Minutes of the CMPP Members Meeting

2nd September 2025

Online Meeting

Chair: Anthony Gallagher (AGa)

Present: Voting Members

Jan Brooke (JBr), Peel Ports
Zoe Clelland (ZC), RSPB
Calum Duncan (CD), Scottish Environment LINK
Kieron Green (KG), Argyll and Bute Council
James Hall (JH), South Ayrshire Council
Lorraine Holdstock (LH), Argyll and Bute Council
Lucy Kay (LK), COAST
Willie Kennedy (WK), SSACN
Catherine Lambert (CL), Clydeplan
Thom Ledingham (TL), North Ayrshire Council
David Nairn (DN), Clyde Coastal Community Councils
Ruth Rice (RR), CMAL
Elke Scheibler (ES), Field Studies Council
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:

Ruairidh Anderson (RA), Marine Directorate
Paul Bancks (PB), Crown Estate Scotland Council
Sandy Downie (SD), SEPA
Claire Jones (CJ), Marine Directorate
Graham Russell (GR), Royal Yachting Association Scotland

1. Welcome and Apologies

The Chair welcomed all attendees and read out the apologies as listed above.

2. Chair's Report

The latest draft of the CRMP was submitted to MD on 13th June. The Plan is still with MD for comments at this time. There have been some staffing and resource issues within MD that has affected the CMPP's timeline, alongside focussing on Shetland and Orkney Plans as they are close to completion. CMPP staff and Chair met with MD on 15th August to discuss Plan corrections. MD gave a verbal update and all comments received are relatively minor e.g. providing a foreword, policy text adjustments, adding references. It was discussed with MD to begin the statutory consultation either in December or in January. It was confirmed with MD that as long as the CMPP start the statutory consultation before the Purdah period begins, the consultation can run into the Purdah period. It is anticipated that the Shetland RMP will be adopted in October 2025 and Orkney RMP in January 2025. The CMPP staff have been working on the draft consultation documents including the Statement of Public Participation (SPP), an FAQ document and the consultation response form.

It has been agreed with NatureScot that they will continue to host CMPP either until Plan adoption, or until March 2027 (end of FY), whichever comes first. CMPP will continue to work with MD to identify a suitable host. As discussed before, the uncertainty around CMPP's funding has hindered conversations with the local authorities. The grant that CMPP currently receives does not cover the annual costs. Staff contracts for 25/26 were originally awarded only until the end of January 2026, as this was only what the grant could cover. However staff contracts have now been extended until the end of the FY as CMPP reserves are sufficient to cover the deficit.

MD is conducting a financial review and RA has made a proposal to Scottish Ministers for an increase in grant funding for MPPs, and to move to multi-year funding for security. CMPP are currently awaiting the outcome of the proposal. CMPP staff had hoped that we would have had a decision by the time of this Members Meeting, but that did not happen. CMPP staff will update members when a decision has been made.

3. Review of Action Points from the last meeting

Reference	Summary	Status
01/03/06/2025	CMPP staff to submit revised plan to MD once all comments are submitted.	See Item 4
02/03/06/2025	CMPP staff to set up specific meeting with MD to discuss fisheries with a subset of CMPP members.	Ongoing
03/03/06/2025	CMPP staff to obtain contact details of the infrastructure projects noted.	See Item 6
04/03/06/2025	CMPP staff to take away members comments and discuss the funding situation with MD and report back to members on next steps.	See Item 7

4. Update on the Regional Marine Plan

CMPP Staff and Chair met with RA on 15th August to discuss Plan corrections. CJ had reviewed the entire Plan and provided her comments, but RA was still to review the Plan. RA verbally went through CJ's comments and all of them were relatively minor. RA intended to review the Plan and send his and CJ's comments to the CMPP staff by end of August. However as of this meeting CMPP are still waiting to hear from RA. Hopeful that these will be received imminently.

Current comments included adding a foreword to the Plan, minor policy text changes, adding references where they are missing or outdated, and updating statistics. One of the large changes made to the Plan was to remove the Fisheries policies and change them into recommendations. MD commented that the recommendations still read like policies and so these will need to be altered accordingly.

Once all the necessary updates have been made to the Plan pertaining to MD's comments, CMPP staff will update all of the associated assessments accordingly.

