



**Harbour Porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*)
Special Area of Conservation:
Bristol Channel Approaches / Dynesfeydd Môr
Hafren**

**Conservation Objectives and
Advice on Operations**

March 2019

Advice under Regulation 21 of The Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulation 2017 and Regulation 37(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

Further information

This document is available as a pdf file on the JNCC website for download if required (www.jncc.defra.gov.uk).

Contact details:**NE**

Natural England enquiries

Telephone: 0300 060 3900

Email: enquiries@naturalengland.org.uk

JNCC

Marine Species Advice Team

Joint Nature Conservation Committee

Inverdee House

Aberdeen

AB11 9QA

Email: OffshoreMPAs@jncc.gov.uk

Tel: +44 (0) 1224 266550

NRW

Marine Advice Team

Natural Resources Wales

Maes y Ffynnon

Bangor

LL57 2DW

Email: marine.n2k@naturalresourceswales.gov.uk

Tel: +44 (0) 300 065 3000

Summary of Conservation Objectives and Advice on Operations

The Conservation Objectives and Advice on Operations are set out for the Bristol Channel Approaches / Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren Special Area of Conservation (SAC) for harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*). The site covers both inshore (within 12 nautical miles of coast) and offshore (beyond 12 nautical miles of coast) waters where Natural England (NE), Natural Resources Wales (NRW) and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) have respective advisory responsibilities as the Statutory Nature Conservation Body (SNCB).

The general objective of achieving or maintaining Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) for all species and habitat types listed in Annexes I and II of the Habitats Directive needs to be translated into Conservation Objectives for SACs. These objectives describe the condition to be achieved by a site for it to contribute in the best possible way to achieving FCS at the national, bio-geographical and European level¹. The Advice on Operations is site-specific but based on a broad assessment of the sensitivity of the harbour porpoise to anthropogenic pressures at a UK scale.

The advice in this document has been developed using the best available scientific information and expert interpretation as of February 2019. The advice provided here may be subject to change as our knowledge about the site and the impacts of human activities improves.

To ensure the site contributes in the best possible way to achieving FCS, management of human activities occurring in or around the site is required if these activities are likely to have an adverse impact (directly or indirectly) on the integrity of the site, with regards to its Conservation Objectives. It should be noted that as a European Protected Species under Annex IV of the Habitats Directive, harbour porpoises are already strictly protected throughout their European range. As such, several conservation measures are already in place in the UK.

To achieve the Conservation Objectives for the Bristol Channel Approaches / Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren SAC, the relevant² and competent³ authorities should consider human activities within their remit which might affect the integrity of the site.

¹ <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/PDF/comm02D07.pdf>

² Relevant authorities are those who are already involved in some form of relevant marine regulatory function and would therefore be directly involved in the management of a marine site lying within territorial waters. The bodies which may be relevant authorities are listed in Regulation 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. All relevant authorities are also competent authorities.

³ Competent authorities are defined in Regulation 5 of the Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and Regulation 7 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. In summary, a competent authority is any person or organisation that has the legally delegated or invested authority (e.g. Minister, government department, public body of any kind or statutory undertaker) to perform a designated function.

Crynodeb o Amcanion Cadwraeth a Chyngor ynglŷn â Gweithgareddau

Mae'r Amcanion Cadwraeth a Chyngor ynglŷn â Gweithgareddau wedi'u cyflwyno ar gyfer yr ymgeisydd Ardal Cadwraeth Arbennig (yACA) Bristol Channel Approaches/Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren ar gyfer yr rhywogaeth Atodiad II, y llamhidydd (*Phocoena phocoena*). Mae'r safle'n cwmpasu dyfroedd y glannau (o fewn 12 morfilltir o'r arfordir) a dyfroedd alltraeth (tu hwnt i 12 morfilltir o'r arfordir) lle mae gan Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru (CNC), Natural England (NE) a'r Cyd-bwyllgor Gwarchod Natur (JNCC) gyfrifoldebau cynghori perthnasol.

Mae angen trosi'r amcan cyffredinol o gyrraedd neu gynnal Statws Cadwraeth Ffatriol i bob rhywogaeth a math o gynefin sydd wedi'u rhestru yn Atodiadau I a II o'r Gyfarwyddeb Cynefinoedd yn Amcanion Cadwraeth ar lefel safle. Mae rhain yn disgrifio'r cyflwr y dylai rhywogaethau a mathau o gynefin o fewn safle ei wireddu er mwyn i'r safle gyfrannu yn y ffordd orau posibl tuag at wireddu Statws Cadwraeth Ffatriol ar lefel genedlaethol, bio-ddaearyddol ac Ewropeaidd.

Mae'r Cyngor ynglŷn â Gweithgareddau yn benodol i safleoedd ond mae'n seiliedig ar asesiad ehangach o ba mor sensitif yw'r llamhidydd i bwysau anthropogenig ar lefel y DU. Datblygwyd y cyngor gan ddefnyddio'r wybodaeth gwyddonol orau bosibl a dehongliad arbenigol fel yr oedd ym mis Chwefror 2019. Bydd y cyngor a ddarperir yma yn newid wrth i'n gwybodaeth am y safle ac effeithiau gweithgareddau dyn wella.

Er mwyn sicrhau bod y safle'n cyfrannu at Statws Cadwraeth Ffatriol, mae angen rheoli gweithgareddau dyn ar y safle ac o'i gwmpas os ydynt yn debygol o gael effaith andwyol ar gyfanrwydd y safle (yn uniongyrchol neu'n anuniongyrchol) o safbwynt ei Amcanion Cadwraeth. Dylid nodi bod y llamhidydd yn ei warchod drwy Ewrop gyfan fel Rhywogaeth a Warchodir Gan Ewrop yn Atodiad IV y Gyfarwyddeb Cynefinoedd. O ganlyniad mae llawer o fesurau rheoli ar waith eisoes yn y DU.

