithology only. NatureScot noted concern over the low numbers of auks (especially guillemots <i>Uria aalge</i>) recorded during the July/August dispersal period in 2021 relative to 2022, suggesting that the auk wreck of Autumn 2021 may have influenced numbers recorded. NatureScot suggested that either additional DAS was undertaken across similar dates, or to undertake a review of available data from other East coast wind farm sites. NatureScot also advised that seasons are defined as per their guidance note (NatureScot, 2020 ¹). NatureScot also acknowledged that the DAS for the Array was undertaken during the HPAI outbreak and noted that they would continue to engage on this matter.	Further consultation has been undertaken through the provision of the Offshore Ornithology Consultation Note (volume 3, appendix 5.1, annex F), issued 15 December 2023. Feedback has been taken into consideration in volume 2, chapter 11.
Post-Hazard Workshop Meeting	10/10/2023	MCA, NLB and UKCoS	Virtual meeting	General discussions were held on the cumulative scenario, in particular around distances to nearby developments. MCA and NLB confirmed content with the distance between the Array and Bellrock Offshore Wind Farm.	Further consultation has been undertaken with consultees on the cumulative scenario. Further meetings were held, and advice provided by MCA (on behalf of MCA, NLB and UKCoS) on 04 June 2024. Cumulative routeing has been considered within the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1) and the CEA is presented in volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.12.
SEP feedback	11/10/2023	HES	Email received	HES noted that the timescale for consultation (review of Marine Archaeology Technical Report and WSI/PAD in December 2023) was unrealistic due to resourcing constraints over Christmas and New Year.	The Applicant clarified that the timescale for review was October to December 2023 and the proposed consultation in December 2023 was an indicative meeting placeholder in which to discuss their feedback on the Technical Report and WSI/PAD.
Issue of Draft Marine Archaeology Technical Report and WSI/PAD	16/10/2023	HES	Email sent (Document(s) issued)	The Marine Archaeology Technical Report and WSI/PAD were issued to HES (as discussed in meeting on 14 June 2023) to seek feedback and confirmation that an EIA chapter for Marine Archaeology was not required.	HES issued a response on 19 December 2023 outlining their feedback on the Technical Report and WSI/PAD.
Consultation letters issued to aviation stakeholders – response	27/10/2023	NATS	Email received	NATS advised the Array will impact the Perwinnes Primary Surveillance Radar (PSR). The Allanshill PSR does not have the range to provide infill, therefore the mitigation available would be a blank from Perwinnes and application to the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) for an airspace change and the provision of a Transponder Mandatory Zone (TMZ).	NATS confirmed adverse impact to Perwinnes PSR. This has been considered in volume 2, chapter 14, section 14.11. A meeting was organised to discuss their response further.

¹ NatureScot (2020). *Seasonal Periods for Birds in the Scottish Marine Environment*. Available at: <https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2020-10/Guidance%20note%20-%20Seasonal%20definitions%20for%20birds%20in%20the%20Scottish%20Marine%20Environment.pdf>. Accessed on: 05 April 2024.