CMPP staff asked members what the internal processes would be for approving the Plan and its associated assessments to go to statutory consultation, and how long would those processes take?

Discussion

- Noted that it's important for Members to have sight of the corresponding changes in the assessments that are made in light of the changes made to the Plan. Members have to be satisfied with the content of the assessments and request that the Members have sufficient time to review these documents.
- LK asked if the consultation can run into and over the election period? CMPP staff have not had absolute clarification on that point. We know that we can run the consultation during the Purdah period and hopeful that we could complete the consultation before the election, however we will take this question to MD.
- DN queried if carrying out the consultation during the Purdah and election period would affect engagement? Noted that we are hopeful we can complete the consultation by end of March/start of April and not run too far into the Purdah period. Also noted that it is a congested landscape with consultations any time of the year.
- TL for North Ayrshire Council stated he thinks the Plan went to the Planning Committee for the pre-consultation and would assume the same would apply this time around. He estimated NA would need approx. 8 weeks - 4 weeks to review the Plan and assessments and make a recommendation to the Planning Committee, then 4 weeks for the lead in time to the meeting and for management to sign off. In the run up to Purdah, Local Authorities become very busy and Committee meetings agendas can be very full as no Committee meetings take place during Purdah. Therefore, if the timeline to getting the Plan approved does run into early next year, there may be a problem in not being able to get it signed off in time as there may be no room on the agenda for it.
- Requested that CMPP staff send out the Plan when it is ready to members, and then send the assessments when they are ready, so members can start reviewing the draft Plan without having to wait for all documents to be received.
- LH for Argyll and Bute Council, would need 12 weeks. LH would need to review the Plan and the assessments before submitting a report to Committee for them to make a decision. Need to confirm which Committee it goes to.

- KG noted that it would most likely go to the Planning Committee which meets on a monthly basis.
- CL for GCR Place, noted that GCR Place represents local authorities that do not attend the CMPP meetings. CL would speak to all the local authorities that fall under the GCR Remit to see what their requirements are in terms of the approval process (if any) once CMPP have a firmer idea of a timeline. GCR Place governance is still in the transitional phase between the former Clydeplan and GCR Place. Most likely 8-12 weeks will be required.
- CMPP staff need to confirm with MD at which stage do Scottish Ministers sign off on the Plan to go to Consultation, is it before or after Members have approved the Plan and its assessments. Strongly suspect Scottish Ministerial approval will be the last step in the process but will confirm.
- LK asked if Scottish Ministers will need to sign off on the assessments before going to consultation? CMPP staff will check. Strongly suspect the answer is yes as the assessments will be published for the public so they will need to be correct and in line with the Plan.
- AWC requested CMPP staff ask for confirmation on timeline from MD and address all of the issues that have been raised so far in the discussion.
- ZC asked if CMPP has a plan in place for the consequence where a member does not approve of the Plan going to statutory consultation? This could affect timelines and could we consider a situation where it is not necessary for all members to approve the Plan going to consultation. CMPP have processes in place for making decisions outlined in the constitution.
- It is unlikely that a December start for the consultation is feasible, but we will work towards a January timeline and communicate that to MD.

5. Consultation Documents

JBu has been working on the consultation documents that were originally started 2 years ago. These documents include the SPP, the FAQ document and the consultation response form. Initial drafts of them have been produced and shared as part of the meeting papers. OIRMP went to statutory consultation this time last year with their Plan and had their SPP approved by MD. MD suggested that CMPP use Orkney's corresponding documents as templates as they ran a successful consultation.

JBu went through each document in turn. Comments and discussion for each are noted below.

<u>SPP</u>

- Stage 6 should be written in past tense
- Noted that there have been a lot of changes between 2019-25 in the draft Plan and suggested CMPP need a summary of the changes that have been made and the steer that had come from MD on many issues in order to set out the narrative and manage expectations of those responding to the consultation (perhaps the SPP is not the right place but something we need to consider). Other members agreed with this point.
- JBu's response was that perhaps the SPP is not the right place for that kind of summary, however a comment via email suggested the FAQ document be restructured as an FAQ and information document so a summary could be included in that document
- JBr commented that we need to consider what document most people are likely to read e.g. including a summary as a preface to the draft Plan. Regardless of where it is we need to signpost to the summary.

