

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2018 16:57
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Link to description of SARF project

From: Carr J (Joyce)
Sent: 18 January 2018 17:52
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Gibbons J (Jeff)
Subject: RE: Link to description of SARF project

Thanks [REDACTED]

As discussed briefly with Jeff, this announcement seems clear that the SARF project will focus on a model for a single development consent and recognises that environmental consenting under CAR will remain separate (although the wording could be clearer). As suggested by Jeff, it would be good to get Richard Slaski's confirmation on that point. That will help reduce this portfolio's concerns considerably.

Moving forward, it will be very helpful for that message to be clear in any terms of reference for the review group, and in further briefing for Ministers etc.,

Thanks
Joyce

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 January 2018 16:39
To: Carr J (Joyce)
Cc: Gibbons J (Jeff)
Subject: Link to description of SARF project

Hi Joyce,

Jeff was a looking for a summary of the SARF project in the meeting juts now so here's a link to that:
<https://www.fishfarmingexpert.com/news/study-probes-faster-consent-for-aquaculture-plans/>

Based on the above, could you take a look and summarize your concerns in a para or so? We'll keep you sighted as we move this on, just something to get us started as we draft submissions, engage with SARF etc.

Thanks,
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Marine Scotland – Aquaculture, Crown Estate, Recreational Fisheries, EMFF and Europe Division (ACRE)

T: [REDACTED]
E: [REDACTED]
W: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/marinescotland>

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2018 16:57
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Link to description of SARF project

From: Carr J (Joyce)
Sent: 18 January 2018 17:52
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Gibbons J (Jeff)
Subject: RE: Link to description of SARF project

Thanks [REDACTED]

As discussed briefly with Jeff, this announcement seems clear that the SARF project will focus on a model for a single development consent and recognises that environmental consenting under CAR will remain separate (although the wording could be clearer). As suggested by Jeff, it would be good to get Richard Slaski's confirmation on that point. That will help reduce this portfolio's concerns considerably.

Moving forward, it will be very helpful for that message to be clear in any terms of reference for the review group, and in further briefing for Ministers etc.,

Thanks
Joyce

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 January 2018 16:39
To: Carr J (Joyce)
Cc: Gibbons J (Jeff)
Subject: Link to description of SARF project

Hi Joyce,

Jeff was a looking for a summary of the SARF project in the meeting juts now so here's a link to that:
<https://www.fishfarmingexpert.com/news/study-probes-faster-consent-for-aquaculture-plans/>

Based on the above, could you take a look and summarize your concerns in a para or so? We'll keep you sighted as we move this on, just something to get us started as we draft submissions, engage with SARF etc.

Thanks,
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Marine Scotland – Aquaculture, Crown Estate, Recreational Fisheries, EMFF and Europe Division (ACRE)

T: [REDACTED]
E: [REDACTED]
W: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/marinescotland>

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2018 16:54
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Review of the aquaculture consenting regime - invitation

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 January 2018 09:37
To: Gibbons J (Jeff)
Subject: FW: Review of the aquaculture consenting regime - invitation

To see. Useful stuff, should probably address the SARF point (1) once we've had tomorrow's meeting or shortly after.

From: Mark Harvey [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 January 2018 17:31
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Shona Turnbull
Subject: Review of the aquaculture consenting regime - invitation

Dear Jason

Regarding this request, the following comments may be helpful.

