



## Combined Report of County Meetings November 2009 6 February 2010

### Introduction

Balanced Seas organised 5 county meetings at the end of November 2009, involving nearly 260 participants (excluding the project team and facilitators). All five meetings followed the same format and had the following **objectives**:

1. Participants to understand the aims and general approach of the Balanced Seas project
2. Develop ideas about how to establish a Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG)
  - Selection criteria for the RSG
  - Sectors/subsectors to be represented, and organisations that might be suitable representatives
3. Decide whether we need, and how we could set up, subregional groups given that not all interest groups and organisations can be on the RSG

The meetings were as follows:

- Mon 23<sup>rd</sup> Nov – Hampshire (Southampton); 46 participants
- Tues 24<sup>th</sup> Nov – Sussex (Brighton); 60 participants
- Weds 25<sup>th</sup> Nov – Essex (Chelmsford); 56 participants
- Thurs 26<sup>th</sup> Nov – Kent (Canterbury); 70 participants
- Mon 30<sup>th</sup> Nov – Isle of Wight (Cowes); 25 participants

Taking the five meetings together, all sectors were well represented, with over 30% of participants representing fisheries, as shown in the table below. A full list of participants is provided in Annex 2. All participants have been entered on the Balanced Seas stakeholder database.

	Hants	Sussex	Essex	Kent	IOW	total
Commercial Fisheries	7	24	21	27	8	87
Recreational Fisheries	4	4	10	3	2	23
Industry	7	3	3	4	1	18
Local Government	2	5	5	6	2	20
National Government	7	7	3	8	3	28
Coastal Partnership	1	1	2	2		6
Environmental NGO	9*	2	2	5	3	21
Research & Consultants	5	6	8	8	1	28
Archaeology & Heritage	1			1		2
Recreation	3	5	4	6	5	23
Misc/Unidentified		3				3
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>259</b>

\*4 members of Solent Protection Society

## Meeting structure and content

Each meeting was about three hours long, and held in the evening (6-9 pm). The Environment Council provided a facilitator and a recorder, and members of the Balanced Seas project team gave the presentation, answered questions and assisted with the organisation. On arrival, participants were registered, given a name label, assigned their sector and given a briefing pack including evaluation forms, map of the project area, agenda, delegate list and a briefing document about the MCZ process. Refreshments were made available throughout the evening.

The objectives for the meeting were explained, and the working conditions were laid out by the facilitator (e.g. “only one voice at a time”). The Project Manager (Sue Wells) introduced the project, and then the floor was opened up for general questions.

Following this general discussion, the general characteristics and qualities that are needed by sector representatives on the Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) were discussed, using as a starting point a slide with suggestions from the project.

Attendees were then broken up into broad sector groups (Recreation, Angling, Commercial Fisheries, Industry, Environmental NGOs) to discuss with their colleagues the subsectors within their interest groups and what organisations would represent them best if they could not sit on the RSG individually. They were asked to write these down and hand them in at the end of the meeting. Participants from organisations representing Archaeology and Heritage, Academics and Consultants, Coastal Partnerships and National and Local Government held a separate discussion with the Balanced Seas Project Manager to start to clarify how these groups might relate to, and participate in, the project.

The final discussion was around the need for smaller subregional groups so that stakeholders could feed their ideas up to the RSG. The meeting closed with another Q&A session and discussion of next steps. Participants were asked to complete their evaluation form (see Annex 3).

## Outcomes

### 1. Creating an understanding of the project

There was an extensive Q&A session at each meeting. The questions and answers are available in the meeting transcripts, and these are being placed on the Balanced Seas website. Please let us know if you would like a hard copy of these.

The main questions asked were:

- How will the MCZs be managed once they are designated?
- What scope there is for making changes to MCZs once they have been established?
- How will any adverse impacts on the fisheries sector be mitigated?
- Given that the project is behind schedule, how will the short deadline be met?
- How will fair representation be achieved on the RSG?
- How large will the RSG be and where will it meet?
- How does the Balanced Seas project (concerning MCZs) relate to the Natura 2000 process which involves the establishment of SACs and SPAs?
- How will data from the four projects be harmonised so that all four sets of recommendations can be integrated?

- How will conflicts between aggregate industry/fisheries and inshore/commercial fisheries be taken into account?
- What is the evidence that further MPAs are needed?
- Can MCZs be degazetted, or have their boundaries changed, if the circumstances change and they are no longer appropriate?