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Percussive Piling Noise Modelling	09/11/2023	NatureScot	Email sent	To seek NatureScot advice on the underwater noise modelling approach, following the Scoping Opinion response and publication of the ScotMER report on Energy Conversion Factors (ECF) in Underwater Radiated Sound from Marine Piling ² . The Applicant sought clarity on whether NatureScot would advise a point source model was used (noting that this was not recommended within the ScotMER ECF paper ²) or if a line source model should be used for underwater noise modelling. The Applicant had previously consulted on an approach which used the point source model and requested feedback on whether they should change their approach to align with the ScotMER ECF approach ² .	NatureScot issued a response to this request on 06 December 2023, The Applicant commenced noise modelling in advance of receiving this advice and proceeded with a line source model only (as per the recommendation in the ScotMER ECF paper ²). This is described in volume 3, appendix 10.1.
Hazard Log Response	14/11/2023	MCA	Email received	The MCA provided suggested score changes and comments relating to the realistic/most likely consequences section of the Hazard Log.	The outputs of the Hazard Workshop, including the Hazard Log are considered within the NRA in volume 3, appendix 13.1.
Project Introduction with MOD-DIO	21/11/2023	MOD-DIO	Virtual meeting	Meeting held with MOD-DIO via Teams to provide an update on the Array and wider Ossian project, present results of radar Line of Sight (LoS) for Remote Radar Heads (RRHs) Buchan and Brizlee Wood Air Defence Radar (ADR) and discuss any additional concerns.	No additional concerns raised by MOD-DIO, stating that they had checked the operating parameters of Practice and Exercise Area (PEXA) D613 and had no concerns. The assessment of impacts on RRHs Buchan and Brizlee Wood ADRs is addressed in volume 2, chapter 14, section 14.11.
eDNA Survey - Technical Note	21/11/2023	NatureScot	Email sent (Document(s) issued)	Consultation note issued to seek advice on the need to undertake eDNA surveys.	Feedback from NatureScot issued 24 January 2024. The eDNA Note issued can be viewed in volume 3, appendix 5.1, annex A. As agreed by NatureScot, eDNA surveys were not carried out within the Array to inform the baseline (detailed in volume 2, chapter 8 and volume 3, appendix 8.1)
Quarterly Call December 2023	05/12/2023	Marine Directorate	Virtual meeting	Quarterly call with MDLOT to provide a project update and receive MDLOT update.	The Applicant has acknowledged advice given at all quarterly meetings and has considered new guidance and tools where appropriate in the preparation of this Array EIA Report.
Percussive Piling Noise Modelling	06/12/2023	NatureScot	Email received	NatureScot issued the following advice in response to the Applicant's query (issued 09 November 2023): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"If Ossian's noise modelling has commenced using a line source model – then please proceed with this approach;</i> • <i>If Ossian's noise modelling has commenced using a point source model – please complete that, but also undertake a second modelling exercise using a line source model. This will enable the outputs to be compared and contrasted, and as it would represent the first application post-publication of the ScotMER report it would offer an important learning opportunity."</i> 	The Applicant had commenced noise modelling in advance of receiving this advice and proceeded with a line source model only. This is described in volume 3, appendix 10.1.
Socio Economic Assessment - Ossian Offshore Wind Farm EIA	13/12/2023	Aberdeen City Council, Aberdeenshire Council, Angus Council, Dundee City Council, Energy Transition Zone Ltd., Forth Ports, Highland Council, Highlands and Islands Enterprise, Scottish Enterprise, and University of the Highlands and Islands	Email sent (Document(s) issued)	A letter was written to each stakeholder, summarising the proposed approach to assessing socio-economic impacts, including the economic and social impacts to be considered.	Comments were sought on the approach, the impacts to be included and any comments on the socio-economic impacts particularly relevant to the geographic areas that stakeholder organisations are responsible. Responses received from Scottish Enterprise and Dundee City Council as detailed below.
Aviation EIA meeting with Safeguarding - Aberdeen International Airport	13/12/2023	Safeguarding - Aberdeen International Airport	Virtual meeting	Meeting held with Aberdeen International Airport via Teams to provide an update on the Array and wider Ossian project. Discussed the requirement of an Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP) assessment and predicted impact to the Allanshill and Perwinnes PSRs.	No additional concerns were raised by Aberdeen International Airport Safeguarding. The assessment of impacts on Aberdeen International Airport operations are discussed in volume 2, chapter 14, section 14.11. The IFP assessment for the Array is presented in volume 3, appendix 14.1, annex A. Following this meeting, NATS confirmed that the Allanshill PSR will not be affected by the Array, and it was agreed this could be scoped out of the Array EIA Report (27 March 2024).
Ossian EIA Marine Mammal Approach Note 1	15/12/2023	NatureScot and MD-LOT	Email sent (Document(s) issued)	Marine Mammal Consultation Note 1 (volume 3, appendix 5.1, annex D) issued, which provides further detail on the proposed approach to assessment of impacts on marine mammal receptors. Feedback sought from consultees.	Feedback from NatureScot was received 24 January 2024 and is presented below. This feedback was taken into consideration in volume 2, chapter 10.

² Wood, M.A., Ainslie, M.A., and Burns, R.D.J. (2023). *Energy Conversion Factors in Underwater Radiated Sound from Marine Piling: Review of the method and recommendations*. Document 03008, Version 1.2. Technical report by JASCO Applied Sciences for Marine Scotland.

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Offshore Ornithology Consultation Note	15/12/2023	NatureScot	Email sent (Document(s) issued)	This consultation note set out the proposed assessment approaches and raised proposed deviations from existing NatureScot guidance and/or scoping opinions with regard to offshore ornithology.	Feedback from NatureScot was received 06 February 2024 and is presented below. This feedback was taken into consideration in volume 2, chapter 11. The Ornithology Consultation Note can be viewed in volume 3, appendix 5.1, annex F.
Feedback provided by HES on the Marine Archaeology WSI/PAD and Technical Report	19/12/2023	HES	Email received	HES requested that a marine archaeology chapter should be included within the EIA Report and submitted with the application. HES disagreed that marine archaeology should be scoped out of the EIA and provided advice on the marine archaeology technical report and outline WSI/PAD including the study area extent, potential aviation losses and potential correlations between known wrecks and recorded losses.	An additional 5 km 'recorded losses study area' was implemented for recorded losses only (including both maritime and aviation records). The recorded losses study area is shown in volume 2, chapter 19, Figure 19.1 and the results of this expanded search are provided in volume 2, chapter 19, section 19.7.3. Reference has been made to the potential for aviation archaeology to be encountered in volume 2, chapter 19, section 19.7.3. The results of the desktop study (volume 2, chapter 19, section 19.7.4) and the assessment of site-specific data (volume 2, chapter 19, section 19.7.5) includes references to the possible correlations between the known wrecks on the seabed and the recorded losses from the area, based on their reported lengths and observed dimensions.
Socio-economics meeting	10/01/2024	Dundee City Council	Virtual meeting	Meeting with Dundee City Council to discuss socio-economics letter. Dundee City Council welcomed the economic opportunities that could arise for the City of Dundee and indicated that the Council would do what it could do to assist the Applicant in maximising the economic impacts for the City. The Council recognised that the scale of the local benefits would depend to a large extent on decisions yet to be made on the construction port(s) and the operation and maintenance port(s). If the Port of Dundee is selected, this would be welcomed by the Council. The potential for any negative effects was discussed, and it was noted that any activities taking place in the Port of Dundee was unlikely to impact on tourism, since there is a clear physical separation of even the waterside tourism assets in Dundee	Volume 2, chapter 18 takes these points into account, however, it should be noted that at the time of writing, construction and operation and maintenance ports are not known.
Meeting with SFF and SWFPA	15/01/2024	SFF and SWFPA	Virtual meeting	Meeting held to provide an update on the Array and the commercial fisheries baseline data collation, including landings statistics with an extended timeline of 2011 to 2022. SWFPA queried if Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data is available for the years before 2016.	Volume 2, chapter 12, Figure 12.6 presents long term landing trends for key species including haddock, and volume 3, appendix 12.1 includes VMS data for UK registered vessels ≥ 15 m length from 2011 to 2020. Information on the upcoming virtual exhibition was circulated to attendees following the meeting by the Applicant.
eDNA Survey - Technical Note	24/01/2024	NatureScot	Email received	NatureScot responded on the eDNA Survey Consultation note (issued 21 November 2023) with agreement that they were not required for the baseline of the Array EIA.	The eDNA Note issued can be viewed in volume 3, appendix 5.1, annex A. As agreed by NatureScot, eDNA surveys were not carried out within the Array to inform the baseline (detailed in volume 2, chapter 8 and volume 3, appendix 8.1)

