

Project Delivery Guidance on the process to select Marine Conservation Zones

ADDENDUM to reflect changes made during the project to the process and timetable, as a result of clarification on the information to be submitted and the consequent timescale

Issued 13th December 2012 by JNCC and Natural England

1. Build status:

Version	Date	Owner	Reason/Comments
0.4	6 Dec 12	S. Wells, Natural England	Incorporation of comments from Rebecca Clarke
0.3	25 Sept 12	S. Wells, Natural England	Incorporation of comments plus final review by Jamie Davies
0.2	24 August 12	J. Davies, Natural England	Issued to JNCC and NE staff for initial feedback

2. Distribution list:

Copy	Version	Issue Date	Issued To
Electronic	0.3	23 October 12	Caroline Cotterell, Amy Ridgeway, Jon Davies, Ollie Payne, Rebecca Clarke, Joanna Redgewell, Jamie Davis
Electronic	0.2	24 August 12	Amy Ridgeway, JNCC; Sue Wells, Natural England

Background information

In July 2010 Natural England and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) published the Project Delivery Guidance on the process to select Marine Conservation Zones (Natural England and JNCC 2010). During the process to select Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs) changes were made to the process and timetable identified in the document. The changes were made to reflect:

1. Clarification from Defra on the information expected to be submitted to support Government decision making on MCZs to designate in 2012 which was provided to Natural England, JNCC, the regional MCZ projects and the Science Advisory Panel in July 2011.
2. The need to manage the complexities of delivering such an ambitious project which led to decisions about the delivery timeline agreed in May 2011 and November 2011 between Defra, JNCC and Natural England, and endorsed by the MCZ Project Board

This addendum has been developed to promote understanding of these changes and reflect Natural England and JNCC's commitment to openness and transparency in MCZ Project delivery.

What the addendum includes

The addendum does not replace the Project Delivery Guidance (PDG) which will not itself be revised. The addendum shows where changes to the project delivery process were made in the course of the project and gives information on:

1. the changes that were made to the process;
2. the reason that the changes were made
3. Any rewording of, or additions and deletions to, the text that is necessary to reflect the changes;

The PDG has been re-issued to include reference numbers which show where changes were made to the process.

Contacts

Contacts for this addendum and the associated version of the PDG are:

Sue Wells
Natural England
Eastbrook
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8DR
Tel: 07795 612784
E-mail: Sue.Wells@naturalengland.org.uk

Ollie Payne,
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House,
City Road,
Peterborough,
Cambridgeshire PE1 1JY
Tel: 01733 866943
E-mail: ollie.payne@jncc.gov.uk

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 6, Section 1.1, penultimate paragraph	<p>Revised approach adopted for development of the IA.</p> <p>Defra subsequently defined the term management measures as referring to management instruments and it was not the role of the regional projects to determine these</p>	<p>Delete: ‘Each regional MCZ project will develop an impact assessment for their proposed regional series of sites.’</p> <p>Replace with: ‘It was initially anticipated that each regional MCZ project will develop an impact assessment for their proposed regional series of sites. However, following discussions between the regional MCZ projects, Defra, JNCC and Natural England it was agreed that it will be more appropriate for the four regional MCZ projects to produce a single IA for all the MCZs that they are recommending.’</p> <p>Delete: ‘management measures that are likely to be needed’ Replace with: ‘management scenarios that are likely to be needed’</p>
Page 6, Section 1.1, last paragraph.	<p>Once the scope of the work for the IA had been determined, it became clear that the RSG did not have the time or expertise to produce the impact assessment themselves and that this task was best undertaken by the project teams, led by the regional project economist.</p> <p>The extension of the project timeline, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra in November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board meant that the delivery date for the impact assessment extended beyond the life of the RSGs</p>	<p>Delete ‘The impact assessment will be included in the package of recommendations from each regional MCZ stakeholder group to Natural England and JNCC. These impact assessments will set out..’</p> <p>Replace with: ‘The impact assessment will be developed by regional MCZ project team members with input from regional stakeholder group members and submitted to Defra in July 2012. The impact assessment will set out...’</p>

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 7, Section 1.2, Figure 1	Defra guidance notes have been finalised since the publication of the PDG and are no longer 'Drafts'. They can be found at: http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/marine/protect/mpa/mcz/	Delete 'Draft' from each reference to Guidance notes
Page 8, Section 1.3, last paragraph	Guidance was subsequently produced for developing MCZ Conservation Objectives	Add to end of paragraph "which were produced in Jan 2011 as the MCZ Conservation Objectives Guidance."

