

Kittiwake Steering Group Agreement Log

Prepared by: Marija Nilova	Checked by: Rachael Devine, Michael Armitage	Approved by: Lisa Western

Revision Summary				
Rev	Date	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
1	27/03/2023	GoBe Consultants	Rachael Devine	Ian Mackay
2	31/05/2023	GoBe Consultants	Rachael Devine	Ian Mackay
3	13/03/2024	Marija Nilova	Rachael Devine Michael Armitage	Lisa Western

Description of Revisions			
Rev	Page	Section	Description
1	All	All	New Document
2	5	1.3	Summary of KCSG review of KIMP
2	13		Summary of KCSG comments on KIMP
3	15		Summary of consultation undertaken with KCSG from Meeting 5 onwards
3	20	3	Meeting minutes from KCSG Meeting 7

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	5
1.1. Overview	5
1.2. The Kittiwake Compensation Steering Group Members.....	5
1.3. KIMP Review by KCSG.....	5
2. Agreement Log	6
3. Meeting Minutes KCSG Meeting 7	20

BEIS	Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy
ESC	East Suffolk Council
FFC	Flamborough and Filey Coast
GYBC	Great Yarmouth Borough Council
KCSG	Kittiwake Compensation Steering Group
KIMP	Kittiwake Implementation Monitoring Plan
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
NE	Natural England
PoW	Plan of Work
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
SoS	Secretary of State
SPA	Special Protection Area

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview

ScottishPower Renewables and Vattenfall have been working collaboratively on the delivery of the kittiwake compensation requirements for East Anglia ONE North and TWO offshore wind farms (the 'East Anglia ONE North and TWO' and 'East Anglia Projects') and Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard (the 'Norfolk Projects'). Further details of the collaborative approach are provided in Section 1.2 and 1.3 of the Kittiwake Implementation and Monitoring Plan (KIMP).

Under the Norfolk Projects' and East ONE North and TWO consents, there are requirements to set up Kittiwake Compensation Steering Groups (KCSG) to discuss and agree the delivery of kittiwake compensation. The Norfolk Projects, due to their requirement to deliver a greater level of compensation, set up the KCSG and took a secretarial role. Representatives of the East Anglia ONE North and TWO were in attendance from the third and fourth KCSG Meetings (11th August 2022 and 6th October 2022).

During the third Norfolk Projects' KCSG it was agreed any discussions and subsequent agreements on compensation that were made at the Norfolk Projects-led meetings are applicable for the East Anglia ONE North and TWO and therefore have been carried through into the East Anglia Projects' KIMP.

On the basis of this agreement, ScottishPower Renewables has prepared this Agreement Log utilising agreements made between the Norfolk Projects and members of the KCSG. The Agreement Log has been updated to reflect specific comments and positions for the East Anglia ONE North and TWO. ScottishPower Renewables has sought to confirm agreement on these matters with the KCSG.

1.2. The Kittiwake Compensation Steering Group Members

The KCSG comprises of representatives of;

- The East Anglia Projects;
- The Norfolk Projects;
- Natural England (NE);
- The Marine Management Organisation (MMO);
- East Suffolk Council (ESC);
- Great Yarmouth Borough Council; (GYBC) and
- The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB).

The KCSG meetings are chaired by an independent chair Eurna Consultancy Ltd.

1.3. KIMP Review by KCSG

Version one of the East Anglia ONE North and TWO KIMP was issued to the KCSG for review on 18th April 2023. Comments were received from ESC and NE, these are summarised in the table below. Following some minor amendments, Version two of the East Anglia ONE North and TWO KIMP was formally issued to the SoS for approval on 12th June 2023.

Versions one and two of the East Anglia ONE North and TWO KIMP included provision for 15 nest spaces as compensation for the impacts of both Projects; the number of nest spaces was calculated using methodology as agreed in the Norfolk Projects KIMP. These 15 nest spaces are provided for in the three nesting structures that were installed at Port of Lowestoft to provide joint compensation for the Norfolk Projects and East Anglia ONE North and TWO. The three nesting structures were installed in February 2023.

Following submission to the SoS, the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) subsequently issued a decision letter on 10th November 2023 stating that: "*The Orders require the KIMP to be based on the Without Prejudice Compensation Plan which has a proposed target of 100 breeding pairs <...>. The 100 breeding pairs is the required compensation and consequently the Applicant's proposed 15 nest spaces in its KIMP does not provide sufficient nest spaces to meet the requirements of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 18 to the Orders. The Secretary of State therefore does not approve the Kittiwake Implementation and Monitoring Plan as currently proposed.*"

DESNZ clarified that the total compensation requirement was for 100 nests breeding pairs for both East Anglia ONE North and TWO projects combined and that these were expected to be split proportionally between the projects according to the scale of impact of each project.

ScottishPower Renewables have revised their approach to provide separate KIMPs for East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO, to account for the different timescales of the Projects and different timescales and availability of the compensation measures for each Project. Updated KIMPs for East Anglia ONE North and TWO projects were issued to the KCSG for review and comment on 26th January 2024 and changes to the approach were presented to the KCSG in a meeting on 31st January 2024. Written comments were received from ESC and NE and are summarised in the table below.

2. AGREEMENT LOG

See below the Agreement Log. The KCSG positions presented in the log include the final iteration of the Agreement Log as submitted alongside the Norfolk Projects' KIMP, amended to include agreements from the subsequent KCSG meetings, including Meeting 7 where the revised East Anglia ONE North and TWO KIMPs were discussed.

