



Fisheries & Conservation Science

European Fisheries Fund Project

Sustainable Use of Fisheries Resources in Welsh Waters

Marine Science Dispensation meeting – 7th November 2013



Y Gronfa Pysgodfeydd Ewropeaidd:
Buddsoddi mewn Pysgodfeydd Cynaliadwy
European Fisheries Fund:
Investing in Sustainable Fisheries



Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government



PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY

Sustainable Use of Fisheries Resources in Welsh Waters

Marine Science Dispensation meeting – 7th November 2013

The Cambria, Aberystwyth

Attendees:

Welsh Government: Phil Marshall, David Tripp, Phil Wensley, Leanne Llewellyn

Natural Resources Wales: Colin Charman, Rowland Sharp

Welsh Fisherman's Association: Jim Evans, Carol Evans

Bangor University: Mike Kaiser, Natalie Hold, Gwladys Lambert, Harriet Salomonsen

Seafish: Holly Whiteley

Minutes taken by Harriet Salomonsen

1. Welcomes, introductions and apologies

Mike and Jim introduced the purpose of the meeting; to gain clarity from Welsh Government about the process of applying for scientific dispensations. Jim also highlighted concern regarding the fishing intensity trial, and the importance of agreeing and committing to a timeline of milestones that need to be completed in order for the experiment to go ahead. Jim highlighted that the fishing intensity trial should be addressed as a priority.

2. Scientific dispensations (general discussion)

- A lot of scientific activities undertaken in Wales by the University. There is no formal system of dispensations in place which this year has become a problem.
- Range of activities undertaken – not clear about which activities need an assessment and therefore need an application for dispensation.
- We are streamlining our own, internal process. Mike has spoken to all colleagues in School of Ocean Science to find out a list of all activities the University undertakes. He has put together a table including this year's October and November teaching trips.
- In January WG will receive a list of activities which need actioning.
- Activities include: Acoustic activities (echo sounder, multibeam, sidescan sonar, boomer, Doppler current profiler, deployment of instruments on the seabed)
- Plankton sampling (water column sampling)
- Removing/moving the sediment (grab, box core, sleds)
- Removing fish/organisms in nets (otter trawl, beam trawl, push nets, seine netting, gill nets, plankton nets)
- Biota – removing undersized individuals, and legally sized individuals, BAP species.
-

ACTION: PLEASE CAN WELSH GOVERNMENT FILL IN THE ACTIVITIES TABLE TO INDICATE:

- What forms do we need to fill
- Where do we find the forms
- Who do we send the forms to

Q: Mike: Is this a reasonable request?

A: David Tripp: Very useful start, and covers a greater range of activities/issues than anticipated. Indications of internal Welsh Government processes and timescales, plus a communication system.

Colin: It's useful to have a generic discussion; however the table cannot be too restrictive as it all depends on the specific area or habitat.

David: This is a very useful starting in place for future discussion.

Mike: Time is the issue that needs addressing here. There is currently time to plan, but we don't want to reach a point when there is none. Timings are making hard to do responsive science (responding to emergency/sudden events). With timescales often too long, or even unknown it is difficult to plan.

Q: Mike: Is it possible for the windows for permissions to be increased? It is difficult to define a specific date – if we can have a broader window for sampling this allows for unpredictable conditions. Can we get greater flexibility for example one application for one year, easier than lots per year?

A: Colin: This is being looked at, 'Work programming applications'. NRW like the principle but sometimes difficult in practise.

Rowland – Within NRW they are already using generic permissions (e.g. for cutting trees obstructing power lines). Generic permissions granted and application only needed if there is going to be a change in the activity.

Mike – What is the timeframe, how long are permissions granted? Should be able to provide 'maximum' numbers of animals for example.

Colin – This depends on the activity. Everyone would like it to be as dynamic and flexible as possible. Will try and provide a mechanism.

Phil W – Novel applications will take longer. Repeat applications should be quicker.

Jim – In comparison to other years. Pushing the boundaries. Legal involvement this year has changed things – more difficult. Once the application process is established things should become simpler.

Natalie: Talked about the difficulties with the whelk collection dispensations. Jodie Haig had dispensations to gather undersized whelks. Successful sampling period gathering the start of a time series of data. However 2 fishers no longer wanted to be part of the study. Needed to change the names on the dispensation. This has led to 2 weeks of waiting, only to be told there were things missing on the application, and now we have a minimum of a 12 week wait for dispensation to be granted, despite this being a repeat application. This will lead to a big gap in the time series of data. Why did this happen?