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 9, Section 1.5, Table 1	<p>Regional profiles continued to be updated as new information was obtained and evolved into Interactive PDFs</p> <p>Two extensions to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011 & November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board (June 2011 and November 2011)</p>	<p>Move "Regional Profile finalised" from <i>Stage 5</i> to <i>Stage 7</i></p> <p>Delete milestones Stages 7-9 only and replace with following text:</p> <p><i>Stage 7 – Mid April-May 2011</i> Regional Projects finalise draft final MCZ recommendations for submission on 1st June 2011. Regional projects collect information on costs, benefits, impacts and prepare material for impact assessment.</p> <p><i>Stage 8 – June-August 2011</i> Regional projects prepare and submit final MCZ recommendation reports to Natural England, JNCC and the SAP by August 31st 2011.</p> <p>Regional projects collect information on costs, benefits, impacts and prepare material for impact assessment.</p> <p><i>Stage 9 –September 2011 – July 2012</i> Natural England and JNCC develop and submit advice on MCZ recommendations and conservation objectives to Defra (18 July 2012)</p> <p>Regional MCZ projects develop and submit the IA to JNCC and Natural England on 13 July 2012. JNCC and Natural England submit the IA to Defra on 18 July.</p>

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 11, Section 2.2, Figure 3	<p>Resignation of Finding Sanctuary Chair on two occasions due to staff changes</p> <p>Resignation of staff responsible for Finding Sanctuary Financial Accountability due to staff changes</p> <p>Resignation of staff responsible for Net Gain financial accountability due to staff changes</p> <p>Resignation of staff responsible for ISCZ financial accountability due to staff changes</p>	<p>Finding Sanctuary: Delete: Board Chair Janette Ward; Replace with: Christine Marshall</p> <p>Financial Accountability: Delete Steve Warman; Replace with: Jamie Davies</p> <p>Net Gain: Financial Accountability – delete: Rob Aubrook; Replace with: Peter Knottage</p> <p>ISCZ: Financial Accountability – delete: David Knight; Replace with: Stephen Ayliffe</p>
Page 12, Section 2.2.1, first paragraph	<p>Two extensions to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board (June 2011 and November 2011)</p> <p>Clarification of Defra's expectations issued July 2011</p>	<p>Delete: Regional Project Boards are responsible for the effective delivery of MCZ recommendations and accompanying impact assessment by the regional stakeholder groups to Natural England and JNCC by June 2011</p> <p>Replace with: Regional Project Boards are responsible for the delivery of MCZ recommendations by 31 August 2011 to Natural England, JNCC and the SAP. They are responsible for the delivery of the regional MCZ project IA to Defra by 18 July 2012,</p>

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 13, Section 2.2.2	<p>Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011 & November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)</p> <p>Clarification of Defra's expectations issued July 2011</p>	<p><i>Responsibility:</i></p> <p>Delete: Regional stakeholder groups are responsible for providing MCZ recommendations to Natural England and JNCC (and copied to Defra) by June 2011</p> <p>Replace with: Regional stakeholder groups are responsible for contributing to the documents listed in the bullet points below for submission by 31 August 2011.</p> <p>Delete the bullet: A draft impact assessment for the regional MCZ series to be submitted to the Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCBs) that is of sufficient quality for formal public consultation and external review (see Chapter 5 below).</p> <p>Replace with a new sentence: Regional stakeholder groups will have the opportunity to contribute to the content of the regional MCZ projects' impact assessment (IA). The IA will be delivered by the regional MCZ project teams to Defra on 18 July 2012.</p>
Page 16, Section 2.2.4, 1 st paragraph	<p>Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011 & November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)</p> <p>Clarification of Defra's expectations issued July 2011</p>	<p><u>Regional Project Teams</u></p> <p>Add additional sentence to end of paragraph: The regional project teams will be responsible for the development of the regional MCZ project IA, engaging stakeholders to provide information and comment on draft materials as they are developed.</p>