Topic	Norfolk Projects	Natural England	East Suffolk Council	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	RSPB	MMO	East Anglia ONE North and TWO	Outstanding Actions
ScottishPower Renewables Steering Group Meeting Attendance								
Agreement that any agreements reached on technical matters during the Norfolk Projects' KCSG Meetings are also applicable to East Anglia ONE North and TWO	Norfolk Projects agree with this position	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	The East Anglia ONE North and TWO KIMP reflects all agreements made to date during the Norfolk Projects' KCSG meetings	
Agreement that from a stakeholder resource point of view, there is no need for ScottishPower Renewables to conduct a separate round of KCSG Meetings	Norfolk Projects agree that there is no need for a separate round of Steering Group Meetings	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	The East Anglia ONE North and TWO specific KIMP documentation has been circulated for review and agreement via email.	
Plan of Work for Steering Group								
Agreement on the Plan of Work (PoW)	Drafted and updated to address comments from all KCSG members and received email approval from all members to proceed under the terms detailed within. Submitted the documents.	Agreed. Draft sent in advance of submission to BEIS, NE confirmed no comments via email with SPR.	Agreed. Draft sent in advance of submission to BEIS, timing was questioned by ESC and answered by SPR via email.	Agreed. Draft sent in advance of submission to BEIS, no comments received.	Agreed. Draft sent in advance of submission to BEIS, no comments received.	Agreed. Draft sent in advance of submission to BEIS, no comments received.	The East Anglia ONE North and TWO PoW has been submitted and approved by BEIS (16/01/2023)	
Structures								
Agreement on the proposed locations (paragraph 3 (a) of Compensation schedule) -general	Norfolk Projects have selected four possible onshore locations and are in the process of identifying possible offshore locations. Order of preference is Lowestoft port and, Great Yarmouth Port, Herbert Barnes Park and Bure Park (latter two are both within Great Yarmouth). All options need to be kept in the mix until planning permission has been	NE, whilst acknowledging the need to maintain options, have a strong preference for the Lowestoft location. Great Yarmouth Port is a less attractive option but has the potential to be a viable location. We would consider other options within Lowestoft or an offshore structure near to the colony as strongly preferable to the Bure Park and Herbert Barnes Park options, which we consider	Appreciate that options need to be maintained at this stage, but ESC can only comment on sites proposed within our District.	Appreciate that options need to be maintained at this stage but there is the potential for some challenges with LVIA and interactions with other planning applications at the Great Yarmouth port site and possible significant impacts at the two inland locations given their designated status.	Strong ecological preference for the Lowestoft location. Whilst appreciative that options need to be maintained at this stage, RSPB would consider all Lowestoft locations as preferable to any of the options at Great Yarmouth. At Great Yarmouth, the RSPB's preference is for the port location.	When the four sites were presented during KCSG meeting 1 no objections were raised.	The East Anglia ONE North and TWO will deliver compensation collaboratively with the Norfolk Projects at Lowestoft as agreed. Details are presented in the KIMP. Agreement for Lease awarded.	

Topic	Norfolk Projects	Natural England	East Suffolk Council	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	RSPB	MMO	East Anglia ONE North and TWO	Outstanding Actions
	granted and landowner agreements are signed	highly unlikely to attract kittiwake.						
Agreement that the proposed location at the port of Lowestoft is a suitable location for a nesting structure	Propose that this location would be suitable as precedent has been set, close to, sea and existing colony and has good access	At KCSG meeting 3 NE confirmed that in their opinion the proposed location at the Port of Lowestoft is suitable for Kittiwake compensation	At KCSG meeting 3 ESC confirmed that in their opinion the proposed location at the Port of Lowestoft is suitable for Kittiwake compensation.	Do not disagree but is outside of GYBC remit to comment	At KCSG meeting 3 RSPB confirmed that in their opinion the proposed location at the Port of Lowestoft is suitable for Kittiwake compensation	At KCSG meeting 3 MMO confirmed that in their opinion the proposed location at the Port of Lowestoft is suitable for Kittiwake compensation	The East Anglia ONE North and TWO will deliver compensation collaboratively with the Norfolk Projects at Lowestoft as agreed. Details are presented in the KIMP.	
Agreement on the Wall Structure design (paragraph 3 (b) of Compensation schedule) – Design	<p>Designs have been updated to address comments on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual hatches for nest Mess avoidance on lower nests Prevention of nesting on access structure 	<p>Suggested that smaller hatches should be included to limit disturbance to fewer nests. This feature has been included and agreed.</p> <p>Concerned that large gulls might nest on the roof so it should be designed in such a way to ensure this is not an issue, including considering the use of deterrents.</p> <p>At KCSG meeting 3 confirmed their agreement with wall design.</p>	Design should prevent mess being deposited on nests below and for design to prevent birds from nesting on the access structure. These have both been addressed and whilst ESC agrees with the rationale for the final design, formal approval is subject to planning.	Agree the designs as presented at KCSG meeting 2	Agree the designs as presented at KCSG meeting 2	At KCSG meeting 3 MMO confirmed that in agreement with wall design.	The East Anglia ONE North and TWO will deliver compensation collaboratively with the Norfolk Projects utilising the agreed design structure. Details are presented in the KIMP.	
Agreement on the Wall Structure design (paragraph 3 (b) of Compensation schedule) -Layout of structures	Orientation has been prioritised when undertaken site layout work, to maximise the ledge space available for nests whilst maintaining a suitable aspect of the nests. This has resulted in three separate wall structures. A 3D model has been produced to show the space between the wall structures which is approx. 7.5m.	<p>Need to see the reasoning for designing the layout as currently proposed.</p> <p>Concerned the design for walls might be too constrained to allow good occupancy rates. As the walls are not as tall as the towers, the short spaces between the walls might deter kittiwake from nesting where the aerial access/departure is compromised (20/07/22).</p> <p>Requested a 3D model to show Kittiwake access between wall structures. Now</p>	Whilst ESC agrees with the rationale for the final design, formal approval is subject to planning (11/08/2022). Planning permission was granted by ESC (4/10/2022).	In agreement with wall design (11/08/2022).	<p>Have some concerns regarding how close the wall structures are to each other and the potential use of barbed wire for predator proofing due to potential bird/chick entanglement.</p> <p>On seeing 3D models is now happy with spacing between walls. In agreement with wall design (11/08/2022).</p>	<p>Did not attend KCSG meeting 2.</p> <p>In agreement with wall design (11/08/2022).</p>	The East Anglia ONE North and TWO will deliver compensation collaboratively with the Norfolk Projects utilising the agreed design structure. Details are presented in the KIMP	

Topic	Norfolk Projects	Natural England	East Suffolk Council	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	RSPB	MMO	East Anglia ONE North and TWO	Outstanding Actions
		that this has been provided NE are happy with the indicative models. However, note that gaps between walls should be maintained in final detailed design. In agreement with wall design (11/08/2022).						
Agreement on fence structure (paragraph 3 (b) of Compensation schedule)	<p>The specification of the fence is included within the KIMP in section 5.4. It will adhere to the guidance provided in the RSPB manual on the Predator Exclusion Fence design (White & Hirons 2019) and will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a height of 1.8m, • Have a mesh size of 5 x 10cm, • Be topped with a 45° angled overhang c. 60cm (smooth material or floppy mesh) to the outside, • A narrow skirt will be pinned at the base to the existing concrete using tamper proof bolts, • Have a wire with min gauge of 1mm, • Have a design life of at least 35 years (with regular maintenance) and be maintained or replaced as necessary for the duration of the compensation; and • Be constructed with particular care to ensure that potential weak points (corners and gates) are well installed with minimal gaps. 	<p>NE await circulation before commenting. Agreed at KCSG meeting 4</p>	Agreed at KCSG meeting 4.	GYBC await circulation before commenting. Agreed at KCSG meeting 4.	Satisfied with the commitment to follow RSPB guidance on fence design, with key considerations to avoid use of barbed wire and use an appropriate mesh size that will avoid entrapment risk whilst preventing access by predators.	Agreed at KCSG meeting 4.	The East Anglia ONE North and TWO will deliver compensation collaboratively with the Norfolk Projects utilising the agreed design structure. Details are presented in the KIMP.	
Agreement that the wall structure is most appropriate at the Lowestoft location	Proposed at KCSG meeting 2. Best option because it offers the same benefits as the towers, has a precedent	Agreed at KCSG meeting 3.	Agreed at KCSG meeting 3, due to the reasons expressed in the KCSG Meetings	Agreed at KCSG meeting 3.	Agreed at KCSG meeting 3.	Agreed at KCSG meeting 3.	The East Anglia ONE North and TWO will deliver compensation collaboratively with the	