We hope that the answers given mean that most participants now have a good understanding of the project's purpose. Many questions related to (a) details of the project process and (b) the ecological evidence and guidance that will support the work of the RSG. The full answers to these particular questions will be available in two sets of guidance that are being finalised at national level. We will be giving this information to stakeholders as soon as it is available. The Balanced Seas website is being revised and will ultimately include background information on the MCZ process, examples of successful MPAs elsewhere, and information on MPA activities in neighbouring countries such as France.

There was a request for further information on the Marine and Coastal Access Act and this can be downloaded from the following website:

[http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2009/pdf/ukpga\\_20090023\\_en.pdf](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2009/pdf/ukpga_20090023_en.pdf)

## **2. Input and ideas for the process to establish the RSG**

### **2.1. Selection criteria/common characteristics of good representatives**

At all five meetings we introduced this topic with a slide showing examples of what we mean by potential selection criteria for, or "common characteristics" of, good representatives. At the first meeting, we asked people to write down their additional ideas about selection criteria, and at the other four meetings we had a discussion in plenary. The following list combines the project team's suggestions given on the slide with those made by meeting participants:

- Knowledgeable about the entire sector
- Knowledge of other sectors
- Respected and trusted by the sector, recognised as its 'voice', and with a 'mandate' from or approved by the sector to fulfil this role
- Willing and able to dedicate time to the work involved over the life of the project
- Able to communicate, listen and understand - (both with other RSG members – to put across the views of the sector – and with their own sector – to feedback information about the work undertaken by the RSG).
- Willing to show respect to others on the RSG – able to work in partnership with other organisations, and listen and accept other people's points of views
- Respectful of the process to be followed
- Able to take in, and work with, new information
- Pro-active and enthusiastic and able to think 'outside the box'

Other points that were raised in relation to selection criteria included:

- RSG members should declare any personal interests in the process,
- Members should have access to the internet or other effective means of communicating back to their sectors
- The project should provide funding as this will affect representation (see below)

At the first meeting, we included the criterion 'Willingness to learn about and/or having a general understanding of maps and the use of computers in conservation planning', but we have removed

this as most participants felt this should not be required and that technical expertise should be provided by the project.

## 2.2. Representation by different sectors

The participants made numerous suggestions for subsectors and organisations that should be represented on the RSG. It is important to emphasise that these are suggestions only at this stage as, for obvious reasons, this list reflects the opinions only of those who attended the meetings. At some meetings, there were no, or very few, representatives for a sector and no recommendations were made. However, the suggestions provide invaluable information for the stakeholder analysis that is being undertaken, and for the independent facilitator that will work with the project team to set up the stakeholder group structure. Names of individuals were also provided; these are being kept on file and will be consulted at a later stage.

The recommendations for subsectors and example organisations made in the group discussions for recreation, angling, commercial fishermen, industry and environmental NGOs are shown in Annex 1. This table demonstrates some key issues to be taken into consideration in the stakeholder analysis and establishment of the RSG:

- **Recreation:** the participants' input emphasises the wide range of subsectors within this broad category. There are a number of national umbrella groups, and it will be essential to look at how the different interest groups can be best represented.
- **Angling:** It was clear from discussions at the meetings that although the Angling Trust is a national organisation, it does not represent all angling interests or local clubs. Further discussions are necessary to determine how the different interests can be involved.
- **Commercial fisheries:** the breakdown into subsectors that was provided by the participants will be a very useful contribution to the stakeholder analysis. The need for fair representation of different interests with the fisheries sector will be given special attention by the independent facilitator.
- **Industry:** Many of the sectors identified are already known to the Balanced Seas project team, and representatives have been in touch. Discussions are on-going with these sectors as to how best they can be represented.
- **Environment NGOs:** We now have a clear idea of the main environmental NGOs active in the Balanced Seas project area and will be looking at appropriate representation for them.

The following points came out of the discussions held between the other groups and the Balanced Seas project manager:

- **Academics and consultants:** there was consensus that the main role of these organisations was the provision of data, information and scientific advice to ensure that the RSG uses 'the best available scientific information' when making recommendations, as required by the project. The project will work with relevant organisations as required, and individuals are welcome to come forward if they have information that might be useful.