Er mwyn diwallu Amcanion Cadwraeth safle llamhidydd Bristol Channel Approaches/Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren, dylai'r awdurdodau perthnasol^[1] a chymwys^[2] ystyried gweithgareddau dyn yn rhan o'u cylch gwaith a allai gael effaith ar gyfanrwydd y safle.

^[1] Awdurdodau perthnasol yw'r rhai sydd eisoes yn ymwneud â rhyw fath o swyddogaeth reoleiddiol forol berthnasol a fyddai'n ymwneud yn uniongyrchol felly â rheoli safle morol sydd o fewn dyfroedd tiriogaethol. Mae'r cyrff a all fod yn awdurdodau perthnasol wedi eu rhestru yn Rheoliad 6 Rheoliadau Gwarchod Cynefinoedd a Rhywogaethau 2017. Mae'r holl awdurdodau perthnasol hefyd yn awdurdodau cymwys.

^[2]

Mae awdurdodau cymwys yn cael eu diffinio yn Rheoliad 5, Rheoliadau Cadwraeth Cynefinoedd a Rhywogaethau Morol Alltraeth 2017 a Rheoliad 7, Rheoliadau Gwarchod Cynefinoedd a Rhywogaethau 2017. I grynhoi, mae awdurdod cymwys yn unrhyw berson neu sefydliad y rhoddwyd awdurdod cyfreithiol neu ddirprwyedig iddo (e.e. Gweinidog, adran o'r llywodraeth, unrhyw fath o gorff cyhoeddus neu ymgymerydd statudol) i gyflawni swyddogaeth ddynodedig.

Contents

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | Background..... | 1 |
| 2 | Responsibilities of Relevant and Competent Authorities | 2 |
| 3 | Conservation Objectives for harbour porpoise SACs | 2 |
| 3.1 | The role of Conservation Objectives | 2 |
| 3.2 | Background to Conservation Objectives | 3 |
| 3.3 | Bristol Channel Approaches / Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren SAC Conservation Objectives | 3 |
| 4 | Advice on Operations..... | 6 |
| 4.1 | Purpose of advice | 6 |
| 4.2 | Background..... | 7 |
| 5 | Operation assessments at UK scale | 7 |
| 6 | Site specific considerations: Bristol Channel Approaches/ Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren SAC9 | |
| 6.1 | Sensitivity of harbour porpoise to existing activities within or impacting on the site . | 9 |
| 6.2 | Limitations of the evidence..... | 17 |
| 7 | References | 19 |
| 8 | Annex A: Assessment of the level of impact risk from operations (activities) on UK harbour porpoise populations..... | 21 |
| 9 | Annex B: Definitions of Pressures as applied within harbour porpoise SAC Advice on Operations | 26 |

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Initial advice on a network of sites identified within UK waters for harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) was submitted to UK and Devolved Governments as a series of draft SACs in June 2015. The sites were identified within the UK portions of Management Units (MUs⁴) defined for the species (ICES, 2014; IAMMWG, 2015). The Welsh and Northern Ireland Governments, along with Defra on behalf of England and relevant offshore waters, gave approval for sites within their areas of jurisdiction to proceed to consultation (January to May 2016). In light of the responses to the consultation, five sites were submitted to the European Commission as candidate SACs in January 2017. These five sites were adopted by the EC as Sites of Community Importance (SCIs) on 12 December 2017 and designated as SACs by Ministers on 26th February 2019. These sites are shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Special Areas of Conservation for the harbour porpoise, *Phocoena phocoena* identified in Northern Ireland, England, Wales and offshore waters. The Management Unit (MU) boundary (red line) refers to the UK portion of the North Sea and Celtic and Irish Seas MUs.

⁴ For conservation and management purposes it is practical to divide the population into smaller units, termed Management Units (MUs). These MUs were developed to take account of biological populations of animals but were also determined by political boundaries and are at an appropriate scale at which to assess human activities. In the UK, three MUs have been defined for harbour porpoise: West of Scotland, Celtic and Irish Seas, and North Sea (IAMMWG, 2015)

This advice document is for the Bristol Channel Approaches / Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren SAC (Figure 2) which is subject to protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017⁵ and the Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulation 2017⁶ (collectively referred to as the Habitats Regulations). The advice is given in fulfilment of the duty of the Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCBs) under the Habitats Regulations to advise Relevant and Competent Authorities as to (a) the Conservation Objectives for the site; and (b) any operations which may cause deterioration of natural habitats or the habitats of species, or disturbance of species, for which the site has been designated. The SNCBs aim to ensure that the Conservation Objectives are up-to-date, accessible and enable the assessment of the potential effects of plans and projects.

2 Responsibilities of Relevant and Competent Authorities

Competent Authorities (including those which are also Relevant Authorities) are required to exercise their functions to comply with the Habitats Regulations. Competent Authorities must, within their areas of jurisdiction, consider both direct and indirect effects on the site. This includes considering operations inside and outside the boundary of the SAC, if the impacts could affect the achievement of the site's Conservation Objectives. Decisions on management measures (e.g. the scale and type of mitigation) are the responsibility of the relevant regulatory or management bodies. These bodies will consider SNCB advice and hold discussions with the sector concerned, where appropriate. Where consent is required and the operation (if considered a plan or project) is likely to significantly affect a European Site, Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive requires that an Appropriate Assessment (AA) is carried out. The AA is part of the "Habitat Regulations Assessment" (HRA), which is a case-specific assessment made in view of the Conservation Objectives for the affected site or sites. Each HRA requires case-specific advice from the SNCB but the assessment is the responsibility of the competent authority concerned.

