



**JNCC Report
No. 656**

**Refining the criteria for defining areas with
a 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef**

Golding, N., Albrecht, J. & McBreen, F.

September 2020

© JNCC, Peterborough 2020

ISSN 0963-8091



For further information please contact:

Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House
City Road
Peterborough PE1 1JY
<https://jncc.gov.uk/>

This report should be cited as:

Golding. N., Albrecht. J., McBreen. F. 2020. Refining criteria for defining areas with a 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef; Workshop Report. *JNCC Report No. 656*, JNCC, Peterborough, ISSN 0963-8091.

JNCC EQA Statement:

This report is compliant with JNCC's Evidence Quality Assurance Policy
<https://jncc.gov.uk/about-jncc/corporate-information/evidence-quality-assurance/>

Acknowledgments:

The authors would like to thank all those individuals and organisations who took part in this project.

Summary

On 14 May 2020, the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) hosted a workshop with the Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCBs) to further refine the definition of Annex I stony reef. The workshop was organised to discuss and further refine guidance for defining areas with a 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef. Since 2008, the original guidance on defining stony reef (Irving 2009) had been used extensively; applied within the inshore (<12nm) and offshore (beyond 12nm) UK waters, it has been used for tasks ranging from identifying Annex I stony reef through to dealing with appropriate assessments for casework. Generally, the guidance has performed well since 2008, although clarifications were sought in certain areas.

The SNCBs reported on the range of Annex I stony reef in their respective regions, within and outwith their Marine Protected Area networks; they provided feedback on particular challenges they had experienced using the existing stony reef guidance. New concepts were presented and explored using available information on biota to help differentiate various classes of Annex I stony reef. The concept of patchiness was also explored in more detail, following research that had taken place after the initial stony reef workshop in 2008. Overarching guidance was developed which will assist practitioners in using the stony reef guidance in a more structured and repeatable way.

Recommendations coming out of the workshop, and agreed by all participants, will ensure that these new concepts discussed will be tested over the coming year in a variety of different biogeographical regions, ensuring their compatibility across inshore and offshore waters, and with a view to potentially integrating these concepts into further refinement of the Annex I stony reef guidance into the future.

Contents

1	Background	1
2	Purpose and scope of the workshop	2
3	Areas with a ‘low resemblance’ to Annex I stony reef: an inshore perspective	3
3.1	A Welsh inshore perspective.....	3
3.2	An English inshore perspective.....	4
4	Areas with a ‘low resemblance’ to Annex I stony reef: an offshore perspective	5
5	Consideration of the biota component during Annex I stony reef characterisation; a Welsh inshore perspective	5
5.1.	Strengths of the above approach:	6
5.2.	Weaknesses of the above approach:.....	6
5.3.	Opportunities of the above approach:	6
5.4.	Threats of the above approach:	7
6	Consideration of patchiness	7
7	Summary of workshop discussion	8
8	Refinement of guidance for defining areas as Annex I stony reef	8
8.1	Introduction.....	8
8.2	Overarching principles for application of the Annex I stony reef guidance	9
9	Summary of recommendations & actions	14
9.1	Recommendation 1	14
9.2	Recommendation 2	15
9.3	Recommendation 3	15
9.4	Recommendation 4	15
9.5	Action 1	15
9.6	Action 2	15
	References	16
	Appendix 1	17
	Appendix 2	18
	Appendix 3	19
	Appendix 4	20
	Appendix 5	21
	Appendix 6	22
	Appendix 7	23
	Appendix 8	24

1 Background

Adopted in 1992, the Habitats Directive¹ sought to conserve a wide range of rare, threatened or endemic animal and plant species. Rare and characteristic habitat types were also targeted for conservation, listed under Annex I of the Directive. Reefs [1170] under Annex I are of particular relevance to this workshop. The Interpretation Manual² of European Union Habitats provides greater clarity on the interpretation of Annex I reef with this explanation:

“Reefs can be either biogenic concretions or of geogenic origin. They are hard compact substrata on solid and soft bottoms, which arise from the sea floor in the sublittoral and littoral zone. Reefs may support a zonation of benthic communities of algae and animal species as well as concretions and corallogenic concretions.”

The Interpretation Manual² also provides these additional clarifications:

- “Hard compact substrata” are: rocks (including soft rock, e.g. chalk), boulders and cobbles (generally >64mm in diameter).
- “Biogenic concretions” are defined as: concretions, encrustations, corallogenic concretions and bivalve mussel beds originating from dead or living animals, i.e. biogenic hard bottoms which supply habitats for epibiotic species.
- “Geogenic origin” means: reefs formed by non-biogenic substrata.
- “Arise from the sea floor” means: the reef is topographically distinct from the surrounding seafloor.
- “Sublittoral and littoral zone” means: the reefs may extend from the sublittoral uninterrupted into the intertidal (littoral) zone or may only occur in the sublittoral zone, including deep water areas such as the bathyal.
- Such hard substrata that are covered by a thin and mobile veneer of sediment are classed as reefs if the associated biota are dependent on the hard substratum rather than the overlying sediment.
- Where an uninterrupted zonation of sublittoral and littoral communities exist, the integrity of the ecological unit should be respected in the selection of sites.
- A variety of subtidal topographic features are included in this habitat complex such as: Hydrothermal vent habitats, sea mounts, vertical rock walls, horizontal ledges, overhangs, pinnacles, gullies, ridges, sloping or flat bed rock, broken rock and boulder and cobble fields.

Within UK waters, three types of Annex I reef have been identified; biogenic, bedrock and stony (Duncan & Pinder 2019). Annex I stony reef was the subject of a workshop with the Statutory Nature conservation Bodies (SNCBs) hosted by JNCC in March 2008 (Irving 2009), with the aim of clarifying the definition of 'stony reef' under the Habitats Directive, and assisting with identifying those areas of the seabed which fell within, and outside the definition. Through this workshop, a consensus was reached on the main characterising features of an Annex I stony reef, summarised in Table 1.