Topic	Norfolk Projects	Natural England	East Suffolk Council	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	RSPB	MMO	East Anglia ONE North and TWO	Outstanding Actions
	for success in the area and due to lower height, would be hidden by existing wall.						Norfolk Projects utilising the agreed design structure. Details are presented in the KIMP.	
Agreement that either a wall or tower structure could be used at the Port of Great Yarmouth	Due to the orientation of the site and lack screening in the landscape either structure could be used at the Port of Great Yarmouth.	In principle agreement of either a wall or tower structure being used at the Port of Great Yarmouth. Indicated a slight preference for a tower structure at KCSG meeting 4.	ESC appreciate that options need to be maintained at this stage, but ESC can only comment on sites proposed within our District.	In principle agreement of either a wall or tower structure being used at the Port of Great Yarmouth.	In principle agreement of either a wall or tower structure being used at the Port of Great Yarmouth. As stated above, the RSPB has a strong ecological preference for the Lowestoft location.	In principle agreement of either a wall or tower structure being used at the Port of Great Yarmouth.	The East Anglia ONE North and TWO have jointly, with Vattenfall, selected Lowestoft as the location to deliver kittiwake compensation.	
Agreement on the number of nests being provided	Norfolk Projects presented in its In-principle compensation documents three different figures for the number of collisions of kittiwakes, based on the Norfolk Projects' assessment and the average and upper 95% confidence estimates applying NE's precautionary approach. The respective mortalities were 5, 21 and 60 for Vanguard and 6, 14 and 28 for Boreas. The number of nest spaces required to compensate for each of these values was calculated and presented (Vanguard: 51, 213, 612; Boreas: 66, 150, 300) applying the same method in each case. There was therefore a clear connection in the Norfolk Projects' submissions between the collision estimates and the scale of compensation required. The SoS stated in the Habitats Regulations Assessment documents that the impacts to be compensated were the	The KIMP has been developed on the basis that the SoS has mandated compensation at a level of 35 kittiwakes per annum being recruited into the wider kittiwake population. NE considers the location, design and scale of what the KIMP proposes at Lowestoft has the potential to provide this level of compensation. NE recognise the scale of compensation proposed is likely to provide an equivalent number of recruits to those lost at FFC SPA into the biogeographic population. However, NE's view is that the scale of compensation should seek to provide a realistic chance of the national site network, rather than the biogeographic population, receiving an equivalent number of recruits to that lost. In this context the current compensation is likely to be insufficient to deliver this. While 432 nests would provide appropriate compensation for Boreas (and potentially Boreas plus East Anglia ONE North and TWO, we do not consider that it would provide	Have no comment on the number of nests that is required but will defer to NE on this matter.	Have no comment on the number of nests that is required.	The RSPB notes the description provided by the Norfolk Projects and that these numbers have been used for detailed design of the artificial nesting structures. RSPB notes new wording drafted since circulation of this version following discussions between the Norfolk Projects and NE. RSPB reviewed the final version of the agreement log and confirm that the initial position stated above remains an accurate reflection of our position	Have no comment on the number of nests that is required.	The proposed compensation has the potential to accommodate up to 432 nests which provides suitable allowance for the East Anglia Projects' compensation requirements (15 nests in total, 7 and 8 for East Anglia ONE North and TWO, respectively). Further details are provided in KIMP.	

Topic	Norfolk Projects	Natural England	East Suffolk Council	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	RSPB	MMO	East Anglia ONE North and TWO	Outstanding Actions
	middle values (Vanguard: 21; Boreas: 14), which can be seen, equate to nest provisions of 213 and 150 respectively. Therefore these have been used as the basis for the Norfolk Projects' compensation structure designs.	appropriate compensation for both Norfolk Projects (irrespective of the East Anglia ONE North and TWO' requirements).						
Agreement on the Tower Structure design (paragraph 3 (b) of Compensation schedule)	<p>Designs have been updated to address relevant comments made on wall structure including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual hatches for nests. Mess avoidance on lower nests. 	<p>Raised concern regarding the large central bar and how this may create a predation opportunity for gulls. However, if this is addressed through Option 2 (Slide 27) as presented in KCSG meeting 3 then this agreed.</p> <p>Following the provision of Annex 5 of the KIMP showing the change in central ledge design this is now agreed.</p>	<p>Raised concern regarding the height of the tower if installed at Lowestoft as it will not be screened and suggested lowering the structure into the foundations if possible. Now that it has been confirmed that the tower structure will not be installed at Lowestoft ESC have no further comment on tower design.</p>	Agreed at KCSG meeting 3.	Agreed at KCSG meeting 4.	Agreed at KCSG meeting 3.	The East Anglia ONE North and TWO will deliver compensation collaboratively with the Norfolk Projects utilising the agreed design structure. Details are presented in the KIMP.	
Programme (paragraph 3 (c) of Compensation schedule)								
Programme	The programme is driven by the need for the compensation to be in place for four full breeding seasons prior to turbines turning. In order to achieve government and project targets that required the fence to be operational prior to the 2023 breeding season. The proposed programme to achieve this was presented at KCSG meeting 1 and a recap during KCSG meeting 2.	It is agreed that the programme is suitable to deliver the compensation package in time to be in place for four full breeding seasons prior to turbines becoming operational (subject to all permissions being in place).	It is agreed that the programme is suitable to deliver the compensation package in time to be in place for four full breeding seasons prior to turbines becoming operational (subject to all permissions being in place).	It is agreed that the programme is suitable to deliver the compensation package in time to be in place for four full breeding seasons prior to turbines becoming operational (subject to all permissions being in place).	It is agreed that the programme is suitable to deliver the compensation package in time to be in place for four full breeding seasons prior to turbines becoming operational (subject to all permissions being in place).	It is agreed that the programme is suitable to deliver the compensation package in time to be in place for four full breeding seasons prior to turbines becoming operational (subject to all permissions being in place).	The programme is driven by the need for the compensation to be in place for four full breeding seasons prior to turbines turning. Construction of the wall was completed prior to the 2023 breeding season. Further details of the programme are presented in the KIMP.	
Compensation Management and Maintenance								
Maintenance (paragraph 3 (e) of Compensation schedule)	The Norfolk Projects proposals for maintenance of the structures is provided in the draft KIMP.	Agreed at KCSG meeting 3.	Agreed at KCSG meeting 3, subject to final comments to the KIMP.	Agreed at KCSG meeting 3.	Agreed at KCSG meeting 3.	Agreed at KCSG meeting 3.	Details of maintenance of structures are presented in the KIMP and follows agreements made to date.	