The variability of harbour porpoise distribution and abundance within sites is in part due to their mobility and wide-ranging nature as well as natural and anthropogenic changes in habitat and prey. Relevant and Competent Authorities are not required to undertake any actions to ameliorate changes in the condition of the site if it is shown that the changes result wholly from natural causes. It is therefore important to contextualise any apparent changes in harbour porpoise presence within the site in terms of natural variability and the abundance and distribution patterns at the population level (i.e. MU).

3 Conservation Objectives for harbour porpoise SACs

3.1 The role of Conservation Objectives

Site level Conservation Objectives are a set of specified objectives designed to ensure that the site contributes in the best possible way to achieving Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) of the designated site feature(s) at the national and biogeographic level (EC, 2012). Conservation Objectives constitute a necessary reference for:

- identifying any site-based conservation measures that may be required;
- carrying out HRAs of the implications of plans or projects.

The purpose of the HRA is to determine whether a plan or project could adversely affect a site's integrity. The critical consideration in relation to site integrity is not the extent or degree of an impact, or whether an impact is direct or indirect, but whether a plan or project, either

⁵ <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2017/1012/contents/made>

⁶ <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2017/1013/contents/made>

individually or in combination with other plans or projects, affects the site's ability to achieve its Conservation Objectives and therefore contribute to Favourable Conservation Status.

Harbour porpoise are protected everywhere in European waters under the provisions of the Habitats Regulations. The harbour porpoise in UK waters are considered part of a wider European population and the highly mobile nature of this species means that the concept of a 'site population' is not considered an appropriate basis for expressing Conservation Objectives for this species. Site based conservation measures will complement wider ranging measures that are in place for the harbour porpoise.

3.2 Background to Conservation Objectives

The Conservation Objectives are designed to help ensure that the obligations of the Habitats Directive can be met. Article 6(2) of the Directive requires that there should be no deterioration or significant disturbance of the qualifying species or to the habitats upon which they rely. Therefore, the focus of the Conservation Objectives for harbour porpoise sites is on addressing pressures that affect site integrity and would include:

- killing or injuring harbour porpoise (directly or indirectly);
- preventing their use of significant parts of the site (disturbance / displacement);
- significantly damaging relevant habitats; or
- significantly reducing the availability of prey.

This document includes both a statement of the Conservation Objectives and explanatory text on their intent and interpretation specific to the site. The Objectives have been set taking account of European Commission guidance (EC, 2012). Further guidance on the management of specific pressures on harbour porpoise is being developed.


3.3 Bristol Channel Approaches / Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren SAC Conservation Objectives

The qualifying feature of the site is the Habitats Directive Annex II species:

- harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*)

Seasonal differences in the relative use of the site have been identified based on the analyses of Heinänen and Skov (2015). Harbour porpoise sightings data were modelled seasonally (Summer: April-September and Winter: October-March) for each MU. The outputs of this analysis were maps of areas by season and MU, that persistently contained elevated densities of harbour porpoises. These areas were used as the basis for site identification and as a consequence, sites may have seasonal components which should be considered in the assessment of impacts and proposed management. Bristol Channel Approaches / Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren (Figure 2) has been designated because of its importance to harbour porpoise in the winter months (October to March).

Bristol Channel Approaches / Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren



Includes data provided by UKHO, Defra, OS and JNCC. © Crown Copyright © OS MasterMap. All rights reserved.
Not to be used for navigation. © JNCC 02/2019. Coordinates displayed in WGS84 geographic coordinate system. Site area calculated using modified Europe_Albers_Equal_Area_Conic_UK projection.

| ID | Latitude | Longitude | ID | Latitude | Longitude | ID | Latitude | Longitude |
|----|-----------------|----------------|----|-----------------|----------------|----|-----------------|----------------|
| 1 | 51° 33' 50.9" N | 4° 20' 1.3" W | 8 | 51° 0' 32.0" N | 4° 32' 9.0" W | 14 | 50° 51' 6.0" N | 5° 9' 27.8" W |
| 2 | 51° 33' 48.3" N | 4° 20' 44.1" W | 9 | 50° 15' 17.4" N | 5° 18' 49.2" W | 15 | 50° 59' 6.7" N | 5° 10' 52.6" W |
| 3 | 51° 32' 12.4" N | 4° 20' 28.6" W | 10 | 50° 14' 35.3" N | 5° 28' 27.3" W | 16 | 50° 58' 48.7" N | 5° 15' 6.3" W |
| 4 | 51° 28' 26.2" N | 4° 37' 7.9" W | 11 | 50° 22' 35.6" N | 5° 29' 53.4" W | 17 | 51° 14' 49.8" N | 5° 17' 59.2" W |
| 5 | 51° 27' 52.1" N | 4° 45' 44.3" W | 12 | 50° 40' 7.3" N | 5° 11' 48.0" W | 18 | 51° 32' 55.6" N | 4° 50' 56.4" W |
| 6 | 51° 25' 11.8" N | 4° 45' 17.1" W | 13 | 50° 50' 48.2" N | 5° 13' 40.9" W | 19 | 51° 38' 16.5" N | 4° 51' 52.1" W |
| 7 | 51° 23' 5.2" N | 4° 36' 17.1" W | | | | | | |

Figure 2: Bristol Channel Approaches / Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren Special Area of Conservation for harbour porpoise.

