

Subject	Fishing Liaison with Offshore Wind and Wet Renewables Group (FLOWW)	
Date meeting held	14/09/2023	
Location	Fishmongers' Hall, London and online via MS Teams	
Chairs	Sion Roberts (SR), Colin Warwick (CW), Emma Wootton (EW)	
Attendees	In-person Eleanor Adamson, EA (Fishmongers' Company) Bailey Bradley, BB (Xceco) Alison Freeman, AF (Fishmongers' Company) Courtney French, CF (Coexistiir Offshore) James Gillespie, JG (Scottish Power) Oliver Goldsmith, OG (MMO) Lucy Guirking, LG (Defra) Abby Haines, AH (TCE) Raymond Hall, RH (SWFPA) Fahim Hashimi, FH (SFF) Rosie Howatt, RH (BP) Rob Hunter, RH (Scottish Power) Merlin Jackson, MJ (TFA) Vaughan Jackson, VJ (MCA) Jerome Malhotra, JM (Defra) Cameron Moffatt, CM (Ørsted) Claire Muir, CM (ESCA) Mark Richardson, MR (Scottish Renewables) Mike Roach, MR (NFFO) Hywel Roberts, HR (Ørsted) Sion Roberts, SR (TCE) Ian Rowe, IR (NFFO) Suzannah Walmsley, SW (ABPmer) Jonathan Walters, JWa (Seafish) John Wrottesley, JW (ESCA) Emma Wootton, EW (ABPmer)	Remote (online) Annie Breaden, AB (Crown Estate Scotland) Doug Borthwick, DB (Hartley Anderson) Bruce Buchanan, BB (Offshore Wind Directorate, Scottish Government) Shini Chandramohan, SC (NNG) Adam Cox, AC (Offshore Wind Directorate, Scottish Government) Luke Eatough, LE (Catapult) Tommy Finn, TF (Blackhall and Powis) Gavin Kelly, GK (Vattenfall) Emily Griffiths, EG (RWE) Peter Jamieson, PJ (Virgin Media) Elsa Lamb, EL (RWE) Fingal McKiernan, FM (SSE) Iain McMyn, IM (Ocean Winds) Nick Salter, NS (MCA) Chris Ranford, CR (CFPO) Dale Rodmell, DR (EEFPO) Mark Pearce, MP (Tupa Energy) Rosie Scurr, RS (NNG Offshore Wind) Emily Simmons (Scottish Government) Colin Warwick, CW (FLOWW Chair)
Apologies	Alistair Byford-Bates (Wessex Archaeology) Lara Leonard (RWE) James Robottom (RUK) Kirsty Wright (Marine Scotland Directorate) Chris Jenner (Outer Dowsing) Matthew Frow (Seafish) Andrew Gill (CEFAS) Amy Balding (MMO) Bethany Casasbuenas (BEIS) Stephen Dawe (Vodafone)	

Summary of Actions arising from Meeting

Action
1. Collate existing definitions of 'co-existence' and 'co-location'. Establish a FLOWW subgroup to evaluate such definitions and propose definitions to be used by FLOWW. EW to send an email to FLOWW members requesting any currently used (or known) definitions of 'co-existence' and 'co-location'. <i>Completed.</i>
2. SR to follow up with Andrew Gill on the outputs of the ICES working group on 'Offshore wind development and fisheries'.
3. Include evidence base updates as a standing agenda item in future FLOWW meetings. SR/EW to approach Andrew Gill on providing a fisheries science update at next FLOWW meeting.
4. FLOWW members to send details (GDPR-complied) of developers, who would benefit from joining FLOWW, to the Secretariat (SR, CW, or EW).
5. SR, BB and AC to discuss how to progress the FLOWW BGP revisions (including who will be responsible for leading the process going forward).
6. SR to send the latest version of FLOWW BPG to the subgroup and request comments within a specified timeframe. <i>Completed by EW.</i>
7. Undertake an initial high-level editorial review of the latest version of the FLOWW BPG (by someone who has not been involved in the BPG revision process). <i>Being undertaken by ABPmer. Completed Dec 2023.</i>
8. Subsequent to the high-level editorial review of the FLOWW BPG, hold an in-person workshop for the FLOWW BPG subgroup to discuss any recommendations and comments arising from the editorial review and to agree upon a version of the FLOWW BPG to be sent to the wider FLOWW membership.
9. FLOWW members to provide information to the FLOWW Secretariat on the FLOWW BPG sign-off process for their organisation's Board/Executive, including timelines.
10. At next FLOWW meeting, present and discuss case studies (from both sectors) of good and bad examples of engagement/liaison (which involve following BPG, or not).
11. EW to discuss with CM, and take forward, the invitation for Isle of Man developers (and fishers) to join FLOWW.
12. JM to share MSPri workshop notes with EW, who will disseminate the notes to FLOWW members. JM to check that it is ok to share the information with Scottish stakeholders.
13. OG to send Defra's/MMO's document on their definitions of 'co-existence' and 'co-location' to EW for dissemination to the FLOWW membership. <i>Completed.</i>

Meeting Minutes

Agenda item 1

- **Welcome by Fishmongers' Company (EA)**

Introduction to Fishmongers' Company by Dr Eleanor Adamson (EA).

EA welcomed everyone to Fishmongers' Company (FMC) and Fishmongers' Hall and commented that FMC are very happy to host FLOWW and provide a place where people are comfortable expressing their views on fishing and the marine environment. FMC are fully aware of the importance of fishing liaison with offshore renewable energy industries (OREI) and are keen to support constructive dialogue between the two sectors. EA commented that she hoped FLOWW would enjoy the surroundings and hospitality of FMC at Fishmongers' Hall. EA and AF (of FMC) would intermittently join the FLOWW meeting to hear the discussions between FLOWW members.

Agenda item 2

- **Welcome by FLOWW Chairs (SR and CW)**

SR confirmed that he would be Chairing the meeting, as he was in attendance in-person, and that CW (who was attending remotely) would play a supporting role.

SR highlighted the importance of the FLOWW meetings and commented that there would be plenty of opportunity for discussion, and therefore, was very keen to hear all attendees' views. There was no opposition to the meeting being recorded for minute-taking purposes.

CW apologised for not being at the meeting in-person and expressed his gratitude to SR for Chairing the meeting (in-person). CW commented that the meeting was very important and that he was confident that correct decisions would be made to maintain the work that FLOWW is doing, as well as encouraging the FLOWW group to improve because of the challenges that the sectors are facing. CW further commented that it is only by collaboration and close working relationships that FLOWW will achieve the best possible outcomes.

CW stated that he hoped for a very productive meeting and that the path is set for the future meetings.

Agenda item 3

- **Update on proposed FLOWW mission statement, objectives, and activities (SR and EW)**

SR introduced the agenda item by explaining that it was an update on a topic of conversation (including agenda items and actions) arising from the previous FLOWW meeting held in April 2023 (please refer to Paper 1 from the April 2023 FLOWW meeting - in Annex 1 of this document), where discussions were had on revising the FLOWW mission statement, objectives and activities; with the intention of understanding how FLOWW can continue to grow and contribute to fisheries and OREI.

SR noted that the proposed updates on the FLOWW mission statement, objectives, and activities (as stated in Paper 1 – see Annex 1) included the work that FLOWW has undertaken to date, the ongoing updates to FLOWW Best Practice Guidance (BPG), and the identification of opportunities for FLOWW going forward. SR stated that he would like to clarify how FLOWW can continue to contribute and grow; and expand FLOWW's strategic abilities to influence.

An action and outcome from the previous meeting (April 2023) were for FLOWW members to provide written feedback on the proposed name change and updated mission statement, objectives and activities for FLOWW (which were presented in Paper 1 in the April meeting).