1. We are not sure why we need a SG review and how it fits into the work being done by the Chief Planner and the SARF project? Surely the work undertaken in 2016 (<http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2016/07/9269>) remains relevant as little has changed in the intervening 13 months regarding the wider "whole consenting process".
2. The existing process, whilst not ideal, does appear to be working. Regulation of the industry is required due to its multiple impacts on the environment and people. Regulation of this intensive farming activity is bound to be complex because it has created so many environmental concerns. But this is the nature of intensive farming – intensive poultry, pig and dairy farmers are in exactly the same position and with good reason – salmonella, foot and mouth and TB.
3. Local Planning authorities have become the key players in the process, especially as we are the only regulator who fully and actively engages in public consultation on the process and falls under local democratic control. In our opinion the industry has lost the public relations argument in respect of sea lice control and impacts on wild salmonids and any attempt to move regulation out of local democratic control and oversight will be seen as the worst sort of cover-up. This is 2018 not 1988 – public sensitivity to the environment and government regulation of it has changed. If anything, the public would prefer to see more local democratic control and regulation in which they can play a direct role, not less. Local politicians will not accept being side-lined at this point in time.
4. On the subject of sea-lice control and wild salmonids, agencies such as MSS and SEPA appear to be side-stepping their biodiversity duty with regard to impacts on wild salmonids and this issue remains one of the key aspects to determining applications. The scientific, ecological assessment of impacts and effects on protected species and habitats is left to planning. A lack of scientific research data from Scottish waters is often flagged as a reason for caution, but little scientific research is being commissioned to overcome this problem.
5. At the moment, the key winners are the sea lice! Their numbers have never been so buoyant! So clearly, practical improvements to the process are required but not ones that allow awkward questions to be avoided.

6. The proposed changes to how SEPA model/consent the CAR applications appears to take little account of dove-tailing in with the LA planning process.

7. In reality unless significant investment and changes to legislation are made by Scot Govt to e.g. provide Marine Scotland with the resources to take over the whole consenting process (inconceivable in current financial circumstances), little is likely to change. At present the 'planning' aspects of the process are subsidised by council tax payers – how will those funds be released for a different regulator?

8. In the meantime, our very stretched capacity means we have very little time to engage in yet another round of meetings. However, we recognize that we are a key component in the process and therefore suggest a meeting be held in Inverness rather than Edinburgh. This would likely be more beneficial for officers from SNH/SEPA as well as the planning authorities and would be more likely to allow us the capacity to fully take part.

Sorry if the above reads as a bit of a rant. We recognise that removing aquaculture from planning control is only one of the possible options to be considered. Reform and improvement of the current mixed-consenting structure is something we would happily engage in but the redefinition of development to exclude aquaculture should not be on the agenda.

Mark Harvey

Team Leader

The Highland Council

Development and Infrastructure Service - Portree

Dr Shona Turnbull

Coastal Planning Officer

Development and Infrastructure Service

The Highland Council

Unless related to the business of The Highland Council, the views or opinions expressed within this e-mail are those of the sender and do not necessarily reflect those of The Highland Council, or associated bodies, nor does this e-mail form part of any contract unless so stated.

Mura h-eil na beachdan a tha air an cur an cèill sa phost-d seo a' buntainn ri gnothachas Chomhairle na Gàidhealtachd, 's ann leis an neach fhèin a chuir air falbh e a tha iad, is chan eil iad an-còmhnaidh a' riochdachadh beachdan na Comhairle, no buidhnean buntainneach, agus chan eil am post-d seo na phàirt de chunradh sam bith mura h-eil sin air innse.

Listening * Open * Valuing * Improving * Supporting * Partnering * Delivering
Èisteachd * Fosgailte * Luach * Leasachadh * Taic * Com-pàirteachas * Libhrigeadh

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2018 16:51
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: SARF core grant

From: Richard Slaski [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 January 2018 19:31
To: Gibbons J (Jeff)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: [REDACTED]

Dear Jeff,

Happy New Year in return – hope you had a good break.

SARF is in the process of managing an orderly 'closure', so at some point it will need to end with as little of Members funds left as possible. But:

- It is still a long way from that point, and we are just launching three new research projects, which we will have to manage and deliver
- There is some consideration about legacy initiatives (reports, website continuity, presentations at events, etc), and a very real prospect of hosting a major 'final Conference'. All of these activities will require funding
- There is always the potential to commission additional necessary 'short sharp' projects if funds are available.