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 17, Section 2.3.1, 2 nd and 5 th bullets	<p>Recognition that the content of the draft regional MCZ project impact assessments did not include information that the SAP could readily review.</p> <p>It was not within the remit of the SAP to ensure that the regional MCZ recommendations met the ENG criteria</p>	<p><i>Roles and responsibilities:</i></p> <p>Delete 2nd bullet point: Provide feedback to the regional stakeholder groups on the quality of the environmental (but not the economic or social) aspects of the impact assessments;</p> <p>Reword 5th bullet point: “Assist the regional MCZ projects in working to consistent standards and to ensure regional MCZ recommendations meet the criteria set out in the Ecological Network Guidance;” as</p> <p>“Assist the regional MCZ projects in working to consistent standards and to help ensure regional MCZ recommendations meet the criteria set out in the Ecological Network Guidance;”</p>
Page 17, Section 2.3.1, final para	Final paragraph reworded for clarification	<p>Final paragraph:</p> <p>Delete last sentence: This should be carried out through the regional project stakeholder group chair and supported by the regional project team and Natural England/JNCC where required.</p> <p>Replace with: The SAP Chair may also be asked to present the SAP’s advice to the regional stakeholder groups if requested</p>
Page 18; Section 2.3.3, first and final paragraphs	JNCC has no economist and it was not possible to recruit one	Delete: and JNCC
Page 19, Section 2.3.5, third paragraph	IFCAs are regional bodies and were engaged through the Regional Stakeholder Groups; they were incorrectly listed here as national stakeholders	Delete: Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 20; Section 3.2, heading	<p>The process is now nine stages because of an extension to the original timeline.</p> <p>Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)</p> <p>Clarification of Defra's expectations issued July 2011</p>	<p>Delete: The eight stage process</p> <p>Replace with: The nine stage process</p>
Page 20, Section 3.2, 1 st Paragraph	<p>The process is now nine stages because of an extension to the original timeline.</p> <p>Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)</p> <p>Clarification of Defra's expectations issued July 2011</p>	<p>Delete: The four regional project teams are responsible for managing stages 1-8 of the MCZ recommendation process as outlined in Table 1.</p> <p>Replace with: The four regional project teams are responsible for managing stages 1-9 of the MCZ recommendation process as outlined in Table 1.</p>

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 21, Section 3.2.1, Table 2	<p>Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)</p> <p>Clarification of Defra's expectations issued July 2011</p>	<p>Heading: Delete: The eight stage process</p> <p>Replace with: The nine stage process</p> <p>Table: Delete: existing table</p> <p>Replace with: the revised table 2 in Annex 1 below to reflect new timings for the development of the IA, revisions to final deadlines and the addition of Stage 9</p>
Page 23 Section 3.2.2, 1 st paragraph on page	Clarification that the work of compiling the impact assessment is the responsibility of the project team; the role of the regional stakeholder group is to provide the necessary information	<p>Delete: The regional stakeholder group will also use these data, with support from the regional project team, to conduct an impact assessment, considering the potential environmental, economic and social impacts of the proposed MCZ sites.</p> <p>Replace with: The regional project team will also use these data, with input from the regional stakeholder group, to develop an impact assessment considering the potential environmental, economic and social impacts of the recommended MCZ sites.</p>
Page 25, Section 3.2.4, 6 th bullet point	Conservation objectives were identified in Stage 7, once the guidance and necessary information were available	Delete: Identify conservation objectives associated with the features of each MCZ option identified.
Page 26, Section 3.2.4, last paragraph of description of Phase 3	The first stage of preparation of the Impact Assessment required a baseline description of socio-economic activities within the project area;	<p>Delete: Throughout the regional MCZ planning process, relevant staff in Defra, JNCC and Natural England will provide support to the regional stakeholder groups and regional MCZ projects in developing their qualitative assessments of the environmental, economic and social impacts of the proposed MCZs.</p> <p>Replace with: (additional bullet point to those above) First draft of baseline description of economic and social activities within the project area</p>
Page 26. Section 3.2.4,	Conservation objectives were identified in Stage 7, once the guidance and necessary	Delete: produce draft conservation objectives for the features of each proposed MCZ, identifying the pressures, and the activities that cause pressures (this should include both pressures that are occurring and those that are permitted that may not be presently

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
description of Phase 4, 2 nd bullet point	information was available	occurring), that may prevent the conservation objectives being furthered; and
Page 26. Section 3.2.4, description of Phase 4, last paragraph	The first stage of preparation of the Impact Assessment required a baseline description of socio-economic activities within the project area;	<p>Delete: The four regional MCZ projects should submit their initial assessments of human activities in areas where MCZs might be located, compatibility of the activities with the MCZs and the management measures that may be required to Defra's economists by 1st July 2010 for review. These outputs will form the 'initial' impact assessment</p> <p>Replace with: The four regional MCZ projects should submit their draft baseline descriptions of human activities in the project areas to Defra's economists by 1st July 2010 for review.</p>
Page 27, Section 3.2.5. Phase 7	<p>Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011 & November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)</p> <p>Clarification of Defra's expectations issued July 2011</p> <p>The extension to the timeline and addition of an extra stage meant that these activities were undertaken in Stages 7 and 8</p>	<p>Delete bullet points 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refine the draft conservation objectives for the features of each proposed MCZ clarifying the pressures and activities (both current and permitted) that may cause pressures preventing the objectives being furthered • Refine identification of possible sites for MCZs that are compatible with current and permitted human activity, sites that are completely incompatible with those activities and sites where some modification of the activity might be needed. Identify how activities might be modified or mitigated; • Identify the likely management measures where necessary through the risk based approach described in chapter 3.5. These should be used to inform the development of the impact assessment; • Make initial estimates of the positive and negative environmental, social and economic impacts of the MCZs compared with the baseline. These should be quantitative where possible (qualitative if quantitative estimates cannot be made); • In collaboration with the other regional stakeholder groups and regional MCZ projects, start to identify cumulative impacts of the four regional networks of MCZs (impacts that are over and above the sum of the impacts of the four networks);
Page 28, last paragraph	Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC	Replace: "draft impact assessment" with "baseline for Impact Assessment"