Phil W: Explains in discussion about the scallop intensity trial process. High level discussion around it and the main question that arose was is it legally allowed for these vessels to do this work. Spoke to lawyers to discuss the legal mechanism and process around granting exemptions (exemption against legislation) for these boats. Lawyers gave advice that cannot now be disregarded until have alternative advice – needs to be considered at a higher level. More robust stance on the process of exemptions.

The whelk project was authorised before this discussion about the legality of exemption under the Habitats directive, and so the dispensation has to undergo HA. In a SAC has to undergo a HA. So the different response now to what was given before is because of the different understanding of the legality of the process.

Q: Jim: Is there a solution?

A: Phil W: Legal advice has given WG an unforeseen resource burden.

EFF project and general Bangor Uni requests, other customers, other general fisheries management all need juggling and resources putting into them. WG is at a pinch point.

David – WG is in a period of transition which is difficult, finding how to use the resources we have. We are optimistic that we can improve but it will take a little time.

Mike: We have objectives and deliverables in the project which were decided upon under a different regime. Now we may not be able to deliver on our objectives because legally we are not allowed. Don't be surprised if we can't deliver what was initial stated, because we have unforeseen limitations on data collection.

Natalie: Deliverables are already from day one due to the Failure to secure second stage of funding. However the targets we can meet may now also be different from those from in the most recent PVF due to lack of permission to carry out work.

David: Please copy me into future emails to the scheme management unit regarding this issue.

ACTION: COPY DAVID INTO FUTURE EMAILS TO SCHEME MANAGEMENT UNIT

Natalie: It was difficult to foresee these difficulties regarding timings as dispensations initially turned round in two to three days. Now have gaps in the data which means it is limited in terms of analyses and also contribution to understanding/management. The wheel work will now have a three month gap in the data.

Mike: We want to make clear that this is the case now and why. We will have time series data with gaps because of this, just so you understand.

Phil W: WG is not ok with this

Mike: Understands but wants to make it clear the impact that lack of permission to carry out the work may have.

ACTION:

- **Mike to produce a comprehensive portfolio of all Bangor university activities.**
- **WG to answer questions and highlighted a list of issues to consider. Also any other issues that have been missed so far.**

Where are the Fisheries legislation exemptions/scientific dispensation request form?

- On the Welsh Government website (Fisheries pages?)

Once the form is completed, who should it be sent to?

- Send to the **Marine Fisheries** or **Milford Haven office** email address.

Who does the form go to, and what happens next?

- The email goes directly to Phil Marshall. Phil will speak to other WG Science and NRW colleagues for advice depending on the exemption/dispensation requested. If the activity is within a European Marine Site, WG and NRW will come to an agreement regarding how to progress.

There was a discussion about improving the current format of the Exemption/dispensation request form.

Phil M: The current forms don't lead the applicant with the specific input needed for the forms. Development of a better, more useful form for fisheries dispensations needed.

Colin: It is an evolving process. Need to adopt a process to improve the process for customers and make it more streamlined. Should be a form that includes information regarding the HA.

- Different form for different EU sites. NRW have made a start on this.
- As time goes on – process will get slicker.
- Make it clear from the start what a decision will be based on.

Natalie: We have data that might be able to contribute to the decision making process.

Jim: How soon will this be done?

Colin: It is already developed just an issue of resources. Rowland has built a form that is used internally. The application stage is still 12 weeks, as there are many stages, but aiming to work on this. It is important to build a relationship, call up and ask advice, communication from the beginning. Give us an indication of what you are planning, have “soft side relationships”. Communication triangle – NRW, BU, WG.

ACTION: NRW TO MAKE MORE DETAILED DISPENSATION FORMS

David: Important to let Phil M know what is happening.

Mike: Nets – What are the rules regarding plankton nets?

Phil M: Are you in breach of fisheries law. That's the question?

Colin: It all depends on the size of net, size of boat, where – context and subtext.

Natalie: lack of flexibility is difficult – because we are working with industry – difficult to say exactly which vessel will be out at which time. Is it possible to have dispensation for the scientist, the gear – on the vessel?

