

# MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

## Mona and Ørsted Interested Parties SoCG

Deadline: 6

Application Reference: EN010137

Document Reference: S\_D6\_48

Document Number: MOCNS-J3303-RPS-10522

20 December 2024

F01



Image of an offshore wind farm

**MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT**

**Document status**

<b>Version</b>	<b>Purpose of document</b>	<b>Authored by</b>	<b>Reviewed by</b>	<b>Approved by</b>	<b>Review date</b>
F01	Submission at D6	RPS	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	20 Dec 2024

**Prepared by:**

**RPS**

**Prepared for:**

**Mona Offshore Wind Ltd.**

## Contents

<b>MONA AND ØRSTED INTERESTED PARTIES SOCG .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND BETWEEN MONA OFFSHORE WIND LIMITED AND ØRSTED INTERESTED PARTIES.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction .....	1
1.1.1 Overview .....	1
1.1.2 Mona Offshore Wind Project elements under the Ørsted IPs' remit .....	1
1.1.3 Overview of Mona Offshore Wind Project .....	1
1.1.4 Approach to SoCG .....	2
1.2 Summary of SoCG.....	2
1.2.1 Overview .....	2
1.2.2 Summary of Those Matters Agreed, Ongoing Points of Discussion and Not Agreed .....	2
1.3 Summary of consultation .....	3
1.3.1 Overview .....	3
1.4 Agreement log .....	5
1.4.1 Overview .....	5
1.4.2 Effects to existing and proposed infrastructure, including wake effects .....	6

## Tables

Table 1.1: Summary of areas agreed, ongoing points of discussion and not agreed between the parties. ...	2
Table 1.2: Summary of pre-application consultation with the Ørsted IPs.....	3
Table 1.3: Summary of post-application consultation with the Ørsted IPs.....	3
Table 1.4: Position definitions and colour coding.....	5
Table 1.5: Agreement Log between the parties on Effects to existing and proposed infrastructure, including wake effects.....	6

## MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

### Glossary

Term	Meaning
Applicant	Mona Offshore Wind Limited.
Development Consent Order (DCO)	An order made under the Planning Act 2008 granting development consent for one or more Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP).
Mona Array Area	The area within which the wind turbines, foundations, inter-array cables, interconnector cables, offshore export cables and offshore substation platforms (OSPs) forming part of the Mona Offshore Wind Project will be located.
Mona Offshore Cable Corridor	The corridor located between the Mona Array Area and the landfall up to MHWS, in which the offshore export cables will be located.
Mona Offshore Wind Project	The Mona Offshore Wind Project is comprised of both the generation assets, offshore and onshore transmission assets, and associated activities.
Mona Offshore Wind Project Boundary	The area containing all aspects of the Mona Offshore Wind Project, both offshore and onshore.
The Planning Inspectorate	The agency responsible for operating the planning process for NSIPs.

### Acronyms

Acronym	Description
ALARP	As low as reasonably practicable
CPA	Closest Point of Approach
CRNRA	Cumulative regional navigational risk assessment
DCO	Development Consent Order
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ERCoP	Emergency Response and Cooperation Plan
ExA	Examining Authority
HAZID	Hazard identification
IoMSPC	Isle of Man Steam Packet Company
MCA	Maritime and Coastguard Authority
MGN	Marine Guidance Note
MHWS	Mean High Water Springs
MLWS	Mean Low Water Springs
MNEF	Marine Navigation Engagement Forum
NRA	Navigational Risk Assessment
OSP	Offshore Substation Platform
OWF	Offshore Wind Farm
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
SAR	Search and Rescue

**MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT**

Acronym	Description
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
WTG	Wind turbine generator
TSS	Traffic separation schemes

**Units**

Unit	Description
kV	Kilovolt
m	Metre
nm	Nautical mile

# 1 Statement of Common Ground between Mona Offshore Wind Limited and Ørsted Interested Parties

## 1.1 Introduction

### 1.1.1 Overview

1.1.1.1 This initial Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared between Mona Offshore Wind Limited (hereafter referred to as ‘the Applicant’) and the Ørsted Interested Parties (Ørsted IPs), hereafter referred together as the parties. The SoCG sets out the areas of agreement and disagreement between the parties in relation to the proposed Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the Mona Offshore Wind Project.