- **Archaeology and heritage:** it was agreed that it is essential that these sectors have some input but we will wait until the project is further advanced before finalising details.
- **Coastal partnerships:** several of these bodies are already playing a key role in the project, providing information on stakeholders, helping to publicise the project and generally supporting project activities. We see these roles continuing and strengthening.
- **National government:** Some people felt government agencies should not be represented on the RSG or that their numbers/role should be limited. However, the main role of these bodies will be to provide the key advice that will ensure that the recommendations that are made are feasible for implementation, and will be acceptable at the end of the process. Their input is thus essential. Each relevant government body will be providing a statement about their role in the project. Some agencies also have particular experience that will be useful for the project, such as the Environment Agency, which has undertaken considerable stakeholder engagement work for the Water Framework Directive.
- **Local government:** Participants agreed that local government will play an important role in the project, and many organisations and individuals are already acting as champions for the work to be undertaken. Further discussions are needed to identify the various ways in which local government might be involved.

The final selection of representatives for the RSG will be carried out under the leadership of the independent facilitator, and will take into account the extent to which different stakeholder groups will be impacted or affected by the project. As explained at the meetings, the exact size of the group has yet to be determined.

### 3. Subregional groups

The county meeting participants were unanimous in their opinion that the Balanced Seas project should set up and support subregional groups. There were several suggestions for how these should be geographically organised. The most frequent recommendations were for:

- Three main subregional groups :
  - Essex, Thames Estuary and north Kent coast
  - South Kent coast and Sussex
  - Solent, Hampshire and Isle of Wight
- Smaller subgroups and or meetings within these larger groups, notably for the Isle of Wight and for the tidal Thames.

The project team will work with the facilitator to finalise the mandate of the subregional groups and we will identify suitable geographical boundaries.

### 4. Other issues raised

**Chair for RSG:** Several participants thought it would be important for the RSG to have an effective Chairperson, preferably someone with good experience of chairing multi-interest groups. This recommendation will be considered as the process to establish the RSG moves forward.

**Financial compensation for RSG members:** Several participants questioned whether the project would cover travel expenses for meeting attendance and lost income. A policy on this is being developed by all four regional MCZ projects to address these concerns. Some limited funding is

available for this purpose and it has been agreed that the four projects should follow the same guidelines.

**Foreign fleets using the project area:** Concern was expressed by some participants as to whether the use of the area by French and other foreign commercial fishing fleets will be taken into consideration. As made clear at the meetings, this issue will indeed be addressed by the project. Discussions are underway with all four MCZ projects on this topic and a mechanism is being developed to ensure appropriate liaison with neighbouring countries.

## **Next steps**

1. Report of county meeting to be circulated, with copy of presentation
2. The project will contract an independent facilitator in January
3. The stakeholder analysis will be completed, and will take account of comments and opinions from the meeting participants
4. Once the facilitator is on board, the process for establishing the subregional group and RSG will be developed.
5. Meeting participants to be kept informed of project progress through website and other communications channels

## Annex 1. Sector working groups – summary of recommendations

Suggestions for subsectors	Example organisations	Meetings at which recommendation was made
<b>RECREATION</b>		
Sailing / Yachting/ Powerboat/PWC/ Windsurfers	RYA	All 5 meetings
Motor cruisers	Royal Motor Cruising Assoc	Hants, IoW
Powerboats	Power Boat Assoc	IoW
Sailing	Tollerbury Mud Club	Essex (subregional)
Personal water craft	Kent PWC Partnership	Kent
Pleasure boat operators		Kent
Canoeing	Canoe England/?Canoeist Assoc	Sussex, Essex, IoW
	British Canoe Union	Kent, IoW
Rowing	Amateur Rowing Assoc	Sussex, Kent
Wind surfing	Wind Surfing Assoc	IoW
Kite surfing	British Kite Surfing Assoc	Sussex, Essex, IoW
Water ski-ing	British Water Ski-ing Assoc	Sussex, IoW
Surfing	British Surfing Assoc	Sussex
	Surfers against Sewage?	IoW
Diving	BSAC	Sussex, Essex, Kent, IoW
	PADI	Essex, IoW
Swimming		Sussex
Beach users		Sussex
Wildfowling	Kent Wildfowlers	Kent
Youth groups	Sea Scouts	IoW
<b>ANGLING</b>		
Umbrella group	Angling Trust	Hants, Essex, Sussex, IoW
Local angling clubs	Eastney Cruising Assoc	Hants
	South Coast Angling Club	Sussex
	Canvey Island SAC Essex Peelers SAC Sea End Angling Club	Essex
	Single Species organisations	Bass Anglers Sportfishing Soc National Mullet Club
Tackle trade (shops, manufacturers)		Essex, Hants
Charter Boat owners		Essex
	West Wight Charter Fishermans Assoc	IoW
Small boat owners		Essex
	Southend Pier Forum	Essex
Bait diggers		Essex
Shore anglers		Essex
Harbour Masters		Essex
<b>COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN</b>		
	New Under Tens Fisheries	Sussex, IoW