[REDACTED]

On 'Special Projects' (SP), two of the three new projects we are commissioning are SP projects, so that's taking a lot of the remaining budget. Also, we recently undertook a thorough analysis of SP expenditure **and allocation of overheads** to SP project management, and I can confirm that from an accounting point of view there is now no remaining dedicated SP budget once the two new projects have been completed.

Happy to discuss any of this in more detail, if that would be helpful.

Kind regards,
Richard



Richard Slaski
Secretariat
Scottish Aquaculture Research Forum (SARF)
PO Box 7223 Pitlochry PH16 9AF

[REDACTED]
Company Registered in Scotland - SC267177

Charity Registered in Scotland - SC035745

EU State Aid Registration No: X939 2009

Website: www.sarf.org.uk

Confidentiality This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from the disclosure under law. If you are not the intended recipient (s) please note that any form of distribution, copying or use of this communication or the information in it is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

From: Jeff.Gibbons@gov.scot [mailto:Jeff.Gibbons@gov.scot]

Sent: 03 January 2018 10:26

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: SARF core grant

Morning Richard

Happy New Year to you.

Just a quick email to check that the SARF Core Grant funding for 2018-19 remains at 25k for the coming financial year? Also, could I ask if we have now exhausted the SARF Special Projects grant or is there still some funding available.

No rush in getting back to me.

Best

Jeff

Jeff Gibbons

Head of Aquaculture Policy Unit

Marine Scotland

Scottish Government | Area 1-B North | Victoria Quay | EH6 6QQ

T: [REDACTED]

F: +44 (0)131 244 6512

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

Tha am post-d seo (agus faidhle neo ceanglan còmhla ris) dhan neach neo luchd-ainmichte a-mhàin. Chan eil e ceadaichte a chleachdadh ann an dòigh sam bith, a' toirt a-steach còraichean, foillseachadh neo sgaoileadh, gun

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2018 16:53
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: SARF113

From: john.rosie@shetland.gov.uk [mailto:john.rosie@shetland.gov.uk]
Sent: 15 December 2017 12:18
To: r.slaski@sarf.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: SARF113

Hi Richard,

Thank you for your email and for clearly setting out the conditions within which SARF Steering Groups are required to operate within.

The meeting I referred to in my email of 12 December is the Council's Crown Estate Working Group. The Group, which meets regularly on a non-statutory basis, is concerned with proposals for the long term management of the Crown Estate in Scotland with current focus being on Crown Estate Scotland's commitment to launch a pilot scheme that will enable local authorities, development trusts and other community bodies to apply to manage assets in their local area: <http://www.crownestatescotland.com/media-and-notices/news-media-releases-opinion/crown-estate-scotland-commits-to-pilot-local-management>

The proposed pilot scheme may be of interest to Shetland Islands Council, and indeed the other island authorities. In Shetland, the Council has regulatory powers for all developments within the Shetland marine region (Planning Act for aquaculture and Zetland County Council Act for everything else) so the proposed pilot scheme offers the opportunity to test the concept of a one-stop-shop where developers could come to the Council for both development consent and corresponding seabed lease. Related to this, it is the following statement contained in the Call for Proposals paper of SARF113 that has prompted the Working Group to take an interest in the project:

"A (lead) Competent Authority would still be required, and the supposition was – and is at the heart of this Call for Proposals – that some sort of Marine Licensing system, managed by MS LOT, could be developed."

There is a feeling in the Working Group that should any future new consenting regime for aquaculture come to fruition where the Council is no longer the competent authority, that it would work against what any possible pilot scheme would hope to achieve.

I hope the above explains my email of 12 December. Thank you again for your response which I shall pass on to the Working Group. We look forward to viewing the final report once the project has concluded.

Kind regards,

John

From: Richard Slaski [mailto:r.slaski@sarf.org.uk]
Sent: 13 December 2017 15:21
To: Rosie John@Marine Planning <john.rosie@shetland.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: SARF113

Hi John,

We have never – at least in my years of looking after SARF – had the need to use formal TORs for our Steering Groups. There are some ‘rules’, but other than that, we are generally just there to help the contractors get the best out of their work in terms of high-quality research.