SR thanked FLOWW members for their feedback and noted that clear themes emerged. SR stated that in response to members feedback, FLOWW would not change its name. This was due to the positive history of the FLOWW group, and that 'FLOWW' is well-known across many industries.

Outcome: Reject the proposed name change. FLOWW will retain its original name for the foreseeable future.

EW provided a summary of the feedback to the proposed FLOWW mission statement, objectives, and activities. EW noted that there were slight differences in the feedback between sectors, but in general the feedback was going in the same direction. EW then gave a summary of the feedback on the different topics, which is summarised below.

Summary of feedback on the proposed FLOWW mission statement (please refer to Paper 1 from April FLOWW meeting, also in Annex 1 of this document)

- The term 'continued co-existence' in the mission statement was considered an issue.
 - FLOWW members believe that co-existence does not currently exist, hence how can it be 'continued'.
 - There is no agreed definition for 'co-existence', hence it should not be used in the mission statement.
- It does not mention FLOWW's original purpose of 'fisheries liaison', which is still considered to be fundamental to FLOWW. This could be an issue and therefore should be addressed.
- It is too vague and needs clarification.
- It is too ambitious and FLOWW will struggle to deliver it (a common feedback theme with regards to the proposed mission statement, objectives, and activities). FLOWW has limited time and resources for delivery, therefore the mission statement should be more specific.

SR invited comments from the attendees on the above feedback. It was suggested that the Terms of Reference should be revised initially to set out what FLOWW would like to achieve, and then the mission statement should be derived from that. It was also suggested that FLOWW should focus on the expertise of its members.

The importance of a shared understanding of what 'co-existence' means was also highlighted, and that there are differences between 'co-existence' and 'co-location'. Many different definitions of those terms exist, and they vary depending upon the organisation. Hence, agreeing upon definitions for 'co-existence' and/or 'co-location' within FLOWW is important, and may help establish the mission statement. It was suggested that, ideally, the definitions should be standardised and mandated by Defra and the devolved administrations. It was also suggested that the mission statement should refer to FLOWW's 'ambition to achieve co-existence', because it reflects the ambition of all sectors, but does not necessarily mean it is wholly achievable (for example, in the case of fishing taking place within floating offshore wind farms). It should also be noted that nuances in the definitions may mean that you are able to achieve 'co-existence', but not 'co-location'. It was also commented that currently, 'co-existence'

exists in the marine space, but not 'co-location', and therefore it is 'co-location' which needs to be resolved. However, this does depend on which definitions for 'co-existence' and 'co-location' are being applied.

The different definitions discussed for 'co-existence' and 'co-location' is summarised in the Table below.

Co-existence	Co-location
Both industries/activities are viable but are not necessarily operating in the same physical space.	Both industries/activities are viably operating in the same physical space.
Both industries/activities are viably operating in the same physical space, without the need for additional adaptations/regulations to enable it.	Both industries/activities are viably operating in the same physical space, but specific mitigations/actions are required to enable it.

Furthermore, a query was put forward as to why there was a need for 2 different terms (particularly 'co-location'), because the aim is to achieve 'co-existence' which requires successful 'co-location' (i.e., 'co-location' leads to 'co-existence'). Responses included that 'if you co-locate, then by default you will also co-exist; but you can 'co-exist' without 'co-locating''. It was also suggested that if you can't 'co-locate' then there are other measures e.g., community benefit funds, that lead to an outcome defined as 'co-existence'.

In addition, it was commented that early site selection of the offshore wind farm, may allow for 'co-existence' with minimal impact on fisheries, without the need for 'co-locating' fishing within the boundaries of the wind farm. Concern was then raised that because most site selections and leases have already been agreed (in Scottish waters) without full engagement with the fishing industry, does this mean that 'co-location' with fisheries cannot be achieved. It was noted that this may not always be the case because for TCE's leasing round 5, fisheries data facilitated changes to the areas of search, and as a result they were moved away from areas of high fishing activity.

It was stated that Defra's current definitions of 'co-existence' and 'co-location' vary in the fact that 'co-existence' occurs when fishing resumes after the construction of the offshore wind farm and requires no further action, whereas 'co-location' requires further actions and mechanisms to enable fishing to resume (Refer to Table above).

It was suggested that the passive definition of 'co-existence' doesn't work, because even though fishing is legally permitted to resume within offshore wind farms (post-construction), in reality it doesn't happen because it is not feasible.

SR stated that he would like FLOWW members to agree upon definitions for 'co-existence' and 'co-location', which SR, CW, and EW could then present to Defra and MMO, in order to work towards developing standardised definitions, which could be applied by all groups/organisations. SR noted that FLOWW members attend many meetings (hosted by numerous different organisations) in which 'co-existence' and 'colocation' are discussed; and understanding the different definitions (and their context) is a reoccurring problem. It was noted, however, that standardised definitions may not be feasible, and that the main priority should be that FLOWW has its own definitions which are consistently applied. MMO commented that they developed their definitions (for their Marine Plans) via extensive stakeholder consultations.

CEFAS have recently undertaken a literature review on the definitions for 'co-existence' and co-location'.

SR suggested that the attendees vote on the definitions of 'co-existence' and co-location' in the meeting, however this was dismissed due to the nuances and intricacies of the definitions requiring

detailed research and thought, which the attendees had not been able to undertake. As a result, the below action was proposed.

Action: Collate existing definitions of 'co-existence' and 'co-location'. Establish a FLOWW subgroup to evaluate such definitions and propose definitions to be used by FLOWW. EW to send an email to FLOWW members requesting any currently used (or known) definitions of 'co-existence' and 'co-location'.

The proposed definitions are to be presented to the full FLOWW membership, as part of the next FLOWW meeting.

Summary of feedback on the proposed FLOWW Objectives (please refer to Paper 1 from April FLOWW meeting, also in Annex 1 of this document).

- FLOWW BPG should be published prior to establishing further FLOWW objectives.
- Objectives should support both fisheries and OREI sectors equally. It should be a balanced approach, as both sectors are affected by each other.
- FLOWW should look at the impacts of OREI on fisheries which are not currently assessed, understood, or fully defined. This is pivotal in achieving 'co-existence'.
- Ensure that best practice for engagement is 2-way between sectors.
- Practicality of delivering objectives is an issue (due to limited resources and capacity; already being delivered by other groups). More focussed objectives would help to overcome this.
- Objectives should make use of FLOWW expertise.

EW suggested firstly completing BPG, followed by reviewing the FLOWW Terms of Reference, and then defining new achievable objectives based on FLOWW expertise, whilst being aware that the landscape is continually changing.

SR invited comments from attendees. One comment noted that while principles for assessment (i.e., EIA methodologies) exist, they haven't been developed in coordination with either the fishing or OREI sectors, and therefore aren't always suitable for assessing fisheries. It was also commented that FLOWW should be cautious in defining assessment methodologies, as there are many different approaches which vary according to the type of practitioner. SR stated that the proposed FLOWW objective was to agree on 'principles' of assessment, and not to define new assessment methodologies. It was noted that it is important to understand what happens when fisheries are not assessed properly. In such instances, the impact on fisheries is determined as being 'low/minor', which then prevents further fisheries involvement (e.g., use of fisheries data, micro-siting), and any mitigation from being put in place. This very formulaic approach leads to many fisheries impacts being assessed as 'low/minor', and as a result the FLOWW BPG becomes irrelevant. Therefore, it is very important for FLOWW to look at the principles of fisheries assessments.

There is an example of where an EIA assessed impact on fisheries as 'low/minor', yet it led to a 5-20% loss of business for a particular fishing vessel/business. In this case, the methodology wasn't applied incorrectly; rather, the methodology was considered to be inappropriate.