Colin: It depends more on the vessel, usually exempting the vessel, and not just the gear.

Natalie: The activity is the same, happening anyway?

Colin: But you are taking undersize individuals – only need exemptions for undersized.

Phil M: There is a clause giving scientific dispensation. Exemptions in primary legislation but with written authorisation – generates the project and plan.

Natalie: My understanding is – Identification of a new plan or project- initial assessment of whether or not there is likely to be a significant effect of the project – Only if “Yes” to this question do we then need to carry out a HRA. Therefore the volume of sampling we are likely to be carrying out should not need to go through an HRA. Is this not the case?

Colin: context dependent, where, what you are doing.

Phil W – we have obligation to prevent damage. Still have to carry out a TLSE – Assess activity against conservation objectives and determine whether or not it is likely to have a sig effect.

Quicker than full appropriate assessment, but still sig amount of work.

Natalie: 12 week timeline applies?

Colin: Can be but there is a lot cued up. Maybe in 1 year when things are sorted this will be the case. Now there are so many, how to prioritise?

Phil M: Long slow process. The HRA/TLSE is one part of it and is also a policy process.

Permission to be given and needs to be signed off by the minister. Document prepared by policy and scrutinised by NRW.

Impacts from fisheries a concern – lots of complainants. Every time need an assessment of legal risks on exemptions. NRW needs a say (this is required by the lawyers). Then the final authorisation can be given.

Long and complex process even for TLSE. WG working as hard as they can. They have a lot of these to get through. They need to know what the order of priority from Bangor is. The scallop intensity trial has been prioritised as were the teaching cruises.

ACTION: BANGOR UNIVERSITY TO MAKE A LIST OF PRIORITIES REGARDING DISPENSATIONS

Phil W: Useful from my point of view. Steer from Bangor which should be prioritised. It took 1 week to get the nets sorted. Trying to prioritise, but could do with some more information. There are other people seeking exemptions.

David: Trying to resolve issues but WG under a lot of pressure.

Natalie: We understand this.

Jim: Same point – back to shortage of resource. Imposed legislation – clear steer for WG to obtain more resource.

David: not as easy as that to gain resource from Europe.

Colin: Context. Phil Marshall emailed 9 dispensations – Bangor and externals

Phil W: To put it into context. Length of process is long even for straightforward applications. Prioritisation of applications.

Jim: The fishing intensity trial is very important. For example getting the names of all the vessels.

NRW: We don't think this will be a problem.

Mike: Prioritisation aside, we need to ensure that people making applications are filling in the right forms and have the correct information.

ACTION: MIKE TO FORWARD THE SPREADSHEET TO ALL.

- **Would like a form with detailed information to make it easier to provide the relevant information.**
- **WHICH ACTIVITY requires an application?**

Colin: People need to call, can't just use a spread sheet as there is no generic answer.

Mike: We need clear advice; a new form would be helpful as well.

ACTION: WG WILL MAKE A REVISED, FIT FOR PURPOSE FORM IN THE NEXT 2 WEEKS.

Mike: The revised form needs to trigger people to think about issues e.g. is this in a SSSI?

Colin: While we are developing forms – not doing HRAs

David: Beyond the fisheries – not sure how much we can do. NRW and WG Science might be able to?

Colin: marine licensing, HRA,

Mike: new form will be able to trigger the relevant questions.

NRW: period of transition. Difficult to create a quick solution

Natalie: Re: MSc projects in the summer. We will know the projects but not the students.

WG: Names can be added at a later date, it is the impact of the activity that is important.

Colin: continual dialogue between.

Phil W: Will have formality to the process following this meeting. Work together to make the process as easy as possible. Streamline the process as much as possible. Amalgamate different work flows into 'group exemptions' – similar impacts – all put in together.

ACTION: WHEN MAKING LARGE NUMBERS OF APPLICATIONS TRY AND LUMP THE DISPENSATION REQUESTS TOGETHER WHERE POSSIBLE E.G. POTTING COVERS BOTH CRAB AND LOBSTER.

Rowland: student contacted me – needed a marine licence – 5 minute discussion to find out an alternative method to remove impact and need for licence.

Colin: Talking to each other. Encouraging dialogue.

Mike: There is no form that specifically asked for the relevant information. Need to provide the right information at the start.

Gwladys: Had a long correspondence regarding one of her applications as the form was not filled in properly as there was not enough information provided at the start. What happens after the HRA?