The meetings are semi-structured, in the sense that we would work with the contractor to develop a short agenda. At the first Steering Group meeting (‘inception’) we would generally ask the contractor to talk us through their proposed work plan, and members of the Steering Group would intervene and suggest refinements that might better answer the questions SARF has posed. We can’t ask the contractor to deviate too much from what they have been contracted to do, but sometimes it’s just about fine-tuning. And good to get this done at the start of the project. We find – having done many inception meetings – that both the contractors and the Steering Group members enjoy the day, and feel that they’ve got something positive out of it.

So, no I am not aware of any formal TORs for SARF Steering Groups. My colleague Sandra may be able to find something buried in old files, and we’ll let you know if we do.

The **rules** are very clear, and your last question about non steering group members seeing things prompts me to stress what these are.

Members of the Steering Groups are appointed by the SARF Board by specific invitation, and we have already gone through that formal process for Mark, and by consultation Paul, with very positive feedback. The rules of confidentiality that SARF operates apply immediately. This means that no material details of SARF projects can be divulged to anyone outside of the Steering Group or the SARF Board until the project has been completed, peer-reviewed and then approved by the SARF Board. At that point the report is published on our website and lodged with the British Library, and is therefore legally in the public domain.

Obviously a Steering Group member might wish to seek advice on a specific technical point by consultation with other experts within his/her circle – perfectly understandable, and actually very beneficial. What the Steering Group member **cannot do** is share any written project-related SARF material he/she has received electronically or in any other way. Nor can he/she forward or copy any SARF email communications with anyone outside of the SARF Steering Group or Board. Any consultation with fellow experts must be in ‘their own words’ electronically, or by telephone or personal meeting. They should be straightforward technical questions, so this is not a great burden. Furthermore, any such consultees must be informed that they are now also considered to be operating under SARF confidentiality rules: they are free to offer their advice back to the Steering Group member, but not to discuss their communications with anyone else.

In the final analysis, the Steering Group member is there at SARF’s invitation, to help SARF with his/her specialist expertise, not to act on behalf of any other group.

SARF takes these rules very seriously, **and if Mark and Paul (both of whom I have copied in) do not feel they can operate within their confines, they should let me know immediately.** All the other Steering Group members are SARF Board, and they understand the confidentiality rules and that their responsibilities are to the SARF Charity alone.

Experience tells us that such discipline is essential.

The actuality is that if appropriate stakeholder or ‘interested’ groups of any sort want to have input to a SARF project, they will probably already be part of the project (‘consultees’) by having been contacted by the contractor as part of their work. If they are not, then the contractor is not doing their job, and the Steering Group will let them know that.

I appear to have written some TORs!

Hope this all helps to answer your question, but if we do find anything more formal in the files, I'll come back to you.

Kind regards,
Richard



Richard Slaski
Secretariat
Scottish Aquaculture Research Forum (SARF)
PO Box 7223 Pitlochry PH16 9AF

Company Registered in Scotland - SC267177
Charity Registered in Scotland - SC035745
EU State Aid Registration No: X939 2009
Website: www.sarf.org.uk

Confidentiality This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from the disclosure under law. If you are not the intended recipient (s) please note that any form of distribution, copying or use of this communication or the information in it is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

From: john.rosie@shetland.gov.uk [<mailto:john.rosie@shetland.gov.uk>]
Sent: 12 December 2017 17:05
To: r.slaski@sarf.org.uk
Subject: SARF113

Hi Richard,

I believe the first steering group meeting for the attached SARF project is to take place in January 2018.

At a recent meeting here in Shetland, I was tasked with finding out if there are Terms of Reference (ToR) for the steering group. I have already contacted Mark Steward from Argyll & Bute Council who is the local authority planning rep on the steering group but he has not seen sight of any ToR.

Do you know of the existence of any ToR? If they exist, do you know if they can be viewed by persons not on the steering group?

Kind regards,

John Rosie
Marine Planning Officer
Shetland Islands Council