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Ossian EIA Marine Mammal Approach Note 1 - Response	24/01/2024	NatureScot	Email received	<p>Marine Mammal Consultation Note 1 (volume 3, appendix 3.1, annex D) summarised the updated underwater noise modelling methodology for piling and the use of a linear model. Feedback from NatureScot is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NatureScot were content that the updated methodology was broadly in line with the JASCO recommendations, however, were unable to confirm whether the proposed methodology was robust and advised that further advice is sought from MD-SEDD, via MD-LOT. NatureScot were content that the note summarised findings of the site-specific DAS and telemetry study and the presentation of species taken forward to assessment, with density and abundance estimates. NatureScot were content with the species-specific density estimates for harbour porpoise <i>Phocoena phocoena</i> (calculated based on DAS data), white-beaked dolphin <i>Lagenorhynchus albirostris</i> (based on Lacey <i>et al.</i> (2022)³) and grey seal <i>Halichoerus grypus</i> (derived from Carter <i>et al.</i> (2022)⁴ maps). NatureScot requested justification for a less precautionary estimate selected for minke whale. NatureScot requested clear justification for the correction factors used in calculating density estimates for agreement prior to submission of the Array EIA Report. NatureScot were content with the approach for the inclusion of Moray Firth SAC as part of the designated sites assessed within the EIA and Habitat Regulations Appraisal (HRA) and deferred to advice from Natural England on Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast SAC and Southern North Sea SAC. NatureScot were content with the list of impacts scoped in and confirmed the approaches to Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) clearance, vessel noise, and geophysical surveys were as expected. 	<p>Marine Mammal Consultation Note 1 issued can be viewed in volume 3, appendix 5.1, annex D.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underwater noise modelling is presented in detail in volume 3, appendix 10.1, with a summary of marine mammal and underwater noise presented in volume 2, chapter 10. Advice was sought from MD-SEDD, no confirmation of approach was received, however, the approach applied is considered appropriate on the basis of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommended ScotMER Report was considered by underwater noise specialists, and, following potential highlighted issues with representing piling as a point source, a line source model was used for the Array. The updated noise modelling methodology was presented to NatureScot, and confirmed the line source model was the correct approach to use. The ScotMER report also identified that noise modelling based on ECFs is prone to significant errors. Therefore, the methodology for the assessment of underwater noise for the Array does not include the use of conversion factors and uses the von Pein <i>et al.</i> (2022)⁵ methodology, and NatureScot response to the Underwater Noise Methodology Note (volume 3, appendix 5.1, annex C) stated “seems to be an improvement on the conversion factors approach”. For harbour porpoise, a site-specific DAS density estimate has been taken forward to the assessment, with the justification for densities taken forward to the assessment provided for each species in volume 3, appendix 10. Further justification for minke whale <i>Balaenoptera acutorostrata</i> density estimates was provided in Marine Mammal Consultation Note 2 (see below), and the density estimate from Lacey <i>et al.</i> (2022)³ was agreed with NatureScot. Justification for densities taken forward to the assessment is provided in detail for each species in volume 3, appendix 10.2, which includes the baseline data sources presented in the Array EIA Scoping Report, and a summary of the species-specific densities used in the assessment is presented in volume 2, chapter 10. Details of the correction factors used in calculating density estimates for harbour porpoise from DAS data were provided in Marine Mammal Consultation Note 2 (see below). NatureScot confirmed they were content with the approach for the Array following the further justification. Species-specific densities taken forward to the assessment are presented in volume 2, chapter 10 with a detailed baseline for each species given in volume 3, appendix 10.2, and includes baseline data sources presented in the Array EIA Scoping Report. SACs considered in the Array EIA Report are presented in volume 2, chapter 10 and are taken forward to the assessment in volume 2, chapter 10, section 10.11. Moray Firth, Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast SAC and Southern North Sea SAC were presented in the Array EIA Scoping Report for consideration in the EIA Report and Report to Information Appropriate Assessment (RIAA). Effects scoped in are assessed in volume 2, chapter 10, section 10.11, with impacts scoped out of the assessment detailed in volume 2, chapter 10, section 10.8.2. The effect of operational noise, disturbance due to pre-construction and geophysical surveys and EMF were initially scoped out in the Array EIA Scoping Report but have been included following the Scoping Opinion feedback from MD-LOT and NatureScot and are assessed in volume 2, chapter 10, section 10.11.