The Conservation Objectives for the site are:

To ensure that the integrity of the site is maintained and that it makes the best possible contribution to maintaining Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) for Harbour Porpoise in UK waters

In the context of natural change, this will be achieved by ensuring that:

1. Harbour porpoise is a viable component of the site;
2. There is no significant disturbance of the species; and
3. The condition of supporting habitats and processes, and the availability of prey is maintained.

Conservation Objective 1: Harbour porpoise is a viable component of the site

This SAC has been selected primarily based on the long-term, relatively higher densities of porpoise in contrast to other areas of the MU. The implication is that the SAC provides relatively good foraging habitat and may also be used for breeding and calving. However, because the number of harbour porpoise using the site naturally varies (e.g. between seasons), there is no exact number of animals within the site.

The intent of this objective is to minimise the risk of injury and killing or other factors that could restrict the survivability and reproductive potential of harbour porpoise using the site. Specifically, this objective is primarily concerned with operations that would result in unacceptable levels of those impacts on harbour porpoises using the site. Unacceptable levels can be defined as those having an impact on the FCS of the populations of the species in their natural range. The reference population for assessments against this objective is the MU population in which the SAC is situated (IAMMWG 2015).

The harbour porpoise is a European Protected Species (EPS) listed on Annex IV of the Habitats Directive and as such is protected under the Habitats Directive Article 12 and transposing regulations from deliberate killing (or injury), capture and disturbance throughout its range. In addition, Article 12 (4) of the Habitats Directive is concerned with incidental capture and killing. It states that Member States 'shall establish a system to monitor the incidental capture and killing of the species listed on Annex IV (all cetaceans). In the light of the information gathered, Member States shall take further research or conservation measures as required to ensure that incidental capture and killing does not have a significant negative impact on the species concerned'. Site based measures should therefore be aligned with the existing strict protection measures in place throughout UK waters. Significant disturbance within or affecting the site is considered in the second conservation objective.

Conservation Objective 2: There is no significant disturbance of the species

Disturbance of harbour porpoise typically, but not exclusively, originates from operations that cause underwater noise including, as examples, seismic surveys, pile driving and sonar. Responses to noise can be physiological and/or behavioural. JNCC has produced guidelines to minimise the risk of physical injury to cetaceans from various sources of loud, underwater noise⁷. However, disturbance is primarily a behavioural response to noise and may, for example, lead to harbour porpoises being displaced from the affected area.

This SAC was identified as having persistently higher densities of harbour porpoises (Heinänen and Skov 2015) compared to other areas of the MU. This is likely linked to the habitats within the site providing good feeding opportunities. Therefore, operations within or

⁷ <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-4273>

affecting the site should be managed to ensure that the animals' potential usage of the site is maintained. Disturbance is considered significant if it leads to the exclusion of harbour porpoise from a significant portion of the site. Specifically, draft SNCB advice / guidance for assessing the significance of noise disturbance to a site suggests:

Noise disturbance within an SAC from a plan/project individually or in combination is significant if it excludes harbour porpoises from more than:

1. 20% of the relevant area⁸ of the site in any given day⁹, and
2. an average of 10% of the relevant area of the site over a season^{10,11}.

Conservation Objective 3: The condition of supporting habitats and processes, and the availability of prey is maintained

Supporting habitats, in this context, means the characteristics of the seabed and water column. Processes encompass the movements and physical properties of the habitat. The maintenance of supporting habitats and processes contributes to ensuring that prey is maintained within the site and is available to harbour porpoises using the site. Some evidence shows that the harbour porpoise has a high metabolic rate compared to terrestrial mammals of similar size (Rojano-Doñate et al. 2018) and high feeding rates (Wisniewska et al., 2016). The harbour porpoise is therefore thought to be a species that is highly dependent on a year-round proximity to food sources and its distribution and condition may strongly reflect the availability and energy density of its prey (Brodie 1995 in Santos & Pierce, 2003). The densities of porpoise using a site are likely linked to the availability (and density) of prey within the site. Harbour porpoise eat a variety of prey including gobies, sandeel, whiting, herring and sprat. However, the diet of porpoises when within the sites is not well known but is likely comparable to that in the wider seas.

There are several operations (Table 2) which potentially affect the achievement of this Conservation Objective. Whilst some plans/projects are unlikely to have a significant effect alone, an effect might become significant when considered in combination with other plans/projects and against the background of existing activities/pressures on the site. Further work is needed to assess historic, existing and planned levels of plans/projects in the sites and to better understand their impacts on the habitats and prey within the sites.

4 Advice on Operations

4.1 Purpose of advice

This section details the activities specifically occurring within or close to the Bristol Channel Approaches / Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren SAC that would be expected to impact the site; this is

⁸ The relevant area is defined as that part of the SAC that was designated on the basis of higher persistent densities for that season (summer defined as April to September inclusive, winter as October to March inclusive).