Suggestions for subsectors	Example organisations	Meetings at which recommendation was made
	Association (NUTFA)	
	South west Fish Producers Association	IoW
	Professional Boatman's Association	IoW
Inshore trawling		Sussex, Essex, IoW
	Newhaven Association	Sussex
	Newhaven Fish & Flake Ice Society	Sussex
Beam trawling		IoW
Long liners		IoW
Inshore netting		Sussex, Essex
	Worthing Fisherman Society	Sussex
	Eastbourne Fishermans Protection Soc	Sussex
	Brighton Fishermans Protection Soc	Sussex
Drift netters		IoW
Seine netters		IoW
Rod fishermen		IoW
Commercial bass fishers		IoW
Inshore potting		Sussex, IOW
Eel Trap fishermen		IoW
Shellfish	Blackwater Oystermen	Essex
Oyster dredgers		IoW
Cuttle trap fishermen		IoW
Clam dredgers		IoW
<b>INDUSTRY</b>		
Umbrella Groups	British Marine Federation	Hants
	Commercial Sea Users Group	Hants
	Crown Estate	Hants
Ports	United Kingdom Major Ports Group	Hants
	British Ports Association	Hants
	Reps of individual ports: Southampton, Medway, Tilbury, London, HHA, Portsmouth, Dover, Ramsgate, Smaller ports	Kent
Harbours	Yacht Harbours Association	Hants
Marinas		Kent
Shipping		Hants, Kent
	Chamber of Shipping	Hants
Shipping subsectors: Cruise, Ferry, Cargo, RoRo, Containers		Kent
Renewable Energy		Hants, Kent
	Renewable Energy Association- Ocean Energy Group	Hants
	British Wind Energy Association	Hants
Aggregates		Hants, Kent
	British Marine Aggregates	Hants

<b>Suggestions for subsectors</b>	<b>Example organisations</b>	<b>Meetings at which recommendation was made</b>
	Producers Association	
Oil and Gas		Hants, Kent
	Oil and Gas UK	Hants
Cables	United Kingdom Cable Protection Committee	Hants
Shore based tourism		Kent
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL NGOs</b>		
General	Wildlife Trusts	Hants, Kent, Essex, IoW
	South East England Biodiversity Forum marine subgroup	Sussex
	WWF	Hants
Marine	Marine Conservation Soc	Hants, Sussex, Kent
	SeaSearch	Sussex
Birds	RSPB	Hants, Kent

## Annex 2. Meeting Participants

### Hampshire

Sector	Name	Organisation
Academic and consultants	S. Bray	University Of Southampton
	K. Collins	Senior Researcher Fellow
	J. Mullison	National Oceanography Center
	G. Watson	Portsmouth University
	C. Brown	abpmer
Coastal Partnership	R. Edwards	Solent Forum
Fisheries	J. Bardell	Lymington Fisheries
	M. Fitzgerald	Gosport Commercial Fishermen ( UKIP)
	S. Gathergood	Gosport Commercial Fishermen
	D. Gathergood	Gosport Commercial Fishermen
	W. Grose	Lymington Fisheries
	G. Mills	Stanswood Bay Oystermen Ltd
	N. Richardson	Southern Sea fisheries
Government	C. Chatters	New Forest National Park Authority
	A. Withers	Navy
	A. Mackenzie	Marine & Fisheries Agency
	W. Fojt	Natural England
	D. Todd	Natural England
	D. Keir	Chichester council
	L. McCulloch	Southampton City Council
	T. Kermode	Environment Agency
	C. Price	Environment Agency
Heritage	V. Dellino-Musgrave	Hampshire & IoW Trust for Maritime Archaeology
	G. Momber	Hampshire & IoW Trust for Maritime Archaeology
Industry	E. Beagley	Marine Projects Ltd
	R. Hill	United Kingdom Cable Protection Committee
	G. Singleton	Cemex
	W. Drake	Volker Dredging Ltd
	A. Lester	Chamber Of Shipping
	S. Merry	Renewable Energy Association
	A. Wilkie	United Kingdom Cable Protection Committee
NGO	S. Bellew	Overfalls Group
	J. Chesworth	Hampshire & Isle Of Wight Wildlife Trust
	C. Cockburn	RSPB
	A. Dale	Hampshire Wildlife Trust
	S. Fremantle	Solent Protection Society
	P. Hebard	Solent Protection Society/ Lymington Forum
	G. Rabbitts	Solent Protection Society.
	R. Rolf	Solent Protection Society

