



An assessment of how the R35 conservation advice package for Liverpool Bay/Bae Lerpwl SPA (v6.5) complies with the R35 process protocol (v 7.0)¹.

Key

Green	Package matches Protocol
Amber	Package largely matches protocol with minor differences.
Red	Package does not match Protocol

Protocol Section	Comment on assessment RAG
5.1 What are conservation objectives?	<p>Overall the Conservation Objectives are set out in line with the protocol, however, there are some differences driven by the joint site nature of Liverpool Bay/Bae Lerpwl. These differences largely reflect the influence of CCW.</p> <p>It is noted that the Objectives should be read in conjunction with the Departmental Brief and will be reviewed if further information or evidence becomes available.</p> <p>The interest features are listed in line with the protocol however, reference to discretionary attributes has been removed throughout at the request of CCW.</p> <p>Objectives of maintain have been amended slightly to “maintain or enhance” to clarify the position that increased population size does not contribute to unfavourable condition status.</p> <p>Interest feature density maps not included as agreed by NE and CCW.</p>
5.2 How will conservation objectives and favourable condition tables (FCTs) be produced?	The Package is in line with the protocol and uses the Departmental Brief and survey results (2001/2 – 2005/6) to underpin the FCTs and mandatory objectives
5.2.1 Summary of the stages involved in drafting the conservation objectives.	The Package follows the protocol

¹ http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/R35ConservationAdvicePackageProtocol_tcm6-33228.pdf

5.2.1 Stage 2: Setting the Conservation Objective	The conservation objectives and favourable condition tables for this site have been set out in line with the protocol with the key documents listed in the protocol used to inform them.
5.3.1 Methods for assessment	The package follows the process outlined in the protocol. References to all information used to obtain feature sensitivity, exposure and vulnerability have been cross checked and quality assured in line with the protocol also.
5.3.2 The Sensitivity Assessment	As above: the packages followed this process in line with the protocol.
5.3.3 The Exposure Assessment	The package follows the protocol. However it should be understood that exposure understanding was refined through dialogue with the relevant authorities and other advisers internally and is based their ground level experience and understanding
5.3.4 The Vulnerability Assessment	The package follows the protocol
5.3.5 Site specific advice on operations	The package follows the protocol with additional input and amendments from CCW
6 Who is involved in the preparation of the conservation advice package	The package follows the protocol with additional input and amendments from CCW
7.1 Preparation of the conservation advice package	The Package follows the protocol with additional input and amendments from CCW
7.2 Document version control	Included in the "Document version control" section of the Package. See Naming_version-control.pdf comments below.
7.3 Quality assurance	Included in the "Document version control" section of the Package. See Quality_Assurance.pdf comments below.
7.4 Conservation advice package sign-off	The Package follows the protocol with specific changes and additional input and amendments from CCW
7.5 The dialogue process	The outline process was followed
7.6 Publication of the conservation advice package	A QA Panel session was convened in order to QA the interim version (v6.3) on 3 rd August 2012. Further dialogue and changes were required in order to reach a CCW/NE-agreed version (v6.5 – see version control details). This remains an interim version until items detailed in the issues log can be fully agreed and signed off by both parties. It was agreed that an advice package should be available publicly. Publication is scheduled for December 2012.
Annex A Natural England Guidance on Favourable Condition Tables	Whilst the Guidance was used to construct and inform the package there were changes made to the content of the FCTs (i.e. removal of

	discretionary attributes) at the request of CCW and agreed by NE staff
Annex B Natural England Standards (broken down by sections below)	
Naming_version-control.pdf	This document wasn't available at the time of drafting the package, and naming between the packages may therefore not be consistent. However, naming and version controls are included within the document
Quality_Assurance.pdf	<p>This document wasn't available at the time of drafting the package. The document states "<i>Where subsequent internal QA or external peer review is planned more explicit explanation of how evidence has been used should be prepared at the outset</i>". The package has been reviewed internally by at least two lead advisers, two specialist ornithologists, one senior adviser and a review board. The package was signed off at Director level initially back in April 2012. It has also been subsequently reviewed by a QA Review Panel</p> <p>The package has also been reviewed by four members of staff at CCW (including specialist and senior staff).</p>
Publishing-Communicating_Evidence.pdf	This document wasn't available at the time of drafting the packages. However, all the evidence used for the packages is referenced throughout the documents, but is not necessarily published and available on our website (e.g. contractor outputs and sensitivity assessments).
Analysis_of_Evidence.pdf	This document wasn't available at the time of drafting the package. It is understood that the principles have been broadly followed and has had specialist input from ornithologists.
Public_Consultation.pdf	This document wasn't available at the time of drafting the package. It is understood that the principles have been broadly followed although the advice package is only available for comment and review by relevant authorities and not the general public.
Documentation_record_keeping.pdf	This document wasn't available at the time of drafting the package. TRIM has not been used in this process. The version controls and tracked change versions of various stages of the development of this package are all available and will be stored on the N:\drive in the appropriate Site folder. In general the principles of the protocol have been followed.