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
of Phase 7	and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)	
Page 28, Section 3.2.6, Phase 10, 4 th bullet point	<p>Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)</p> <p>The extension to the timeline and addition of an extra stage meant that the activities listed in the bullet points were moved from an earlier stage (see above) to Stages 7 and 8</p>	<p>Delete: bullet point: Continue to develop the assessment of the potential environmental, economic and social impacts of the proposed MCZs and the presentation of these in the impact assessment document</p> <p>Replace with bullet points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refine identification of possible sites for MCZs that are compatible with current and permitted human activity, sites that are completely incompatible with those activities and sites where some modification of the activity might be needed. Identify how activities might be modified or mitigated; • Identify the likely management measures where necessary through the risk based approach described in chapter 3.5. These should be used to inform the development of the impact assessment; • Continue development of the baseline for the impact assessment and develop methods for assessing impacts
Page 28, Phase 10, last paragraph	Clarification of SAP's role in their Terms of Reference (Defra, 2010) meant that this task was not within their remit	<p>Delete: The draft impact assessment should be submitted to Defra's economists, the external economists and social scientists and the SAP by 1st March 2011 for final review. The SAP should also be asked to comment on the draft impact assessment document</p> <p>Replace with: The revised baseline and draft methods should be submitted to Defra's economists, external economists and social scientists by 1st March 2011 for final review</p>
Page 29, Section 3.2.7	Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)	<p>Delete: Stage 7: Finalise regional MCZ recommendations</p> <p>Replace with: Stage 7: Develop final draft MCZ recommendations</p>

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 29, 3.2.7	<p>Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)</p> <p>The extension to the timeline and addition of an extra stage meant that the activities listed in the bullet points were moved from an earlier stage (see above) to Stages 7 and 8</p>	<p>Delete: <i>Phase 12: Finalise the regional MCZ recommendations.</i></p> <p>Replace with: <i>Phase 12: Meetings to agree the final draft regional MCZ recommendations</i></p> <p>Delete:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalise the MCZ recommendations based on any guidance and additional information received through the wider stakeholder consultation; • Finalise draft conservation objectives for the features of each proposed MCZ clarifying the pressures and activities (both current and permitted) that may cause pressures preventing the objectives being furthered; • Identify where consensus has and has not been achieved, logging all unresolved objections; • Finalise assessment of the potential environmental, economic and social impacts of the regional MCZ recommendations; and • In collaboration with the other stakeholder groups and regional projects, finalise assessment of the cumulative impacts of the four regional networks. <p>Replace with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop draft MCZ recommendations based on any guidance and additional information received through the wider stakeholder consultation; • Develop draft conservation objectives for the features of each proposed MCZ clarifying the pressures and activities (both current and permitted) that may cause pressures preventing the objectives being furthered; • Assess the potential environmental, economic and social impacts of the regional MCZ recommendations.
Page 29, Section 3.2.8	<p>Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and</p>	<p>Add: <i>Phase 13: Meetings to agree final recommendations to be submitted to JNCC, Natural England and the SAP on 31 August 2011</i></p> <p>Add: The outputs of this phase will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalise the MCZ recommendations based on any guidance and additional information received through the wider stakeholder consultation;

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
	<p>November 2011)</p> <p>The extension to the timeline and addition of an extra stage meant that the activities listed in the bullet points were moved from an earlier stage to a later stage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalise draft conservation objectives for the features of each proposed MCZ clarifying the pressures and activities (both current and permitted) that may cause pressures preventing the objectives being furthered; • Continue to collect information on costs, benefits, impacts and prepare material for impact assessment <p>Add: <i>Phase 14: Submission of regional MCZ project recommendations</i></p> <p>Delete: 1st June 2012</p> <p>Replace with: 7th September 2011</p> <p>Delete:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact assessment for each regional package of MCZ recommendations and assessment of the cumulative impacts will be assessed by a senior economist in Defra who will ascertain whether it is of sufficient quality for formal public consultation;
<p>Page 30, Section 3.2.8 , last bullet point (top of page)</p>	<p>Once the regional project facilitators were employed, the difficulty of obtaining consensus within the RSG was recognised and instead it was considered a better approach to allow each sector to record its views</p>	<p>Delete:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A consensus log for each site, indicating any outstanding objections from the regional stakeholder group members including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of organisation/stakeholder group; and • Reason for the objection. <p>Replace with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A summary of any outstanding objections and/or degree of support from the regional stakeholder group members including each sector concerned and a brief description of its view of the site (i.e. whether supported or opposed, and if so why)
<p>Page 30, Section 30.2.8, last paragraph</p>	<p>Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project</p>	<p>Delete: The impact assessments should include information on the costs, benefits and uncertainty associated with sites that do not have full stakeholder support.</p> <p>Add (as a new paragraph): During this time, the regional MCZ projects will continue to collect and analyse</p>

