Minutes of the CMPP Annual Members Meeting

26th November 2024

Online Meeting

Chair: Anthony Gallagher (AGa)

Present: Voting Members

Jan Brooke (JBr), Peel Ports
Zena Clark (ZC), South Ayrshire Council
Zoe Clelland (ZC), RSPB
Calum Duncan (CD), ScotLINK
Sandy Downie (SD), SEPA
Allan Finlayson (AF), North Ayrshire Council
Kieron Green (KG), Argyll and Bute Council
Mark Griffin (MG), SWRIFG
Penny Hawdon (PH), Bakkafrost
Lorraine Holdstock (LH), Argyll and Bute Council
Lucy Kay (LK), COAST
Willie Kennedy (WK), SSACN
Thom Ledingham (TL), North Ayrshire Council
David Nairn (DN), Clyde Coastal Community Councils
Lisa Reilly (LR), Peel Ports
Ruth Rice (RR), CMAL
Graham Russell (GR), Royal Yachting Association Scotland
Joseph Scott (JS), Clydeplan
Kerry Wallace (KW), NatureScot
Elaine Whyte (EW), Individual

Present: Non-Voting Members

Jill Bunyan (JBu), CMPP Staff
Chris Cutts (CC), CMPP Staff
Alex Watson-Crook (AWC), Board

Apologies:

Paul Bancks (PB), Crown Estate Scotland
Kevin Braidwood (KB),
David Hearton (DH), South Ayrshire Council
Catherine Lambert (CL), Clydeplan
Elke Scheibler (ES), Field Studies Council

1. **Welcome and Apologies**

The Chair welcomed all attendees and read out the apologies as noted above. Members were informed that David Hearton has left South Ayrshire Council and moved to Dumfries and Galloway Council. A replacement for his role is currently being sought.

2. **Chair's Report**

The Chair noted the Chair's report provided within the meeting papers, which reflects the activities of the Partnership over the last year. Progress has been slow this year for Clyde, Orkney and Shetland MPPs. Orkney have now completed their statutory consultation, whilst Shetland are still waiting for final approval on their Plan. The fourth draft of the Regional Marine Plan was returned to the Partnership in November '23 following a gateway review of all 3 regional marine plans by Marine Directorate. That contained a number of feedback points that needed to be addressed. The overarching issue was that the Regional Marine Plan cannot create duties or obligations and therefore we had to review the policies to ensure that the language was suitable. The full list of feedback points is listed in the Meeting Papers.

Marine Directorate presented the CMPP with 2 options on how to progress with the process of regional marine planning: either to pause development of the draft until NMP2 was adopted, or to review the plan and incorporate the feedback. A meeting was held between CMPP, C2020 and MD to discuss the options in January. A further CMPP meeting was held in February to make a decision. It was decided that CMPP would continue to progress with the draft Plan and amend in line with the feedback. It was indicated at the time that if CMPP had decided to pause plan development, there would have been no guarantee that funding for CMPP would continue in the short-term.

CMPP staff continued to amend the policies and the wider Plan in line with the feedback. Initially it was agreed with MD that this would be an iterative process, however resourcing and staffing issues within the Regional Marine Planning team at MD, combined with MD focusing on Shetland and Orkney's plans, meant that this did not happen. A revised draft of the Plan was submitted to MD and circulated with members in November, and we are awaiting further comment.

The MD team has 2 new staff members – Ruairidh Anderson (Team Lead) and Claire Jones. Claire came into post in September, and Ruairidh in November. CMPP staff met Ruairidh in person at the Regional Marine Planning Forum in November and have met Claire online. Lewis Hurley remains the Marine Planning and Policy Team Manager.

Whilst there have been delays in moving forward with the Plan, the staff team have been able to focus on redrafting the constitution and the processes on how CMPP will operate post-Plan adoption. There have been multiple iterations of the draft constitution

and operational documents shared with the members. CMPP also sought legal advice from Harper MacLeod in July and that communication is ongoing.

Funding for the facilitation of C2020 was removed from the Grant 23/24. The last C2020 meeting took place in December, however as mentioned above, C2020 members attended the meeting with MD in January. C2020 have been invited to become part of the new governance structure of CMPP and align the work of the two more closely. This decision is still to be made and hopefully that can progress over the next year.

Since December, CMPP have been having monthly catch up meetings with Orkney and Shetland MPPs. This has improved the dialogue between the 3 MPPs and enabled us to learn from each other as we engage with MD and progress our Plans.