It was suggested that FLOWW could provide advice to developers that when a 'low/minor' level of impact is determined, developers should not automatically discontinue engaging with the fishing industry, but instead should look at it on an individual fishery level and continue working with the fishery to enhance co-existence. It was agreed that this would be a very good idea.

It was also noted that the international ICES working group on 'offshore wind development and fisheries' are investigating 'superior' assessment methodologies, and that in time, there may be some ICES

outputs which FLOWW could review to see if they were appropriate for UK fishery impact assessments. The ICES working group have just entered a new Terms of Reference and are currently working on outputs from the previous term. It could be up to a year before there are any official ICES outputs. Andrew Gill (CEFAS), who is a FLOWW member, is the Chair of the ICES working group.

Action: SR to follow up with Andrew Gill on the outputs of the ICES working group on 'Offshore wind development and fisheries'.

SR closed the discussion by stating that it appears that the objective which states that FLOWW should set out agreed principles for assessment of impacts on fisheries by OREI is broadly correct, and that FLOWW could progress this in the future.

Summary of feedback on the proposed FLOWW core activities (please refer to Paper 1 from April FLOWW meeting, also in Annex 1 of this document)

- The core activities are too ambitious - they require considerable capacity and resources.
- Need to determine role and purpose of FLOWW, prior to setting core activities.
- Focusing on key evidence or policy drivers would be more realistic.
- FLOWW should remain a forum for discussion, the proposed activities do not represent the core function of FLOWW.
- Core activities should focus on regular meetings to discuss/present new evidence and challenges and discuss methods to solve them.
- Currently FLOWW is not central to dissemination of new evidence – but it could be.
- Proposed core activities are already being undertaken by other groups, organisations, and projects – therefore FLOWW needs to be careful not to duplicate effort.

In summary, based on feedback to Paper 1, EW and SR commented that the best way forward was to firstly review the FLOWW Terms of Reference, mission statement and objectives; and return to discussing the proposed core activities at a later date.

SR asked for any further comments, and it was commented that the evidence base for fisheries and offshore wind is rapidly increasing, especially because the USA has entered the sphere. In addition, FLOWW should be aware that evidence and reports are commonly issue-specific, and therefore, may not always be relevant. Therefore, FLOWW should focus on key papers/reports which are relevant to the wider issues. It was suggested that FLOWW meetings could provide opportunities for short presentations to summarise new evidence/reports in order to keep FLOWW members informed and up to date, whilst not having to read extremely long documents. There could be a standing agenda item of 10 min slots for updates e.g., from a fisheries scientist (which a FLOWW member from the OREI sector suggested would be extremely helpful). Several FLOWW members agreed that this was a good suggestion. SR noted this suggestion as an action for further consideration and suggested that Andrew Gill (CEFAS) would be well-placed to provide a fisheries science update.

Action: Include evidence base updates as a standing agenda item (10 min slots) in future FLOWW meetings. SR/EW to approach Andrew Gill on providing a fisheries science update at next FLOWW meeting.

It was queried whether developers (from OREIs) are officially invited to FLOWW meetings, or whether they attend on 'their own accord'. This was raised because a FLOWW members noted that there are only a limited number of developers which regularly attend FLOWW meetings. It was stated that it was particularly important to know whether developers are officially invited to attend the meetings because there are many new/emerging developers in the OREI sphere. SR noted that it was a valid point and

confirmed that there is an open invite for developers to join FLOWW; and that the more developers that attend FLOWW, the better FLOWW will be. SR requested FLOWW members to forward the names of any developers that aren't currently members of FLOWW. SR noted that there had been several requests to join FLOWW over the past 6 months, and SR also commented that he would be willing to reach out to developers who weren't aware of FLOWW, to ascertain whether they would like to join the group.

Action: FLOWW members to send details (GDPR-complied) of developers, who would benefit from joining FLOWW, to the Secretariat (SR, CW, or EW).

It was further commented that lack of developers in the FLOWW membership was a long-standing issue, and because early engagement is extremely important in fisheries-OREI relationships, it is very important for developers to be attending FLOWW, particularly if they are using FLOWW BPG. SR commented that FLOWW may need to come up with a plan on how to get new developers to be aware of, and engage with, FLOWW.

Another comment was that numerous other industry groups attend FLOWW, and such groups could act as conduits for disseminating information. It was also noted that the delay in publishing the revised FLOWW BPG may be preventing more developers and industry groups attending FLOWW.

A suggestion put forward was whether TCE could put a requirement in place, as part of the leasing arrangement, for developers to engage with FLOWW. SR commented that FLOWW engagement is flagged to developers during the leasing process, but it is not a requirement.

Agenda item 4

- **FLOWW Best Practice Guidance, BPG (BB and AC)**
Update and next steps.

BB apologised on behalf of himself and AC for not being able to attend FLOWW in-person.

AC provided a summary of where the revision of the FLOWW BPG currently stands. AC noted that he has incorporated the comments from the last round of reviews. Comments were received from 8 people. AC then sent 'tracked-changed' and 'clean' versions of the revised BPG to SR, CR and EW on 22nd August 2023.

SR suggested that the next step for signing off the revised FLOWW BPG was to send the BPG out for review to the entire FLOWW group, and therefore asked FLOWW members whether there was any opposition to that procedure. It was commented by a FLOWW member that the BPG still contained much repetition and suggested that the next step was for SR and the FLOWW Secretariat to undertake an editorial review to remove the repetition. AC commented that he had already undertaken an editorial review to remove as much repetition and duplication, as possible.

A further comment from one of the 8 reviewers, was that they felt that there were some elements of the BPG which were still insufficiently developed. For example, the section on 'windfarm interactions and planning and mitigation'. The reviewer also thought that the BPG was disjointed in places, and therefore, re-iterated the need for a high-level editorial review prior to sending it for final review by the whole FLOWW group. Another suggestion was that the work undertaken by the OTNR (Offshore Transmission

Network Review) could be reviewed to see whether any elements of this work could be incorporated into the BPG.

BB reminded the group that Marine Scotland (now known as the Marine Directorate and the Offshore Wind Directorate) had originally agreed to take on the administration role for revising the FLOWW BPG, together with co-ordinating the BPG subgroup. Roger May originally undertook this role, however due to his retirement, AC has temporarily taken over this role. AC confirmed that himself and BB (of the Offshore Wind Directorate) have limited resources to further progress the FLOWW BPG revisions, hence the review process requires new leadership. BB confirmed that AC has taken the FLOWW BPG revisions as far as he can and would like to have a discussion with SR to determine who will be taking the lead on the BPG revisions going forward. BB confirmed that himself and AC would still be happy to feed into the process.

BB commented that the administration role is very challenging and noted that FLOWW needs to develop a strategy on how to take the BPG forward when it is sent out to review by the whole FLOWW group, as it is likely to produce more comments and feedback. BB was happy to discuss this further with SR outside of the FLOWW meeting. Another BPG reviewer commended AC for his work on the BPG.

It was also commented that the BPG currently reads like it has been written by committee (which it has been), and therefore, in some places it does not flow. It was re-iterated that an editorial review with a fresh pair of eyes (i.e., somebody not previously involved in the BPG review process) would be very useful, prior to sending it to the wider FLOWW group.

Furthermore, it was suggested that as part of the editorial view, the reviewer could identify sections that require more work, and this could be fed back to the FLOWW BPG sub-group to address, prior to sending out for final review.

A further FLOWW member credited AC for his hard work on the BPG, and re-iterated that finalising and publishing BPG should be FLOWW's priority task. They commented that it warranted an in-person meeting to achieve this.

Concern was raised that it was unlikely that the FLOWW BPG subgroup workshop would result in a final version of the FLOWW BPG suitable for sign-off by the full FLOWW membership. It was suggested that following the workshop, further technical and editorial reviews would be required – possibly by 1-3 editors (each representing a particular sector). It was suggested that members of the FLOWW BPG subgroup would be most appropriate to undertake this task.