- Suggested to include the summary as an appendix in the SPP
- Suggested a summary could be included in multiple places and cross referenced
- Noted that the 2 documents everyone that is responding to the Plan will read will be the draft Plan and the consultation response form
- AG suggested seeking some guidance on if we could include a summary in the SPP, but noted that it might be best in a separate document and referenced
- JBu noted that the SPP is the only document out of these 3 that needs to be formally approved by MD, but may be common courtesy to let MD read the others
- AWC noted that if MD are unhappy with any summary CMPP produces, then we should request some writings from them to outline the guidance that they have provided over the years.

<u>FAQ Document</u>

- Suggested from GR (via email before the meeting) that this document be changed from an FAQ to an information document.
- JBr noted we need to be really clear about the purpose of the policies informing decisions on marine license applications and we need to be clear that we have tried our best to retain the management emphasis but in some instances we haven't been able to do that through policies, but still retained a level of ambition through recommendations.
- ZC noted we need to be honest about the reasons behind why certain items aren't covered in the Plan e.g. spatial management, and where we haven't been permitted to include policies due to MD instruction.
- Suggested that reference should be made to what the CMPP see being taken forward through the Action Plan via Partnership working, and note that although certain items might not be captured in the Plan itself, there is an avenue for those items to be carried forward by the work of the CMPP post adoption.
- Noted it would be helpful to differentiate the instances where the CMPP has come to a decision on the way forward when drafting the Plan, and where CMPP has received MD direction on certain issues on what can and can't be included in the Plan.
- EW noted that we want to be seen as an effective body for what is within our remit to achieve, so being clear about CMPP's remit and our role in the marine planning process and expectation management is important.
- EW suggested a referral document to have a list of contacts if anyone responding to the Plan wishes to engage with a particular sector further.

<u>Consultation Response Form</u>

- JBu noted that from conversations with Orkney, their recommendation was to keep the questions in the response form broad (with some exceptions if we wish for a more specific response to a certain chapter or issue) as this made the responses easier to analyse.
- Suggestion from GR (comment received via email) for each section to ask whether the respondent is happy with it or not, and if not they should state what changes they propose, noting that some respondents may not be happy with the content of a chapter because it does not go far enough. Also suggested using a 5 point scale rather than yes/no, with a box for further comment.
- JBr suggested adding a section at the top of the form to direct respondents to the summary that we will write and say 'please read the summary before answering these questions'.

- JBr queried for the questions that cover the general policies and sector policies, are we looking for comments on the chapter content or are we looking for comments on the policies and recommendations? Noted that what we need from respondents is if they agree or don't agree with the policies and recommendations, and space for comment or 'suggest an alternative'. The questions should still be open so content with the language of 'do you have any comments' being used, but specify that we are looking for comments on the policies and recommendations.
- ZC noted that a point scale of agreement would be useful and would be less onerous than requiring a written response to every question which some respondents may struggle with. Would support having a mix of open questions and point scale of agreement questions e.g. a point scale type question may be appropriate when asking about the vision, aims and guiding principles and would allow for some quantitative analysis of the feedback.
- Suggested that alongside the open questions that address receiving comments on the policies and recommendations, add in a question that addresses does the respondent think that these policies and recommendations will help CMPP deliver what this Plan is meant to (vision, aim, guiding principles), and if not why not. The first part of the question could be an open comments box and the 2nd part of the question could be a point scale of agreement, with a box for further explanation.
- Noted that if we are going to use a scale of agreement, we need to ensure the questions are still broad and doesn't limit the answers.
- Noted that using a 5 point scale of agreement will be easier to analyse than a 10 point scale of agreement.
- Noted that having a range of questions will enable respondents to respond to the degree that they wish to and maximising accessibility.