¹ Council Directive 92/43/EEC <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:31992L0043>

² Interpretation Manual of European Union Habitats
https://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/legislation/habitatsdirective/docs/Int_Manual_EU28.pdf

Table 1: The main characteristics of an Annex I stony reef, as determined during the 2008 Annex I stony reef inter-agency workshop (Irving 2009).

Characteristic	Not a 'stony reef'	'Resemblance' to being a 'stony reef'		
		Low ³	Medium	High
Composition:	<10%	10-40% Matrix supported	40-95%	>95% Clast supported
<i>Notes: Diameter of cobbles / boulders being greater than 64mm. Percentage cover relates to a minimum area of 25m². This 'composition' characteristic also includes 'patchiness'.</i>				
Elevation:	Flat seabed	<64mm	64mm - 5m	>5m
<i>Notes: Minimum height (64mm) relates to minimum size of constituent cobbles. This characteristic could also include 'distinctness' from the surrounding seabed. Note that two units (mm and m) are used here.</i>				
Extent:	<25m ²	←————— >25m ² —————→		
Biota:	Dominated by infaunal species			>80% of species present composed of epifaunal species

Note that in line with the footnote below, areas of the seabed having a 'low resemblance' to stony reef, where 'low' was scored in any of the four criteria (composition, elevation, extent or biota), as highlighted in Table 1 above, required a strong justification for the area to be considered as Annex I stony reef.

2 Purpose and scope of the workshop

Since the first stony reef workshop in 2008, the resulting guidance (Irving 2009) has been used extensively by the SNCBs over the past twelve years. It has been applied within the inshore (<12nm) and offshore (beyond 12nm) UK waters, for example when identifying stony reef or when dealing with appropriate assessments through casework. Generally, the guidance developed in 2008 has worked well, although further clarification was required in some areas. In particular, some criteria to assist the practitioner in better defining areas with a 'low resemblance' to stony reef was required, allowing a stronger justification to be made where areas of seabed identified as stony reef fall within the 'low resemblance' category.

In light of the above requirement, a second inter-agency Annex I stony reef workshop was convened by JNCC, with the aim to develop further guidance when identifying those areas of the seabed with a 'low resemblance' to stony reef. Participants (listed in Appendix 1) from the JNCC, Natural England (NE), Natural Resources Wales (NRW), the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (CEFAS), Marine Scotland Science (MSS) and the Agri-Food & Biosciences Institute (AFBI), nominated to represent on behalf of the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs, Northern Ireland (DAERA), met 'virtually' via Microsoft Teams on 14 May 2020. Apologies were received from Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) and DAERA. The final agenda is provided in Appendix 2. Three examples of Annex 1 reef discussed at the workshop are provided in Appendix 3 and discussed in section 8.2.3.

³ When determining whether an area of the seabed should be considered as Annex I stony reef, if a 'low' is scored in any of the four characteristics (composition, elevation, extent or biota), then a **strong** justification would be required for this area to be considered as contributing to the Marine Natura site network of qualifying reefs in terms of the EU Habitats Directive.

The workshop was chaired by Neil Golding, a participant of the first workshop held in 2008. During the introductory session, he noted that it wasn't the intention of this second workshop to reopen a wider debate on what constituted an Annex I stony reef, especially with respect to 'medium' and 'high resemblance' categories.

The workshop opened with presentations from the participating SNCBs providing a range of perspectives of how they have dealt with areas of 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef using the existing guidance. New concepts were presented and explored around developing the *biota* criterion to provide a stronger justification for areas of 'low resemblance' to stony reef. The concept of patchiness was also explored in more detail, following research that had taken place after the initial stony reef workshop in 2008.

3 Areas with a 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef: an inshore perspective

3.1 A Welsh inshore perspective

Natural Resources Wales (NRW) provided an overview of Annex I stony reef in Welsh inshore waters. The full presentation can be viewed in Appendix 4.

NRW were seeking clarity regarding the definitions and thresholds for 'low resemblance' stony reef. Challenges in using the current Irving (2009) stony reef guidance have also been fed back to NRW from contractors and data analysts, particularly around identifying areas of 'low resemblance' stony reef, and what the required *strong justification* may look like.

Welsh inshore waters contain all three sub-types of Annex I reef; bedrock, stony and biogenic. Subtidal stony reef is a component of the Annex I reef feature in the majority of Welsh marine Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), the notable exception being the Dee Estuary. While some areas of stony reef can be easily categorised using the guidance in Irving (2009), other areas have proved more of a challenge. The predominant area providing this challenge was Cardigan Bay SAC.

NRW detailed some specific casework examples where there was a requirement to better distinguish between areas of 'low resemblance' Annex I stony reef compared to those areas not classified as reef. Specific examples were shown where multibeam and side-scan datasets, along with interpreted underwater imagery, have been used to identify potential areas of Annex I stony reef.

Key challenges were:

- Where and how to identify the boundaries between reef and sediment along video transects, particularly where mosaics of seabed habitats are prevalent; how should the stony reef guidance be applied in these situations.
- Interpreting the *biota* criteria in Irving (2009) which discusses infaunal versus epifaunal dominated communities.
- The relationship between composition/elevation thresholds and those data collection and analysis methods used, such as multibeam echosounder bathymetry/backscatter and seabed imagery.

- Around the requirement for a **strong justification** if any one of the four criteria fall into the 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef category. What does this strong justification mean in practice?

NRW have pursued some work within Welsh inshore waters to help resolve some of the challenges mentioned above (see Section 5).