Topic	Norfolk Projects	Natural England	East Suffolk Council	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	RSPB	MMO	East Anglia ONE North and TWO	Outstanding Actions
Success Criteria & Adaptive Management and reporting								
Monitoring (paragraph 3 (d) of Compensation schedule – general Approach	The Norfolk Projects proposals for monitoring of the structures is provided in the draft KIMP.	<p>20.07.22 Could confirmation be provided that the monitoring will reflect, where needed, the latest JNCC seabird monitoring guidance. NE assumes that egg counting will be achieved through use of the nest hatches. However, could confirmation of this please be provided.</p> <p>The key monitoring outputs are pairs and productivity. This will allow identification of any need for adaptive management and also track any debt/surplus. Whatever ongoing monitoring beyond the initial period needs to robustly inform these as an absolute minimum. The monitoring may be reduced in frequency however, it is our opinion that monitoring will be required for the lifetime of the project.</p> <p>Collaboration with other Offshore Wind Farm developers would be beneficial, especially with regard to monitoring of the regional population size. More generally, collaboration with other kittiwake monitoring efforts in the area would be efficient.</p> <p>KCSG meeting 3 – would it be a good idea to bring in a third party to help determine targets in relation to productivity.</p> <p>Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the Norfolk Projects KIMP.</p>	Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP. ESC defer to NE and the RSPB on the specific details of the monitoring required as part of this compensation.	GYBC to defer to NE and RSPB on these points. Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	MMO to defer to NE and RSPB on these points. Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	The East Anglia ONE North and TWO will deliver compensation collaboratively with the Norfolk Projects utilising the agreed approach to monitoring. The KIMP notes the option for future discussions on proportionate monitoring for the East Anglia ONE North and TWO should the collaborative approach not provide the required compensatory effect.	Report to KCSG on outcomes of meeting with experts on kittiwake productivity.

Topic	Norfolk Projects	Natural England	East Suffolk Council	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	RSPB	MMO	East Anglia ONE North and TWO	Outstanding Actions
Monitoring (paragraph 3 (d) of Compensation schedule – Ringing	Norfolk Projects agrees with NE’s suggestion to include ringing, which will also assist in identifying any movement of adults between colonies. Before embarking on this however consideration will need to be given to the level of resighting effort that would be required, as well as the welfare implications.	20.07.22 NE would advise consideration of colour ringing of adults as well as chicks breeding at the compensation site. This may give information on if the birds return to breed each year, a low proportion returning may give an indication of an issue at the colony. However, we note concerns regarding adult welfare and the need to consider if such monitoring would be practicable. Agreed at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP. ESC defer to NE and the RSPB on the specific details of the monitoring required as part of this compensation.	GYBC to defer to NE and RSPB. Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	MMO to defer to NE and RSPB. Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	The East Anglia ONE North and TWO will deliver compensation collaboratively with the Norfolk Projects utilising the agreed approach to monitoring. The KIMP notes the option for future discussions on proportionate monitoring for the East Anglia ONE North and TWO should the collaborative approach not provide the required compensatory effect.	
Details of how results will be reported (paragraph 3 (f) of Compensation schedule)	Norfolk Projects included an indicative timetable of reporting within the KIMP.	Agreed at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	Details of reporting requirements are presented in the KIMP.	
Details of how natal dispersal and colony interchange with the FFC kittiwake colony should be investigated. Note, this is a requirement specified in the Norfolk Projects Compensation Schedules; equivalent detail is not provided in the East Anglia ONE North and TWO Compensation Schedules but has been presented here for completeness.	Further details of natal dispersal and colony interchange were provided following a meeting of expert ornithologists on the 14 th September 2022.	20.07.22 NE questions how it will be determined that the compensation has not secured an increase in the number of adult kittiwake available to recruit? As this will trigger the need for adaptive management it is important that the principles and approach be agreed. We would suggest that a productivity approach could be developed alongside current proposals. Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP. ESC defer to NE and the RSPB on the specific details of the monitoring required as part of this compensation.	Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	The East Anglia ONE North and TWO will deliver compensation collaboratively with the Norfolk Projects utilising the agreed approach to monitoring. The KIMP notes the option for future discussions on proportionate monitoring for the East Anglia ONE North and TWO should the collaborative approach not provide the required compensatory effect.	
Determination of appropriate range of productivity to be used as a measure of success	The plan is for this to be discussed and agreed at KCSG meeting 5 post KIMP submission.		ESC to defer to NE and RSPB. Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further	GYBC to defer to NE and RSPB. Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further	Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	MMO to defer to NE and RSPB. Agreed in principle at KCSG meeting 4 following further	The East Anglia ONE North and TWO will deliver compensation collaboratively with the Norfolk Projects utilising the	Final agreement is to be determined at KCSG meeting 5 and is not required for