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
	Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)	information on impacts of the MCZ recommendations and prepare material for the impact assessment.
Page 30 Section, 30.2.8, at end of last paragraph	<p>Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)</p> <p>The extension to the timeline involved the addition of an extra stage that focused on completion of the Impact Assessment materials by the regional projects</p>	<p>Following 30.2.8, add:</p> <p><u>3.2.9 Stage 9. Continued development and finalisation of the Impact Assessment materials in support of the Regional Marine Conservation Zone Projects' Recommendations.</u></p> <p><i>September 2011 – July 2012</i></p> <p>Continue development of IA material that assesses the economic, environmental and social impacts of the regional MCZ project recommendations. Review of the IA material by Defra's economists and the external economists and social scientists.will take place in two tranches.</p> <p>The majority of the 1st tranche of material will be reviewed 25th November - 6th January. This material will include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assessment of site specific impacts for all sectors other than flood and coastal erosion risk management and for all sites other than reference areas. • other annexes and sections and that have been completed at this stage. <p>Additional material from the 1st tranche will be reviewed 23rd January – 10th February as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments of site-specific impacts on flood and coastal erosion risk management • Assessments of impacts of reference areas. • Assessments of site-specific benefits if completed. <p>The 2nd tranche of material will be reviewed 6th February – 2nd March as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • regional and national summaries of assessments of impacts of MCZs. • the Evidence Base and IA Summary. • other material that was not submitted previously.

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
		The regional MCZ project staff will address the feedback provided by the reviewers. Defra's economists will check that they are content with the revisions. The regional MCZ project staff will make any outstanding revisions identified by Defra.
Pg 30, 3.3, 4 th bullet point	Once the scope of the work for the IA had been determined, it became clear that the RSGs did not have the time or expertise to produce the impact assessment themselves and that this task was best undertaken by the project teams, led by the regional project economists.	<p>Delete: An assessment of environmental, economic and social impacts of the proposed regional MCZs, presenting the results in a formal impact assessment document</p> <p>Replace with: Support the regional project teams in delivery of an assessment of environmental, economic and social impacts of the regional MCZ projects' recommendations. This assessment will be conducted and presented as a formal impact assessment that meets with government requirements.</p>
Pg 30, 3.3, 5 th bullet point	Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)	<p>Delete: June 2011</p> <p>Replace with: 31 August 2011.</p>
Page 32, Figure 4	Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)	<p>Delete: Overview of the eight stages in the MCZ process</p> <p>Replace with: Overview of the nine stages in the MCZ process</p> <p>Delete: 1st June 2011</p> <p>Replace with: 31 August 2011.</p> <p>Revise: Stages 1 to 8 and Add Stage 9 (in line with the detail provided above)</p>

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 33, section 3.4, 1 st paragraph, 2 nd line	Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)	<p>Delete: eight-stage process</p> <p>Replace with: nine-stage process</p>
Page 34 Section 3.5.1, heading and 1 st paragraph	Defra subsequently defined the term management measures as referring to management instruments; since the regional projects were not involved in developing management measures, this phrase was replaced with “management scenarios”.	<p>Delete: Responsibilities for developing conservation objectives and management measures</p> <p>The framework for conservation objectives and management measures is provided in the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009, Defra MPA strategy and Guidance Notes 1 and 3.</p> <p>Replace with: Responsibilities for developing conservation objectives and management scenarios</p> <p>The framework for conservation objectives and management scenarios is provided in the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009, Defra MPA strategy and Guidance Notes 1 and 3.</p>
Page 34, Section 3.5.1., 3 rd paragraph	Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)	<p>Delete: Autumn 2010</p> <p>Replace with: January 2011</p>

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 34 Section 3.5.2, heading	Defra subsequently defined the term management measures as referring to management instruments; since the regional projects were not involved in developing management measures, this phrase was replaced with “management scenarios”.	<p>Delete: Process to identify management measures for MCZs</p> <p>Replace with: Process to identify likely management scenarios for MCZs</p>
Page 35, Section 3.5.2., 3 rd paragraph on page	Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)	<p>Delete: Autumn 2010</p> <p>Replace with: January 2011</p>