1.1.1.2 The Examining Authority (ExA) has requested that a SoCG between the Applicant and the Ørsted IPs be submitted into the Examination in the Examining Authority’s Written Questions 2 (ExQ2) (PD-018).

1.1.1.3 This document is intended to provide the Examining Authority with an overview of the level of common ground between the parties. The SoCG will facilitate further discussion between the parties and will be updated during the Mona Offshore Wind Project Examination and submitted at Deadlines 6 and 7.

### 1.1.2 Mona Offshore Wind Project elements under the Ørsted IPs’ remit

1.1.2.1 The Ørsted IPs are other offshore wind farm operators in the east Irish Sea who have made representations in relation to the Mona Offshore Wind Project.

1.1.2.2 The elements of the Mona Offshore Wind Project which may affect the interests of the Ørsted IPs are detailed in Schedule 1 (Authorised Project), Part 1 (Authorised Development) of the Draft Development Consent Order (C1 F06).

### 1.1.3 Overview of Mona Offshore Wind Project

1.1.3.1 The Mona Offshore Wind Project is a proposed offshore wind farm located in the east Irish Sea. The Mona Offshore Wind Project will include offshore infrastructure and consists of:

- **Mona Array Area:** This is where the wind turbines, Offshore Substation Platforms (OSPs), foundations (for both wind turbines and OSPs), inter-array cables and interconnector cables will be located.
- **Mona Offshore Cable Corridor and Access Areas:** The corridor located between the Mona Array Area and the landfall up to Mean High Water Springs (MHWS), in which the offshore export cables will be located and in which the intertidal access areas are located
- **Intertidal access areas:** The area from MHWS to Mean Low Water Springs (MLWS) which will be used for access to the beach and construction related activities
- **Landfall:** This is where the offshore export cables make contact with land and the transitional area where the offshore cabling connects to the onshore cabling
- **Mona Onshore Development Area:** The area in which the landfall, Mona Onshore Cable Corridor, Mona Onshore Substation, mitigation areas, temporary

**MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT**

construction infrastructure (such as access roads and construction compounds), operational access to the Mona Onshore Substation and the 400 kV connection to National Grid infrastructure will be located

- Mona Onshore Substation: This is where the new substation will be located, containing the components for transforming the power supplied from the offshore wind farm up to 400 kV
- Mona 400 kV Grid Connection Cable Corridor: The corridor from the Mona Onshore Substation to the National Grid substation.

**1.1.4 Approach to SoCG**

1.1.4.1 This SoCG has been developed during the Examination phase and will continue to be progressed during the Examination phase of the Mona Offshore Wind Project. In accordance with discussions between the parties, the SoCG is focused on those issues raised by the Ørsted IPs within its response to Scoping and Section 42 consultation. This SoCG also includes those issues raised by the Ørsted IPs during the post-application phase (i.e. relevant representations and pre-Examination meetings).

1.1.4.2 The structure of this SoCG is as follows:

- Section 1.1: Introduction
- Section 1.2: Summary of SoCG
- Section 1.3: Summary of consultation
- Section 1.4: Agreement Log.

**1.2 Summary of SoCG**

**1.2.1 Overview**

1.2.1.1 This SoCG outlines the consultation that has taken place between the parties during the pre-application and post-application phases of the Mona Offshore Wind Project. The agreement logs present the updated position reached on 20 December 2024 (Deadline 6).

**1.2.2 Summary of Those Matters Agreed, Ongoing Points of Discussion and Not Agreed**

1.2.2.1 Table 1.1 provides a summary of those matters agreed, an ongoing point of discussion or not agreed between the parties.

**Table 1.1: Summary of areas agreed, ongoing points of discussion and not agreed between the parties.**

Topic	Agreement status
Proximity and co-existence	Agreed
Offshore ornithology cumulative & in-combination assessment	Some areas Not Agreed – material impact, some ongoing points of discussion
Wake effects	Not Agreed – material impact
Aviation and radar	Ongoing point of discussion

**MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT**

Topic	Agreement status
Shipping and navigation	Not Agreed – material impact

### 1.3 Summary of consultation

#### 1.3.1 Overview

1.3.1.1 Table 1.2 below provides a summary of the consultation undertaken by the Applicant with the Ørsted IPs during the pre-application phase of the Mona Offshore Wind Project. Table 1.3 below provides a summary of the consultation undertaken by the Applicant with the Ørsted IPs during the post-application phase of the Mona Offshore Wind Project.