Topic	Norfolk Projects	Natural England	East Suffolk Council	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	RSPB	MMO	East Anglia ONE North and TWO	Outstanding Actions
	Aim is 180 fledged chicks/year, in at least 3 out of 5 years (but in context of performance of regional populations as this may indicate wider underlying causes).		discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.		discussion and review of V3 of the KIMP.	agreed approach to monitoring. The KIMP notes the option for future discussions on proportionate monitoring for the East Anglia ONE North and TWO should the collaborative approach not provide the required compensatory effect.	submission of the KIMP.
Minutes								
Minutes approved (paragraph 2 (c) of the Norfolk Projects Compensation schedules)	Final minutes circulated to KCSG for: KCSG meeting 1 KCSG meeting 2 KCSG Meeting 3 KCSG Meeting 4	Minutes approved from KCSG meeting 1 Minutes approved from KCSG meeting 2 with one minor amendment. Minutes approved from KCSG Meeting 3 KCSG Meeting 4 minute approved via email (25/10/2022) with a minor amendment which was accepted)	Minutes approved from KCSG meeting 1 Minutes approved from KCSG meeting 2 Minutes approved from KCSG Meeting 3 KCSG Meeting 4 minute agreed via email (14/10/2022)	Minutes approved from KCSG meeting 1 Minutes approved from KCSG meeting 2 Minutes approved from KCSG Meeting 3 KCSG Meeting 4 minute agreed via email (26/10/2022)	Minutes approved from KCSG meeting 1 Minutes approved from KCSG meeting 2 Minutes approved from KCSG Meeting 3 (with some minor amendments provided) KCSG Meeting 4 minute agreed via email (14/10/2022)	Did not attend KCSG meeting 1 Minutes approved from KCSG meeting 2 Minutes approved from KCSG Meeting 3 KCSG Meeting 4 minute agreed via email	ScottishPower Renewables circulated the East Anglia ONE North and TWO KIMP for review, comments received have been provided below. No Project specific KCSG meeting was required. Meeting minutes of previous KCSG meetings are provided in the Norfolk Projects be required details of meeting minutes will be circulated for review and approval.	
The East Anglia ONE North and TWO KIMP Review by KCSG –								
Issued Revision of the KIMP for KCSG on 18/04/2023	No comments received	Following the steering group meetings with Vattenfall's Norfolk Projects in 2022, it was agreed that matters discussed and agreed upon for Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard are applicable to the East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia Two projects. Taking this into account, we refer you to Natural England's response to the BEIS consultation on the Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard KIMPs EN010087-003005-KIMP-NE-Response.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk), to form the main bulk of our response to the East Anglia	I can confirm that we have reviewed the 'KIMP' and agreement log provided. The only comments we wish to make at this time relates to the KIMP, we feel this should include photographs of the completed nesting structures. It was also noted that Page 18 – Fig 3 And 4 refers to 'proposed' site at Port of Lowestoft which could read 'selected site'. Finally, in reference to Section 9 – Annual reporting to SoS and NE	No comments received	No comments received	No comments received	Updated KIMP with ESC suggested amendments. No amendments made in regard to NE comments. East Anglia ONE North and TWO provided a response via email clarifying that the level of compensation provided is sufficient to discharge the compensation conditions under the DCOs for the two SPR projects (issued 05/06/2023)	N/A

Topic	Norfolk Projects	Natural England	East Suffolk Council	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	RSPB	MMO	East Anglia ONE North and TWO	Outstanding Actions
		<p>ONE North and East Anglia Two KIMP.</p> <p>As stated in the above response, Natural England advised that the compensation for Norfolk Project KIMP was insufficient for Boreas and Vanguard, and therefore it follows that the compensation is not sufficient for those two projects with the addition of the impacts from East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia Two. This reflects the Secretary of State's (SOS) HRA's for these projects seeking a quantum of compensation that relates to providing additional recruits to the wider biogeographic population, rather than a level of compensation that will provide sufficient recruits into the national site network.</p> <p>Similar to the Norfolk Projects, our eventual advice will highlight that during the East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO Examination, the in-principle submissions referred to a greater level of nest provision than is now being provided. The in-principle plan referred to the provision of 100 nest spaces, which was understood to be 100 nest spaces per project.</p> <p>(Received 25/05/23)</p>	<p>– ESC would like to be copied into this reporting activity (in parallel to updates via the Steering Group).</p> <p>(Received 28/04/23)</p>					
Monitoring of the colony								
The KIMP contains a commitment to agree the detailed monitoring requirements for the colony post submission of the	The Norfolk Projects presented its proposal for <u>what would be monitored</u> during KCSG meetings 3 and 4 and these were agreed and included in the KIMP. How this monitoring	The methodologies for monitoring were agreed at meeting 5.	The methodologies for monitoring were agreed at meeting 5. ESC defers detailed comments on this	The methodologies for monitoring were agreed at meeting 5.	The methodologies for monitoring were agreed at meeting 5.	The methodologies for monitoring were agreed at meeting 5.	The methodologies for monitoring were agreed at meeting 5.	

Topic	Norfolk Projects	Natural England	East Suffolk Council	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	RSPB	MMO	East Anglia ONE North and TWO	Outstanding Actions
IMP but prior to beginning of the 2023 breeding season.	is to be conducted was discussed and agreed during KCSG meeting 5		matter to Natural England and the RSPB.					
Following 2023 breeding season								
Reporting on results to the KCSG	At KCSG meeting 6 the Norfolk Projects presented the results of the 2023 breeding season. The reports show that no kittiwakes nested on the artificial nest sites.	No comments on the results of the monitoring	No comments on the results of the monitoring	Not present at meeting	No comments on the results of the monitoring Encourage the monitoring to be integrated between the different compensation projects in future	Not present at meeting	No comments on the results of the monitoring	
Adaptive management to be deployed for 2024 breeding season	At KCSG meeting 6 the Norfolk Projects presented its proposal for deployment of adaptive management for the 2024 breeding season. These are: Placement of decoy birds Installation of a playback system. Placing nests on the structures – nest will be disinfected now to mitigate spread of disease.	Need to be careful about disease risk associated with old nests- so creation of nests is worth investigating. Could use disinfectant as mitigation. Decoys – should be placed on shelves at the eastern most – outer face as this is the most obvious location to be observed by passing kittiwakes.	Do not anticipate any concerns with the play back	Not present at meeting	Need to be careful where you remove from to make sure you don't compromise future nesting. Needs to be considered in the future – take nests from areas where they will be removed or destroyed anyway. RSPB to seek additional advice regarding disinfectant of nests Decoys and nests- start off in the middle of the face.	Not present at meeting	Noted that a host virus will probably not survive outside of a host throughout winter	Norfolk Projects have arranged for the nests to be disinfected to mitigate spread of disease and will look at creating artificial nests.
Reporting to the SoS	At the KCSG meeting 6 Norfolk Projects suggested a timeline to issue the report to the SoS by the end of November On the 20th October Norfolk Projects provided a draft report for review by the KCSG. The intention of the report is that it is submitted to the SoS to discharge its reporting commitments. Following receipt of comments the Norfolk Projects provided (on the 21 November) a version of the	Natural England have reviewed the monitoring Report and all of our comments have been addressed therefore we agree its content is fit for submission to DESNZ	East Suffolk Council have reviewed the monitoring Report and all of our comments have been addressed therefore we agree its content is fit for submission to DESNZ	Not present at meeting Due to the fact that the ANSs are not within the jurisdiction of Great Yarmouth Borough Council the monitoring report was not reviewed.	The RSPB have reviewed the monitoring Report and all of our comments have been addressed therefore we agree its content is fit for submission to DESNZ	The MMO defer to Natural England with regard to comments on the Monitoring report	Suggested to include wording in the reports referring to East Anglia ONE North and TWO in addition to the Norfolk Projects, to make it clear it is a joint monitoring report.	