CMPP staff and the Chair attended the Regional Marine Planning Forum and the National Marine Planning 2 Forum on the 12th November and the 13th November. The set up of the Regional Marine Planning Forum is a commitment from the Scottish Government as part of the ECCLR Report Response. This was a good opportunity to renew dialogue between the MPPs and the LCPs, and also with MD. The aim is that the Forum will be held at a minimum, biannually going forward.

One of the key successes of the past year has been the achievement of the Peel Ports Group Marine Environmental Award, which was awarded to CMPP together with the Glasgow Science Centre and the University of Glasgow, for the Floating Wetland project. CMPP also supported the successful bid to the UKRI fund for the TRACC (Transformative Actions for Resilience Coastal Communities) project. It is a £2.8 million, 4-year project led by the University of Greenwich. It includes 4 case study areas from around the UK, of which the Clyde Marine Region is the Scottish case study area. The project aim is to bring together diverse social groups and movements, decision-makers, researchers and other stakeholders to design new approaches together to tackle coastal challenges. The project started in September and CMPP staff and the Chair attended the first meeting.

DN asked what is the main impediment to plan adoption? The Plan doesn't have to be perfect to go out to consultation, many of the issues will be teased out during that process and can be addressed afterwards. There is a duty of care to the people and the environment that we cannot ignore. It is acknowledged that the process has been going on for several years and progress has been slow for a multitude of factors. More recent delays have included the resourcing issues at MD, and the legal feedback, especially with different interpretations of the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010.

It was noted that CMPP welcomed the 4Cs to the Partnership this year and this is an important success that should be mentioned. This was included in the Meeting Papers.

AWC asked if MD have given CMPP clear timescales on the next steps. CMPP have made clear to MD that we would like to conduct the statutory consultation in Spring ’25. The draft Plan is now with MD for comment. It is likely that the next Members Meeting will focus on the plan for the statutory consultation. A further update on this is provided in the Members Meeting.

3. **Permanent Board Members**

There are no changes to the permanent Board members this year. Current permanent Board members are as follows:

1. Kevin Braidwood, South Ayrshire Council
2. Gary Doyle, ClydePort Operations Ltd.
3. Allan Finlayson, North Ayrshire Council
4. Kieron Green, Argyll and Bute Council
5. Catherine Lambert, Clydeplan
6. Kerry Wallace, NatureScot

4. **Appointment of Non-Permanent Board Members**

Three nominations were received, and these are noted below. The maximum number of non-permanent Board members is six, therefore no voting was required. Nominations required support from two other members; indicated below.

- Alex Watson Crook nominated herself for re-election and this was supported by COAST and ScotLINK.

- Mark Griffin nominated himself for election and this was supported by Bakkafrost and Elaine Whyte.

- Elaine Whyte nominated herself for re-election and this was supported by Bakkafrost and South Ayrshire Council.

5. **AOB**

There was no AOB.

6. **Close**

The AMM concluded at 10.25am.

Minutes of the CMPP Members Meeting

26th November 2024

Online Meeting

1. Welcome and Apologies

As per the AMM

2. Chair's Report

As per the AMM.

3. Review of action points from the last meeting

Reference	Summary	Status
01/20/08/2024	CMPP staff to meet with MD and report back at next members' meeting.	Done, see item 5
02/20/08/2024	CMPP staff to liaise further with lawyers to explore options of Board membership and circulate a revised draft to members.	Done, see item 6
03/20/08/2024	TRACC will be further outlined in an Agenda item for the next meeting.	Done, see item 4

The minutes from the last meeting (20th August) were approved. GR asked for a small amendment to be made. This will be done, and the updated minutes sent round for members' records.

4. Resilient Seas Grant Application

The TRACC Project launched in September. In Year 1 the main objective is to put in place a transdisciplinary action plan (TAP) for engagement within each of the 4 case study areas. The engagement should add value to the work that has already been carried out by CMPP, support our work and go beyond. There will be 3 retreats in Year 1, the first took place in Wales in October, the second will take place in London in March, and the 3rd is planned for the Clyde in June. The Partnership hopes to be able to conduct our statutory consultation in Spring '25. TRACC will start its engagement work in Year 2 of the project and that process will run for 2 ½ years. TRACC are trying to draw into the process a variety of voices and include those that do not normally take part in these kinds of discussions. CMPP should be able to provide some guidance on how they achieve that. AG attended a programme management committee meeting in November. Work is underway to produce a guidance document on how to action transdisciplinary engagement within each of the case study areas. That guidance will help to produce a TAP by June '25. The guidance and the TAP will outline how the engagement process will work. The authors of the guidance should have the document

drafted by the end of the year. They will set up meetings with each of the case study areas in the new year, to explain how they see the guidance operating in practice, and to discuss what the stakeholder baseline is in each area. CMPP will engage in that process, and we should think about what the project team focus on as part of this engagement process and what would be beneficial for the Clyde.