Phil W: WG do the HRA - it goes to NRW to get formal, senior signoff – then back to WG into legal/policy team to be checked by lawyers then to the minister.

David: If we get the system working properly – will get quicker.

Phil W: Higher risk and novel – need specific approval. At the moment it's very precautionary. Once we've done a few will be able to sign off without the minister. Signed off when HRA is done. At the moment only one lawyer working on all of this?

David: Despite a small legal team it is efficient.

LUNCH BREAK

3. Scallop fishing intensity trial – Cardigan Bay

Jim gave attendees an overview of the background/history surrounding the scallop fishing intensity trial and emphasised the importance of the work in the context of what has already been achieved

and what was planned, e.g. scallop stock assessments, understanding of scallop reproduction and maturity. The fishing intensity trial is key to developing a well-managed, sustainable scallop fishery within the SAC.

Mike and Gwladys introduced the scallop fishing intensity trial

- Scientific work:
 - 1) PERMISSIONS NEEDED FOR SCIENTIFIC SAMPLING + PERMISSIONS FOR FISHING VESSELS
 - 2) GOING TO OPEN TENDER FOR FISHING VESSELS TO PARTICIPATE
- Need advice on tendering and rules for the vessels, commercial fishing activity
- Central point for landing with enforcement officer to check catches. Landings of catches to be verified every day. On-board checks needed.

ACTION: NEED RULES TO BE DRAFTED AND CIRCULATED TO PHIL MARSHALL FOR ADVICE.

- In the actual tender process. Can tender, might be successful, but might not go ahead at the end of the day.

ACTION: AIMING TO GO TO TENDER IN JANUARY AT THE LATEST TO ALLOW RESPONSE TIME AND CHOICES OF VESSELS.

- Make it clear from the outset that it might not actually happen.
- Tendering process most comfortable approach to opening an experiment fishery.
- Needs to be well advertised and time needs to be allowed for this as well.
- Workshop prior to the experiment with those selected so the details of the experiment can be fully explained.

ACTION: BANGOR WILL DRAFT A TENDER DOCUMENT BASED ON CEFAS AND SEAFISH DOCUMENT.

- Opportunity to trial gear-in gear-out technology that might help with future management.
- Maintain flexibility – in case any changes are made during the dispensation application process.
- Needs to be clearly worded tender document to make it clear that **if you do not comply with the requirements of the experiment, you forfeit your catch.**
- The fishermen are taking a risk being part of the experiment, perhaps we could provide an indication of scallop densities to inform their decision over whether or not to apply to the tender.

Phil M: Need legal advice regarding buying and selling of the catch. Exemption for a profitable activity is difficult.

Phil W: Has made enquiries already and the sale of the catch is less of an issue than expected. Not solid in the legislation. The main problem is minimising the risk during tendering process, authorising the fishing boats. Measures need to be taken to make it equitable, and to avoid breaching fisheries legislation. Need to be robust about the conditions of the tender. Need to investigate the legality. Human rights?

It would be desirable to lend the tendering to Welsh boats but without writing this on the cover. There will be a wide interest. Already have been contacted regarding this.

Jim: In the tender should we put prosecution rules?

Phil M: Is this a legal option?

Mike: Tender applications need an assessment. Price is one aspect; need a scoring sheet – clear and transparent. E.g. Minus points for history of infringements.

Phil W: Needs to go in front of the minister to get signed off. V careful management necessary.

Mike: Cardigan Bay Scallop Fishery is rated 3 on the MCS scale (out of 5). This is good and acknowledges heavy management.

ACTION: MIKE + JIM TO DEVELOP THE TENDER AND CIRCULATE TO ALL FOR INPUT.

Phil W: Lawyers won't give advice.

Jim: History of the Scallop fishery in Cardigan

There was a judicial review. WFA had an agreement to start discussions in March 2012 with all parties (WG, CCW, and Seafish) to look at options and to consider the long-term for the scallop fishery that was facing closure. Proactive approach decided on to look at future possibilities. At the same time EFF was awarded to Bangor University. They carried out a stock status survey and identified a strategy. Aim was to deliver a fishery that was well managed and a sustainable model in an SAC. Lots of loops to jump through. The box is not a solution as the recovery time between seasons is not long enough. For sustainability looking at other possible solutions. The experimental fishery will look at another area and answer questions regarding the recovery, a considered review of the area. The intention is to open a bigger area with rotational plan and permitting scheme for regulating effort and the capacity of fishing boats. It's a rich scallop bed in Cardigan Bay and very important to Wales. Needs to be controlled. VMS is very important and the fishing experiment.