³ Lacey, C., Gilles, A., Börjesson, P., Herr, H., Macleod, K., Ridoux, V., Santos, M. B., Scheidat, M., Teilmann, J., Sveegaard, S., Vingada, J., Viquerat, S., Øien, N. and Hammond, P. S. (2022). *Modelled density surfaces of cetaceans in European Atlantic waters in summer 2016 from the SCANS-III aerial and shipboard surveys*. SCANS-III project report 2. University of St Andrews. UK pp.31.

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Response to Socio-economics Stakeholder Engagement Letter	02/02/2024	Scottish Enterprise	Email received	<p>Written response from Scottish Enterprise to provide feedback on the Socio-economics letter issued.</p> <p>Scottish Enterprise provided advice on the considerations that it would take into account when considering impact on the Scottish economy, whilst recognising that the Applicant has a wide range of potential stakeholders. The considerations are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metrics: quantitative measures could include gross jobs created, gross value added (GVA) and tax take. • Ranges and scenarios: consider the range of benefits by considering commitment and ambitions levels. • Displacement: competition and displacement should be considered. • Multipliers: direct, indirect and induced effects should be considered. • Spatial impacts: anticipate that it may be easier to estimate impacts at the UK and Scottish levels, and more challenging at the local level where Scottish suppliers, construction and operation bases have yet to be determined. • Clarity for assumptions and limitations: it may be useful to make clear what assumptions have been made to inform calculations. • Timing and impact period: it may be helpful to understand the scale of impacts associated with different aspects (construction, operation and maintenance, decommissioning phases) to understand how impacts build up over time. • Supporting research: the Scottish Government, via ClimateXchange, has commissioned work regarding future monitoring and evaluation of supply chain content and associated economic impacts for Scotland's offshore wind farms. 	<p>These points have been taken into account within the assessment undertaken in volume 2, chapter 18, and within volume 3, appendix 18.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metrics: gross jobs created and gross GVA have been used as measures, but the tax take has not been considered since this will depend on future government decisions on the tax system. • Ranges and scenarios: volume 3, appendix 18.1 includes the economic impact of both commitment and ambitions scenarios. • Displacement: the treatment of displacement is discussed in volume 3, appendix 18.1. • Multipliers: direct, indirect and induced effects have been considered in volume 3, appendix 18.1. • Spatial impacts: the assessment in volume 2, chapter 18 includes the study areas of the UK and Scotland, as well as areas surrounding the construction port(s) and the operation and maintenance port(s), whilst recognising that the ports are not yet known. • Clarity for assumptions and limitations: the methods used, and assumptions are set out in volume 3, appendix 18.1. • Timing and impact period: the assessment in volume 2, chapter 18 includes the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Array. • Supporting research: the research had not yet been published when this assessment was undertaken.
Offshore Ornithology Consultation Note - Responses	06/02/2024	NatureScot	Email received	<p>Response from NatureScot on Ornithology Consultation note (volume 3, appendix 5.1, annex F; issued 15 December 2023):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The additional 'auk abundance review' evidence allowed NatureScot to support the conclusion that the difference between year 1 and 2 auk observations arise through natural variation. • NatureScot confirmed that there is no current access to SeaBORD, and that NatureScot considers a matrix approach to be acceptable for the displacement assessment. • NatureScot noted that should SeaBORD become available in time for it to be incorporated into the assessment then it should be used. • Impacts of HPAI should be assessed using qualitative methods, • NatureScot welcomed the commitment to carry out CRM using the parameters set out in their guidance, and the approach to present alternative scenarios using alternative parameters. 	<p>The baseline environment, including impacts of HPAI on the baseline and future baseline, is further discussed in volume 2, chapter 11, section 11.7. SeaBORD was not available for the assessment. Instead, displacement assessment has been carried out using the matrix approach for all species, as detailed in volume 2, chapter 11, section 11.11 and in volume 3, appendix 11.3.</p> <p>The approach to CRM is presented in volume 3, appendix 11.2. The Ornithology Consultation Note can be viewed in volume 3, appendix 5.1, annex F.</p>
Ornithology assessment - seasonal definitions	16/02/2024	NatureScot	Email sent	<p>Query raised with NatureScot to discuss seasonal definitions. The Applicant requested to deviate from the NatureScot guidance, to use a "full month" approach to seasonal definitions, as this aligned with the methodology for the site-specific DAS and enabled a more transparent approach to assessment.</p>	<p>This consultation was followed up by further email correspondence and a meeting (22 March 2024). The outcomes of this have been considered in volume 2, chapter 11.</p>