It was also suggested that a final professional editorial review would be required prior to publication of the FLOWW BPG.

SR summarised the discussion by stating that the initial core action was to undertake a high-level editorial review of the FLOWW BPG by a person who had not been involved with the revisions. This should be followed by an in-person workshop for the FLOWW BPG sub-group to discuss any recommendations and comments arising from the review. SR commented that the workshop should aim to reach an agreement on the BPG elements which are still outstanding and require further work. The final aim would be to present a clean, and hopefully final, version of the BPG to the wider FLOWW group at the next FLOWW meeting in 2024.

SR re-iterated that a process for finalising the BPG and getting it signed off by FLOWW members needs to be developed, as it is a complex task. FLOWW member suggested that a comments log would be very useful to the process.

BB commented that one of the challenges for AC was reaching an agreement/consensus on how best to address (and incorporate) all the comments he received during FLOWW BPG review process;

particularly new comments that arose after the subgroup meetings had taken place (as it is at the FLOWW BPG subgroup meetings where all existing comments are discussed and addressed), and as such, any new comments still require attention.

Action: SR, BB and AC to discuss how to progress the FLOWW BPG revisions (including who will be responsible for leading the process going forward).

Action: SR to send the latest version of FLOWW BPG to the subgroup and request comments within a specified timeframe.

Action: Undertake an initial high-level editorial review of the latest version of the FLOWW BPG (by someone who has not been involved in the BPG revision process).

Action: Subsequent to the high-level editorial review of the FLOWW BPG, hold an in-person workshop for the FLOWW BPG subgroup to discuss any recommendations and comments arising from the editorial review and to agree upon a version of the BPG to be sent to the wider FLOWW membership. Ideally the workshop should be held before the end of 2023, and potentially take place outside of London (e.g., York or Scotland). Workshop outputs should include a record of the contentious areas of the FLOWW BPG, and a justification for the revised guidance for such areas. This would help the wider FLOWW group understand the context of the BPG revisions.

SR summarised the discussion by stating that:

- The FLOWW BPG sub-group needs to agree on the version of the revised BPG which is to be sent to the wider FLOWW membership (and this is likely to require an in-person workshop).
- A process for agreeing and signing off the final version of the revised FLOWW BPG by the wider FLOWW group needs to be established. For example, determining whether complete consensus is required for sign-off.

Action: FLOWW members to provide information to FLOWW Secretariat on the FLOWW BPG sign-off process for their organisation's Board/Executive, including timelines.

SR commented that understanding FLOWW member's organisations' sign-off process would help to determine the steps and timelines required to achieve consensus on the revised FLOWW BPG. SR suggested that a 'Red Flag Review' could be undertaken by the wider FLOWW membership, prior to requesting the Boards of FLOWW members to sign-off on the final version of the FLOWW BPG.

It was noted that publication of Position Statements on the FLOWW BPG from individual FLOWW membership organisations may help with the sign-off process.

A comment, in response to SR's summary, was that for FLOWW members who are not in the BPG subgroup, it would be very useful to understand the history of the BPG revisions, in order not to repeat previous comments and issues as part of the final review and signing-off process. For example, highlighting how and where compromises were made. A further comment raised was that, for time-saving purposes, an in-person workshop may facilitate sign-off by the wider FLOWW membership.

It was noted that it should be remembered that the FLOWW BPG is for guidance purposes only, therefore the document does not require the same level of scrutiny as that required for a legislative document.

A further comment was that the FLOWW BPG should not be wieldy (which was an issue with the previous version). It needs to be user-friendly, as users may not be experts. It was suggested that a bullet point approach may prove useful. Furthermore, the document needs to be 'fit for purpose' for both the present day and the future (as OREI expands).

There was a suggestion of whether creating a short-hand version of the FLOWW BPG (e.g., a pamphlet), which could be used for dissemination, would be worthwhile. This would be useful for fishers. It was mentioned that waterproof pull-outs had been previously discussed, but a budget would be needed to produce the pull-outs. Further comments noted that the full version of the BPG contains much information that is useful for developers but not fishers. The FLOWW BPG are not used by individual fishers, and instead are used by their industry representatives. Therefore, a small pamphlet would be useful. It was also noted that it is the fishers which don't have official representation that often need most help with guidelines (such as FLOWW BPG), and that it is important for fishers to understand why developers are doing things the way they are (e.g., asking for fisheries data). It was also pointed out that most fishers don't know that the FLOWW BPG exists. It was highlighted that it is the responsibility of Fishing Industry Representatives (FIRs) and Fishing Liaison Officers (FLOs) to make fishers aware of the FLOWW BPG, therefore a FLOWW BPG pamphlet would be very useful to help with awareness.

SR stated that he agreed that pullouts, and an accessible version, would be very valuable; but highlighted that the priority was to finalise and sign-off the full version.

AC commented that as part of the FLOWW BPG revisions, the subgroup had agreed to identify areas of the revised BPG version which would warrant pullouts. The actual areas were not agreed upon, but there is an example pullout in the latest version, which covers Notice to Mariners. AC believes that there are other sections of the BPG which would warrant pullouts.

An additional discussion was then had on the limited level of engagement which is currently happening between developers/surveyors with fisheries during pre-construction surveys for offshore wind farms. It was commented that there was little early engagement and warning to fishers of when pre-construction activities/surveys would be taking place. Fishers are often provided with <7 days' notice prior to commencement of activities (for many different types of offshore construction). Pre-construction activities are considered to have the most impact on fisheries (because many of them happen at the same time), hence better engagement with developers and surveyors is needed to help establish a collaborative approach between developers/surveyors. One problem that was highlighted was that pre-construction surveys don't require licensing, and as such, highlights the importance of the FLOWW BPG during the pre-construction process.

A developer recognised that there are challenges in offshore development, particularly as it is a very congested area; and that in the past, the various development sectors haven't communicated with each other as well as they should have done. It was noted that there are synergies between developers, but also challenges in the technical specifications between developers/developments (which needs to be addressed). However, developers are now working towards aligning with each other (e.g., collaborating and cooperating by using the same survey vessels). It was also noted that developers' attendance in FLOWW meetings is important in understanding the needs of the fishing industry, such as early engagement and notification of activities. It was also commented that FLOWW attendance is particularly important for new developers. The group was reminded that surveys do not always go to plan, and that this is becoming more frequent. A lack of knowledge, understanding and 'needing to know' within survey companies, with regards to the effect on fishing activities, was also noted as a hindrance to effective engagement between fishers and developers. It was further noted that in the past, FLOWW was a forum where problems were brought to the table to be discussed and resolved, however, for the past few years FLOWW meetings have focussed on revising the FLOWW BPG.

It was highlighted by a developer that they do support survey companies in engaging with fishers (e.g., feeding into the engagement strategy, attending kick-off meetings, and explaining what fishing industry is like, and what the surveyors should do to minimise impacts on fishing activities). It was also commented that it is the responsibility of FIRs/FLOs to engage with fishers. It was further noted that developers are cautious of providing too much notice for activities, as this could also cause problems. It was commented by a FLO/FIR that they understood why early engagement on activities was not always

beneficial, particularly as the fishers could unintentionally end up being in the way when the activity commences. It was also noted that not all developers (and/or projects) have a FLO to help engage with fishers, and that this is another re-occurring problem. Managing expectations with respect to surveys is very important, but often that isn't happening. On occasion, fishers have been given no notice of activities.

It was noted that survey companies do not attend FLOWW, and it was suggested that this was because surveyors are driven by contract specifications and managed by the developer; hence their attendance at FLOWW meetings may not be considered as relevant. However, there was a suggestion that educating surveyors on fisheries liaison may be beneficial.