Discussion

- The project should engage with children and young people, these groups are normally missed from these types of discussions.
- There's a disparity in the Clyde of knowledge about what is going on within marine planning so anything that TRACC can do to improve knowledge in communities of place would be great.
- Clarity is needed over whether this project will be targeted at engagement with stakeholders or engagement with communities of place.
- Look to our Action Plan for suggestions of areas where the project could gather views e.g. habitat and ecological restoration.
- Scope within the project to understanding in the Clyde how a variety of voices can be heard in decision-making and exploring through engagement how people feel about issues that are addressed in the Action Plan and issues that were raised in the pre-consultation.
- Should be aware of timing of the statutory consultation, and any work going on with TRACC so that the public are not overwhelmed or confused about what is being asked of them.
- Inshore MPA and PMF consultations taking place in early '25 running for several months. This will affect capacity to engage in other activities.
- How is the budget of £2.8million divided between the case study areas? The money for the Clyde will go through the University of Glasgow, and they will employ an RA to facilitate the engagement process. The RA won't necessarily be science based; the person employed will have to work across all areas of engagement which will go beyond science-based methods.
- Some clarity is needed on the definitions of words for e.g. resilience in relation to the project and how it fits with the work of CMPP. Any work that is carried out should look at issues as a whole and take a holistic approach, and not just the environmental impact e.g. looking at socio-economic outputs.
- There have been other projects across the UK that has carried out this type of work before, and we need to learn the lessons from those projects going forward and ensuring the project is adding value to the area.
- The Community Councils that are hardest to contact are the communities that are perceived to be the most at-risk ones, so special effort to reach out to these communities would be useful in the project.
- Who at the community levels is engaged is involved in designing what the project does? The project team are largely university based researched with arms-based organisations involved, but the CMPP will be able to provide information and support on how to reach these more local level groups that need to be involved in the process. The concept of co-creation is extremely important and getting the communities involved right from the start.

- Problematic that no funding isn't coming to the CMPP to contribute to the project as without the input from a group like this, then the project wouldn't work. There can be value in the work, however the importance of the CMPP is not being recognised because none of the resource is allocated to a group that is contributing to the project. Unfortunately, our legal structure limits the scope of our involvement.
- Communities Officers in local authority areas are good contacts for TRACC and for the statutory consultation.

5. Update on Regional Marine Plan

CMPP staff sent the policy amendments document to MD in June. They received some initial feedback from MD in August in response to that document, however this was just from the policy and planning team. They were largely supportive of the changes that had been made, however this was caveated with the need for legal colleagues to ultimately approve the amendments. As an iterative process to work through the feedback from MD did not take place, it was agreed between CMPP staff and MD to insert the policy amendments in the draft plan and make other amendments that were necessary in the draft, and then submit the entre draft Plan to MD for comment. CMPP staff worked on this and submitted the draft Plan to MD and the members in November '24, accompanied by a supporting document outlining where changes had been made in the draft plan and what those changes were in line with the feedback received from MD in November '23. In the email sent in November to MD, CMPP staff did again ask for a specific meeting to discuss fisheries policies, following on from the feedback we received from MD at the start of the year on removing the fisheries policies from the plan. We are awaiting a response on this.

Orkney MPP went out to statutory consultation from August-October. They received good feedback and attendance from consultees and will be analysing the data over the coming months. They have a new marine planner, Emily Murphy Gray, who started in September, taking the team to 3 members of staff. Rachael Kelly, the interim staff member who was brought in on an emergency basis over the summer at MD, largely worked with Orkney to get them to consultation. Hopefully the MD team will now focus on our plan.

AG, CC and JB attended the Regional Marine Planning Forum, and the National Marine Plan 2 Forum in Stirling on the 12th and 13th November. This was the first meeting of the RMP Forum, and all MPPs and LCPs attended except from Tay Estuary Forum. Each MPP and LCP gave a short presentation covering their work. The rest of the day was spent having group discussions on the function of the forum, future opportunities for training, and sharing information between the MPPs and LCPs. It was proposed that there be a minimum of 2 meetings a year, with 1 of them held in person, with each MPP and LCP taking ownership of chairing and running one forum. Overall, the RMP Forum will operate similarly as the previous Scottish Coastal Forum did, but without the funding. MD will produce a report for the day. At the NMP2 Forum, MD gave a progress update, and there were various workshops to discuss prioritisation and what weight to

give to certain sectors/policies in NMP2. MD are responsible for providing a report on the day.