⁹ Applicable only in Habitats Regulations Assessments (HRA) due to impracticality of daily noise limit management of activities, but retrospective compliance analysis advised

¹⁰ Summer defined as April to September inclusive, winter as October to March inclusive

¹¹ For example, a daily footprint of 19% for 95 days would result in an average of $19 \times 95 / 183$ days (summer) = 9.86%

known as Advice on Operations. Initial assessments were conducted at a UK scale, with subsequent site-level assessment detailing our understanding of the operations and their potential to impact the site (Sections 5 and 6). Advice is only given where pressures¹² may impact the site and therefore, may require management, if the Conservation Objectives are to be met. Widespread pressures may also act to affect the overall status of harbour porpoise, but their effects are not restricted to specific sites. Such pressures are best dealt with through broader measures. Alongside and in addition to the identification of the network of harbour porpoise sites, an overarching conservation strategy (DETR, 2000) has been in place for harbour porpoise since 2000. In light of a recent conservation literature review (IAMMWG *et al* 2015), a UK Dolphin and Porpoise Conservation Strategy is being developed.

The advice outlined below should also be used to help identify the extent to which existing operations are, or can be made, consistent with the Conservation Objectives, and thereby focus the attention of Relevant and Competent Authorities and monitoring programmes to areas that may need management measures.

This Advice on Operations will be supplemented through further discussions with the Relevant and Competent Authorities and any advisory groups that may be formed for the site.

4.2 Background

In compiling this Advice on Operations, the SNCBs have considered the pressures that may be caused by human activities and may affect the integrity of the site when considered against the Conservation Objectives. The advice is generated through a broad grading of sensitivity and exposure of the harbour porpoise to pressures associated with activities to gain an understanding of how vulnerable the species is to each activity at a UK level. The activities and their associated pressures to which the harbour porpoise is deemed vulnerable at a UK level are then considered at a site level to inform the risks to achieving the Conservation Objectives along with any potential management that may be required to mitigate against such risks. Annex A details the assessments of the level of impact risk¹³ from operations on harbour porpoise populations at a UK-wide scale. This informs on the activities/operations likely to impact the site.

This document is guidance only and activities/operations and their management within or affecting the site will be considered in the context of a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and where applicable through other environmental assessment processes, such as Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

5 Operation assessments at UK scale

The assessments have been carried out using all available evidence as of February 2019. If further information is made available in future which would improve our understanding of harbour porpoise vulnerability in UK waters, the assessments may be updated. This advice is provided without prejudice for use by the Relevant and Competent Authorities. The level of any impact will depend on the location, timing and intensity of the relevant operation. This advice is provided to assist and focus the Relevant and Competent Authorities in their consideration of the management of these operations.

The harbour porpoise is a wide-ranging species and occurs throughout the UK Continental Shelf area (JNCC, 2013). It does occur in deeper waters but in very low densities, and

¹² See Annex B for definition of key terms

¹³ Risk includes consideration of severity of implications of impact

perhaps only seasonally. As a predominantly continental shelf species, it is exposed to a wide range of pressures that are both ubiquitous (e.g. pollution) and patchy (e.g. bycatch) in nature, and the list of anthropogenic activities leading to these pressures is long. Based on current available information, the operations that pose the most notable risk of impact to UK harbour porpoise are shown in Table 1.

The current levels of impact of the various pressures are based on the Article 17 assessments¹⁴ and the full list of assessed activities and key references can be found in Annex A. Updates to the assessments will occur as more evidence becomes available. Definitions of pressures are explained in Annex B.

Activities which currently pose a low risk of impact to harbour porpoise at the UK level (Annex A) have not been considered in this advice. The exposure to the pressures associated with these activities is currently very limited. Non-anthropogenic impacts are also not considered, such as attack and predation from other marine mammal species that have the potential to impact harbour porpoise populations.

¹⁴ EU Habitats Directive Article 17 assessment, harbour porpoise report: http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/Article17Consult_20131010/S1351_UK.pdf . Updated Article 17 reports for 2013-2018 will be available in 2019.

Table 1: Key activities (operations) and the relative level of risk of impact on harbour porpoise in UK waters. Those pressures ranked 'high' are known to have the greatest impact relative to other pressures on the population of UK harbour porpoises. Activities which currently pose a low risk are not shown.

| Operations | Pressures | Impacts | Current relative level of risk of impact |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Commercial fisheries with bycatch of harbour porpoise (predominantly static nets) | Removal of non-target species | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mortality through entanglement/bycatch | High |
| Discharge/run-off from land-fill, terrestrial and offshore industries | Contaminants | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on water and prey quality • Bioaccumulation through contaminated prey ingestion • Health issues (e.g. on reproduction) | High |
| Shipping, drilling, dredging and disposal, aggregate extraction, pile driving, acoustic surveys, underwater explosion, military activity, acoustic deterrent devices and recreational boating activity | Anthropogenic underwater sound | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mortality • Internal injury • Disturbance leading to physical and acoustic behavioural changes (potentially impacting foraging, navigation, breeding, socialising) • Habitat change/loss | Medium |
| Shipping, recreational boating, tidal energy installations | Death or injury by collision | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mortality • Injury | Medium/Low |
| Commercial fisheries (reduction in prey resources) | Removal of target species | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in food availability • Increased competition from other species • Displacement from natural range | Medium |

6 Site specific considerations: Bristol Channel Approaches/ Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren SAC

6.1 Sensitivity of harbour porpoise to existing activities within or impacting on the site

The Bristol Channel Approaches / Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren site covers an area of 5,850km² and stretches along the north Cornish coast and across the Bristol Channel north towards Carmarthen Bay in Wales. Further detail on the site can be found in the Selection Assessment Document on the Site Information Centre¹⁵.

All available information on activities within the site has been used to assess the threats and pressures within the site. However, precise information on some activities within the boundary is not currently available due to lack of targeted data collection to date. Assessing

¹⁵ Site Information Centre for BCA: <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-7241>

exposure carries certain assumptions about the spatial extent, frequency and intensity of the pressures associated with marine activities.