6. Transformative Actions for Resilient Coastal Communities

Each case study in the project has to produce a TAP and develop a Resilience Collective (RC). Each RC will be made up of approximately 25 individuals that represent the communities and stakeholders in the case study area. Each RC will then produce an action plan around transdisciplinary that will support coastal communities to become more resilient to the impacts of climate change, however the project is not limited to climate change and there could be other resilience issues that emerge. The Clyde study will focus on engaging with Community Councils. The project now has a research assistant based at University of Glasgow, who contacted the Community Councils in the Clyde Region via email. There have been a small number of Community Councils that have expressed interest in being part of the project. Other case study areas are focussing more on established networks of stakeholders. Engaging with Community Councils via this project could be beneficial to CMPP as we will be establishing a Community Councils Working Group as part of our new structure post Plan adoption. David Bailey at University of Glasgow has been in touch with Melissa Stewart from Argyll and Bute Council who is the Community Council Liaison Officer. Presumably there are similar officers in the other Local Authorities that would be beneficial to make contact with.

On the 9th and 10th September, the third TRACC Retreat is being held in Glasgow. CMPP staff and Chair will be attending. As stakeholders, CMPP members are invited to attend a session (agenda tbc and will be circulated).

DN expressed interest, but noted that there has been no communication about the project with the Community Council in Lochgoilhead. Suggested Lochgoilhead would be good to be part of the project as new SEPA flood assessments have been released and it will significantly affect the area. EW also expressed interest. The agenda will be sent out to all members when available.

7. Legal Structure and Housing Options Update

The work on the legal structure, housing options and the constitution is still on pause. We are still waiting to hear from MD if CMPP will be granted an uplift in funding for next year. MD carried out a funding review in July/August and asked the MPPs to fill out a questionnaire outlining our assessment of the funds we receive and how that compares to the statutory and non-statutory duties we fulfil, if we received any other funding and how that is allocated, and how sustainable are our current hosting arrangements. All of this information has already been provided to MD over the past year however this questionnaire was used as a more concise tool to provide evidence for the funding review of MPPs. CMPP are waiting to hear from MD the outcome of the funding review. As both Shetland and Orkney's Plans are going to be adopted in the coming months, it would be a huge legal risk if they were underfunded and not able to carry out their statutory duties. The figure that RA put to Scottish Ministers would cover 2 FT staff members and a budget for additional costs e.g. travel and subsistence, maintenance fees. Part of the proposal to Scottish Ministers also includes a request to move away from single-year funding to multi-year funding for the MPPs. However this has not been done before in relation to delegated statutory functions.

ZC asked if the figure RA put to Scottish Ministers included hosting costs i.e. if a future host does not provide services in kind as NatureScot has done. JBu said that we do not know the exact figure that was submitted as part of the funding review, and it was only an ask for funding to cover 2 FT staff and some additional costs. However, MD have the business case that was prepared for the members' meeting in June which includes a more detailed overview of CMPP costs and what in kind services NatureScot currently provide.

8. Members Updates

4Cs

DN has been trying to read out to local community groups and Community Councils. Found most people fall into 2 groups – 1 group being the users of the marine environment and those that are a bit more engaged with the planning processes, and the other group containing people who are disengaging, lack hope in the planning system and expressing concern that community interests are being disregarded e.g. approval of the fish farm in Loch Long.

GCR Place

GCR Place now has an officer in post who will be focusing on the delivery of Clyde Mission and the Energy Masterplan.

Heather Claridge started over the summer and her post will manage the team dealing with the Regional Spatial Strategy. CL has encouraged Heather to have a meeting with the CMPP team.

Inverclyde Council had submitted their Evidence Report. It has been returned to them by the Reported for reconsideration so they are working on the areas that require further information.

9. AOB

The NMP2 PPS Consultation analysis has been published. The NMP2 Consultation has been postponed with no new dates confirmed as of yet.

The Consultation on the draft Marine and Coastal Restoration Plan is live. It closes on 19th October. CMPP staff will prepare a response and circulate for comment.

The 3rd Regional Marine Planning Forum will be held on 25th September in Aberdeen. CC and JBu will be attending.

10. DONM, AGM and Close

DONM – Tuesday 2nd December.
As usual, the AGM will be held before the Members Meeting.
The meeting ended at 12.30pm

Actions Summary

Reference	Summary	Status
02/03/06/2025	CMPP staff to set up specific meeting with MD to discuss fisheries with a subset of CMPP members.	
01/02/09/2025	CMPP staff to contact MD and receive updates on funding, draft Plan feedback and consultation timings. CMPP staff to communicate any updates to Members.	
04/03/06/2025	Members to submit any comments on the draft consultation documents to CMPP staff by Friday 12th September.	