On returning to the discussion of FLOWW BPG, it was commented that the revised BPG could include several strong recommendations with respect to pre-construction surveys. For example, minimum notice periods for activities/surveys, offshore FLOs onboard survey vessels, and gear scouts prior to surveys. It was also noted that developing a strong evidence base and evidence-sharing process was important, but that this wasn't currently happening. There was a comment that sharing of evidence is strongly recommended in the revised version of the FLOWW BPG.

The group was also reminded that there are still many occasions when the FLOWW BPG are not being followed by various offshore activities, developers, and consultants; and this needs to be resolved because it is causing problems. It was then noted that there are also occasions when fishers do not provide evidence to developers, which is also an issue. There was a comment from a FLOWW member that fishers, as well as developers, will/should commit to adhering to the FLOWW BPG.

The group was reminded that most of the time the FLOWW BPG are adhered to, and that the FLOWW group should not create the impression that nothing is working between the 2 sectors.

SR summarised the discussion by stating that the FLOWW BPG needs to be finalised and published ASAP; and emphasised that it should be an evidence-based process, which is both reasonable and proportionate. SR also suggested presenting and discussing case studies (good and bad examples) of engagement and liaison (including following BPG, or not) from both sectors at the next FLOWW meeting.

Action: At next FLOWW meeting, present and discuss case studies from both sectors of good and bad examples of engagement/liaison (which involve following BPG, or not).

Agenda item 5

- **TCE Offshore Wind Evidence and Knowledge Hub, OWEKH (SR)**
Introduction to the hub (OWEKH)

SR gave an overview of the recently launched TCE Offshore Wind Evidence and Knowledge Hub (OWEKH). In summary:

- The Hub has been developed under the Offshore Wind Evidence and Change Programme

- The Hub is intended to provide a single portal for information (i.e., an evidence base) relating to all aspects of offshore wind development and consenting. The hub will host information on many different topics, such as environment, navigation, and fisheries.
- It is hoped that the Hub will create a smoother pathway to consenting (because relevant information will be in a single place – i.e., the Hub), so consenting can focus on the genuine issues.
- The Hub is aiming to create consistency and proportionality within consenting.
- The Hub is an open digital platform which brings together information from multiple different sources. For example, from Tethys, MDE, and Medin.
- The Hub is currently in its test phase and is due to publicly launch by the end of 2023.
- The Hub is based on a Community of Practice: A structure of stakeholders will support and curate the Hub's content.
- The Hub has 2 organisational levels:
 - An oversight board – consisting of key organisations in the policy and regulatory landscape.
 - Technical topic groups – for individual topics. The topics are based on Environment Statement chapters. The groups will be composed of technical experts. However, the Hub does not want to replicate technical groups that already exist.
- Different types of information (but not data) can be uploaded on the Hub. It can also provide links to existing documentation. Information on live research (or surveys) can also be uploaded and updated when required.
- Stakeholders who have signed up to the Hub (website) will receive notifications when new documents/information has been uploaded.
- The technical topic group pages will explain the current focus of work (e.g., creating guidance). There is the ability for people to contact the group and get involved (which may be of particular use to new stakeholders).
- Guidance produced by technical topic groups can be downloaded from the Hub. There will also be summary information on what the guidance says, who signed up to it, and how it's been developed. There is also an opportunity to provide comments.
- Any guidance produced by technical topic groups, must be approved by the group itself, and then endorsed by the oversight board (a 2-stage process).
- The Hub is an opportunity to disseminate FLOWW outputs to the wider community.

A Q&A session followed SR's overview. It was questioned whether uploaded documents would go through a peer review process, and SR stated that the technical topic groups are responsible for reviewing, agreeing and curating documents to be uploaded. Stakeholders can also comment on the validity and accuracy of uploaded documents, which can then be flagged for removal from the Hub, if deemed necessary. It is hoped that it will be a community-led approach. Another concern was raised regarding the potentially large number of 'upload' notifications you would receive. SR confirmed that when you signed up to the Hub you can choose which topics you would like to receive notifications on, and whether you would like to receive immediate notifications every time a document is uploaded, or have a daily, weekly or monthly summary of uploads.

A point was also raised that the Hub could be used by researchers and academics as a means of uploading (and promoting) their papers, and therefore the relevance of documents should be part of the curation process. SR confirmed that the technical topic groups can choose and agree which documents form the genuine evidence base and produce guidance (and/or a summary report) on which documents should be referred to (e.g., during an environmental impact assessment; EIA).

An additional comment was raised on whether the Hub would make it too simple for consultants to do their job, and that there may be a risk of omitting relevant information from an EIA because it hadn't been uploaded to the Hub. Concern was also raised that contemporary evidence isn't always used in EIAs.

It was also noted that a similar hub led by the USA, known as Tethys, already exists. SR stated that the OWEKH Hub is already linked to Tethys. It was further noted that although the OWEKH Hub was a good idea, it shouldn't replace face-to-face engagement with stakeholders, SR agreed with this comment, and confirmed that that was why data could not be uploaded to the Hub. He also noted that the Hub is intending to create consistency in approach in the consenting process, and not replace the need for detailed engagement and data collection.

A question was raised on how the technical topic groups are to be created. SR commented that where there are already established groups on relevant topics, the Hub would be keen to adopt their outputs. Where established groups do not currently exist, we/TCE may need to create a specific group for this purpose. For example, an overarching impact assessment group for offshore wind has been created, and the group met for the first-time last week, where they discussed what opportunities exist for the generalist, what challenges they are seeing in terms of impact assessments. The group is composed nature conservation bodies, policy organisations, developers, consultancies and TCE.

A final comment was that if FLOWW were to act as the technical topic group for commercial fisheries, then this task should be added to the FLOWW objectives.

Agenda item 6

▪ **Regional updates**

Updates from developers and fisheries (England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales)

England and Wales fisheries update – led by MR.

MR provided an update from NFFO (includes England and Wales). A summary is provided below.

- Since the last FLOWW meeting (in April 2023) NFFO have responded to many OWF PEIRs (Preliminary Environmental Information Reports) consultations on behalf of NFFO members, including PEIRs on Morgan, Mona, Morecombe, Dogger Bank South, Five Estuaries, North Falls, Outer Dowsing, and the Morgan and Morecambe transmission aspects (all due in July), NFFO has undertaken 9 full consultation reviews in 6 months.
- NFFO are currently holding meetings with developers regarding the NFFO responses.
- NFFO's general comments in their PEIR consultation responses were related to the:
 - (in)appropriate interpretation of data and evidence used,
 - lack of use of the precautionary approach,
 - lack of site-specificity in the assessment,
 - lack of contemporary data.
- NFFO's overall concern was that impact on fisheries is normally assessed as being minor, which is generally inaccurate. For example, a 5-20% loss of turnover for a scallop vessel was assessed as a minor impact.
- Not all environmental impact assessments (EIAs) consider the economic impact on fisheries.
- NFFO have observed disparity in how EIAs are undertaken.
- NFFO are experiencing increasing pressure from Carbon Capture (CC) initiatives. CC surveys are overlapping with OWF surveys, which is demonstrating lack of synergy between surveys.
- There are different liaison mechanisms between different activities/surveys.
- NFFO still have issues with non-local fishing vessels acting as guard vessels/scout vessels.