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 35 Section 3.5.2 paragraph 7	Defra subsequently defined the term management measures as referring to management instruments; since the regional projects were not involved in developing management measures, the terminology relating to management has therefore been revised	<p>Delete: To identify the actual management measures required will need further analysis, as the management measures will be dependent on the occurrence or risk of occurrence of an activity causing an identified pressure within a proposed MCZ, the intensity of the activity and the way the activity is undertaken. To identify what measures will be required, the vulnerability of the feature to the activity will need to be identified. If the feature is vulnerable to (or is at future risk from) a specific activity, or the way the activity is undertaken, management measures will be required to achieve the conservation objective(s) of the feature.</p> <p>Replace with: To identify the actual additional management required will need further analysis, as the management will be dependent on the occurrence or risk of occurrence of an activity causing an identified pressure within a proposed MCZ, the intensity of the activity and the way the activity is undertaken. To identify what additional management will be required, the vulnerability of the feature to the activity will need to be identified. If the feature is vulnerable to (or is at future risk from) a specific activity, or the way the activity is undertaken, additional management will be required to achieve the conservation objective(s) of the feature.</p>
Page 36, end of Section 3.5.3	Requirement that the IA provides information on options for the management measures that can be used to provide the additional management for MCZs, as set out in the revised version of Guidance on Selection and Designation of MCZs (Note 1) produced by Defra in September 2010.	Add: The IA will indicate the options for different management measures (such as regulatory instruments or voluntary codes of practice) that can be used to deliver the additional management that is likely to be needed for the MCZs recommended by the regional MCZ projects. These should include voluntary measures. This will need to be informed by the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and others, including Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities (IFCAs), the Environment Agency and other stakeholders.

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 37, paragraph 3	Clarification of expectation from Defra issued July 2011	<p>Delete bullet points 2, 4, 5, and 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact assessments of these proposed regional MCZs and an assessment of their cumulative impacts for formal public consultation; • An assessment of the level of support for each MCZ highlighting where agreement could not be achieved. Outstanding objections should be included, along with an explanation as to why resolution has not been possible and why the particular MCZ is deemed necessary to fulfil the Ecological Network Guidance; • JNCC will undertake an assessment of how the regional MCZ project recommendations contribute to the wider MPA network in UK and will offer any advice on the nature and extent of any ecological shortfalls; • If the MCZ recommendations are not deemed adequate by the SAP, Natural England and JNCC will undertake an assessment over the Secretary of State waters on how best to address any outstanding ecological shortfalls which remain. Their advice will be submitted alongside the regional recommendations; <p>Replace with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Impact Assessment that assesses the economic, environmental and social impacts of the regional MCZ projects' recommendations, including their cumulative impacts, for formal public consultation; <p>The other materials were not required at the point of submission following confirmation of expectations by Defra in July 2011.</p>
Page 38, section 3.6, last paragraph	Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)	<p>Delete: November 1st 2011</p> <p>Replace with: 18th July 2012</p>
Page 39 Section 4.1, para 2.	Agreement that one IA would be produced for all four regional MCZ projects' recommendations.	<p>Delete:...in preparing the impact assessments</p> <p>Replace with: ... in preparing the impact assessment.</p>

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 39 Section 4.2 1 st paragraph	Agreement that one IA would be produced for all four regional MCZ projects' recommendations.	Delete: through to preparation of the impact assessments. Replace with: through to preparation of the impact assessment
Page 40 Section 4.3 1 st paragraph	Agreement that one IA would be produced for all four regional MCZ projects' recommendations.	Delete: ...preparing their impact assessments. Replace with: ...preparing their impact assessment.
Page 40 Section 4.3 2 nd paragraph	Requirement that the IA provides information on options for the management measures that can be used to provide the additional management for MCZs, as set out in the revised version of Guidance on Selection and Designation of MCZs (Note 1) produced by Defra in September 2010. Also, clarification of expectation from Defra issued July 2011	Add: The IA will also indicate the different management measures that can be used to deliver the additional management that is likely to be needed for the recommended MCZs. This will consider an assessment of the measures' effectiveness, feasibility, costs (of development, implementation and enforcement) and other advantages and disadvantages. The preferred measures should be identified in collaboration with public authorities
Page 40, section 4.3, 3 rd paragraph	Clarification of expectation from Defra issued July 2011 Once the scope of the work for the IA had been determined, it became clear that the RSGs did not have the time or expertise to produce the impact assessment themselves and that this task was best undertaken by the project teams, led by the regional project economists.	Delete: Each stakeholder group, supported by the regional project, will produce an impact assessment for the MCZs that it recommends. The four stakeholder groups and four regional projects will also collaboratively produce an assessment of cumulative impact of the four regional MCZ recommendations. Replace with: Each regional project team, with information from the stakeholder group and other stakeholders, will produce materials for an impact assessment that assesses the economic, social and environmental impacts of all four of the regional MCZ projects' recommendations. They will include an assessment of cumulative impacts.