In addition, the challenges around mosaics and patchiness of Annex I stony reef, along with potential advances in their assessment were presented by JNCC later in the workshop (see Section 6).

3.2 An English inshore perspective

Natural England (NE) provided an overview of Annex I stony reef in English inshore waters; there are eight coastal SACs where Annex I stony reef is a designated sub-feature. Some Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs) also contain examples of stony reef. The full presentation can be viewed in Appendix 5.

Conservation advice for all features was revised a number of years ago. No distinction was made between the different levels of stony reef resemblance, for example, 'medium resemblance' versus 'high resemblance'.

For all features (including Annex I stony reef), NE developed a list of EUNIS⁴ habitat codes which sat under each particular feature. Of these codes, two hundred and twelve were recorded as being correlated with Annex I stony reef, although these were primarily EUNIS codes from the rocky part of the classification; in addition to those two hundred and twelve codes identified, there may be some EUNIS codes on the mixed subtidal sediment part of the EUNIS classification which may correlate with 'low resemblance' Annex I stony reef, however these were not identified in the automated process.

Various survey methods used to assess Annex I stony reef within sites were discussed; examples highlighted where Annex I stony reef had been identified through casework or monitoring. These included Walney Extension offshore wind farm (2011), Shell Flat fisheries assessment, Lyme Bay fishery closure and Plymouth and Estuaries SAC. Lyme Bay posed a challenge when considering biota and epifaunal communities; some areas of the seabed which had been disturbed previously often had a reduced epibiota community; would they still be considered as Annex I stony reef? These epifaunal communities could also become re-established with time, following cessation of the disturbance, for example as observed within Lyme Bay. Plymouth and Estuaries SAC (Duke Rock) contained some interesting examples of sediment biotopes (SS.SMp.KSwSS.LsacR.CbPb – red seaweeds and kelps on tide swept mobile infralittoral cobbles and pebbles) which could be considered to have a 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef. It was noted that for this example, stability was also a factor for consideration. The Duke Rock example was one where a stable seabed allowed a diverse epifaunal 'reef-like' community to develop, even though from a substratum 'clast-size' perspective, it may not exactly fit the definition of a stony reef.

Following the presentation, one of the questions posed was around biota, and whether criteria such as composition and elevation could be used to 'flag' areas of possible Annex I stony reef in their own right, even if there wasn't a strong biota component visible at that time (maybe due to disturbance for example). From a NE perspective, this would only be relevant where disturbance was suspected to be the cause of reduced biota; NE consider the value of biota key in defining reef. It was also noted that under European Commission (2007), the existence of an epifaunal community is not a prerequisite for an area to be classified as Annex I reef.

⁴ <https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/eunis-habitat-classification>

4 Areas with a 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef: an offshore perspective

JNCC provided an overview of Annex I stony reef in UK offshore waters (beyond 12 nautical miles), using examples from four offshore sites; Pobie Bank SAC and Solan Bank SAC (both which span the 12nm Territorial Sea limit into Scottish inshore waters), Wight-Barfleur Reef SAC and Pisces Reef SAC. The full presentation can be viewed in Appendix 6. Deep sea Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) were not discussed as deep sea MPAs containing Annex I stony reef are considered to be a special case due to the presence of iceberg plough marks, as agreed at the 2008 workshop (Irving 2009). Annex I reef in the deep sea is likely to be more patchy but small amounts of reef can make a great difference to biodiversity in the deep sea.

Pobie Bank SAC contained a mixture of Annex I bedrock and stony reef, as well as mosaics with more sedimentary habitats.

Solan Bank SAC also contained a mixture of Annex I bedrock and stony reef. Seabed imagery data collected and analysed for this site was classified as 'confirmed' Annex I stony reef and 'potential' Annex I stony reef. The site was subject to significant scour, so the diversity of epifaunal communities was reduced as a result.

Wight-Barfleur Reef SAC, located in the English Channel, provided a good example of an offshore SAC with a very complex, heterogenous seabed; a mosaic of bedrock and stony reef, interspersed with sedimentary habitats.

Pisces Reef SAC, located in the Irish Sea, provided an example of how hard substrata, when covered by a veneer of mud, could be classified as non-reef habitat. Noting the statement in the European Commission (2007) Interpretation Manual that "such hard substrata ... covered by a thin and mobile veneer of sediment are classed as reefs if the associated biota are dependent on the hard substratum rather than the overlying sediment", areas of the seabed at Pisces Reef which appeared as mud at first glance could be classified as reef due to the presence of epifaunal species. Detailed exploration of the seabed imagery from Pisces Reef revealed discrete communities with transitional communities between; the main reef community transitioned into a reef veneer community, which then transitioned into muddy seabed with burrows. Analysis of this seabed imagery from Pisces Reef is ongoing.

The presentation reiterated many of the challenges highlighted by the other workshop participants, around dealing with mosaics of Annex I stony reef and non-reef sedimentary habitats.

5 Consideration of the biota component during Annex I stony reef characterisation; a Welsh inshore perspective

Natural Resources Wales (NRW) reported on work undertaken in Welsh inshore waters which examined available information on biota in more detail to help differentiate between areas classified as having a 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef from other areas which were not reef. A detailed working paper covering the methodology and results, submitted ahead of the workshop, is shown in Appendix 7. However, a concise summary is provided here.

One of the key principles to be considered for an area when assessing its 'resemblance' to Annex I stony reef was stability; areas of consolidated and patchy hard substrate may not necessarily fulfil the composition requirements of the Annex I stony reef criteria (i.e. not having the required percentage of cobbles and boulders), yet stability allows a diverse and 'reef-like' epifaunal community to develop. Therefore, is there a way that the biota/biodiversity requirement can be

better defined in the Annex I stony reef guidance to provide greater clarity when assessing areas against that guidance?