Sector	Name	Organisation
Recreation	D.Digby	Hayling Island Kite surfing Association
	Z.Mapleston	Portsmouth Outdoor Centre
	J.Pocketts	RYA
	L.MacCallum	Portsmouth Outdoor Centre
Angling	T.Legg	
	J.Ridgen	National Mullet Club
	D.Ridgen	National Mullet Club

## Sussex

Sector	Name	Organisation
Academic and consultants	C. Philcox	Environmental Lawyer –
	C. Moses	University of Sussex
	D. Robinson	University of Sussex
	M. Pendle	Haskoning UK Ltd.,
	D. Smith	Haskoning UK Ltd
	S. Vize	Haskoning UK Ltd.,
Angling	A.Brothers	Angling Trust, Marine committee
	T. Mansfield	
	N. Page	
	R. Phillips	South Coast Angling Club
Coastal Partnership	P. Belden	South Downs Joint Committee
	P. Millmore	South Downs Partnership
Fisheries	B.Brock	Brighton & Newhaven Fish Sales (BNFS)
	Mr Partridge	Chairman Montium Ltd (Shoreham) & Member Shellfish Association
	G. Brownrigg	Worthing Fisherman Society
	G.Doswell	Eastbourne Fishermans Protection Society
	D.Downey	Fishing Newhaven
	S. Parker	Fishing Newhaven
	M. Scott	Fishing Newhaven
	M. Parker	Newhaven Fisherman
	Mr Phipps	Newhaven Fisherman
	P. Pickett	Newhaven Fisherman
	R.Eason	Brighton Fisherman Protection Society
	A.Gilliam	Brighton Fishermans Protection Society
	C.Dilson	Newhaven Fisherman
	M. Fuller	Newhaven Fisherman
	A.Griggs	Newhaven Fisherman
	M.Harvey	Newhaven Fisherman
	S.Marsh	Newhaven Fisherman
J. Reeves	Newhaven Fisherman	

	J.Sheppard	Newhaven Fisherman
	C.Swannack	Newhaven Fisherman
	N.Tester	Newhaven Fisherman
	M.Walker	Newhaven Fisherman
	Mr Whitney	Newhaven Fisherman
Government	P. Serafino	Marine and Fisheries Agency
	T. Dapling	Sussex SFC
	B.Vause	Sussex SFC
	J. Farrell	Environment Agency
	E.Dornbusch	Environment Agency
	C.Bacchus	Environment Agency
	P.Batty	Environment agency
	K. Bull	Natural England
	E.Kelman	Natural England
	B.Rainbow	West Sussex County Council
C.Ward	Government Office for the South East	
Industry	D.Guy	European Fisheries Fund (EFF)
	M. McKeown,	Southern Water
	J. Seaman	Shoreham Port
NGO	L. Jackson	Sussex Biodiversity Partnership
	J. Watson	Sussex Wildlife Trust
	R. Williams	
	D.Harvey	SeaSearch
	A.Tait	Sussex SeaSearch
Recreation	M.Card	Independent diver
	N.Clare	Arun Yacht Club Ltd
	P.Raynor	RYA
	T.Rowe	RYA SE
	O.Stringer	British Kite Surfing Association
	R.Simmons	

## Essex

Sector	Name	Organisation
Academia & Consultants	J.Merchant	Independent Marine Biologist
	D.Brutto	Marine Ecological Surveys
	J.Measures	Richard Newell Associates
	R.Newell	Richard Newell Associates
	B.Perkins	Sustainability Consultant
	L.Seiderer	Marine Ecological Surveys
Angling	S.Belbin	Blackwater and Cole Professional Boatman Association
	A,Mason	Canvey Island Sea Angling Club
	E,Murphy	Anglersnet Website
	T.Pinsborough	Independent angler