Discussion

- Noted that there are different views within the Partnership on whether or not fisheries policies should be included in the plan.
- Difficult for communities to engage with any fisheries policies. Much of the community engagement for that policy framework is done through consultations. The CMPP is one of the only ways communities can engage with fisheries policies in a planning context.
- Fisheries and marine planning have different legislative frameworks, and it is necessary for fisheries colleagues and marine planning colleagues to work together. Important to recongise that the IFG are represented on the Partnership.
- There have been examples of local community/NGO input during consultations that have resulted in changes to management decisions for local fishermen, so there are examples of engagement from Clyde communities.
- There are other sectors covered in the plan that are governed by another area of legislation, the plan is a place where they can be brought together, and the interactions thought about and addressed.
- Clarity is needed on the meaning of 'should' and how the Partnership interprets that when it comes to license applications.
- From a regulatory perspective, interpreting the word 'should' means it is something that is expected to be seen or done, and would look for a justifiable reason why it hasn't been done, as that would be expected of the developer to include in the application, and would determine the outcome of the application accordingly. When CMPP is consulted on a marine license application, we think it would be reasonable for the same approach to be taken. If there is a justifiable reason why a certain policy has not been adhered to (that includes the use of 'should do xyz') e.g. conflict, then it shouldn't be the case that the application isn't in line with the plan, it should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. If there are potential mitigations that can be put in place that haven't been by the developer, CMPP could make a suggestion. If the policy has been completely ignored by the developer for no justifiable reason, CMPP should report that to MD for them to address and find out if it's a misunderstanding, an omission, been ignored, or something else.
- Guidelines for CMPP staff will be necessary on how to respond to applications. Could potentially run useability workshops in the future.
- There should be a shared understanding and definition of wording across all of the regional marine areas, MPPs and MD. The use of 'should' is littered throughout the general planning principles in NMP so they should be able to give us guidance.
- CMPP should have its on view on the definition and interpretation of the word 'should' before we ask MD-LOT, hopefully they will agree with our view on it, but let's not just accept whatever they impose on us.
- We need to formalise CMPP's view on the interpretation of the word 'should' in the new year.

Action: CMPP staff to meet with MD and report back at the next Members Meeting.

Action: Members to send any comments or questions to CMPP staff regarding the draft regional marine plan.

6. Revised Constitution

Following the last members meetings, amendments were made to the Constitution, primarily focusing on the Executive Board. A final draft of the Constitution and the operational documents was circulated with members in October for comment. This was intended to be the last time for members to submit any comments for any changes to be made, before the Constitution could be sent to any of the members' legal teams for checking. Thanks to the members that sent comments in. The main piece of feedback that was to be discussed came from Peel Ports. Their legal team had reviewed the constitution and questioned if the current legal structure that CMPP uses, that of an unincorporated association, is the most appropriate structure for the Partnership to continue using when the plan is adopted. They proposed that CMPP consider a Company Limited by Guarantee (CLG) structure, in case members were somehow held liable for a decision made by CMPP. A supporting statement from Peel Ports was circulated with members. The legal structure we choose to use will impact on our hosting arrangements. The current agreement between CMPP and NatureScot dictates that NatureScot would host CMPP from April '23-March '25, with the intention that by March '25, the Plan would be very near adoption, or had already been adopted. CMPP staff have had some initial discussions with NatureScot about continuing the hosting arrangements but that needs to be confirmed in the New Year. It would be ideal if CMPP could remain housed within NatureScot until plan adoption and remain as an unincorporated association. The possibility of becoming a Company Limited by Guarantee would mean that CMPP could enter into contracts, employ staff, and apply for other funding. The constitution is currently written as CMPP remaining an unincorporated association, so if the Partnership decided to change our legal structure, some amendments would have to be made to the document to reflect that.