Table 2 is an overview of activities (operations) occurring within or in proximity to the Bristol Channel Approaches / Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren site to which the harbour porpoise has a current level of impact risk of High or Medium at UK level (Table 1) and therefore may require further consideration concerning options for management. The impact of a pressure at the site level can differ to that at UK level dependent on the amount of activity within or adjacent to the site. GIS layers of spatial activity data as well as review of literature, were used to identify the impact risk within the site (where a pressure is concentrated within a site) and whether it differs from the UK level risk. These assessments include all available information as of February 2019.

In 2012, Defra announced a revised approach to the management of fishing activities within European Marine Sites (EMS) in England¹⁶. The revised approach is designed to ensure consistency in the management of fishing activities with Article 6 of the Habitats Directive. Risk based prioritisation of managing the fishing activities of UK and non-UK vessels has been applied to relevant SAC features within the English 12 nm territorial limit. For SACs or parts of SACs outside of 12 nm, management measures will be introduced by appropriate regulators to ensure adequate protection.

The Welsh Government is assessing new fisheries legislation and permitted activities under Article 6 of the Habitats and Birds Directives. The Welsh Government, in partnership with Natural Resources Wales, are undertaking a structured evaluation of the impacts from fishing activities (from licensed and registered commercial fishing vessels) on the features of Marine Protected Areas (MPA) in Welsh waters. This is referred to as the Assessing Welsh Fishing Activities (AWFA) Project¹⁷. The Welsh Government is responsible for decisions relating to whether additional management measures are required to avoid impacts to features of MPAs in Welsh waters. The evidence base provided by the AWFA Project will inform fisheries management decisions and support the aims of The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015, The Environment (Wales) Act 2016 and the Habitats Directive by contributing to the sustainable management of the marine environment.

JNCC and the country SNCBs are working with the Regulators and Industry to ensure that a pragmatic approach to mitigation and management of pressures that may affect the integrity of the site is adopted. Any future guidance documents will be made available on the Site Information Centre on the JNCC website.

¹⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/revised-approach-to-the-management-of-commercial-fisheries-in-european-marine-sites-overarching-policy-and-delivery>

¹⁷ <https://naturalresources.wales/about-us/our-projects/marine-projects/assessing-welsh-fishing-activities/?lang=en>

Table 2: Operations (activities) occurring within/near to the Bristol Channel Approaches/ Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren site which may affect the integrity of the site.

| Operations | Pressure | Comment on current level of activity | Management considerations |
|---|---|---|--|
| Fisheries (commercial and recreational) with harbour porpoise bycatch | Removal of non-target (bycatch) species | <p>Bycatch of harbour porpoise in fishing gear is one of the most significant anthropogenic pressures impacting the population at a UK level. The commercial fisheries most associated with harbour porpoise bycatch are bottom set nets, such as gillnets and tangle nets.</p> <p>Data obtained from the UK Bycatch Monitoring Programme shows higher levels of fishing effort in parts of the site, with small vessels (<12m) deploying both static and drift nets throughout the site, resulting in particularly high effort along the Cornish coast. The high effort is partly located within the site, but extends around Penzance and along the south coast of England. Bycatch has been recorded within the site, but is higher in the surrounding areas, particularly in the South Western Approaches, although with differing vessel types/metiers (ICES 7d-g) (e.g. Northridge <i>et al</i> 2016). According to Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data, there is some static net effort from larger (≥12m) UK vessels in western offshore waters of the site but limited evidence</p> | <p>Where bycatch may pose a risk to achieving the site's conservation objectives, the site may have to be assessed and where necessary, mitigation may need to be considered.</p> <p>Where management measures are required, the development of these would be led by fishery managers in discussion with fishing interests and informed by any detailed information about fishing activity that can be made available. Detailed measures, if required, will be developed by the relevant management authority (European Commission/MMO/IFCA/Defra/Welsh Government).</p> <p>Current measures in place to mitigate bycatch are the use of pingers to comply with Reg812/2004. However, gillnetters of >12m working within the site operate within ICES area VIIa and are not legally required to use pingers under EU Regulation 812/2004¹⁸. The bulk of the bycatch in the UK is taken by the numerous small bottom-set gillnetting vessels (<12m), for which the use of pingers is not mandatory under Regulation 812/2004.</p> |

¹⁸ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2004:150:0012:0031:EN:PDF>