Using a Welsh inshore dataset from Marine Recorder (a combination of seabed imagery and diver recordings), the following process was undertaken by NRW to attempt to identify Annex I stony reef records from this dataset. This involved three key steps:

- **STEP 1: Assignment of biotopes.** There will be a suite of biotopes that are clearly associated with (and define) reefs, and an inverse list which are clearly not associated with reefs. There will also be a grey area in the middle where biotopes may (or may not) be associated with reefs.
- **STEP 2: Identification of key species.** These were species selected due to their abundance in bedrock/boulder/cobble habitat. In total, 51 species were identified from Welsh inshore datasets. Note therefore that this list will likely be more extensive if scope is expanded wider than Welsh coastal waters.
- **STEP 3: Identification of reef species.** These were species that had a strong affiliation with stable, hard substrata. Considered as positive indicators of reef habitat.

A number of trials of the above process were run using the same dataset, and the results compared with the actual video tow. One of the primary issues was that species records tend to be from a whole camera tow; in areas of patchy habitat, this can result in the whole tow being tagged as reef. This is more a consequence of the video analysis methodology for the raw data than the above process.

5.1 Strengths of the above approach:

- Uses all of the substratum and species data that are available.
- Biotope assignment filters out a proportion of records, reducing the number of records for which species must be handled.
- Developing a key species list effectively provides a 'shortcut' for those species poor records that have the major characterising species (e.g. A Seasearch Observer of a kelp forest will have kelp).
- Not dependent on having infaunal data.
- Auditable lookup lists created for biotopes, Key species and Reef species.
- Utilises data from different methods with different metrics.

5.2 Weaknesses of the above approach:

- Currently requires extensive spreadsheet manipulation.
- Presence only data are generally not adequate.
- Lookup tables must be maintained, to cover all habitats, across the UK (ideally).
- Does not handle sediment veneers very well.

5.3 Opportunities of the above approach:

- Large datasets can be analysed in one go.
- Thresholds are set (or can be varied) to ensure only the justified records are assigned as Annex I Reef feature.
- Standardised approach can be developed at the UK scale.
- Guidance can be rolled out to third parties, for planning casework (EIA, HRA, etc.).

5.4 Threats of the above approach:

- Will likely fail to identify stony reef that has been highly disturbed through fishing or other activities.
- Insufficient survey points.
- Insufficient data associated with a survey point.
- Currently no easy solution to mapping patchy habitats.

The discussion following the presentation by NRW covered a number of points. One was around the *biota* criterion within the current stony reef guidance (Table 1), and the fact that this assumes knowledge (and data) for both the infaunal and epifaunal communities. Typically, survey methodologies over stony reef habitat tend to allow only the epifaunal component of the community to be effectively sampled. This may not be an issue for areas of 'medium' and 'high resemblance' to stony reef, as *composition* (high percentage of cobble/boulder) and *elevation* will drive this determination. However, for areas of 'low resemblance' to stony reef, when consideration of *biota* has additional significance, this presents a challenge. Particularly when at the lowest end of 'low resemblance' to stony reef, the composition of the seabed may be 90% sedimentary and only 10% cobble/boulder. Annex I stony reef is inherently patchy, and so the guidance should take into account the fact that there will be patches of less dense cobbles/boulders interspersed with sediment areas. Patchiness was discussed in more detail during a dedicated session later in the workshop.

6 Consideration of patchiness

JNCC provided an overview of some work undertaken to examine the patchiness of habitats in offshore waters, and potential ways it could be recorded. The full presentation can be viewed in Appendix 8.

A recap was given on how patchiness was originally considered during the March 2008 workshop (Irving 2009). In summary, patchiness was ultimately incorporated within the *composition* criterion. However, work undertaken following the 2008 workshop demonstrated that percentage cover may not be the best mechanism to provide a measure of patchiness. Patchiness, with respect to Annex I biogenic reef (*Sabellaria spinulosa*) was first explored in Jenkins *et al.* (2015) and reported in more detail in Jenkins *et al.* (2018), and an overview of the approach taken was provided to the workshop participants. Jenkins *et al.* (2018) trialled the use of a *patchiness index*; this approach could also be applied to Annex I stony reef, particularly to tackle some of the problems associated with identifying 'low resemblance' Annex I stony reef.

Some of the precursor data analysis work required to trial this approach on Annex I stony reef has already been undertaken around Solan Bank, although this work hasn't been completed. Workshop participants agreed that progressing this Solan Bank work to its natural conclusion would provide a valuable trial of this approach's application to stony reef; this was taken forward as a recommendation from the workshop. A key challenge to this work will be getting the segment length for video analysis correct; too short and you will add a significant time penalty (and resultant financial cost) to any analysis. Conversely, selecting a segment length which is too long will oversimplify the process, reduce the resolution of the variability that can be measured, resulting in some of the patchiness information being lost.

7 Summary of workshop discussion

Following the presentations on various topics related to Annex I stony reef, there was a wide-ranging discussion between the workshop participants on some of the challenges that exist with using the current stony reef guidance. In particular, the ability to distinguish 'low resemblance' stony reef with areas that shouldn't be considered as reef.

During the discussions, the refinement of the existing sublittoral sediment classification for Britain and Ireland being undertaken by JNCC was touched upon. JNCC clarified that the current plan was to expand the definitions of the circalittoral mixed sediment (CMx) and the circalittoral coarse sediment (CCS) which contain a high degree of epifauna. The concept of mixing and matching infaunal and epifaunal components for sediment biotopes was also being explored. While the aim is to provide some refinement to these sections of the classification, this is unlikely to solve the current issues of aligning 'low resemblance' Annex I stony reef habitat with areas of stable sediments on the seafloor with pebbles and cobbles, which can afford a habitat for 'reef-like' communities to develop, and which cannot be identified as Annex I reef habitat through percentage cover of cobbles and boulders alone.