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
	T.Hall	Natural England, Norfolk and Suffolk Team
	S.Coppolo	Independent angler
Coastal Partnership	S.McMellor	University of Essex & Colne Estuary Partnership
	J.Goddard	TEP
Fisheries	W.Baker	Mersea Oystermen
	R.Hayard	Mersea Oystermen
	A.Bird	Blackwater Oystermen
	R.Hipwell	Orford District Inshore Fishing Association
		Orford District Inshore Fishing Association
		Orford District Inshore Fishing Association
		Orford District Inshore Fishing Association
		Orford District Inshore Fishing Association
	T.Lineham	Trevor Lineham Shellfish
	D.Melton	DM Marine
	T.Melton	DM Marine
	J.Melton	DM Marine
	R.Mole	West Mersea Fishermen's Association
	S.Murray	Thorpe Bay Fisheries
	R.Reeves	Thorpe Bay Fisheries
	P.Caunter	Colchester Fishermen
	M.Frawle	
	P.Gilson	Kent and Essex Fisherman
	D.Godbold	Leigh on Sea and Southend Fisherman's Association
	G.Haggis	Essex Fisherman
	W.McCully	
Government	H.Clack	Natural England
	T.Hall	Natural England
	L.Jenner	Natural England
	R.Jacobs	Kent & Essex Sea Fisheries Committee
	J.Wiggins	Kent & Essex Sea Fisheries Committee
	N.Mynard	MFA
	N.Spurr	Essex County Council
	P.Wrexham	Southend Government
Industry	R.Fifield	Britannia Aggregates
	I.Jonston	Hutchison Ports (UK) Ltd
	T.Manning	Global Marine Systems Limited
NGO	S.Allison	Essex Wildlife Trust
	D.Smart	Essex Wildlife Trust
Recreation	C.Edwards	RYA Environmental Committee
	R.Lankester	Tollesbury Mud Club
	S.Mudd	British Kite Surfing Association
	K. Merchant	British Kite Surfing Association

## Kent

Sector	Name	Organisation
Academic and Consultants	D. de Moulins	University College London
	G. Meaden	North East Kent Scientific Coastal Advisory Group
	J. Bramley	Bramley Associates
	B. Lewis	Lewis Ecology
	J. Measures	Richard Newell Associates
	R. Newell	Richard Newell Associates
	M. Stockwell	Macalister-Elliott
	P. Buckley	Christ Church University (also SCUBA)
	I. Tittley	Natural History Museum & Kent WT
Angling	G. Bushell	Nayland Sea Fishing Club
	D. Hancock	Excel Angling
	L. Roskilly	Angling Trust
	R. Marshall	Fishing Ramsgate Charter Boats
	J. Armstrong	Independent Angler
	T. Hills	Independent Angler
	J. Hopper	Independent Angler
Coastal partnership	M. Loos	Medway Swale Estuary Partnership
	J. Goddard	Thames Estuary Partnership
Fisheries	T. Brown	Thanet Fishermans Association
	R. Haisell	Hythe Fishermen's Association
	D. Harris	Deal and Walmer Fishermen's Association
	J. Walpole	Hollowshore Fisheries
	B. Walpole	Hollowshore Fisheries
	D. Thomas	Dungeness Fishermens Association
	D. Tart	Dungeness Fishermens Association
	J. Thomas	Dungeness Fishermens Association
	K. Thomas	Dungeness Fishermen's Society
	M. Price	Deal and Walmer Fishermens Association
	M. Barnes	Whitstable and Queenborough Fishermens Assoc
	P. Edwards	Whitstable and Queenborough Fishermans Assoc
	C. Huggins	Isle of Sheppey Fisherman
	D. Huggins	Isle of Sheppey Fisherman
	M. Gosman	
	E. Temple	Ramsgate Fisherman
	I. Barker	
	D. Greenan	
	D. Pilcher	Folkestone Fisherman
	C. Riddell	
M. Young		
G. Quinn	Ramsgate Fisherman	
D. Barrett	Ramsgate Fisherman	