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>for non-UK vessel activity.</p> <p>Recreational netting also occurs at a low level of effort along the coast (at least in Wales) but bycatch here is thought to be negligible.</p> | |
| Discharge/ run-off from land-fill, terrestrial/ offshore industries | Contaminants | <p>Current exposure within/near the site is unknown. Historical metal mining operation outfalls potentially exist within the site.</p> | <p>This pressure generally cannot be managed effectively at the site level. Most of the relevant pollutants have been effectively phased out of use by action under the OSPAR Convention and, more recently, the EU (through Council Directives 67/548/EEC and 76769/EEC and the Stockholm convention, which restrict the marketing and use of PCBs; plan for disposal of PCBs; and eliminate or restrict the production and use of persistent organic pollutants [POPs]). However, human activities are the most likely cause of the re-release of these chemically stable chemicals into the environment or for introduction of other contaminants of which the impacts are poorly known.</p> <p>Any novel sources of potential contamination and/or activities likely to cause re-release of pollutants from stores associated with a new plan or project will be assessed under HRA both within and outside the site where there is the potential to impact upon site integrity.</p> <p>Current sources of exposure have to be identified and further efforts to limit or eliminate PCB discharges to the marine environment may still be needed.</p> |
| Shipping | Anthropogenic underwater sound | <p>Moderate levels of shipping through the site, predominantly running parallel to the coast of SW England and SW Wales into Bristol Channel ports (Cardiff, Newport, Barry and Avonmouth). Some aggregate is landed at Burry port in the north of the site.</p> | <p>Harbour porpoise use sound for foraging, navigation, communication and predator detection. Underwater noise therefore has the potential to interrupt or affect these behaviours as well as cause hearing damage, particularly at short distances. The peak frequency of echolocation pulses produced by harbour porpoise is 120–130 kHz, corresponding to their peak hearing sensitivity although hearing occurs throughout the range of ~1 and 180 kHz (Southall <i>et al</i> 2007).</p> <p>The underwater sounds created by large ships are unlikely to cause physical trauma, but could make preferred habitats less attractive as a result of disturbance (habitat</p> |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | displacement, area avoidance). However, additional management is unlikely to be required based on current levels of activity within the site. Significant increases in vessel traffic, for example as may be associated with the installation of large-scale marine developments in the area, would be routinely assessed in HRA. |
| Pile Driving | | <p>There are currently no plans for the development of a commercial offshore windfarm within/close to the site although there are proposals for trials of small numbers of floating turbines at Wave Hub off the N Cornwall coast within the site.</p> <p>Harbour/marina developments and other marine developments, may utilise impact piling during construction.</p> | <p>A European Protected Species (EPS) licence may be needed for any construction activity which carries the risk of significant disturbance or deliberate injury to cetaceans. Developers are advised to follow the 'Statutory Nature Conservation Agency protocol for minimising the risk of injury to marine mammals from piling noise'¹⁹.</p> <p>Management measures will be assessed if and when new plans or projects come forward. Further advice on assessment and management of noisy activities within the sites is being developed by the SNCBs in consultation with Regulators, industry and NGOs.</p> |
| Dredging and disposal | | Small overlap of a dredge disposal site close to the English coast. | <p>Dredging and disposal can cause disturbance leading to changes in harbour porpoise behaviour as well as to their habitat and prey. There is also potential for resuspension of pollutants from the sediment. The risk from single plans/projects may be considered relatively low but this is assessed through a formal HRA. However, there is currently considerable uncertainty regarding effects on habitat and prey.</p> <p>New dredge and disposal projects (or licence renewals) are subject to HRA. Cumulative impacts will be considered within the HRA.</p> |
| Aggregate extraction | | An active aggregate extraction site is located within the site (Nobel Bank). | <p>Aggregate extraction can cause disturbance leading to changes to harbour porpoise behaviour as well as to their habitat and prey. However, the risk is considered relatively low for single plans/projects and additional management is unlikely to be required.</p> <p>New aggregate extraction projects (or licence renewals) are subject to HRA.</p> |

¹⁹https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/50006/jncc-pprotocol.pdf

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| | | | Cumulative impacts will be considered within the HRA. |
| Geophysical surveys (including seismic) | | Commercial seismic activity is currently of a low level in the site, although large-scale surveys have covered areas within the site boundary in the past. Some acoustic surveys are carried out in relation to marina works. Commercial and research based acoustic seabed surveys using multibeam and/or sidescan sonar occur in parts of the site. | <p>Some geophysical surveys that may affect the integrity of the site may require consent and be subject to HRA. Each case needs to be assessed individually, and the <i>JNCC Guidelines for minimising the risk of injury to marine mammals from geophysical surveys</i> (updated August 2017²⁰) are available online. Within the guidance, seismic survey is defined as ‘Any geophysical survey that uses airguns to generate sound which is sent into the seabed and the reflected energy is recorded and processed to produce images of the geological strata below; described as 2D, 3D and 4D and includes any similar techniques that use airguns.’</p> <p>There may also need to be a consideration of sub-bottom profilers in HRA on a case by case basis. It is currently not known whether these could cause disturbance to harbour porpoise. Further research is needed to understand the sound propagation and effect ranges from these types of equipment.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts of geophysical surveys will need to be considered.</p> <p>Further advice on assessment and management of noisy activities within the sites is being developed by the SNCBs in consultation with Regulators, industry and NGOs.</p> |
| Recreational boating activity | | Royal Yachting Association (RYA) cruising routes throughout the site. Some pockets of higher sailing and racing activity around Tenby, Padstow and between Barnstaple and Lundy Island. | <p>Adherence to wildlife codes of conduct is already advocated, e.g:</p> <p>WiSe scheme; SeaWatch code of conduct; ZSL code of conduct; The RYA good practice guide - The Green Wildlife Guide for Boaters; Cornwall Marine and Coastal Code; Wild Seas Wales and Swansea code of conduct.</p> <p>UK SNCBs are looking at the option of developing a wildlife watching code of conduct to sit alongside the Scottish code.</p> |
| Acoustic deterrent/mitigation devices | | Negligible or not currently present but may be used as a mitigation tool during | Management/assessment would be required for use of devices in the site since they introduce noise to the environment and are designed to disturb marine mammals. |

²⁰ http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/jncc_guidelines_seismicsurvey_apr2017.pdf.