- UK fisheries are currently undergoing a huge reform due to the Fisheries Act 2020, and between the present day and 2028 there will be 43 new Fishery Management Plans (FMPs).
 - The 1st 6 FMPs went out for consultation over summer 2023, and the consultations close on 1st Oct 2023.
 - Each FMP has over 300 pages of documentation associated with it.
- In addition, to the PEIR and FMP consultations, the NFFO also needs to respond to consultations on:
 - Discard reform
 - Remote Electronic Monitoring (REM)
 - Fisheries management measures for HPMAs - where a buffer zone has been introduced, (which wasn't include in the original consultation)
 - Lifting the licence cap on the under-10 m fishing fleet
- Effective liaison across activities and sectors is very important because there is much going on the marine/fisheries sphere, and as such, there is a huge demand on the fishing industry.
- NFFO also has concerns over fisheries stocks. For example, the European-wide decline in brown crab abundance, and area-specific issues, such as the decline in whelk stocks in the southern North Sea. This confirms that it is a very challenging time for shellfisheries.
- Due to the high workload, resources are still an issue, and the fishing industry is struggling to keep on top of everything. It is a challenging time for the fishing industry.
- There is little cross-sector, cross-government communication, therefore all policy-specific and project-specific work ends up with the fishing industry at the same time.
- NFFO are imminently expecting a call for evidence for Round 4 MCZs.

IR reiterated that there are many conflicts and issues in the southern North Sea. For example, CC projects (and large 3D surveys) taking up very large sea areas where a lot of static gear fishing takes place. Fishermen are overwhelmed with MCZ legislation as well as OREI developments. MR commented that in the 6 months he has been working for the NFFO he has undertaken 34 written consultations, and only 8 of those were for OWFs; which highlights scale of activities taking place in the marine environment.

MJ agreed with MR's and IR's comments and highlighted that from an Outer Thames Estuary, the fishing industry is also experiencing resourcing issues. So far in 2023, 5 surveys have been undertaken in the Outer Thames Estuary, and there are 3 more surveys expected from Spring 2024. There are also 2 more OWFs in development. MJ further commented that it is the same Fishermen's Associations having to deal with the associated work, all on a voluntary basis, therefore resourcing is very tough. There is fatigue due to be continually being asked to meet on multiple development projects. MJ further noted that Fishermen's Associations are running out of time, trying to keep up with all the EIAs and licence applications; and unless you are constantly involved, it is almost impossible to understand what is going on. Fishermen's Associations now feel that they are out of the loop and are finding it difficult knowing how to deal with EIAs and licence applications etc. This highlights the need for good liaison.

MJ further commented that a positive outcome from all the activities taking place in the Outer Thames Estuary, is the creation of Outer Thames Regional Coordination group, which aims to get all sectors together in same space to find better ways of engaging with each other and to understand the impact of each other's activities on the fishing industry. The group meets once a month. Some FLOWW members are also members of Outer Thames Regional Coordination group.

It was queried whether there was Government funding to provide additional resources for the fishing industry to help respond to consultations. MR commented that the FaSS fund could help fund additional resources, but the problem was that match funding was required, and that the level of experience and expertise required to undertake such work may not be available within the fishing industry. Therefore, it would require someone from outside the industry, but the level of financial support on offer was not attractive to such people. MR commented that he would be keen to know how many applications the FaSS fund received for additional support. MR further highlighted that the high level of expertise

required to respond to consultations and the overwhelming amount of work involved did not make it an attractive proposition (for any one person). MR also highlighted his concern that with the current levels of resourcing, the fishing industry (including Fishermen's Associations and Organisations) was not able to undertake the due diligence required to provide optimum responses to consultations.

Further comments highlighted that the workload would not be decreasing, and so solutions to address the lack of resources (and expertise) needs to be addressed as soon as possible. For example, if no one applied for FaSS funding, what were the reasons for that. It was questioned how best to train people to facilitate knowledge gain and undertake consultation responses on behalf of the fishing industry, and it was further questioned whether training people within the fishing industry to undertake such work and/or provide training for young university graduates, was feasible. The possibility of FLOWW facilitating training sessions was also raised. It was commented, however, that the fishing industry did not have the time to provide such training, and that additional resources were required immediately. RH suggested that extending the response time to consultation would be very helpful.

It was noted that the funds which are available for training within the fishing industry need to be prioritised, such as prioritising the training of new fishers. It was also noted, however, that both types of training are required, because otherwise, the newly trained fishers may not have fishing opportunities at their disposal (e.g., co-existing/co-locating with OWFs) if the fishing industry was not able to be involved with the OREI development process (e.g., via responding to consultations).

MR commented that the NFFO is moving towards employing more onshore staff, and that funding for the non-sector vessels is difficult. MR is aware that a system whereby fisheries rely on a short term-funded entity to respond on behalf of fishers was not a viable solution.

CR noted that he (and his organisation, CFPO) have had much recent experience of what has previously been discussed in the FLOWW meeting. This is with regards to the development of OREI in the Celtic Sea. CR wanted to re-iterate the point on non-viability of short-term funding in some circumstances; and noted that such funding will typically pay for a service, rather than an employee. Government fisheries funds were used to commission a piece of work to evidence CFPO's members footprint in the Celtic Sea. Therefore, the funding paid for a specialist to collate and present data, and this could be useful use of funds for other parts of the UK. CR agreed with MR that funding for training personnel was not viable because of the short-term nature of funds. CR further noted that it is a difficult situation, and that the industry needs to look beyond trying to find people to train up. Instead, the industry needs to look for existing expertise which can be commissioned/paid for to support the fishing industry.

CW commented that it has always been a problem for small Fishermen's Associations who are not members of POs, and therefore have smaller representation. CW further commented that the long-term beneficiaries need to be considered (e.g., developers and TCE), and questioned whether such beneficiaries could provide some financial support for smaller Fisherman's Associations to produce consultation responses. This may help ensure that due diligence is undertaken in their responses, and that the information presented is correct, which in turn would enable good planning decisions to be made. The funding could be made available on a 'needs must' basis.

CW clarified that funding could also be used to produce/access better quality supporting data on behalf of fisheries for planning applications. AB (from Crown Estate Scotland) commented that getting the best possible data into the consent applications in the first place would be the ideal route, rather than it being retrospectively added once the consent application had been made. AB further commented that Crown Estate Scotland (and hopefully TCE) have a vested interest in this, and that AB would be keen to have a further discussion with CW on the topic, outside of the FLOWW meeting. CW commented that he would be very keen to discuss it further with AB.

MR clarified that when he was referring to 'due diligence', he was not referring to the consenting process, but instead, the due diligence on the NFFO's consultation responses.

CR (from CFPO) provided an update on developments in the Celtic Sea. The update concentrated on activities affecting SW England fisheries (and waters). A summary is provided below.

- The past couple of months has been busy due to many surveys taking place at a similar time, including those associated with:
 - Floating wind in the Celtic Sea (via TCE).
 - Celtic Interconnector crosslinks.
 - White Cross OWF
- It has been challenging to keep up to date with the surveys.
- Together with the reform of fisheries management and FMPs, the SW fishing industry (like the rest of the UK) is experiencing a huge workload.
- Keeping CFPO members well-informed on activities taking place at sea is also a big task.

There was a comment noting that the issues being experienced by CR, and the fishing industry in general, and highlights the usefulness of the Kingfisher Bulletin, with regards to disseminating notifications/alerts on activities taking place at sea. The Kingfisher Bulletin can set up regional alerts. There was also a plea to all developers to make sure that their Notices to Mariners (NtMs) are uploaded to the Kingfisher Bulletin and for the fishing associations to make sure their members are aware of the Kingfisher Bulletin. CF commented that there had been a 50% increase in NtMs on the Kingfisher Bulletin in the past 6 months (which a positive step forwards).

Scotland fisheries update – led by RH.

Firstly, RH asked to the FLOWW group to recognise and appreciate Malcolm Morrison's valuable contributions to FLOWW over the past 14 years. Malcolm is no longer with SFF, and hence is no longer attending FLOWW meetings. Malcolm's extensive knowledge and expertise of the fishing industry will be missed at FLOWW. FH is the new SFF representative at FLOWW meetings.