**Table 1.2: Summary of pre-application consultation with the Ørsted IPs.**

Date	Form of consultation	Statutory or non-statutory engagement	Summary of consultation
<b>Statutory (Section 42) consultation</b>			
02 June 2023	Barrow Offshore Wind Limited, Burbo Extension Ltd, Ørsted Burbo (UK) Limited, Morecambe Wind Limited, Walney (UK) Offshore Windfarms Limited, Walney Extension Limited submitted Section 42 responses	Statutory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need for continued access to the offshore wind assets for maintenance, and for any upgrading, repowering or decommissioning activities</li> <li>Potential for the Mona Offshore Wind Project turbines to interfere with wind speed or wind direction of the existing Barrow, Burbo Bank, Burbo Extension, West of Duddon Sands, Walney 1 and 2, and Walney 3 and 4 offshore wind farms, causing a reduction in energy output.</li> </ul>
<b>Shipping and navigation consultation</b>			
28/09/2023-29/09/2023	Hazard workshop	Non-statutory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In person hazard workshop</li> <li>Cumulative NRA hazard workshop undertaken to inform the Environmental Statement</li> <li>Mona Offshore Wind Project NRA hazard workshop undertaken to inform the Environmental Statement</li> </ul>

**Table 1.3: Summary of post-application consultation with the Ørsted IPs.**

Date	Form of consultation	Statutory or non-statutory engagement	Summary of consultation
06 May 2024	Barrow Offshore Wind Limited, Burbo Extension Ltd, Ørsted Burbo (UK) Limited, Morecambe Wind Limited, Walney (UK) Offshore Windfarms Limited, Walney Extension Limited submitted Relevant Representations	Statutory	Relevant representations submitted by the Ørsted IPs.



**MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Form of consultation</b>	<b>Statutory or non-statutory engagement</b>	<b>Summary of consultation</b>
27 November 2024	Meeting with Ørsted IPs	Non-Statutory	Discussion on scope and process for SoCG
13 December	Meeting with Ørsted IPs	Non-statutory	Discussion on content of SoCG

**MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT**

**1.4 Agreement log**

**1.4.1 Overview**

1.4.1.1 This section of the SoCG sets out the level of agreement between the parties. For each matter the status is identified as being either agreed, not agreed, not agreed but not material, or an ongoing point of discussion, according to the criteria set out in Table 1.4 below.

**Table 1.4: Position definitions and colour coding.**

<b>Position and colour coding</b>	<b>Definition of position</b>
Agreed	The matter is considered to be agreed between the parties.
Ongoing point of discussion	The matter is neither agreed or not agreed and is a matter where further discussion is required between the parties.
Not agreed, but not material	The matter is not considered to be agreed between the parties, but is not deemed material.
Not agreed	The matter is not considered to be agreed between the parties.

**1.4.2 Effects to existing and proposed infrastructure, including wake effects**

1.4.2.1 Table 1.5 sets out the level of agreement between the parties for each relevant component of the application in relation to shipping and navigation.

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

1.4.3 Effects to existing and proposed infrastructure, including wake effects

Table 1.5: Agreement Log between the parties on Effects to existing and proposed infrastructure, including wake effects.