During this discussion session, there was an opportunity to discuss the Annex I stony reef scenarios that had been shared with the group earlier (see Appendix 3). In the form of an exercise, participants were required to follow the existing Annex I stony reef guidance (summarised in Table 1) to assign each of the three examples as either 'not a reef' or having a 'low', 'medium' or 'high resemblance' to Annex I stony reef. Through this exercise, it became clear that the existing guidance could be applied and interpreted in a number of ways, resulting in different final assessments of resemblance to a stony reef. All participants agreed that some overarching guidance for interpreting the existing stony reef guidance (Table 1) was required, to ensure consistency of application across a variety of scenarios. This was carried forward as a recommendation from the workshop, and this overarching guidance has been provided in Section 8.

Following on from discussions around areas of 'low resemblance' stony reef typically found on stable, subtidal sediment with low proportions of cobble, the applicability of stability and disturbance to help define 'low resemblance' stony reef was considered further. In light of the fact that biota could be treated as a proxy for stability, discussion centred around the approach undertaken by NRW for Welsh inshore waters to better understand the biological communities and specific species associated with stony reef. All participants agreed that this approach could also be trialled in offshore waters, and within English inshore waters.

8 Refinement of guidance for defining areas as Annex I stony reef

8.1 Introduction

An exercise posed to workshop participants (Appendix 3) required them to follow the existing Annex I stony reef guidance (summarised in Table 1) to assign three examples as either 'not a reef' or having a 'low', 'medium' or 'high resemblance' to Annex I stony reef. Through this exercise, it became clear that the existing guidance could be applied and interpreted in a number of ways, resulting in different final assessments of resemblance to a stony reef. It was agreed that some overarching guidance for using Table 1 was required, to ensure consistency of application across a variety of scenarios.

8.2 Overarching principles for application of the Annex I stony reef guidance

The following principles should be used alongside Table 1 (shown on Page 4 of this report). For areas of *hard, compact substrata (either on solid or soft seabed)* on the seabed to be considered Annex I stony reef, they must fulfil these four criteria:

1. **Composition** across the area being considered should be at least 10% cobbles (greater than 64mm in minimum diameter) or boulders (greater than 256mm in diameter). This 10% should be considered across the entire area (or at least across the minimum extent of 25m²). Stony reef habitat is inherently patchy in nature, and although composition is not a measure of patchiness it should take patchiness into account (i.e. on a patchy reef the percent cover of cobbles should take into account areas where cobbles are sparse or absent as well as areas where cobbles are abundant). Composition can be assessed using in-situ (diver) or remote (underwater imaging systems such as drop-camera/Remotely Operated Vehicle) or using acoustic remote sensing such as side-scan sonar or multibeam echosounder backscatter data.
2. **Elevation** of the area under consideration should generally be greater than 64mm. However, matrix supported cobbles >64mm in diameter (partially buried in a sediment matrix) may still function ecologically as a reef with an associated reef community, yet have an elevation less than 64mm. Where the elevation is less than 64mm, particles must have a diameter greater or equal to 64mm to be considered as stony reef. This criterion can include consideration of topographic distinctness from the surrounding seafloor, noting the requirement for the Annex I reef to "arise from the sea floor". Clast size (considered above in composition) could be used as an approximate proxy for elevation. Topographic distinctness (height of the feature) in its broadest term, is best assessed using side-scan sonar or multibeam bathymetry data. Required resolutions of the system will vary dependent on the height of feature.
3. **Extent** of the area under consideration should be greater than 25m² (e.g. 5m x 5m / 10m x 2.5m). Note that the inherent patchiness of stony reef should be taken into account when considering extent. For example, individual patches may measure less than 25m², but the whole area of patchy reef may exceed 25m².
4. **Biota** associated with the area should typically be dominated by epifaunal species. Some areas of seabed subject to scour/disturbance may have an impoverished epifaunal community, yet may still function ecologically as a reef⁵. *Biota* should be considered across the entire area being considered under the *extent* criteria, not just the cobble/boulder fraction being used to consider the *composition* criteria, reflecting the prevalence of an epifaunal or infaunal community. However, more detailed guidance on the *biota* criterion is currently being developed, with respect to assessing which biological communities are typically associated with Annex I stony reef. This may include consideration of particular species which could be used as a proxy for stability.

Meeting the above four criteria (as a minimum) means that the area meets the minimum requirement to be considered as having a 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef. Where 'low' was scored for any of these four criteria (composition, elevation, extent or biota), a **strong justification** will be required to consider the area as Annex I stony reef. However, if the majority of the four criteria exceed 'low', then this strong justification could result in classifying the area as having a 'medium resemblance' to Annex I stony reef.

⁵ Further work is planned to develop this disturbance/stability aspect, building on initial concepts developed by Brazier (2020) for Welsh inshore waters.

8.2.1 What happens if the area meets the extent criteria, with two of the remaining criteria meeting the 'medium resemblance' requirement, and the final criteria meeting 'high resemblance'?

Imagine you are considering an area that meets the minimum requirement for *extent*, i.e. an area greater than 25m². For the remaining three criteria, two meet the requirement for 'medium resemblance' to Annex I stony reef (*composition & elevation*). The area has also a dense, diverse, epifaunal community. Accepting the current limitations around the *biota* criterion discussed in Section 8.2, the precise percentage ratio of epifaunal to infaunal species is unclear. However, on this occasion, the assumption will be made that this is known, and this well-established, dense epifaunal community meets the 'high' category for *biota* (see Table 3 below). As a general rule, it would be expected that this area would be classified as 'medium resemblance' to Annex I stony reef. Note that not all criteria need to be classed as 'medium resemblance' for the area to be classified as that.