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 40 section 4.3.1, 1 st paragraph	<p>Extension to project timeline and clarification of tasks, agreed between Natural England, JNCC and Defra (May 2011& November 2011 and endorsed by Project Board in (June 2011 and November 2011)</p> <p>Clarification of expectation from Defra issued July 2011</p>	<p>Delete: eight stage process</p> <p>Replace with: nine stage process</p>
Page 41 Section 4.3.1, last paragraph	Recognition that the impact assessment did not include information that the SAP could readily review.	<p>Delete 4th bullet point</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SAP, to provide comments on the environmental aspects of the impact assessment. <p>Add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public authorities to provide advice on the different measures that could be used to provide the additional management likely to be needed for recommended MCZs, . This will include the measures' effectiveness, feasibility, costs (of development, implementation and enforcement), other advantages and disadvantages and the authorities' preferred mechanisms.
Page 41, section 4.3.2, 1 st paragraph	Clarification of expectation from Defra issued July 2011	<p>Delete: An impact assessment will accompany each regional MCZ recommendation put forward for formal public consultation undertaken by Defra (see Chapter 5).</p> <p>Replace with:</p> <p>An Impact Assessment for the recommendations of all four regional MCZ projects, which will include an assessment of the cumulative impacts of the recommendations, will be submitted by the regional MCZ projects.</p>

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 42, Section 4.3.2, 6th paragraph	Agreement that one IA would be produced for all four regional MCZ projects' recommendations.	<p>Delete: ... inform their impact assessments.</p> <p>Replace with: ... inform their assessments of impact.</p>
Page 41, section 4.3.2, 'process for submission of impact assessments'	Clarification of expectation from Defra issued July 2011	<p>Delete: <u>Process for the submission of impact assessments</u></p> <p>Replace with: <u>Process for the submission of the impact assessments</u></p> <p>Delete: The impact assessments for formal public consultation will be part of the final outputs submitted by the four regional MCZ projects to JNCC and Natural England (copied to Defra). The responsibility for impact assessments will then transfer to SNCBs.</p> <p>Replace with: The impact assessment for formal public consultation will be part of the final outputs submitted by the four regional MCZ projects to JNCC and Natural England (copied to Defra). The responsibility for impact assessments will then transfer to SNCBs.</p> <p>The impact assessment will accompany the formal consultation on the regional MCZ projects' recommendations.</p> <p>Delete Draft designation orders and impact assessments for the four regional MCZ recommendations will be submitted to formal public consultation along with an analysis of the potential cumulative impacts.</p>

Page and section	Reason for change	Change to document:
Page 43, Section 4.3.3, 1 st paragraph	Agreement that one IA would be produced for all four regional MCZ projects' recommendations.	<p>Delete: ...make any revisions to the impact assessments...</p> <p>Replace with: ...make any revisions to the impact assessment...</p> <p>Delete: ... impact assessments are finalised.</p> <p>Replace with: ... impact assessment is finalised.</p>
Page 44 Section 5, 2 nd bullet point	Agreement that one IA would be produced for all four regional MCZ projects' recommendations.	<p>Delete: ...take account of the accompanying impact assessments</p> <p>Replace with: ... take account of the accompanying impact assessment</p>
Page 44 Section 5, 5 th bullet point	Agreement that one IA would be produced for all four regional MCZ projects' recommendations.	<p>Delete: The impact assessments will ...</p> <p>Replace with: The impact assessment will...</p> <p>Delete: The impact assessments may...</p> <p>Replace with: The impact assessments may...</p>

Annex 1. Revised Table 2 showing timings for the development of the IA, revisions to final deadlines and the addition of Stage 9