⁴ Carter, M. I. D., Boehme, L., Cronin, M. A., Duck, C. D., Grecian, W. J., Hastie, G. D., Jessopp, M., Matthiopoulos, J., McConnell, B. J., Miller, D. L., Morris, C. D., Moss, S. E. W., Thompson, D., Thompson, P. M. and Russell, D. J. F. (2022). *Sympatric Seals, Satellite Tracking and Protected Areas: Habitat-Based Distribution Estimates for Conservation and Management*. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 9, pp.18. DOI:10.3389/fmars.2022.875869.

⁵ von Pein, J., Lippert, T., Lippert, S., and von Estorff, O. (2022). *Scaling Laws for Unmitigated Pile Driving: Dependence of Underwater Noise on Strike Energy, Pile Diameter, Ram Weight, and Water Depth*. *Applied Acoustics* 198: 108986.

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Ossian EIA Marine Mammal Approach Note 2	16/02/2024	MD-LOT	Email sent (Document(s) issued)	<p>Marine Mammal Consultation Note 2 was produced in response to feedback and queries raised on Marine Mammal Consultation Note 1 and to agree further points. The items that the Applicant sought agreement on were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assessment of the Southern Trench ncMPA; • current assumptions surrounding inspection of ghost gear snagging; • densities of minke whale and harbour porpoise for use in the impact assessment; • inclusion of projects in European Economic Areas (EEAs) in the CEA; • approach to including INTOG projects for ScotWind in the cumulative effects assessment; and • approach to population modelling using the Interim Population Consequences of Disturbance (iPCoD) model. 	Feedback from NatureScot was received 08 March 2024 and is presented below. This feedback was taken into consideration in volume 2, chapter 10.
Post meeting correspondence from HES	20/02/2024	HES	Email received	<p>HES clarified that “<i>The outline WSI & PAD and proposed mitigation measures are a mechanism for controlling and responding to impacts on cultural heritage. However, they cannot be assumed to reduce all those impacts to insignificant.</i>”</p>	Volume 2, chapter 19.2, section 19.11 presents an assessment of significant effects which concluded that due to the measures adopted as part of the Array (volume 2, chapter 19.2, section 19.10) all effects on marine archaeology receptors will be reduced to not significant in EIA terms.

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Ossian EIA Marine Mammal Approach Note 2 - Response	08/03/2024	NatureScot	Email received	<p>NatureScot responded to the Applicant's request for feedback and agreement on Marine Mammal Approach Note 2 (issued 16 February 2024). The feedback/advice is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NatureScot were content that a separate supporting marine protected area (MPA) assessment document was not required for the minke whale feature of the Southern Trench ncMPA as the assessment of noise impacts is contained within the marine mammal chapter of the Array EIA Report. This was based on the understanding of the distribution of minke whale within Southern Trench ncMPA, i.e. low densities in the eastern part of the site which is closest to the Array and initial modelling work which suggests that noise levels within this part of the ncMPA are likely to only present a risk of mild, but not strong, disturbance as defined by NMFS (2005)⁶ and Southall <i>et al.</i> (2021)⁷. NatureScot accepted the use of Lacey <i>et al.</i> (2022)³ density estimate for minke whale on the basis that environmental covariates used in the study are particularly relevant to determining minke whale distribution and the 10 km spatial resolution used with these environmental variables offers more fine-scale density mapping than the large-scale Small Cetaceans in European Atlantic waters and the North Sea survey (SCANS) blocks. NatureScot confirmed the CEA methodology approach presented in Marine Mammal Consultation Note 2 seemed reasonable but deferred to MD-LOT to confirm which plans and projects should be included in cumulative assessment and what cut-off timescale is acceptable. NatureScot confirmed the approach to CEA with regards to inclusion of projects in other EEAs was appropriate, with a qualitative assessment carried out to assess transboundary impacts. NatureScot confirmed the proposed approach to iPCoD modelling was as expected and confirmed that Coastal East Scotland (CES²) Management Unit (MU) is the appropriate population for assessment of impacts on bottlenose dolphin. NatureScot advised that pre-piling mitigation should be based on the instantaneous risk for PTS onset, but the impact assessment itself should use SEL_{cum} (acknowledging all the caveats around it being over-precautionary due to the assumptions made) as well as SPL_{pk} (i.e. the dual metric approach). If the SEL_{cum} predictions indicate that there may be auditory injury to marine mammals, then the figures for injury should be inputted to the iPCoD model. NatureScot confirmed the approach to base auditory injury assessment on the number of animals remaining present following 30 minutes of Acoustic Deterrent Device (ADD) usage is appropriate for population modelling (iPCoD). NatureScot stated they expected the use of ADDs to be secured via conditions of any relevant consents. 	<p>Marine Mammal Consultation Note 2 issued can be viewed in volume 3, appendix 5.1, annex E. NatureScot's feedback has been addressed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment of noise impacts on the minke whale feature of the Southern Trench ncMPA is contained within the impact assessment in volume 2, chapter 10, section 10.11. The minke whale density estimate used in the assessment is presented in volume 2, chapter 10, Table 10.14 and is derived from Lacey <i>et al.</i> (2022)³, which was included in the baseline sources in the assessment of the LSE¹ of the Array. The CEA assessment methodology, which was presented to NatureScot, is detailed in volume 2, chapter 10, section 10.12.1 and aligns with the approach outlined in the Array EIA Scoping Report. Projects within the regional marine mammal study area have been screened in for the CEA (volume 2, chapter 10, section 10.12) including projects in other EEAs. Though initially scoped out in the Array EIA Scoping Report, transboundary effects have been assessed in volume 2, chapter 10, section 10.14 and volume 3, appendix 6.6 following advice from MD-LOT and NatureScot. Detailed iPCoD modelling is presented in volume 3, appendix 10.3, and has been used to inform the assessment of effects from piling (volume 2, chapter 10, sections 10.11 and 10.12). The CES² MU has been used to assess effects on bottlenose dolphin (which has been scoped in as a key species since the Array EIA Scoping Report). Following more recent advice from NatureScot following Marine Mammal Consultation Note 2, the assessment of PTS from piling and UXO is based upon the dual metric approach, whereby the maximum injury range from either SPL_{pk} or SEL_{cum} is used in assessment and inputted into the iPCoD modelling for piling (see volume 2, chapter 10, section 10.11.2). This dual metric approach aligns with the approach presented in the Array EIA Scoping Report. The assessment of auditory injury (PTS) for piling is based upon inclusion of 30 minute ADD duration and is presented in volume 2, chapter 10, section 10.11.2. This is also applied to the population modelling which informs the assessment (use of iPCoD, as presented in the Array EIA Scoping Report), with a detailed iPCoD report presented in volume 3, appendix 10.3.