Topic	Norfolk Projects	Natural England	East Suffolk Council	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	RSPB	MMO	East Anglia ONE North and TWO	Outstanding Actions
	report showing how comments had been addressed.							
KCSG Meeting 7 – East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO Revised KIMPs								
Approach by East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO to re-calculating the level of compensation required	No comments on the re-calculated number of nests.	No comments on the re-calculated number of nests.	No comments on the re-calculated number of nests.	Not present at the meeting.	No comments on the re-calculated number of nests.	Not present at the meeting.	At the KCSG Meeting 7 East Anglia ONE North and TWO Provided a summary of the decision letter from DESNZ received 10th November 2023, rejecting the revision one KIMP for EA ONE North and EA TWO. The letter refers to the calculations held in the Without Prejudice Compensation Plan, stating 100 nests are required as compensation. EA ONE North and EA TWO presented updated numbers outlining the proposal to provide 60 nest spaces per project (120 in total) to compensate for predicted impacts on kittiwake.	
Approach to have two separate KIMPs for SoS approval – one for EA ONE North and one for EA TWO	No comments on the proposed approach.	Agree the approach is appropriate.	Agree the approach is appropriate.	Not present at the meeting.	Agree the approach is appropriate.	Not present at the meeting.	EA ONE North and EA TWO propose to submit two separate KIMPs to the SoS for approval, which will reflect differences in the two projects' delivery timelines.	
Agreement that compensation requirements for EA TWO are covered by three existing ANS structures	No comments on the EA TWO nest allocation.	Natural England continues to consider that 360 nest spaces are insufficient compensation for the impacts of Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas, though we do recognise that the KIMP for these projects has been signed off on that basis. Therefore, we consider it reasonable for EA ONE North and EA TWO to calculate the required number of nest spaces for their projects on that basis.	No comments on the EA TWO nest allocation.	Not present at the meeting.	RSPB supportive of the approach to keep with the four breeding season requirement for EA ONE North and EA TWO.	Not present at the meeting.	Based on the compensation numbers proposed in the revised KIMPs the nest spaces at already installed ANS are sufficient for the revised compensation proposal for EA TWO. Delivery timescales for EA TWO mean compensation would have been in place four breeding seasons before operation of any EA TWO turbine.	

Topic	Norfolk Projects	Natural England	East Suffolk Council	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	RSPB	MMO	East Anglia ONE North and TWO	Outstanding Actions
<p>Construction of a fourth ANS in the same location to provide sufficient compensation for EA ONE North</p>	<p>No comment on the proposal to build an additional ANS.</p>	<p>Natural England welcomes the proposal for an extra kittiwake wall at Port of Lowestoft. We consider that a structure holding a similar number of nest spaces as those already installed (144 nest spaces) would address the compensatory requirements of EA ONE North and EA TWO and would improve the combined offer across the four projects in question.</p> <p>Natural England would be open to further discussion regarding whether an alternative orientation for the 4th wall nest face, e.g. due east rather than north-east, as this would provide different environmental conditions to those already in place.</p> <p>We highlight the adaptive management measures being proposed for 2024 for the existing walls due to non-colonisation in 2023. We recommend that these measures (trace nests, decoys, colony playback) are used on the 4th wall 'from day 1' to increase the likelihood of prompt colonisation. The KIMPs should be updated to confirm the commitment to these measures.</p>	<p>ESC confirmed the planning process would follow the same approach as before for the original three ANSs.</p>	<p>Not present at the meeting. Due to the fact that the additional ANS is not within the jurisdiction of Great Yarmouth Borough Council no comment was requested.</p>	<p>RSPB supportive of the approach to keep with the four breeding season requirement for EA ONE North and EA TWO.</p>	<p>Not present at the meeting.</p>	<p>Based on the compensation numbers proposed in the revised KIMPs the nest spaces at already installed ANS are insufficient for the revised compensation proposal for EA ONE North. Therefore, construction of an additional fourth ANS at Port of Lowestoft, within existing lease area is proposed. The fourth structure will follow the design of the existing ANSs, and the aim is to maintain spacing, alignment and separation from harbour wall the same as existing ANSs as far as the red line boundary allows.</p> <p>The south-west orientation (i.e. reversing the nesting face of the wall structure) has been discounted as this would result in exposure to the afternoon sun, which could result in over-heating when birds are at the nest (see Annex 3 to the Norfolk Projects' KIMP). An east facing orientation has also been discounted, because it would not be possible to accommodate the structure and maintain sufficient separation (to allow access) between the structure and the harbour wall or the structure and the sea front. The fourth structure will therefore be orientated the same as the existing three structures</p> <p>The predator control fence will be re-aligned to encircle all ANSs.</p> <p>A new request for planning permission will be</p>	<p>Amend the EA ONE North KIMP to include commitment to implementing adaptive management measures agreed for other ANSs in KCSG Meeting 6 in advance of the first breeding season after the fourth structure is constructed.</p> <p>Prior to installation, any further suggested modifications can be discussed with the KCSG, in light of the results of ongoing monitoring in 2024.</p>

Topic	Norfolk Projects	Natural England	East Suffolk Council	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	RSPB	MMO	East Anglia ONE North and TWO	Outstanding Actions
							submitted to ESC to extend the current permission held within the red line boundary. Delivery timescales for EA ONE North mean compensation would have been in place four breeding seasons before operation of any EA ONE North turbine.	
Approach to monitoring of the fourth ANS	No comments on the proposed approach to monitoring.	No comments on the proposed approach to monitoring.	No comments on the proposed approach to monitoring.	Not present at the meeting.	Questioned if there had been any further discussions regarding apportionment of nests / recruits between the four projects. Suggested, with the addition of the 4th structure, depending which ANSs are colonised first (or if colonised unevenly) it could be a case of EA1N and EA2 meeting the compensation requirements but not the Norfolk Projects. Noted, that such approach hadn't been tested to date, and the discussion might need to be held in the future.	Not present at the meeting.	Monitoring provisions previously agreed for the existing ANSs would be extended to include the fourth structure once it is constructed and the four ANSs together will be treated as a single colony providing compensation for all four offshore wind projects. EA ONE North and EA TWO will continue to work together with the Norfolk Projects to undertake monitoring.	