Gwladys: Brief overview of experiment + handed out detailed document outlining the experimental plan.

1. Finding out how long it will take for an area to recover. The experimental area is very similar to the fished area. Habitat is similar in the SAC.
2. Fishing different intensity levels and then looking at the impact and recovery rates.
3. Lots of ideas and discussion have been evolving; plan has gone through several iterations in order to identify the most suitable experimental design. This is the final plan. Fishing along a gradient of intensity. The literature states that the impact is the highest at the start of fishing activity, where is the point where no more damage can be done?
4. There will be 17 fishing corridors, 14 impacted and 3 control areas. There will be a gradient of fishing on a logarithmic scale. **Pg2** of the document describes the design. Normal fishing activity can cover an area x4 times (based no knowledge from the IOM). Cardigan Bay is thought to be a resilient area therefore the maximum intensity in the experiment is 8 times.
5. The description of the effort is on **Pg3** Need roughly 6 vessels not much more as this is a manageable number as will need to have observers on board and will be less obvious for the public.

Jim: Easier to communicate, therefore easier to enforce. Easier to enforce – vessels allocated to set lanes.

Gwladys: Discussed with Mark Roberts – is it manageable/practical to do the fishing in these areas. 1 vessel will have 2/3 lanes.

Mike: Do fishers fish an area x8 times?

Gwladys: Not usually, but it is possible in Cardigan as it is such a small fishing area.

Mike: What about the costs?

Gwladys: We will pool the catch so it is fair, hope to capture depletion as well as the impact of the fishing on the seabed.

6. Rules to fishers – **Pg6**. Instructors to skippers. List of things to comply to – will be in the tender. Based on previous experience of applying for dispensations.

Colin: Gwladys your instructions are very clear.

Gwladys: In the experiment follow the existing legislation – needs to comply with the SI of the area. Only looking for the right to fish.

7. Pg.7 – Scientific sampling (before and after experiment). We will be doing grabs/videos/beam trawls. Calculated impact of all sampling gears has been quantified.

8. Timetable of when we need dispensations. Before Feb – get the tender document out. By 1st Feb – have the dispensation sorted out in order to be able to stick the schedule.

Colin: Previous set of applications for experiment in October? No previous dispensation request for experiment fishery.

Gwladys: Submitted last week

Colin: Design and HRA – may need to be changed based on the HRA. Experimental design – from Mike and Lily. Accept on principal that this is the final submission so will have the HRA discussion now. The experimental design may need changing. There are a few issues – features and bottlenose dolphins so you need to stay out side of 3 nm. New surveys in 2011 – Fiona Evans, Tom Stringer have come up. There has been an update to the marine mammal atlas in 2012 (Marine Mammal Atlas – 2012 document.) regarding the hotspots of bottlenose dolphins in Cardigan Bay. Now in the scallop fishing box. This needs to be mapped out. It is from a published report, peer reviewed in 2012. Areas for the fishing trial might need changing. Bringing this report to attention, Tom is the marine mammal guy and he needs to help with this issue.

Confidence in the Mammal Atlas data?

1990 – 2012.

Counts in a 10km area.

Tom – to provide detailed advice.

Jim: the fishery area this year has been opened. Why is not an issue for the fishery as at stands? It's a prey species issue regarding 3nm?

Colin: The experiment design has to match into a process – one of the loops of the HRA process will revolve around the information in the document. Now need to update advice based on this document.

Jim: You have been aware of this document since 2012.

WG: It may not be an issue, it just needs addressing.

Phil W: This has been blown out of proportion; Colin is just highlighting the issue. The Marine mammal atlas can't be ignored, because it exists.

Gwladys: What do we do?

Colin: Get an area mapped out on the dolphin map, get Tom to look at the rationale behind the data points, look at seasonality. It may not be an issue at the time the fishing trial is on-going.

Mike: What do we need to do and by when?

Jim: How long will it take to make the assessment?

Colin: Get this all done in the next 2 weeks. Tom is inundated, but Colin will bring this to his attention to map the overlap between the “hotspots” and the experiment.