⁶ NMFS. (2005). *Scoping Report for NMFS EIS for the National Acoustic Guidelines on Marine Mammals*. National Marine Fisheries Service.

⁷ Southall, B. L., Nowacek, D. P., Bowles, A. E., Senigaglia, V., Bejder, L., & Tyack, P. L. (2021). *Marine Mammal Noise Exposure Criteria: Assessing the Severity of Marine Mammal Behavioral Responses to Human Noise*. *Aquatic Mammals*, 47(5), 421-464.

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Meeting with NLB	20/03/2024	NLB	In person meeting	<p>General discussions were held on the cumulative scenario, in particular cumulative routing options for vessels. Agreed outputs of this NLB consultation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“the optimal safe passage in terms of available sea area and minor deviations would likely involve most vessels passing west of Bowdun and east of Seagreen”.</i> • The Array and other local developments (and the space between them) will remain open for navigation should vessels choose; however it is considered likely that most vessels will pass inshore given route length changes were negligible. • <i>“Depending on weather conditions and vessel types some vessels may go further offshore east of Bellrock”.</i> • Key cumulative mitigations include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Cumulative approach to lighting and marking of the Array and nearby developments. – Cooperation between both projects during the operational phases i.e. between marine coordinators. – Enhanced surveillance. 	<p>Further consultation has been undertaken with consultees on the cumulative scenario. Further meetings were held, and advice provided by MCA (on behalf of MCA, NLB and UKCoS) on 04 June 2024.</p> <p>Cumulative routing has been considered within the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1) and the CEA is presented in volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.12.</p>
Ossian Ornithology Assessment - seasonal definitions meeting	22/03/2024	NatureScot	Virtual meeting	<p>Meeting regarding the ornithology assessment approach around allocating abundance estimates to breeding seasons.</p> <p>NatureScot agreed during the meeting that the guillemot count in August 2022 could be assigned to the post-breeding season within the ornithology assessment.</p>	<p>This consultation was followed up by further email correspondence (27 March 2024). The outcomes of this have been considered in volume 2, chapter 11.</p>
Ossian Ornithology Assessment - seasonal definitions email correspondence	22/03/2024	NatureScot	Email sent	<p>The Applicant sent a post-meeting follow up to seek clarity on their proposed approach to include the August 2022 data as part of the post-breeding season and keep July 2022 as part of the breeding season.</p>	<p>This consultation was followed up by further email correspondence (27 March 2024). The outcomes of this have been considered in volume 2, chapter 11.</p>
Aviation EIA meeting with NATS	27/03/2024	NATS	Virtual meeting	<p>Meeting held with NATS via Teams to provide an update on the Array and wider Ossian project. Discussed NATS’ representation within the Ossian Array Scoping Opinion. NATS confirmed that the preferred NATS mitigation will be as per their response to the consultation letter (see details on 27 October 2023). NATS confirmed from the results of their technical assessment, that there would be no impact to the Allanshill PSR.</p>	<p>Impact to NATS infrastructure is considered in volume 2, chapter 14, section 14.11. As confirmation was given by NATS during this meeting that no impact to the Allanshill PSR is expected, this has been scoped out of further assessment.</p>
Ossian Ornithology Assessment - seasonal definitions email correspondence	27/03/2024	NatureScot	Email received	<p>NatureScot agreed that the large count of guillemot in August 2022 was likely due to post-breeding dispersal and therefore the August survey should be included in the post-breeding season in the EIA and associated technical reports. NatureScot also agreed that the large counts of guillemot in July 2021 and 2022 are also likely to be inflated by post-breeding dispersal and agreed to a qualitative consideration of this in the EIA.</p>	<p>The August 2022 count for guillemot has been included in the non-breeding season for calculating the bio-season mean peak abundance presented in volume 3, appendix 11.3, the results of which inform the assessment carried out within volume 2, chapter 14 and the Array RIAA (Ossian OWFL, 2024)⁸.</p>
Ossian Ornithology Assessment - CRM Band Options	27/03/2024	NatureScot	Email sent	<p>The Applicant queried whether NatureScot would accept their proposal to only present and assess CRM Band Option 2 collision values in the EIA Report, on the basis of as yet unpublished feedback on other projects that NatureScot are advising that they want projects to use Option 2 and no longer require Option 3.</p>	<p>NatureScot issued a response on 28 March 2024.</p>