<u>Discussion</u>

- Interested to know how other statutory bodies manage the issue of liability and risk with their boards.
- If the status quo has worked so far within CMPP, then perhaps ideal just to remain as is.
- A more corporate governance structure may create a barrier to participation for some people.
- Plan adoption is the main goal, so if any changes to governance would potentially delay plan adoption, then it should be put to one side for the time being.
- The proposal of becoming a CLG or any other legal structure would need to be taken to the legal teams of some of the members for their opinion.
- From a statutory body's experience, they carry no insurance except for vehicle insurance, everything else is dealt with by an agreement with Scottish Government.

- Peel Ports are keen to remain involved with the CMPP but the legal team had a few concerns, namely the liability issue, but also that the constitution reads as if the Executive Board would make the decisions on the license applications if they are compliant with the Plan or not, but if there was any liability it would be the members who would be held accountable.
- Some agreement from members about the issue of board members making decisions that could impact on other industries.
- The legal structure is not something that CMPP staff has discussed with the lawyer from Harper MacLeod at this time, however this issue was not something that was asked of the lawyer to consider. The lawyer was asked to review the constitution and operational documents as they were presented to them, which they did. JBu will seek further advice on this issue, but was waiting until members had discussed first.
- Need to be conscious of mission creep and becoming a corporate body could see the Partnership becoming involved in other activities that might or might not be complimentary to the work of CMPP.
- CMPP need to be clear on who the liability sits with when we are making decisions on applications if they are compliant or not compliant with the Plan.
- Interested to see what the legal teams of other members say about how they interpret liability from reading the constitution, and what legal structure they may recommend to explore.
- CMPP are currently delegated to draft the regional marine plan that can then be signed off by Scottish Ministers. Once the plan is adopted there probably needs to be a further delegation from Scottish Government on our role.
- CMPP staff will revisit the options available to the Partnership for legal structure and update the document for the next meeting.
- How CMPP draft their responses when fulfilling the statutory consultee role is extremely important.
- Clarity on liability and what is it limited to is needed in case there are ever any cases of mistakes or mischief (or beyond) when responding to license applications.

Action: CMPP staff to produce an updated version of the 'CMPP Housing and Legal Structure Options' document and circulate with Members.

Action: Members to send any comments or questions to JBu regarding the latest draft of the constitution and the operational documents.

7. **Members Updates**

Clyde Coastal Community Councils (4Cs)

The Community Councils are sad to announce that David Telford lost his battle with cancer and passed away peacefully on the 12th October. We extend condolences to his family and friends. A tribute to David can be found at https://www.pressreader.com/uk/largs-millport-weekly-news/20241106/281758454804997

4Cs have contacted and continue to reach out to Community Councils around the Clyde. In person engagement has taken place at community council meetings but also through email and phone calls with their members. There has been quite a broad range of feedback and it is apparent that there is disparity in people's knowledge around marine planning issues. 4Cs website and social media channels will be fully functioning before the new year. Capacity and resource issues are being identified and assets developed to facilitate CC engagement.

The community councils are concerned that CMPP seems to be in a state of limbo. It states on the CMPP website that "Members have agreed that the CMPP will not respond to any consultations until the Regional Marine Plan has been agreed by Scottish Ministers, except in exceptional cases". It was understandable that the Partnership is reluctant to discuss and comment on issues until the plan is adopted. However, 4Cs were not party to this agreement, and due to inordinate delays in plan adoption would like this agreement to be revisited and/or exceptional cases to be identified. In particular 4Cs would like to address:

- The marine license and application to dredge a volume equivalent to Wembley Stadium at Hunterston with the environmental impacts which seem contrary to National Marine Plan policy.
- The Harbour Authorities proposal to impose a levy on recreational boat users in the Clyde who have a perceived right to free navigation as established in Crown Estate Commissioners vs Fairlie Yacht Slip Ltd. 1976. We believe the removal of people's fundamental rights is extreme.

It seems sensible that one of CMPP primary functions and being able to discuss marine issues is not impeded by any more delays? 4Cs can be contacted at infor@clydeccc.org or by telephone 07714784473.

Clydeplan:

The transfer of Clydeplan and Glasgow and Clyde Valley Green Network (GCVGN) staff to Glasgow City Region (GCR) is now underway, as are the associated changes in the governance arrangements relating to the Clydeplan Joint Committee. The Clydeplan/GCVGN staff will report to Ross Nimmo – GCR Head of Place. The Place team will develop the new Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the GCR area.

The Clydeplan Joint Committee is currently being wound down and the new Regional Spatial Planning Sub Committee (which will report to the GCR Cabinet) will replace this body hopefully within the next 6 months to a year. As with the Clydeplan Joint Committee, all eight local authorities will continue to be represented on the Regional Spatial Planning Sub Committee including the 5 Councils with an interest in the CRMP and CMPP.