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
	C. Attenborough	Herne Bay Fisherman
	S. Barnes	Whitstable Fisherman
	R. Hales	
	M. Hales	
Government	C. Bagwell	Environment Agency
	R. Hunter	Environment Agency
	N. Brain	Environment Agency
	T. Reid	Environment Agency
	D. Webb	Environment Agency
	I. Humphreys	Environment Agency
	I. Chudleigh	Natural England
	C. Drake	Kent County Council
	T. Hawkins	Canterbury City Council
	S. Hiscock	Kent Police
	L. Pinkham	Shepway District Council
	W. Wright	Kent and Essex Fisheries Committee
	R. Catchlove	London Port Health Authority
Industry	V. Case	Dover Harbour Board
	A. Mortley	PLA
	T. Sims	SIMS Industrial and Marine Services
	L. Buchan	Dover Ports
NGO	J. Bassedine	Marinet
	B. Chapman	Kent Wildlife Trust
	R. Moyse	Kent Wildlife Trust
	S. Thompson	Kent Wildlife Trust and Kent Mammal Group
	C. Strangeways	Rother Environmental Group
Recreation	T. Rowe	RYA SE
	T. Thatchers	Sea Searcher Charters

## Isle of Wight

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>organisation</b>
Angling	J. Rackett	IoW. Marine Region Angling Trust
	T. Williams	IoW. Marine Region Angling Trust
Consultants	C. Kilgour	Macallister and Elliott & Partner
Fisheries	T. Lankford	South West Fish Producers Association
	W. Wareham	Solent Oysters
	Mr Long	Isle of Wight fisherman
	W. Long	Isle of Wight fisherman
	B. Attree	Isle of Wight fisherman
	J. Blake	Isle of Wight fisherman

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>organisation</b>
	S. Hutchinson	Isle of Wight fisherman
	N. Weeks	Isle of Wight fisherman
Government	M. Hopwood	Environment Agency
	C. Price	Environment Agency
	D. Todd	Natural England
	C. Mills	Isle of Wight Council
	S. Hawley	Isle of Wight Council
Industry	T. Francis	Yarmouth Harbour
	S. Sheldon	Yar Estuary
NGO	B. Clough	Bembridge and St Helens Harbour Association
	R. Grogan	Hampshire and Isle of Wight Trust
	V. Gwynn	Hampshire and Isle of Wight Trust
Recreation	R. Gawn	Wightsapphire Charter Boats
	C. Marsh	Wight Dolphins Dive Club
	M. Morphy	Yarmouth Sailing Club
	M. Samuelson	Bembridge Sailing Club
	J. Wheelton	Vectis Boating and Fishing Club Ryde

### Annex 3. Evaluation results

A total of 109 evaluation forms were completed. The table below shows the analysis of the rankings given on the evaluation forms, with the score '1' representing poor, the score '6' excellent. The quality of facilitation and of the venues was considered to be good. Many people felt that the information provided was clear, although others (as described in the text) wanted more detail. Certain sectors felt that there had been insufficient advance notice of the meetings, although others found this adequate. Overall, about 60% of respondents felt that the meetings had met their expectations adequately or above average.

Question	Meeting	No. forms	Ranking: 1 = poor; 6 = excellent					
			1	2	3	4	5	6
Communication before event	Hants	32	0	0	9	17	6	0
	Sussex	25	10	2	4	6	2	1
	Essex	30	7	5	11	5	2	0
	Kent	15	0	0	3	6	4	2
	IoW	7	2	1	1	1	1	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>109</b>	19	8	28	35	15	3
Clarity of information given	Hants	32	0	0	10	12	8	1
	Sussex	25	2	3	3	7	8	2
	Essex	30	2	4	14	6	3	1
	Kent	15	1	1	1	4	5	4
	IoW	7	0	1	2	3	1	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>109</b>	5	9	30	32	25	8
Facilitation	Hants	32	0	1	5	9	10	4
	Sussex	25	1	2	3	9	6	3
	Essex	30	1	0	6	8	12	3
	Kent	15	0	0	1	2	8	4
	IoW	7	0	1	2	1	3	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>109</b>	2	4	17	29	39	14
Quality of venue	Hants	32	0	0	4	12	9	6
	Sussex	25	1	1	6	7	7	2
	Essex	30	1	0	1	10	13	3
	Kent	15	0	0	2	3	7	3
	IoW	7	0	0	0	3	4	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>109</b>	2	1	13	35	40	14
Meeting expectations	Hants	32	0	0	8	15	6	0
	Sussex	25	1	3	6	8	6	2
	Essex	30	2	3	12	10	2	0
	Kent	15	0	0	2	3	7	3
	IoW	7	0	1	2	2	1	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>109</b>	3	7	30	38	22	5