Table 3: A scenario where an area was assessed against the four different Annex I stony reef resemblance criteria, with the end result of a 'medium resemblance' to stony reef classification.

Characteristic	Not a 'stony reef'	'Resemblance' to being a 'stony reef'		
		Low	Medium	High
Composition:	<10%	10-40% Matrix supported	40-95%	>95% Clast supported
Notes: Diameter of cobbles / boulders being greater than 64mm. Percentage cover relates to a minimum area of 25m ² . This 'composition' characteristic also includes 'patchiness'.				
Elevation:	Flat seabed	<64mm	64mm – 5m	>5m
Notes: Minimum height (64mm) relates to minimum size of constituent cobbles. This characteristic could also include 'distinctness' from the surrounding seabed. Note that two units (mm and m) are used here.				
Extent:	<25m ²	←————— >25m ² —————→		
Biota:	Dominated by infaunal species			>80% of species present composed of epifaunal species

This area could be considered as having a 'medium resemblance' to Annex I stony reef.

8.2.2 What happens if the area meets the extent criteria, with one of the criteria meeting the 'medium resemblance' requirement, and the remaining criteria meeting 'high resemblance'?

Imagine you are considering an area that meets the minimum requirement for *extent*, i.e. an area greater than 25m². For the remaining three criteria, one only meets the requirement for 'medium resemblance' to Annex I stony reef (*composition*). *Elevation* meets the requirement for 'high resemblance'. The area has a dense, diverse, epifaunal community. Accepting the current limitations around the *biota* criterion discussed in Section 8.2, the precise percentage ratio of epifaunal to infaunal species is unclear. However, on this occasion, the assumption will be made that this is known, and this well-established, dense epifaunal community meets the 'high' category for *biota* (see Table 4 below). It would be anticipated therefore that this area would be classified as 'high resemblance' to Annex I stony reef. Note that not all criteria need to be classed as 'high resemblance' for the area to be classified as that.

Refining the criteria for defining areas with a 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef

Table 4: A scenario where an area was assessed against the four different Annex I stony reef resemblance criteria, with the end result of a 'high resemblance' to stony reef classification.

Characteristic	Not a 'stony reef'	'Resemblance' to being a 'stony reef'		
		Low	Medium	High
Composition:	<10%	10-40% Matrix supported	40-95%	>95% Clast supported
<i>Notes: Diameter of cobbles / boulders being greater than 64mm. Percentage cover relates to a minimum area of 25m². This 'composition' characteristic also includes 'patchiness'.</i>				
Elevation:	Flat seabed	<64mm	64mm – 5m	>5m
<i>Notes: Minimum height (64mm) relates to minimum size of constituent cobbles. This characteristic could also include 'distinctness' from the surrounding seabed. Note that two units (mm and m) are used here.</i>				
Extent:	<25m²			
Biota:	Dominated by infaunal species			>80% of species present composed of epifaunal species

This area could be considered as having a 'high resemblance' to Annex I stony reef.

8.2.3 Further worked examples

The following worked examples are based on the three examples provided to workshop participants, listed in Appendix 3. Participants were asked to decide how they would categorise these three examples, either 'not reef', 'low', 'medium' or 'high resemblance' to Annex I stony reef:

1. Extensive area (>25m²) of seabed (topographically distinct from surrounding seafloor), with an elevation of 2m, composed of gravel.

Even though the extent and elevation criteria are met, because the mound/bank is composed solely of gravel and has a composition of <10% cobble / boulder, it cannot be considered an area of Annex I stony reef (see Table 5). Irving (2009) makes reference to consolidated gravel banks being considered as Annex I stony reef, "such areas could only be considered if they met the 'reefiness' criteria" in Table 1 (Page 4 of this report); therefore the composition of this gravel bank would need to include a fraction >10% cobble/boulder.

*This area would **NOT** be considered an Annex I stony reef*

Table 5: Example 1 - An extensive area (>25m²) of seabed (topographically distinct from surrounding seafloor), with elevation >64mm (say 2m), composed of gravel, would NOT be classified as an Annex I stony reef.

Characteristic	Not a 'stony reef'	'Resemblance' to being a 'stony reef'		
		Low	Medium	High
Composition:	<10%	10-40% Matrix supported	40-95%	>95% Clast supported
Notes: Diameter of cobbles / boulders being greater than 64mm. Percentage cover relates to a minimum area of 25m ² . This 'composition' characteristic also includes 'patchiness'.				
Elevation:	Flat seabed	<64mm	64mm - 5m	>5m
Notes: Minimum height (64 mm) relates to minimum size of constituent cobbles. This characteristic could also include 'distinctness' from the surrounding seabed. Note that two units (mm and m) are used here.				
Extent:	<25m ²	←—————> >25m ² —————→		
Biota:	Dominated by infaunal species			>80% of species present composed of epifaunal species

- Extensive (>25m²) banks/mounds of material 2m in elevation, composed of 30% cobbles (>64mm) or larger, with significant epifaunal communities on stable material.

Meeting the extent criterion, and with a composition of 30% cobbles or larger (e.g. boulders), falling into the 'low resemblance' bracket for this criterion, this area could be classed as 'low resemblance' stony reef. The justification for its classification as Annex I stony reef lies in its elevation, which is 2m, thereby meeting 'medium resemblance' for this criterion. Accepting the current limitations around the biota criterion discussed in Section 8.2, the precise percentage ratio of epifaunal to infaunal species is unclear. However, there is a significant epifaunal community on the stable material. Therefore, this area could be considered as having a 'medium resemblance' to Annex I stony reef (Table 6). This assessment would need to be made on a case by case basis.

This area could be considered as having a 'medium resemblance' to Annex I stony reef.