RH confirmed that the Scottish fishing sector was experiencing the same issues as discussed for England and Wales. However, RH added the following insights.

- The Scottish catching sector remains buoyant for 2023.
- The market price for small haddock is still a problem, due to the lack of processors being unable to handle large quantities of small haddock.
- The haddock biomass in our seas is currently the greatest it has been since records began and it is predicted to increase.
- There has been negative press on cod stocks being in a bad state, which RH stated was untrue. The catching sector in England and Scotland is governed by ICES scientific advice and ICES' recommendations have been followed for the setting of cod TACs.
- The prawn sector is reporting decreased catches compared to previous years; however, market prices remain very strong.
- Lobster and crab catches are down in some Scottish areas for the fall fishery; however, they are stronger in others. The fall fishery is normally the most productive time of the year, but prices are slightly deflated.
- The gross earning of vessels increased last year (2022); however, profits were down because of increased fuel costs.
- New build projects are not as prolific as in the previous 5 years, due to rising costs of materials, high interest rates and high fuel costs. There are uncertainties around fishing opportunities in the next decade and beyond which are making skippers wary of future investment.
- Offshore wind farms are still the biggest physical challenge that fishing sector has faced and is likely to face. This is causing deep concern to the fishing industry.

- Subsea cabling, including export cables and interconnectors, are increasing at an exponential rate, and is causing major problems in several areas - specifically Peterhead, Moray Firth and Firth of Forth and Tay. This is causing problems for both the fishing industry and developers (who are trying to facilitate surveys at the same time). It is recognised by both sectors that this is an issue which needs to be resolved.
- Offshore renewables currently appear to be having a 'speed wobble'. Major players are pulling out due to increased costs, high interest rates, supply chain problems etc. The cost of fixed foundations has increased by 60% over past 5 months. This was highlighted in the recent CfD (Contracts for Difference) auction round, where there were no bids for offshore wind developments. One reason for this may be that, in Scotland, offshore wind projects have not yet been consented.

RH also commented that he was disappointed with the lack of Scotwind and INTOG developers attending FLOWW meetings and hopes that this will be addressed going forward.

Developers update - led by HR.

HR's update is summarised below.

- Even though the offshore wind sector is experiencing some issues (as highlighted by RH in his Scottish update), policy support for offshore wind still remains.
- Cost increases of up to 40% are being experienced by some OWF developments, which was not reflected in older agreed strike prices, which led to no bids in the latest CfD auction. The result of this is that all the developments will likely be in the next allocation round (#6), which will take place next year.
- The Norfolk Boreas offshore wind development (from Round 4) has been postponed for the next 2 allocation rounds.
- The delay in OWFs is a preventable delay, and it hasn't been good for the cost of electricity for consumers (estimates of £ billions have been provided as the extra cost).
- Some people may consider that developers are 'crying wolf' because of the increased costs.
- Allocation round 6 could see large number of projects coming through, which would be operational from 2027 onwards.
- The Ørsted – Hornsea 4 has recently received DCO consent.

CM (from Ørsted) commented that developers in the Isle of Man are interested in attending FLOWW meetings and adopting FLOWW BPG. As the Isle of Man is not part of the UK (but instead is a Crown Dependency), FLOWW members were asked whether they had any objection to the Isle of Man joining FLOWW. No objections were received; therefore, EW will discuss with CM about Isle of Man developers (and potentially fishers) attending FLOWW and adopting FLOWW BPG. It was mentioned that Isle of Man fishers attended FLOWW meetings in the past.

Action: EW to discuss with CM, and to take forward, the invitation for Isle of Man developers (and fishers) to join FLOWW.

ESCA update – led by JWr.

JWr stated that, recently, ESCA have been focusing on Marine Spatial Prioritisation (MSPri). ESCA have been working towards producing guidelines for linear power cables, telecoms cables etc. (not for offshore renewables), and so been working to arrange a fishing and cables information-exchange

workshop. The workshop would enable sectors to have a better understanding of each other's activities, as well as act as the precursor to the production of guidelines. The workshop is still in the planning stages, but ESCA is looking at holding the workshop in Nov 2023, and are currently working on its location, venue, and format. JWr has had discussions with Mike Cohen (NFFO) regarding agenda and topics.

JWr also introduced Claire Muir (who was present in-person at the FLOWW meeting) as ESCA's new liaison officer. Claire will significantly increase ESCA's resources (ESCA is a very small organisation of 3 people).

It was commented that the workshop was a very good idea, and a question was asked of when cable burial first took place. JWr stated that cable burial is a long-standing technique which began in the 1960s using cable clouds. JWr also commented that cables have also always been surfaced laid in areas of hard seabed. Cloud burial is a passive method, but jetting is used to bury cables to a target depth (so that they remain recoverable). JWr commented that around Scottish islands there may be more surface laid cables, because of high currents and lack of sediment.

General comments and updates

FM raised an issue for comment by the FLOWW group. FM described how the Berwick Bank OWF had undertaken a geophysical survey of its Cambois export cable route in June, with landfall occurring in Blyth, Northumberland. Gear clearance was required, and co-operation agreements entered, which was a very challenging process. However, a FIR made SSE aware that they (through the FLO) had not asked for IFCA shellfish permits as part of the evidence collection. IFCA shellfish permits being part of the evidence collection is not stated in the FLOWW BPG, which was being followed during this process. SSE had already signed agreements with 2 fishers who did not possess IFCA shellfish permits.

Based on this experience, FM queried how many other co-operation agreements based on FLOWW BPG, have been made to fishers who have no legal right to fish in an area (i.e., do not possess any mandatory IFCA shellfish permits). FM suggested that IFCA shellfish permits should now form part of the evidence collected under the revised FLOWW BPG. CW confirmed that he is undertaking some research into this scenario. A discussion was then had around the differences between fishing vessel licences, shellfish entitlements and IFCA shellfish permits. The main discussion points are summarised below.

- Shellfish permits issued by IFCA's are only required when fishing within the 6 nm limit of an IFCA district.
- The specifics of shellfish permits vary between IFCA's; some IFCA's do not issue shellfish permits.
- Shellfish permits allow fishing to take place within the IFCA district, but do not control landings.

The following general comments were also discussed.

CF highlighted how far the UK has come with regards to fisheries and OWF interactions over the past 15 years. CF works on an Irish offshore wind project, and she had asked some FLOWW members to present the activities of FLOWW to the Irish equivalent of FLOWW (because Ireland refuse to adopt FLOWW BPG and want to produce their own BPG). CF commented that it is so useful that FLOWW exists and is willing to present lessons learnt to other groups, and feed into other markets.

MR asked the developers for their opinions on achieving UK offshore wind targets, due to the current delays in offshore wind development and associated increased costs. Responses stated that the determination to reach the target is still there, but there have been suggestions amongst developers that reaching 50GW by 2023 is an 'extremely tall order'.

Agenda item 7

- **Marine Spatial Planning**

Update from Defra (TBC)

This item was removed from the agenda because there were no Defra representatives attending the FLOWW meeting, who could provide an update.

Agenda item 8

- **Marine Spatial Prioritisation (JM)**

Update from Defra

JM provided an update on Defra's Marine Spatial Prioritisation (MSPri) Programme. The update is summarised below.