⁸ Ossian OWFL. (2024). *Array Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment*.

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Ossian Ornithology Assessment - CRM Band Options	28/03/2024	NatureScot	Email received	<p>NatureScot noted the following in response to the Applicant's query sent on 27 March 2024:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have taken account of Ozsanlev-Harris <i>et al.</i> (2023)⁹ and we now advise that when running CRM, we only require: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most likely scenario (MLS) – option 2 (using the generic flight height dataset) Worst case scenario (WCS) – option 2 (using the generic flight height dataset) With regards to the work undertaken by Natural England around macro-avoidance for gannet, we are not currently in a position to adopt the full recommendations of this work, we do however accept the outputs for gannet during the non-breeding season. Migratory species – an updated review of migratory routes and vulnerabilities across the UK has been published by Marine Directorate and The Crown Estate. This work also includes development of a stochastic migration CRM tool (known as mCRM) to enable quantitative assessment of risks to migratory SPA species including swans, geese, divers, seaduck and raptors. This updated review should be used. 	<p>As set out in volume 2, chapter 11, section 11.11, although volume 3, appendix 11.2 presents the results of the Band model Options 2 and 3, the EIA collision assessment only uses Option 2 values. It should be noted that the CRM has focused on the maximum design scenario (MDS), which provides the WCS, rather than the MLS. This ensures that impacts will be no greater than those calculated and may actually be lower than the assessment determines.</p> <p>CRM results for gannet have not applied a correction for macro avoidance in any season. However, the implications of macro avoidance on the magnitude of impacts predicted are raised when assessing the significance of the impact.</p> <p>Further clarity was sought on the mCRM tool as detailed below (02 and 04 April 2024).</p>
Ossian Ornithology Assessment - CRM Band Options	02/04/2024	NatureScot	Email sent	<p>The Applicant sought clarity on NatureScot's advice issued 28 March 2024 on whether the mCRM tool should be used for the Array. The Applicant wanted to check the status of this tool and whether it was approved for use. In addition, the Applicant noted that in line with the Ossian Array Scoping Opinion the assessment had been undertaken using a qualitative approach and have also used the BTO SOSSMAT tool which provides a level of quantitative assessment to augment the qualitative approach. The Applicant noted that due to the application timescales it would be their preference to continue with this approach.</p>	<p>NatureScot issued a response on 04 April 2024 to confirm the approach to be taken with regard to the mCRM tool.</p>
Ossian Ornithology Assessment - CRM Band Options	04/04/2024	NatureScot	Email received	<p>NatureScot recognise that the advice on the use of the mCRM tool in their email dated 28 March 2024 is not appropriate for the Array, given the stage the project has reached in the application process. We withdraw that point of advice and confirm that CRM for migratory species should continue as per the Ossian Array Scoping Opinion and as set out in previous communications from the Applicant on 02 April 2024.</p>	<p>The updated review (Woodward <i>et al.</i>, 2023¹⁰) has been used as the basis of the qualitative approach to assessment for the risk of collision to migratory species in volume 2, chapter 11, section 11.11. At time of writing, the quantitative mCRM is still in beta testing phase and not approved for use in assessment and therefore the assessment relies on a qualitative approach informed by Woodward <i>et al.</i> (2023)¹⁰ and supplemented by quantitative information from Wright <i>et al.</i> (2012)¹¹.</p>
Meeting with UKCoS	23/04/2024	UKCoS	In person meeting	<p>General discussions around cumulative routeing options in the area. The UK CoS highlighted importance of maintaining optionality for vessel routeing within the region.</p>	<p>Further consultation has been undertaken with consultees on the cumulative scenario. Further meetings were held, and advice provided by MCA (on behalf of MCA, NLB and UKCoS) on 04 June 2024.</p> <p>Cumulative routeing has been considered within the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1) and the CEA is presented in volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.12.</p>
Ossian Offshore Wind Farm - Statement of Common Understanding	24/04/2024	NATS	Email sent	<p>Following an EIA consultation meeting with NATS, the enquiry was sent to request sight of a Statement of Common Understanding, which NATS mentioned in meeting on 27 March 2024 could be shared to give sight of potential post consent requirements.</p>	<p>Awaiting receipt of a Statement of Common Understanding for review.</p>