Table 6: Example 2 - An extensive (>25m²) area 2m in elevation (bank/mounds feature), composed of 30% cobbles (>64mm) or larger, with significant epifaunal communities on stable material. This area could be considered as having a 'medium resemblance' to Annex I stony reef.

Characteristic	Not a 'stony reef'	'Resemblance' to being a 'stony reef'		
		Low	Medium	High
Composition:	<10%	10-40% Matrix supported	40-95%	>95% Clast supported
Notes: Diameter of cobbles / boulders being greater than 64mm. Percentage cover relates to a minimum area of 25m ² . This 'composition' characteristic also includes 'patchiness'.				
Elevation:	Flat seabed	<64mm	64mm – 5m	>5m
Notes: Minimum height (64mm) relates to minimum size of constituent cobbles. This characteristic could also include 'distinctness' from the surrounding seabed. Note that two units (mm and m) are used here.				
Extent:	<25m ²	←————— >25m ² —————→		
Biota:	Dominated by infaunal species		?	>80% of species present composed of epifaunal species

- Extensive (>25m²) banks/mounds composed of 100% cobble (>64mm) material. Elevation ranges from 64mm up to ~2m. Significant epifaunal communities on stable material.

This area meets the extent criteria, has an elevation criteria meeting the 'medium resemblance' criteria, and is composed of 100% cobbles (composition meeting 'high resemblance'). Noting the presence of a significant epifaunal community, this area could be considered as having a 'high resemblance' to Annex I stony reef (Table 7). The area has a dense, diverse, epifaunal community. Accepting the current limitations around the biota criterion discussed in Section 8.2, the precise percentage ratio of epifaunal to infaunal species is unclear. However, on this occasion, the assumption will be made that this is known, and this well-established, dense epifaunal community meets the 'high' category for biota (see Table 7 below).

This area could be considered as having a 'high resemblance' to Annex I stony reef.

Table 7: Example 3 – An extensive (>25m²) banks/mounds composed of 100% cobble (>64mm) material. Elevation ranges from 64mm up to ~2m. Significant epifaunal communities on stable material. This area could be classified as 'high resemblance' to Annex I stony reef.

Characteristic	Not a 'stony reef'	'Resemblance' to being a 'stony reef'		
		Low	Medium	High
Composition:	<10%	10-40% Matrix supported	40-95%	>95% Clast supported
Notes: Diameter of cobbles / boulders being greater than 64mm. Percentage cover relates to a minimum area of 25m ² . This 'composition' characteristic also includes 'patchiness'.				
Elevation:	Flat seabed	<64mm	64mm – 5m	>5m
Notes: Minimum height (64mm) relates to minimum size of constituent cobbles. This characteristic could also include 'distinctness' from the surrounding seabed. Note that two units (mm and m) are used here.				
Extent:	<25m ²	←—————> >25m ² —————→		
Biota:	Dominated by infaunal species			>80% of species present composed of epifaunal species

9 Summary of recommendations & actions

The workshop generated a number of recommendations and actions, and these are summarised below, with a short explanation beneath each. Some of the actions listed below have been addressed within this workshop report.

9.1 Recommendation 1

JNCC and NRW to complete an Annex I stony reef patchiness assessment on existing seabed imagery. From a JNCC perspective, the imagery analysis for data collected from around Solan Bank SAC has already taken place to allow this work to happen. It should be possible to develop a patchiness index (for cobbles and larger) from seabed imagery data collected around Solan Bank, adopting the same principles described in Jenkins *et al.* (2018). This index, using appropriate thresholds, could help inform decisions around determining areas of the seabed as 'low', 'medium' or 'high resemblance' to stony reef, or not reef at all. There is also value in this stony reef patchiness assessment being tested in Welsh inshore waters by NRW.

9.2 Recommendation 2

JNCC to test the NRW approach of assessing stability and biodiversity in UK offshore waters with respect to refining methods to identify 'low resemblance' Annex I stony reef. NRW have piloted an approach detailed in Section 5. There is an opportunity to test this approach in UK offshore waters (for example Solan Bank SAC) to see if the methods are equally applicable in a different biogeographical area. The work will also include a more detailed consideration of stability, through the use of stability indicator species.

9.3 Recommendation 3

Natural England to test the NRW approach of assessing stability and biodiversity in English inshore waters with respect to refining methods to identify 'low resemblance' Annex I stony reef. NRW have piloted an approach detailed in Section 5. There is an opportunity to test this approach in English inshore waters.

9.4 Recommendation 4

All to meet in one years' time to take stock of progress following completion of the work outlined in Recommendations 1 and 2. Work highlighted for completion following this workshop is required to fill some of the gaps in knowledge that have been identified following extensive use and testing of the existing Annex I stony reef guidance. Upon completion of this work, the integration of its results will allow the Annex I stony reef guidance to be further refined, and a better understanding and description of what may constitute a strong justification for areas which fall into the 'low resemblance' stony reef category.

9.5 Action 1

ASM and JNCC to draft some overarching guidance on using the existing Annex I stony reef guidance summarised in Table 1 (Page 4 of this report) and to be included in the workshop report. Worked examples should be used to help ensure consistency of application of the guidance across a variety of scenarios, by Friday 29th May 2020.

9.6 Action 2

JNCC to update Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) on the key outputs from this workshop. By Friday 26th June 2020.

References

Brazier, P. 2020. *Defining 'Reefiness' – inclusion of 'low stony reef' as Annex I Reef feature*. Working paper by Natural Resources Wales. NRW. 11pp.

European Commission, 2007. *Interpretation Manual of European Union Habitats - EUR27*. European Commission DG Environment.