Stage	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Stage 5	Stage 6	Stage 7	Stage 8	Stage 9
Activity	Project Preparation	Stakeholder Group Formation and Information collation	Regional Profile	Explore MCZ Options: 1st MCZ iteration	Explore MCZ Options: 2nd MCZ iteration	Explore MCZ Options: 3rd MCZ iteration	Develop final draft MCZ recommendations	Submission to JNCC, Natural England and the SAP	Finalisation of Impact Assessment materials in support of the Regional Marine Conservation Zone Projects' Recommendations
Recommended Timetable	Start – January 2010	February – March 2010	April 2010	May – August 2010	September - December 2010	January – March 11	April - June 2011	June – August 2011	August 2011 – July 2012
Project Team	Establish project governance structures. Produce project, communications and project delivery plans Undertake liaison meetings. Regional data collation.	Undertake liaison meetings. Regional data collation. Develop draft regional profile and circulate to stakeholders.	Produce regional profile and circulate to stakeholders .	Produce required analysis. Initiate the development of the impact assessment. Update regional profile.	Produce further analysis as required. Develop baseline for draft Impact Assessment (IA) Complete data collation October 2010. Update regional profile.	Produce further analysis as required. Continue development of baseline for draft IA	Produce further analysis as required. Produce final draft recommendation report. Develop analysis for the Impact Assessment (IA) and analysis of cumulative impacts.	Collate MCZ recommendation report. Submit MCZ recommendations to JNCC, Natural England and the SAP on 31 st August 2011. Refine analysis in Impact Assessment (IA) and analysis of cumulative impacts.	Gather information from stakeholders following confirmation of recommended boundaries and conservation objectives. Revise IA materials to address feedback and meet Defra expectations for submission to JNCC and Natural England on 13 July.
Regional Stakeholder Group Phases (Stakeholder	Advertise for regional stakeholder group.	Appoint stakeholder group. Phase 1 – briefing.	Stakeholder group members to liaise and inform their	Phase 3 – develop 1st MCZ iteration. Liaise with	Phase 5 – Review 1st iteration following SAP, Defra	Phase 8 – Review 2nd iteration following SAP, Defra	Phase 11 – Review 3rd iteration following SAP and stakeholder	Phase 13 - Agree final recommendations to be submitted to	Review draft IA materials as they are made available: First part of 1 st

Group Phases in bold)		Phase 2 – develop shared understanding.	sectors of the MCZ identification process. Liaise with Defra economists to review social and economic information.	wider sector. Phase 4 – Finalise 1st MCZ iteration by 30th June 2010. Liaise with wider sector.	economists and stakeholder advice. Phase 6 - targeted meetings as required to refine recommendations. Phase 7 – finalise 2nd MCZ iteration by 31st October. Liaise with wider sector.	economists and stakeholder comment. Phase 9 - targeted meetings as required to refine recommendations. Phase 10 – finalise 3rd MCZ iteration by 28th Feb 2011. Liaise with wider sector.	comment. Phase 12 – meetings to agree final draft recommendations. Liaise with wider sector.	JNCC, Natural England and the SAP on 31st August 2012	tranche – 25 Nov – 6 Jan Additional material in 1 st tranche – 23 Jan – 10 Feb 2 nd tranche - 6 Feb – 2 Mar
Local, national and international Stakeholder advice	Undertake stakeholder analysis.	Stakeholders to meet with their stakeholder group representatives as appropriate. Provide data as requested.	Stakeholders to meet with their stakeholder group representatives to build understanding. Provide data as requested.	Stakeholders to comment and feedback advice to stakeholder group representatives on 1st iteration.	Stakeholders to comment and feedback advice to stakeholder group representatives on 2nd iteration.	Stakeholders to comment and feedback advice to stakeholder group representatives on 3rd iteration.	Stakeholders to comment and feedback advice to stakeholder group representatives to inform final draft recommendations.	Stakeholders to comment and feedback advice to stakeholder group representatives on final draft recommendations.	
Science Advisory Panel	Recruit panel. Inaugural meeting to finalise Terms of Reference and working method.	Meet Project Managers - develop shared understanding. Review the draft Ecological Network Guidance.	Review social and economic information in regional profile.	1st Iteration to be received on 1st July 2010. Review 1st iteration by 31st July 2010. Provide advice and support to	Review 2nd iteration to be received by 1st Nov 2010. Review 2nd iteration by 15th November 2010. Provide advice and support to regional MCZ	Review 3rd iteration to be received by 1st March 2011. Review 3rd iteration by 15th March 2011. Provide advice and support to regional MCZ	Review final draft recommendations to be received by 1 June 2011. Review final drafts by 30 June 2011. Provide advice and support to regional MCZ projects.		Review of final MCZ reports and produce a report for Defra by 30 September 2011

				regional MCZ projects.	projects.	projects.			
Socio-economic review		On request, advise on data that have been collected and methods used	Review social and economic information in regional profile.	Comment on socio-economic information provided by stakeholders and initial qualitative assessments	Provide advice to regional MCZ projects on strengthening the IA to satisfy necessary standards.	Provide advice to regional MCZ projects on strengthening the IA to satisfy necessary standards.	Provide advice to regional MCZ projects on strengthening the IA to satisfy necessary standards	Provide advice to regional MCZ projects on strengthening the IA to satisfy necessary standards.	Review of draft IA materials as they are made available in tranche 1 – 3 and subsequent review of the revisions made to each tranche