- The programme involves optimisation, maximisation, and prioritisation of marine area uses.
- Defra has recently undertaken dual-sector workshops on MSPri, with the various sectors involved in potential co-location.
- The dual-sector workshops involved the following sectors:
 - Fisheries
 - Nature recovery
 - Offshore wind
 - Carbon capture storage
 - Hydrogen
 - Telecoms cabling
- The workshops aimed at investigating how co-location could be improved. The main objectives were:
 - To build a better understanding of the barriers to co-location.
 - To identify potential solutions to co-location.
 - To identify the role of the Defra MSPri Programme (i.e., Government) in realising improved co-location.
- The main discussion topics of the workshops were:
 - Engagement, and the importance of early engagement.
 - EIAs and data - robustness of data, data baselines, relevance of data (e.g., age of data and location of where data was gathered from), evidence gaps, the process for considering and gathering data.
 - Role of MSPri Programme in facilitating co-location - via facilitation and engagement, and improvements in relevant data.
- Notes from the workshops have already been circulated to the workshop attendees, and JM is willing to share the notes with FLOWW members, particularly the notes on the offshore wind and fisheries workshop.

- Defra is considering undertaking a trilateral workshop with fisheries, nature recovery and offshore wind, because there is an overlap between the 3 sectors.
- Defra is trying to strike the balance between progressing policy and not alienating stakeholders and industries, who are important to engagement and solutions.
- The fisheries and cabling knowledge-sharing workshop (being facilitated by ESCA) is considered to be important.
- Defra is currently undertaking research on fisheries displacement (includes displacement modelling, adaptations to climate change, and socioeconomic impacts) due to its relevance to co-location.
- JM thanked everyone for their participation in the MSPri workshops.
- Defra will be revisiting the fisheries and nature recovery workshop (due to issues with this workshop).
- Defra is beginning the process of updating the East Marine Plan, with public consultation due to be published in autumn 2023.

Action: JM to share MSPri workshop notes with EW, who will disseminate the notes to FLOWW members. JM to check that it is ok to share the information with Scottish stakeholders.

It was commented that Defra's MSPri Programme, is a very useful and important initiative, and it would be beneficial if the devolved administrations could undertake a similar initiative. It was also noted that short-term wins and gains can be simple, and all that is required is a room for discussion between stakeholders. Short-term, key achievements can be met, and these will have long-term meaningful benefits. It was further commented that the MSPri Programme is a good opportunity to look both at the short, medium, and longer-term aspects of MSPri, and what maximisation and optimisation means with regards to MSPri, (because MSPri has not yet been achieved).

JM clarified that the outputs from Defra's Marine Spatial Prioritisation (MSPri) Programme work stream on co-location would be recommendations to Government ministers on what Defra may be able to change with regards to achieving co-location.

Agenda item 9

- **Summary of next steps (EW and CW)**

EW summarised the meeting's actions to be taken forward. In summary, the main actions were to:

- Progress the FLOWW BPG, in order to achieve sign-off by FLOWW members as soon as possible. It will involve:
 - Editorial and technical reviews.
 - A FLOWW BPG subgroup workshop/meeting (by end of 2023, if possible). There was a suggestion that this workshop/meeting could align with the cables/fisheries knowledge exchange workshop being organised by ESCA and Defra.
- Collate definitions for 'co-existence and 'co-location' for review by FLOWW, with the intention of agreeing on definitions to be used in the context of FLOWW and FLOWW BPG. EW to

disseminate in writing the collated definitions for FLOWW members to comment, with the intention of discussing it further at the next FLOWW meeting.

- Present case studies on the successes and challenges of each sector at the next FLOWW meeting.
- SR to follow up with AG on providing an update on new fisheries evidence at the next FLOWW meeting- with the intention of updates on new evidence/research becoming a standing agenda item at future FLOWW meetings.
- Setting a date for the next FLOWW meeting in early 2024.

CW questioned whether FLOWW should consult (or share thoughts) with Defra and MMO to try and agree on one definition to be used by all parties for 'co-existence' and 'co-location'. OG (from MMO) commented that he believes that the definitions should be led by the regulators (i.e., Defra and MMO) because they are already being used in marine plans, and it would be confusing if different organisations used different terminologies. OG is already in discussion with Defra about the definitions but commented that it would be useful to hear FLOWW's views on the current Defra/MMO definitions. OG also noted that Defra/MMO may have some solutions to adjust the definitions, but re-iterated that it may be difficult to make the changes because the current definitions are already in use in 11 marine plans. OG has an existing document on Defra's/MMO's views on 'co-existence' and 'co-location' definitions and OG agreed to send it to FLOWW members. OG suggested building on the definitions that Defra and MMO currently use, and possibly add some extra definitions. CW stated that the more aligned the definitions were across the sectors, the more it would help support a level playing field.

Action: OG to send Defra's/MMO's document on their definitions of 'co-existence' and 'co-location' to EW for dissemination to the FLOWW membership.

It was commented that it does not matter if the FLOWW definitions vary slightly to Defra's/MMO's, as long as the FLOWW-specific definitions are clearly stated in the FLOWW BPG. The task of all sectors agreeing upon one standard definition is extremely challenging.

It was confirmed that there are currently no specific definitions for 'co-existence' and 'co-location' in the revised FLOWW BPG, and it was commented that the FLOWW BPG subgroup was awaiting definitions from Defra, possibly by means of an outcome/action from the OTNR group.

It was also noted that there should be input from the Marine Directorate (Scotland) and Welsh Government into the definitions for 'co-existence' and 'co-location', due to devolved nature of marine spatial planning.

There was short discussion on the cables and fisheries knowledge exchange workshop being organised by ESCA and Defra. It was confirmed that ESCA would be willing to share the workshop agenda with FLOWW members. It was stated that, currently, there is an outline programme which has been put together by ESCA and NFFO (Mike Cohen). CW confirmed that the FLOWW Secretariat would be willing to help with the workshop, if required.

CW (as FLOWW Chair) closed the meeting's discussions with a summary on FLOWW's progression, despite challenging landscapes and tasks (e.g., the co-location of fisheries and OWFs and FLOWW BPG). CW acknowledged the collective expertise within the FLOWW membership, and as a result, believes that FLOWW will continue to move forward and find solutions to problems within the co-location sphere.

- **AoB (CW)**

Note: Prior to the meeting, FLOWW members were requested to indicate whether they had any items they would like to raise under AoB.

CW asked FLOWW members whether anyone had AoB matters they would like to raise. No matters were raised.

CW and EW finally closed the meeting by thanking everyone for their attendance and contributions to FLOWW. Thanks were also given to Fishmonger's Company for hosting the meeting.

Meeting closed.

06 December 2023

Annex 1 - Paper#1 from FLOWW meeting in April 2023

Title	Agenda item 1. FLOWW Mission Statement, Objectives, and Activities
Date	26/04/2023
Action	Discussion and approval of recommendations
Presenters	Colin Warwick and Sion Roberts

Purpose

To reposition FLOWW's mission Statement, objectives, and core activities to reflect current and future activities within the offshore renewable energy (ORE) and fisheries sphere.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are for approval during the meeting.

	Recommendation	Action
1.	Rename FLOWW	Change of name to 'The ORE and Fisheries Co-existence Forum'
2.	Create overarching Mission Statement	Mission Statement to be: To identify the key challenges to the continued coexistence of the Offshore Renewable Energy (ORE) and fishing industries, and to centralise/coordinate efforts to drive long-term solutions.
3	Set 3 main objectives for the next 12-18 months	3 objectives to be as follows: 1. Agree and publish the updated Best Practice Guidance, to support developers in achieving success through a consistent liaison approach. 2. Set out agreed principles for assessment of impacts on fisheries from ORE development. 3. Set out best practice for engagement with fisheries and fisheries data in a spatial design exercise
4	Set core activities for the next 12-18 months	Core activities to be as follows: 1. Remain central to dissemination of new evidence / information across the UK in this space. 2. React to changes in evidence and reflect this in advice communicated to key stakeholders. 3. Take a leading role in progressing cross sector collaboration across research and other activities to support UK wide objectives for both fisheries and ORE.

06 December 2023