Duncan, G. & Pinder, J. 2019. *Method for creating version 8 of the UK Composite Map of Annex I Reefs*. JNCC, 19pp. <https://hub.jncc.gov.uk/assets/992dfef7-3267-43db-b351-5927bf0621d4>

Irving, R. 2009. *The identification of the main characteristics of stony reef habitats under the Habitats Directive*. Summary report of an inter-agency workshop 26-27 March 2008. JNCC Report No. 432, JNCC, Peterborough, ISSN 0963-8091.

Jenkins, C., Eggleton, J., Albrecht, J., Barry, J., Duncan, G., Golding, N. & O'Connor, J. (2015). North Norfolk Sandbank and Saturn Reef cSAC/SCI Management Investigation Report, JNCC/Cefas Partnership Report Series No. 7, JNCC, Peterborough, ISSN 2051-6711. <http://data.jncc.gov.uk/data/e1cfa60-03e5-411a-96b6-d7fed00dccb0/JNCC-Cefas-7-FINAL-WEB.pdf>

Jenkins, C., Eggleton, J., Barry, J. & O'Connor, J. 2018. *Advances in assessing Sabellaria spinulosa reefs for ongoing monitoring*. Ecology and Evolution. 2018;8:7673–7687. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/ece3.4292>

Appendix 1

A list of workshop attendees and affiliation

Name	Affiliation
James Albrecht	Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC)
Yolanda Arjona	Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC)
Paul Brazier	Natural Resources Wales (NRW)
Alex Callaway	Agri-Food & Biosciences Institute (AFBI), nominated representative on behalf of the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (DAERA)
Anna Downie	Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (CEFAS)
Neil Golding (Chair)	Aquarius Survey & Mapping (ASM)
Elly Hill	Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC)
Fionnuala McBreen	Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC)
Amy Ridgeway	Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC)
Karen Robinson	Natural Resources Wales (NRW)
Trudy Russell	Natural England (NE)
David Stirling	Marine Scotland Science

Appendix 2

Final workshop agenda

09:30 – 09:45	Welcome & Introductions	Fionnuala McBreen (JNCC)
09:45 – 10:00	Purpose & scope of the workshop <i>Agree criteria for the defining areas with a 'low resemblance' to stony reef (Table 1)</i>	Neil Golding (ASM)
10:00 – 10:45	Areas with a 'low resemblance' to stony reef: an inshore MPA perspective	Karen Robinson (NRW) Trudy Russell NE (NE)
10:45 – 11:00	Coffee\Tea Break	
11:00-11:30	Areas with a 'low resemblance' to stony reef: an offshore MPA perspective	Fionnuala McBreen (JNCC)
11:30 – 12:30	NRW proposal for biota assessment	Paul Brazier (NRW)
12:30– 13:30	Lunch	
13:30 – 13:45	Potential application of a <i>patchiness assessment method</i> from seabed video imagery (based on offshore <i>Sabellaria</i> reef & Seapen methods & Solan Bank)	James Albrecht (JNCC)
13:45 –15:15	Discussion of options and revised criteria for defining areas with a ' <i>low resemblance</i> ' to stony reef	ALL (Chaired by Neil Golding)
15:15 - 15:30	Coffee\Tea Break	
15:30 – 16:15	Present summary of options and agree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions • Recommendations • Format of workshop report • Deadlines 	Neil Golding

Appendix 3

Annex I stony reef examples for discussion

Three examples of what may constitute Annex I stony reef were provided to workshop participants, in order to stimulate discussion about the existing guidance outlined in Irving (2009). These were discussed during the afternoon discussion session. Participants were asked to decide how they would categorise these three examples, either 'not reef', 'low', 'medium' or 'high resemblance' to Annex I stony reef.

1. Extensive area ($>25\text{m}^2$) of seabed (topographically distinct from surrounding seafloor), with elevation $>64\text{mm}$ (say 2m), composed of gravel.
2. Extensive ($>25\text{m}^2$) banks/mounds of material 2m in elevation, composed of 30% cobbles ($>64\text{mm}$) or larger, with significant epifaunal communities on stable material.
3. Extensive ($>25\text{m}^2$) banks/mounds composed of 100% cobble ($>64\text{mm}$) material. Elevation ranges from 64mm up to ~2m. Significant epifaunal communities on stable material.

Refining the criteria for defining areas with a 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef

Appendix 4

Areas with a 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef: a Welsh inshore perspective. Presentation by Karen Robinson, Natural Resources Wales.

This presentation is included as supplemental information on the report entry:

JNCC-Report-656-Appendix4-NaturalResourcesWales.pdf

Refining the criteria for defining areas with a 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef

Appendix 5

Areas with a 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef: an English inshore perspective. Presentation by Trudy Russell, Natural England.

This presentation is included as supplemental information on the report entry:

JNCC-Report-656-Appendix5-NaturalEngland.pdf

Refining the criteria for defining areas with a 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef

Appendix 6

Areas with a 'low resemblance' to Annex I stony reef: a UK offshore perspective. Presentation by Fionnuala McBreen, Joint Nature Conservation Committee.

This presentation is included as supplemental information on the report entry:

JNCC-Report-656-Appendix6-JNCC.pdf

Appendix 7

Working paper exploring the inclusion of 'low resemblance' stony reef as an Annex I feature in Welsh inshore waters, considering disturbance and stability.

Author: Paul Brazier (NRW), 2020

This working paper is included as supplemental information on the report entry (jncc-report-656-Appendix-7.pdf). It is accompanied by a spreadsheet produced by Natural Resources Wales and provided in 2024 (jncc-report-656-app-7-biotopes-species-matrix.xlsx).

Appendix 8

An overview of work undertaken to examine the patchiness of habitats in UK offshore waters, and potential ways it could be recorded. Presentation by Joint Nature Conservation Committee.

This presentation is included as supplemental information on the report entry:

JNCC-Report-656-Appendix8-JNCC.pdf