The Local Authorities are continuing with LDP development. Glasgow City Council have submitted their Evidence Report (City Development Plan 2 Evidence Report | City Development Plan 2 Information Hub) to the Scottish Government's Gate Check

process and are currently considering the Reporters recommendations. Scottish Government - DPEA - Case Details).

RYA:

A lot going on concerning the problems of abandoned and derelict boats. The Cross-Party Group for Recreational Boating and Marine Tourism had a session on this topic and what might be done to address the problem. GR has been having discussions with RYA, Crown Estate Scotland, and others about insurance that individuals might be expected to have if the boat was on a mooring. Part of the issue that needs tackled is ensuring individuals have the appropriate insurance or are aware of their responsibilities and liabilities.

SEPA:

SEPA has entered into an agreement with the Marine Directorate's Fleet Management Team for the operation of our main survey vessel, *Sir John Murray*. The vessel will be used for both SEPA and MD work. For example, the vessel was recently used to conduct survey work in the Clyde by MD. The logo will not change.

RSPB:

RSPB and others are supporting the UK government's proposals for Sandeel closures - NGOs once again join forces to support UK governments on sandeel closure

Recently published – seabird population trends and causes of change: 1986-2023, annual report of seabird monitoring programme https://www.bto.org/our-science/publications/research-reports/seabird-population-trends-and-causes-change-1986%E2%80%932023

NGOs once again join forces to support UK governments on Sandeel closure. The RSPB and partners respond to the EU's decision to trigger an arbitration on Sandeel fishing.

North Ayrshire Council:

NAC planning service has started preparing for the first formal stage of the LDP process, the evidence report. To aid this we have produced "place profiles", these profiles contain the key social and environmental information of each of the localities in North Ayrshire. You can view these by visiting the consultation hub https://northayrshireldp.commonplace.is/. Just please get in touch if any of this raises any questions.

8. AOB

4Cs mentioned in their member update about the Partnership not responding to marine license applications whilst the plan is still in development and would like this position to be reconsidered due to the delays in plan adoption. It was noted that it would be a useful exercise to have informal discussions about consultations, share views and raise awareness of what's going on around the Clyde between the members and perhaps test some of the draft plan policies. However, concern was noted that it may not be suitable to formally respond to consultations as CMPP without a plan in place.

The consultation on whether a new National Park should be established in Galloway and parts of South and East Ayrshire has been opened by NatureScot. The Partnership may want to consider responding to this consultation, or speak directly with NatureScot, as the marine boundary goes down to the MLWS and part of option 3 in the consultation paper includes parts of South Ayrshire. There is also a clause relating to the UNESCO Biosphere boundary out to 12nm which might be considered later in the process.

The Extending Marine Planning Zones Consultation closes on the 11th December. The consultation paper outlines the proposals to extend existing marine planning zones out to 12 nm, via a Scottish Statutory Instrument, as there is a legislative gap in which there is no designated planning authority to which a developer may submit an application for a marine fish or shellfish farm located between 3-12 nm. Argyll and Bute Council, and North Ayrshire Council have submitted responses and are in support of the proposals. Noted that the impact of the proposals in the CMR may be limited, however CMPP will draft a response and circulate with members for comment.

The National Marine Plan 2 Planning Position Statement consultation opened on the 5th November. CMPP will submit a response to this consultation and will circulate the draft response to members in the new year. The consultation closes on the 28th January.

CMPP have agreed to not use X (Twitter) going forward and will explore Blue Sky as an option for a social media channel.

9. DONM

CMPP staff will send out a placeholder Teams meeting invite for a date in February and a date in March. Depending on what the update is regarding the timeframe of CMPP receiving the Plan back from MD, this will dictate if we need to have a slightly earlier meeting in February or if it can wait until March. If this changes based on a meeting with MD, CMPP staff will update Members via email.

Actions Summary

Reference	Summary	Status
01/26/11/2024	CMPP staff to meet with MD and report back at next members' meeting.	CMPP staff will arrange a meeting with MD for December '24 or January '25.
02/26/11/2024	Members to send any comments or questions to CMPP staff regarding the draft regional marine plan.	
03/26/11/2024	CMPP staff to produce an updated version of the 'CMPP Housing and Legal structure options' and circulate with Members.	
04/26/11/2024	Members to send any comments or questions to JBu regarding the latest draft of the constitution and the operational documents.	