Phil W: A quick review with scoping advice needs to be done to limit the problems later. Needs to make sure that the experiment design will get through the HRA. Action after as this might be used as a management tool to inform the management of the fishery. Just need to check that the HRA hoops are jumped through. Has to be absolutely robust.

Colin: This isn't raised to say it's not happening, just raising the issue.

Jim: dolphin prey 0-3 nm. All previous sighting indicated that they didn't come into 3 nm.

Colin: Hotspots now indicate just outside the 3nm.

Rowland: It's not a no, just have to look carefully as you may get around it easily, or might just need to add something extra to mitigate the problem. The experiment is short term so disturbance would be less than if it was a full fishery. Could include mammal observers during the experiment? Gain extra information.

Phil W: WG not looking to stall this, if you can do a simple measure it could ease the issue. The fishing trial is a priority WG will be enabling. Can't see any issues. We need to acknowledge the Dolphin document during the HRA process, to ensure that someone can't turn round and question us on it. It is a non-issue and not to worry about it. Issue of process.

ACTION: COLIN TO PROVIDE GWLADYS WITH INFORMATION REGARDING DOLPHIN DOCUMENT. GWLADYS TO MEET WITH TOM REGARDING THE DATALAYERS.

Mike: Is this the only issue?

Colin: Yes. The advice until now was 3nm, but this document might change things.

Mike: To clarify Gwladys and Colin to share layers of the experiment and dolphin sightings for the box. Gwladys to join Tom and overlay the layers and discuss timings as Tom is the marine mammal expert.

Mike: Rowland please can you clarify– acoustic sensors/mammal observers – mitigate because it is a short-term experiment.

Rowland: Ask the question at the time – in order to answer it in the future. Might mitigate the experiment now, but in the future might not have the mitigation if you hadn't collected data now. So for future need to collect information now. E.g. observers: do the dolphins come close/swim away during fishing?

Link is between the fishery and dolphin prey habitat.

Natalie: Is there anything else we need to do?

Phil W: Need to keep this moving. Constant meetings to discuss it. Need to do this all together. Task and finish group to get this through. Regular meeting to discuss and ensure. Screen several times to ensure that the HRA document and experimental design development is done together. So that when it is presented to WG – it'll go straight through.

Mike: Fine and agree with that. Currently document has been submitted. Does it need formally withdrawing?

Phil W: Can minute - the application is in submission, and undergoing an iterative process – as a group. Series of meeting. Start the HRA process by populating the document together

Natalie: Please can you send us a copy of the Marine mammal atlas?

Jim: Who is in the group? When should we meet? Should we also discuss the tender document?

Mike: Tender document is a Bangor + WG issue. NRW can look out of interest.

Natalie: What is the timescale for the next meeting?

Colin: do not need that many meetings. Ask Tom to break down his advice who has the raw data.

Mike: can we have the raw data?

Colin: Will have to speak to Monica, check the data privacy rules as there might be private things.

Natalie: Next meeting?

ACTION: NEXT MEETING: 2 WEEKS TIME IN BANGOR (GWLADYS, COLIN, PHIL.W, MIKE, LEE, JIM)

TENDER: GWLADYS, MIKE, PHIL.M

Gwladys: Also dispensations for the scientific work-

Grabs – has gone to Marine Licensing (sent to Phil M by Lee M)

Beam trawl – go to Phil M – fisheries legislation.

Video sled – do we need permission (HD Article 6.2). Each time we do a video sled what do we do?

Colin: Video sled – let NRW know. Give them a call. Colin/Rowland. Phone up and say exactly what you want to do – just have a conversation.

Gwladys: Is there any more I need to do regarding the experiment?

Phil W: No, if it is all in the document you have given us then that is it.

David: By the next meeting we will have reviewed the fisheries dispensation form and collectively NRW and WG will populate the table that Bangor University have provided. Joint response NRW + WG in 2 weeks.

Mike: Put it on the website?

David: Yes, I would like to turn it into a formalised process.

ACTIONS:

- 1. WG to draft an improved fisheries dispensation form ready for meeting in two weeks.**
- 2. WG/NRW to populate Bangor University activities table and provide a joint response in two weeks.**
- 3. NRW to clarify potential dolphin issue with NRW marine mammal expert. Perhaps invite Tom to the next meeting?**