3. MEETING MINUTES KCSG MEETING 7

East Anglia ONE North and TWO Kittiwake Compensation Steering Group Meeting 7

Teams Meeting

29 January 2024

15:00 – 16:30

Attendees:

Name	Role	Company
James Mckie (JM)	SG Chairperson	Eurona Consultancy Ltd
Andrew Dodd (AD)	Advisory member	RSPB
Luke Wilkinson (LW)	Advisory member	RSPB
Grahame Stuteley (GS)	Advisory member	East Suffolk Council
Rachel Hall (RH)	Advisory member	East Suffolk Council
Martin Kerby (MK)	Advisory member	Natural England
Alan Gibson (AG)	Advisory member	Natural England
Sophie Sparrow (SS)	Advisory member	Natural England
Rachael Devine (RD)	Compensation project manager	SPR
Michael Armitage (MA)	Senior ecology manager (Ornithology)	SPR
Marija Nilova (MN)	Ecology manager	SPR
Matthew Jeans (MJ)	Offshore consents manager	Vattenfall

Apologies:

James Meyer – East Suffolk Council

Yana Bosseva – Vattenfall

Relevant Documents:

EA2 Kittiwake IMP revised v1.3

EA1N Kittiwake IMP revised v1.3

DESNZ Decision on the EA1N and EA2 Kittiwake Implementation and Monitoring Plan (dated 10 Nov 2023)

EA1N & EA2 Kittiwake Implementation and Monitoring Plans (KIMP) Revised proposal – 29 Jan 2024 summary slides

NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	<p>Introductions</p> <p>JM as chair of the meeting introduced parties present and asked if anyone who had not previously attended a kittiwake compensation steering group (KCSG) meeting would like any background information on the role of this group.</p> <p><i>Attendees did not require any additional context for the KCSG meeting.</i></p> <p>JM asked if there is AOB that attendees would like to raise at the end of the meeting in addition to the agenda items.</p> <p><i>No additional AOB raised at this point.</i></p>	
2	<p>EA1N and EA2 KIMP Overview (RD)</p> <p>RD provided an overview of the context of the meeting and the response from DESNZ in regard to the revision 1 of SPR EA1N and EA2 Kittiwake implementation and Monitoring Plan (KIMP) that was submitted for approval.</p> <p>Went over the aims of the KCSG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous KIMP combined (EA1N/EA2) • SoS Rejection of proposal for 15 nests as compensation • Advice given by DESNZ, requirement of 100 nests for both projects combined • New KIMPs proposed • Seeking Agreement on our proposals prior to SoS submission • Timescales 	
3	<p>Timelines for submission (RD)</p> <p>RD provided an overview of the timeline that SPR is working towards to implement compensation for EA1N and EA2. The projects are planning to submit the revised KIMPs for DESNZ (SoS) approval before end of February 2024.</p> <p>MN added that to meet the timescales, SPR has requested KCSG members to provide their written comments on the KIMPs (issued via email on 26 January 2024) and the minutes of the current meeting (will be issued shortly after the meeting) by 12 February 2024.</p> <p>JM asked if anyone had any questions so far regarding context of the meeting, SoS decision and the timelines?</p> <p><i>No questions raised by attendees.</i></p>	<p>MN to circulate draft meeting minutes after the meeting for KCSG comment and sign off.</p>
4	<p>Amended KIMP Proposal (MA)</p> <p>MA outlined scale of compensation which informed rev. 1 of EA1N and EA2 KIMP and explained the scale of compensation proposed in the revised EA1N and EA2 KIMPs.</p> <p>MA laid out what the artificial nest structures (ANS) already installed at Port of Lowestoft could accommodate. Based on the compensation numbers proposed in the revised KIMPs it is sufficient for the revised compensation proposal for EA2. SPR deliberately 'allocated' the nests already available at the ANS to EA2 as timescales for delivery and construction are ahead of EA1N.</p> <p>MA explained, that the existing ANS left a deficit of 48 nests for EA1N. SPR proposes to construct a 4th structure in the same location. The delivery would be in line with currently expected EA1N timeline (ensuring compensation is in place four breeding seasons before operation of any turbine).</p> <p>MA presented a table, comparing the scale of the proposed EA1N and EA2 compensation with the scale of kittiwake compensation proposed for other projects (The Norfolk Projects and Hornsea Three).</p>	

NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<p>JM asked if attendees had any questions regarding the proposed numbers and metrics used?</p> <p>MK clarified if the approach to allocate 60 of the available nests on the existing ANS to EA2 was driven by the project consent stipulation that compensation needs to be in place four breeding seasons prior to operation?</p> <p>MA confirmed this was the main driving force behind allocating of EA2 nests to the existing structure.</p> <p>MK provided a general comment regarding the situation where EA1N and EA2 had received a rejection from DESNZ on rev. 1 of the KIMP. Suggested, that at the root of this decision is what projects proposed at examination. The Norfolk Projects proposed around 800-900 nest sites, but post-consent brought forward a proposal for ANS that would accommodate up to 432, for The Norfolk Projects and EA1N and EA2. NE position in both instances had been that the level of compensation to be delivered should be in line with what was proposed in examination. It appears that DESNZ took a different approach when approving The Norfolk Projects' KIMP, accepting the updated calculations of 360 nest requirement, while in the case of EA1N and EA2, DESNZ considered the projects need to deliver in line with the without prejudice document.</p> <p>MK also enquired if EA1N and EA2 thought about a non-material change (NMC) approach or any other approach to get compensation approved? MK commented that the current EA1N and EA2 compensation proposal appears generous.</p> <p>MA confirmed that EA1N and EA2 had considered a NMC approach, in particular, to change the number of breeding seasons required for the compensation to be in place before the first turbine operation. However, the fact that the two SPR projects are being delivered at a slightly different programme, allowed EA2 to be prioritised to ensure it would have delivered four breeding seasons of compensation with the existing ANS at Lowestoft, as is the current requirement. Consequently, the proposal for a 4th structure at Lowestoft can be solely focused on providing additional nests for EA1N.</p> <p>MA also enquired if discussion about reducing the number of monitoring years was something Natural England was involved in for Hornsea Three NMC?</p> <p>MK confirmed this was the case, but in case of Hornsea Three, the scale of compensation was significantly larger, as well as geographically spread, so on balance Natural England agreed to a reduced number of years.</p> <p>AD added that RSPB had a slightly different approach for Hornsea Three NMC and expressed concern about the 'mortality debt' issue. AD confirmed that, in-principle, RSPB would be supportive of the approach to keep with the four breeding season requirement for EA1N and EA2, even though RSPB might have further comments on the numbers proposed.</p> <p>JM asked if there was anything in the current EA1N and EA2 compensation proposal that Natural England had a particular worry about or where further clarifications might help?</p> <p>MK welcomed the proposal for an additional wall structure. Natural England would need to confirm their approach when providing written comments. MK mentioned that accepting this proposal for EA1N and EA2 would mean Natural England 'agrees' the 360 nests the Norfolk Projects delivered is sufficient, where Natural England had previously stated it was not. MK expressed concern that ecological aspects were often put on the side after the examination process. A question remains open – what number of nests is considered 'spare' on the existing ANS?</p> <p>JM enquired if anything specific could be done to minimise Natural England's concerns?</p> <p>MK confirmed that natural England would need to deliberate internally. Overall the proposal for an additional ANS appears to be 'a good thing' for kittiwake, however, accepting it would potentially mean going against the position Natural England expressed previously.</p>	<p>AD to consult with RSPB ornithology specialists to inform comments on the updated EA1N and EA2 KIMPs.</p> <p>MK to consult with Natural England ornithology specialists to inform comments on the updated EA1N and EA2 KIMPs.</p>

NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<p>MA confirmed there was more detail on the EA1N and EA2 proposals within the KIMPs than in the slides and SPR would be keen to provide any further explanations or respond to questions, if anyone had them after the meeting.</p> <p>AD had a comment about future monitoring and adaptive management of ANS at Lowestoft. Questioned if there had been any further discussions regarding apportionment of nests / recruits between different projects? As this was the first compensation of this kind delivered in collaboration, it was difficult to know how it would play out. Suggested, with the addition of the 4th structure, depending which ANSs are colonised first (or if colonised unevenly) it could be a case of EA1N and EA2 meeting the compensation requirements but not The Norfolk Projects. Accepted, that such approach hadn't been tested to date, and the discussion might need to be held in the future.</p> <p>JM commented that such conversations could certainly be facilitated in the future if there is a need from the KCSG members. JM asked if there were further comments on the info presented in the slides so far?</p> <p><i>No questions recorded.</i></p> <p>RD confirmed that future apportionment of nests between The Norfolk Projects and EA1N and EA2 is not held in the Vattenfall and SPR collaboration agreement. RD agreed this could be discussed at a suitable time in the future.</p>	
5	<p>Amended KIMP proposal – EA1N compensation structure (MA)</p> <p>MA outlined the plan to construct a 4th structure in line with the existing ANS to maintain all structures within the red line boundary of the compensation site at Port of Lowestoft. Aiming to provide the same spacing between structures.</p> <p>MA noted the current agreement with the landowner (ABP) specifies number of nests that is linked to the number agreed in the projects' KIMPs and those cannot be exceeded. SPR will apply for a new planning permission to construct the 4th structure once the revised EA1N and EA2 KIMPs are approved by DESNZ (SoS).</p> <p>JM asked if GS had any comments on the planning process.</p> <p>GS confirmed the planning process would follow the same approach as before for the original three ANS.</p> <p>MK questioned if following the exact design of the existing structures was the right approach? Taking into account kittiwake colonisation of the ANS was not successful in the first year, suggested there might be an opportunity to reconsider some of the ANS aspects, such as design or orientation. MK acknowledged, this type of work is still very new, there is little evidence as to what orientation might be more attractive for kittiwake – potential to explore a south-facing nesting wall?</p> <p>MA agreed that such an opportunity existed, however SPR had not considered any specific alterations to the design. The KCSG could be used as a forum to discuss any ideas and proposals. One option might be easily achieved, such as turning the 4th structure around so that nesting ledges face the opposite direction. In addition, adaptive management proposals put forward in Vattenfall's KCSG Meeting 6 (29 September 2023) could also be implemented on the 4th structure from the start.</p> <p>AD asked if the 4th structure would be limited to only providing 48 nest sites?</p> <p>MA acknowledged this was a nuanced topic. The intention is to provide a structure as per design of the existing ANS, which could in theory accommodate up to 144 nests (allowing 50cm per nest space as per previous ANS assumptions). However, the lease with the landowner limits the number of nests in total. SPR is intending to make the full structure available for colonisation to begin with, as it is still unknown, which parts of the ANS might be colonised first. MA confirmed that discussions how to manage structures to adhere to the number in the lease agreement would need to happen down the line involving The Norfolk Projects and the landowner and the KCSG, once the number of nests starts reaching the maximum allowance in the lease agreement.</p> <p>AD clarified if the KCSG members would have visibility to the nest cap as specified in the lease agreement.</p>	

NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	<p>RD confirmed the maximum nest allowance will be made clear to the group once a revised agreement with the landowner is finalised.</p> <p>JM noted the complexities around landowner agreements and compensation requirements.</p> <p>GS returned to the point brought up by MK – if the 4th structure was designed differently, and if this structure was to be occupied first – would all nests be allocated to EA1N (so ahead of EA2 and The Norfolk Project delivery)? Asked if this had been discussed with Vattenfall?</p> <p>MA confirmed this scenario had not specifically been considered. The general approach so far had been that the number and nest allocation for projects was mostly in plans for approval, rather than a reflection of how it might work in nature. MA agreed that the apportionment point would need to be picked up at a later point and collaboratively with The Norfolk Projects.</p> <p>MA noted that if anything was to be done differently on the 4th structure and was shown to be effective, it could be taken on board for adaptive management for all structures.</p> <p>MK confirmed that Natural England would have an internal discussion with ornithology specialists regarding the potential suggestions for alternative design for the 4th structure.</p> <p>MA speculated the initial justification for the orientation of the existing ANS was likely in relation to south-facing walls being prone to overheating.</p> <p>MK checked if the orientation of the existing ledges is towards northeast?</p> <p>AD recalled that such orientation was chosen to avoid overheating and for potential futureproofing against rising global temperatures.</p> <p>MK confirmed if the 4th structure was to be turned around, the nest ledges would be southwest-facing and exposed to the warmest temperatures.</p>	<p>MK to provide any feedback on design modifications with comments on the updated EA1N KIMP.</p>
6	<p>Conclusions</p> <p>JM commented that the meeting had some positive discussion, SPR clearly presented suggestions for EA1N and EA2, and some points were raised for future consideration.</p> <p>RD added that SPR was looking forward to hearing further feedback from the KCSG.</p> <p>JM noted that a number of matters needed to be taken into account to come to an agreement on such a complex issue. He also noted that the group acknowledged that as presented the proposal meets the SoS’s request and is an improvement on what was initially proposed. However, he acknowledged that NE had points of principle to address internally and requested that as far as possible if these could be considered within the timeframes set out.</p> <p>JM confirmed that the KCSG forum was open to discuss any other matter that may arise in the future. Asked for any final questions on the topics presented?</p> <p>GS clarified if SPR was looking to undertake a formal pre-planning application ahead of the planning application being submitted?</p> <p>RD confirmed this was the approach being followed.</p> <p>MA / RD had nothing else to raise.</p>	
7	<p>AOB</p> <p>JM asked if there was AOB?</p> <p><i>No AOB or any further questions raised by attendees.</i></p> <p>JM closed the meeting and thanked everyone for their time and contribution.</p>	