Reference Number	Discussion point	Applicant's Position	Ørsted IPs' Position	Status
<b>Proximity and co-existence</b>				
OIP.OWF.1	Proximity	<p>The Ørsted IPs represent the following operational offshore wind farms in the east Irish Sea which are presented together with distance from the Mona Array Area (as set out in Table 10.10 of Volume 2, Chapter 10: Other sea users (APP-062)):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burbo Bank Extension (30.6 km)</li> <li>Walney Extension (30.7 km)</li> <li>West of Duddon Sands (31.9 km)</li> <li>Walney 1 and 2 (34.1 km)</li> <li>Burbo Bank (40.3 km)</li> <li>Barrow (43.3 km).</li> </ul>	Agreed	Agreed
<b>Offshore ornithology cumulative &amp; in-combination assessment</b>				
OIP.OO.1	Offshore ornithology cumulative and in-combination assessment (raised by Barrow Offshore Wind Limited, Burbo Extension Ltd, Morecambe Wind Limited, Ørsted Burbo (UK) Limited,	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a suitably robust assessment of all potential impacts on offshore ornithology informed by appropriate data sources from site-specific surveys and detailed desktop studies, in accordance with relevant guidance. The assessment of potential impacts to offshore ornithology is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology (REP4-007) and the HRA Stage 2 information to support an appropriate assessment Part Three: Special Protection Areas and Ramsar Sites assessments (REP2-010). Further information is presented in the following</p>	<p>The Ørsted IPs are not convinced that the assessments are robust and require to analyse this further and engage with Mona Offshore Windfarm Ltd.</p> <p>Note that the Ørsted IPs might change their position at deadline 7 following the Applicant update of the CEA to gap-fill Barrow</p>	Not Agreed – material impact

**MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT**

Reference Number	Discussion point	Applicant's Position	Ørsted IPs' Position	Status
	Walney Extension Limited and Walney (UK) Offshore Windfarms Ltd)	<p>submissions made by the Applicant into the Examination process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offshore Ornithology Assessment of Pen y Gogarth/Great Orme's Head SSSI (REP4-025)</li> <li>• Review of Offshore ornithology CEA and In-Combination Assessment (REP4-027)</li> <li>• Offshore Ornithology Cumulative Effects Assessment and In-combination Gap-filling Historical Projects Technical Note (REP4-028)</li> <li>• Offshore Ornithology Supporting Information in line with SNCB advice (REP4-030)</li> <li>• Offshore ornithology additional supporting in-combination assessment information in line with SNCB advice (REP5-074)</li> <li>• Offshore Ornithology Additional Supporting Cumulative Assessment Information in line with SNCB Advice (REP5-075).</li> </ul>		
OIP.OO.2	Gap filling of historical offshore wind farms	<p>The Applicant notes the Ørsted IPs Comments on Deadline 4 Submissions (REP5-117) requesting that quantified predicted impacts for Barrow Offshore Wind Farm be included in the Applicant's cumulative effects assessment (CEA) given the potential for the project to repower.</p> <p>To address this matter, the Applicant intends to update the CEA to gap-fill Barrow (and North Hoyle which is understood to be in a similar position) for submission at Deadline 7. To enable the Ørsted IPs to have regard to this information within their</p>	Barrow Offshore Windfarm is incorrectly excluded from the Applicant's ornithological CEA. Exclusion of an operational offshore windfarm on the grounds set out in the Applicant's position goes against precautionary principle.	Ongoing point of discussion

**MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT**

Reference Number	Discussion point	Applicant's Position	Ørsted IPs' Position	Status
		Closing Statement, the updated ES chapter and associated relevant annexes will be shared with them (for information purposes only) ahead of Deadline 7.		

**Wake effects**

OIP.WE.1	Wake effects (raised by Barrow Offshore Wind Limited, Burbo Extension Ltd, Morecambe Wind Limited, Ørsted Burbo (UK) Limited, Walney Extension Limited and Walney (UK) Offshore Windfarms Ltd)	<p>There is a fundamental disagreement between the Parties on wake loss and the ExA should refer to each Party's latest written submission for the most up to date position.</p> <p>In summary the key points of disagreement are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Application documents include sufficient information for an assessment of the Mona Offshore Wind Project against the policies in National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 and EN-3. The correct interpretation of the NPS and the application of relevant policy to the Mona Offshore Wind Project application does not require any further 'wake assessment' to be undertaken or submitted.</li> <li>The Applicant has followed EIA legislation and undertaken its baseline characterisation and assessment appropriately (Volume 2, Chapter 10: Other sea users (APP-062)).</li> <li>There is no policy stating an assessment of wakes is required at any distance.</li> <li>If an assessment was required, there is not a robust or recognised approach to undertake it.</li> <li>The Applicant has amended the boundary closest to the Ørsted IPs following statutory pre-application consultation</li> </ul>	<p>The Ørsted IPs commissioned an independent wake report which demonstrated that the Mona Offshore Wind Project will adversely affect the energy yield of their developments. Furthermore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Ørsted IPs have stated that this impact should have been fully assessed by the Applicant as part of the site selection process. The Applicant denies that wake will have a significant impact and is continuing to refuse to undertake an assessment.</li> <li>The terms of NPS EN-3 are unambiguous in their requirement to carry out an assessment (see paragraph 2.8.197-2.9.198).</li> <li>The necessary data and modelling tools to undertake such an analysis is available to the Applicant. Wake loss modelling, within and between wind farms, is not novel, it underpins all investment decisions in the wind industry.</li> <li>Similarly, The Crown Estate's response to the Outer Dowsing examination confirms that the Applicant cannot rely on compliance with the boundary requirements in TCE's Round 4 Leasing Information Memorandum to justify not carrying out a detailed assessment.</li> <li>There are now limited options to address this issue. Those options are (1) to modify</li> </ul>	Not Agreed – material impact
----------	--	---	---	------------------------------

**MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT**

Reference Number	Discussion point	Applicant's Position	Ørsted IPs' Position	Status
		<p>(Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives (AS-016)), increasing the distance between the projects. The amendment in the boundary follows the mitigation hierarchy.</p>	<p>site layout or project design; (2) to modify the operation of the development (for instance through wind sector management or wake steering); or (3) privately negotiate compensation, noting that the latter is a standard outcome across the UK wind industry.</p>	
<b>Aviation and radar</b>				
OIP.A&R.1	<p>Aviation and radar (raised by Burbo Extension Ltd and Walney Extension Limited)</p>	<p>The Applicant has received an objection from the MOD Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) dated 06 August 2024 (REP1-054) in relation to the Air Traffic Control (ATC) radar at BAE Warton. The Applicant has progressed a SoCG with DIO on this matter. The Applicant is in discussion with BAE Systems and the DIO regarding mitigation, which will be agreed with BAE Systems and the DIO where necessary to ensure significant effects are avoided. Therefore, the Applicant has no reason to believe that the Mona Offshore Wind Project might adversely affect or increase the cost of the mitigation put in place by Burbo Extension Ltd or Walney Extension Limited related to Warton Aerodrome Primary Surveillance Radar (PSR). Any agreement which may be required with BAE Systems related to the funding of mitigation will be made exclusively between the Applicant and BAE Systems.</p> <p>At this time the nature of the Ørsted IPs' mitigation deployed at BAE Warton, and whether its application would extend to the Mona Offshore Wind Project, is unknown to the Applicant. The Applicant is also unaware as to whether such mitigation is contractually underpinned between BAE</p>	<p>Burbo Extension Ltd and Walney Extension Limited are implementing appropriate mitigation in relation to potential impacts on the Warton Airfield Primary Surveillance Radar (PSR) the details of which remain confidential at the time of writing and cannot be shared with the Applicant.</p> <p>As such, it is inappropriate for the Applicant to assume that Mona Offshore Windfarm project will not "adversely affect or increase the cost of the mitigation".</p> <p>Burbo Extension Ltd and Walney Extension Limited require assurance that the Applicant will not adversely affect or increase the cost of such mitigation and that, in the event that the Applicant draws beneficial use of this mitigation, the Applicant will contribute to the purchase, installation and maintenance costs.</p> <p>It is widely acknowledged that CAPEX and OPEX cost-sharing across beneficial users of both defence and civilian PSR mitigation solutions has been standard practice across the UK wind industry for more than a decade.</p>	Ongoing point of discussion

**MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT**

Reference Number	Discussion point	Applicant's Position	Ørsted IPs' Position	Status
		Systems and Ørsted IPs by cost sharing principles or similar. As noted above, any agreement which may be required with BAE Systems related to the funding of mitigation will be made exclusively between the Applicant and BAE Systems. The Applicant would welcome further clarity to enable resolution of any residual concern on this matter.		
<b>Shipping and navigation</b>				
OIP.S&N.1	Marine Navigation Engagement Forum (MNEF) pre-application	The Applicant established a MNEF to engage stakeholders in the pre-application process. This included hosting a Hazard Workshop to discuss findings of the Navigational Risk Assessment (NRA) and Cumulative Regional Navigational Risk Assessment (CRNRA). Ørsted IPs were invited to attend the Hazard Workshop in September 2023.	Ørsted IPs confirm engagement with both the MNEF and the Hazard Workshops from September 2023.	Agreed
OIP.S&N.2	MNEF post-consent	The Applicant has committed to ongoing engagement with stakeholders (including the Ørsted IPs) via the MNEF. Details of this are set out in the Outline Vessel Traffic Management Plan (REP3-018), which will be updated at Deadline 6 to include a commitment to facilitating the MNEF for a minimum 5 years into the operational and maintenance phase.	Ørsted IPs welcome the Applicant's commitment to ongoing engagement and wish to secure this outcome via a Deemed Marine Licence condition. Ørsted IPs note that they are not currently named within the Outline Vessel Traffic Management Plan. The Ørsted IPs expect the MNEF to establish the 'when' and 'how' of ongoing consultation.	Not Agreed – Material Impact
OIP.S&N.3	Shipping and navigation	The Applicant notes that the Ørsted IPs shipping and navigation concerns are only for West of Duddon Sands (Morecambe Wind Limited) and Walney Extension and therefore shipping and navigation is not a concern for the other Ørsted IP projects.	Ørsted IPs shipping and navigation concerns cover West of Duddon Sands (Morecambe Wind Limited), Walney Extension and Barrow.	Not Agreed – Material Impact

**MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT**

Reference Number	Discussion point	Applicant's Position	Ørsted IPs' Position	Status
OIP.S&N.4	Shipping and navigation	<p>The Applicant notes that West of Duddon Sands is located 17.2 nm to the northeast of the Mona Array Area.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed within Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation (APP-059) to continue engagement with all stakeholders through the MNEF post-consent, which includes offshore wind energy developers. This will include the post-consent documentation, including the ERCoP, MPCP and VTMP, once approved by the licencing authority, a commitment which will be updated in the VTMP at Deadline 6 .. Additionally, the Applicant has made a commitment to facilitating the MNEF for a minimum 5-years into the operational and maintenance phase as set out in OIP.S&amp;N.2.</p> <p>The Applicant understands through ongoing discussion with Ørsted IPs that there is concern that engagement with shipping operators could result in an increased collision/allision risk to Ørsted assets. The Applicant has assessed the potential impacts of the Mona Offshore Wind Project on navigational risk for all marine users, including collision and allision risk with existing operational windfarms within the shipping and navigation study area presented in the CRNRA (Appendix E of Volume 6, Annex 7.1: Navigational risk assessment (APP-098)). It was concluded that all hazards had been reduced to As Low As Reasonably Practicable or Broadly Acceptable (as per section 1.9.8 of Volume 6, Annex 7.1: Navigational risk assessment (APP-098)).</p>	<p>The Ørsted IPs request that they are afforded the opportunity to review and comment on relevant documents and plans, e.g. the Marine Pollution Contingency Plan, the Emergency Response and Cooperation Plan, and the Vessel Traffic Management Plan, once these plans are submitted to the Licensing Authority (the MMO) for conditional sign-off. This contrasts with the Applicant's unsecured commitment to continue the MNEF post-consent through 'engagement on the relevant documentation once agreed with the relevant statutory authority'.</p> <p>It is recognised that the Ørsted IP's assets are located out with Mona's shipping and navigation study area; however, when considering the Cumulative Navigation Risk Assessment appended to the in-isolation NRA [APP-098 Environmental Statement - Volume 6, Annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment] it is clear that the Mona Offshore Wind Project influences cumulative routing within the area, including shipping routes now passing in closer proximity to the Ørsted IP's operational assets, specifically West of Duddon Sands (WoDS) and Walney Extension. Figure 56 of the NRA (CNRA) shows higher levels of allision risk associated with the southern corner of WoDS and the southwestern edge of Walney Extension.</p> <p>When the list of impacts contained within Table 7.40 (Summary of potential effects, mitigation and monitoring) of the Shipping and Navigation Chapter [APP-059-Environmental Statement - Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation] are</p>	Not Agreed – Material Impact



**MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT**

Reference Number	Discussion point	Applicant's Position	Ørsted IPs' Position	Status
		<p>Ongoing engagement with vessel operators relating to residual concerns do not relate to navigational safety and therefore would not result in any changes in risk to the Ørsted IPs' developments.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to continuing the MNEF post-consent and this will include engagement on the relevant shipping and navigation documentation once agreed with the relevant statutory authority.</p>	<p>considered, increased allision risk to existing assets (including operational offshore wind farms) does not appear to be listed alongside the risk to vessels, ports and search &amp; rescue. Nor is it considered within APP-062 (Environmental Statement - Volume 2, Chapter 10: Other Sea Users) for existing offshore energy (wind) activities. Specifically, the NRA identifies an impact on allision (contact) risk to vessels which it states to be ALARP, however, the NRA does not address the impact of allision (contact) risk on existing offshore wind farms. The Ørsted IPs expect the Applicant to quantify and demonstrate that the allision risk that will directly impact the Ørsted IPs assets (as per Figure 56 of APP-098) remains within ALARP parameters, and to confirm whether additional mitigation measures are required for those projects to achieve that ALARP status.</p>	
OIP.S&N.5	Shipping and navigation	<p>The Applicant notes that 'accidental pollution during all phases of the development' was scoped out of the Mona Offshore Wind Project Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) as agreed with the Planning Inspectorate in the Scoping Opinion, on the basis that this will be mitigated through management practices including an Offshore Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) and a Marine Pollution Contingency Plan (MPCP) (paragraph 67 of the Scoping Opinion (APP-194)). The Applicant has committed to preparing an OEMP, which includes a MPCP, to minimise and manage the risk of marine pollution events. The OEMP is secured as a condition of the deemed</p>	<p>The NRA identifies an impact on allision (contact) risk to vessels which it states to be ALARP but does not address the impact of allision (contact) risk on existing operational offshore wind farm assets. Can the Applicant confirm that the changes in allision risk that directly impact the Ørsted IP's assets (as per Figure 56 of APP-098) remain within ALARP parameters, and whether additional mitigations are required for those projects to achieve that ALARP status?</p> <p>The Ørsted IPs request that they are afforded the opportunity to review and comment on relevant documents and plans, e.g. the Marine Pollution Contingency Plan, the Emergency Response and Cooperation Plan, and the Vessel Traffic Management Plan,</p>	Not Agreed – Material Impact

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Reference Number	Discussion point	Applicant's Position	Ørsted IPs' Position	Status
		<p>Marine Licence within the draft DCO (C1 F06).</p> <p>The Applicant has committed within Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation (APP-059) to continue engagement with all stakeholders through the MNEF post-consent (for a minimum of 5-years as set out in OIP.S&amp;N.2), which includes offshore wind energy developers. This will include the post-consent documentation as appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicant understands through ongoing discussion with Ørsted IPs, there is concern that engagement with shipping operators could result in an increased collision/allision risk to Ørsted IP assets. The Applicant has assessed the potential impacts of the Mona Offshore Wind Project on navigational risk for all marine users, including collision and allision risk with existing operational windfarms within the shipping and navigation study area presented in the CRNRA (Appendix E of Volume 6, Annex 7.1: Navigational risk assessment (APP-098)). It was concluded that all hazards had been reduced to As Low As Reasonably Practicable or Broadly Acceptable (as per section 1.9.8 of Volume 6, Annex 7.1: Navigational risk assessment (APP-098)).</p> <p>Ongoing engagement with vessel operators relating to residual concerns do not relate to navigational safety and therefore would not result in any changes in risk to the Ørsted IPs' developments.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to continuing the MNEF post-consent and this will include engagement on the relevant shipping and navigation documentation, including the</p>	<p>once these plans are submitted to the Licensing Authority (the MMO) for conditional sign-off. This contrasts with the Applicant's unsecured commitment to continue the MNEF post-consent through 'engagement on the relevant documentation once agreed with the relevant statutory authority'.</p> <p>The Ørsted IP's wish to establish whether and, if so how, the Applicant can demonstrate that ongoing engagement with vessel operators will not result in any changes in risk to the Ørsted IP's assets.</p>	

**MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT**

Reference Number	Discussion point	Applicant's Position	Ørsted IPs' Position	Status
		ERCoP, MPCP and VTMP, once approved by the licencing authority, a commitment which will be updated in the VTMP at Deadline 6.		