⁹ Ozsanlav-Harris, L., Inger, R. & Sherley, R. (2023). *Review of data used to calculate avoidance rates for collision risk modelling of seabirds*. JNCC Report 732, JNCC, Peterborough, ISSN 0963-8091.

¹⁰ Woodward, I., Thaxter, C.B., Owen, E. and Cook, A.S.C.P. (2019). *Desk-based revision of seabird foraging ranges used for HRA screening*. BTO Report 724 for The Crown Estate.

¹¹ Wright, L.J., Ross-Smith, V.H., Massimino, D., Dadam, D., Cook, A.S.C.P. and Burton, N.H.K. (2012). *Assessing the risk of offshore wind farm development to migratory birds designated as features of UK Special Protection Areas (and other Annex I species)*. Strategic Ornithological Support Services. Project SOSS-05. BTO Research Report, 592.

Consultation Title	Consultation Date	Consultee	Consultation Type	Issue(s) Raised	Response to Issue
Meeting with MCA	02/05/2024	MCA	In person meeting	<p>Cumulative routeing options were discussed with the MCA, with a focus on how vessels may route regionally in the area. This included presentation of the outputs of routeing assessment undertaken which showed usable routeing options to the east and west of the Array and Morven Offshore Wind Farm, and evidence that local traffic volumes were relatively low.</p> <p>The sea space between the Array and Morven Offshore Wind Farm was considered within these discussions, noting that general consultation input undertaken for the Array has indicated that any use of this area would be limited, with vessels preferring to pass further inshore or further offshore.</p>	<p>Further consultation has been undertaken with consultees on the cumulative scenario. Further meetings were held, and advice provided by MCA (on behalf of MCA, NLB and UKCoS) on 04 June 2024.</p> <p>Cumulative routeing has been considered within the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1) and the CEA is presented in volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.12.</p>
Ossian EIA - hard copies for statutory consultation	06/05/2024	NatureScot	Email sent/received	Enquiry to confirm if NatureScot would require a hard copy of the Array EIA Report and submission documents.	NatureScot confirmed a hard copy is required.
Shipping and Navigation Consultation – MCA Response	04/06/2024	MCA (on behalf of MCA, NLB and UKCoS)	Email received	<p>Feedback from the MCA post meeting (on 02 May 2024) indicated agreement that use of this area (sea space between the Array and Morven Offshore Wind Farm) was unlikely, given the current activity, overall length of the gap formed by the sea space between the projects, other future case developments and expert opinion. On this basis the MCA confirmed they were content for the boundaries bordering the sea space between the Array and Morven Offshore Wind Farm to remain as they were.</p> <p>The MCA also noted preference for developers to maximise sea room where practicable, with a focus of this additional sea room being beneficial to shipping and navigation and indicated this should be considered in future layout discussions.</p>	Cumulative routeing has been considered within the NRA (volume 3, appendix 13.1) and the CEA is presented in volume 2, chapter 13, section 13.12.
Quarterly Meeting – June 2024	04/06/2024	MD-LOT and NatureScot	Virtual meeting	<p>MD-LOT Quarterly meeting agenda:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project update. 2. MS-LOT update. 3. NatureScot update. <p>Ossian project information form submitted to MD-LOT on 21 May 2024.</p>	The Applicant has acknowledged advice given at all quarterly meetings and has considered new guidance and tools where appropriate in the preparation of this Array EIA Report.
Commercial Fisheries meeting	21/06/2024	SFF, SWFPA and SPFA	Virtual meeting	<p>Meeting to provide a project update, and to present the results of the commercial fisheries impact assessment and the outline Fisheries Mitigation and Management Plan (FMMS) (volume 4, appendix 23) to commercial fisheries stakeholders.</p> <p>The EIA significance determinations of the commercial fisheries chapter (volume 2, chapter 12) were discussed. The stakeholders highlighted the importance of coexistence with fisheries and raised queries around post-consent review of the FMMS.</p>	The Applicant will continue to liaise with commercial fisheries stakeholders post consent to facilitate coexistence and to update the FMMS. In addition, the Applicant are in the process of forming a Regional Commercial Fisheries Working Group which will allow developers to address shared challenges and optimise solutions with the involvement of commercial fisheries stakeholders.

Ossian



Marubeni



Ossian Offshore Wind Farm Limited

Inveralmond House
200 Dunkeld Road
Perth
PH1 3AQ

Project Office

Fourth Floor
10 Bothwell Street
Glasgow
G2 6NT

ossianwindfarm.com