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | noise-generating activities. | |
| Pinger devices | | <p>Requirement on >12m vessels (EC Reg812/2004).</p> <p>All southwest based (e.g ICES area VIIe,f,g,h) >12m vessels have the Dolphin Deterrent Device (DDD) pingers. But none of the registered set net vessels >12m are known to fish in the site.</p> | <p>See 'Fisheries (commercial and recreational) with harbour porpoise bycatch'.</p> <p>The use of pingers is already required under Reg812/2004 for >12m sector but the relevant registered set net vessels do not fish within the site.</p> <p>However, because vessels <12m are the greatest component of the UK gillnetting fleet, most bycatch occurs in this sector. Effort by this sector of the fleet in the site is currently considered low and, therefore, risk of bycatch is also likely to be low. The need for further management will need to be fully assessed based on local fisheries data but it is currently considered unlikely that further measures will be required.</p> <p>If further measures were deemed necessary, one option for management could be to extend the pinger requirement to vessels deploying static nets within site boundaries. However, the impact of potential disturbance as a result of pinger use in the site may need to be assessed and the potential for other mitigation options such as alternative gear types or gear modifications could be considered.</p> |
| Military activity | | <p>Pendine and Pembrey MOD firing ranges are situated in Carmarthen Bay but out with the site. Pendine regularly has firing activity directly into the sea whereas activity at Pembrey is usually limited to low flying aircraft and terrestrial target practice. Regardless of the location of known firing ranges, the MOD can operate anywhere in UK waters.</p> | <p>Activities take place under Range Standing Orders, command guidance and environmental risk management tools, which include measures to reduce the risk of killing, injury and disturbance of marine mammals (for example live firing trials are subject to confirmation that marine mammals are not present in the vicinity of targets). No further management is considered necessary as MOD, which are a Competent Authority, incorporates the cSACs into their assessments via their MOD Environmental Protection Guidelines (Maritime) and Marine Environment and Sustainability Assessment Tool (MESAT)²¹.</p> |
| Unexploded ordnance (UXOs) | | <p>Unknown whether they exist in the site. However, unexploded ordnance from WWII</p> | <p>Although the impact from removal (detonation) of unexploded ordnance (UXOs) is short term, the noise is significant and can cause injury or</p> |

²¹ <http://www.royalnavy.mod.uk/-/media/royal-navy-responsive/documents/useful-resources/environmental-protection/environmental-protection-guidelines-maritime-v21.pdf?la=en-gb>

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>can be found in many areas in UK seas. UXO is also possible from military activity such as within firing ranges.</p> <p>Projects that could inadvertently explode UXOs must undertake a survey to search for possible ordnance ahead of the project commencing. Any ordnance found must be exploded on site, or removed for health and safety reasons.</p> | <p>death to harbour porpoise. A HRA may be required. A European Protected Species licence may also be required.</p> <p>Mitigation is usually required to reduce risk of injury and killing. As a minimum, the JNCC guidelines for minimising the risk of disturbance and injury to marine mammals whilst using explosives are applied. A combination of Marine Mammal Observers (MMO)s, Acoustic Deterrent Devices (ADD) and occasionally scare charges are used to ensure harbour porpoise and other marine mammals are a sufficient distance from the explosion to prevent death or injury. Discussions are ongoing between industry, regulators and SNCBs on the most appropriate suite of mitigation measures for UXO clearance (including the possible use of bubble curtains). This will depend on the size of UXOs likely to be encountered and the practicality of deployment of the mitigation measure, amongst other factors.</p> |
| Shipping | Death or injury by collision | Relatively low levels of shipping (see above). | Post mortem investigations of stranded harbour porpoise (Deaville and Jepson, 2011; Deaville 2011:2017) have revealed some deaths caused by trauma (potentially linked with vessel strikes). However, this is not currently considered a significant risk and no additional management is likely to be required. |
| Recreational boating activity | | Cruising routes throughout the site. Some pockets of higher sailing and racing activity around Tenby, Padstow and between Barnstaple and Lundy Island. Wildlife watching organisations also operate in the SAC. | <p>See 'Shipping' (with death or injury by collision) above.</p> <p>Boats conducting recreational activity should adhere to wildlife codes of conduct to avoid risk of collision (see 'recreational boating activity' with regards to underwater noise).</p> |
| Wet renewable energy installations | | South Pembrokeshire demonstration zone for wave energy is situated directly outside of the boundary. North Cornwall 'Wavehub' wave energy leasing areas exists within the site. | <p>New tidal range, tidal stream and wave projects would be subject to a HRA. Additionally, an EPS licence might be suitable if there is a residual risk of significant disturbance or injury. Any consented, but not yet built, tidal stream and tidal range developments likely to impact the SAC will likely undergo a review of consent.</p> <p>Animal detection systems, e.g. active and passive acoustics, may be used to monitor animal presence and behaviour</p> |

| | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p>around devices for consented projects. These systems might be used to establish any probable collisions and invoke adaptive management decisions. In addition, the use of ADDs has been suggested as a mitigation tool to exclude animals from the vicinity of devices.</p> <p>Potential future mitigation related to death or injury by collision will be based on new and emerging research and evidence.</p> |
| Commercial fisheries (and recreational set nets) | Removal of target (prey) species | Demersal fisheries operate within the site, targeting species such as flatfish, whiting and other demersal round fish as well as other potential harbour porpoise prey. Also, pelagic fisheries target sandeel, sprat, herring and mackerel. The prey of harbour porpoise when in the site is currently unknown. | <p>Currently, most commercial species are managed at scales relevant for stock management via the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP), and not at the site level.</p> <p>Harbour porpoise diet within UK waters includes a wide variety of fish and they will generally focus on the most abundant local species (De Pierrepont <i>et al</i> 2005; Camphuysen <i>et al</i> 2006). The predominant prey type in UK appears to be whiting, gobies and sandeel, although shoaling fish such as mackerel and herring are also taken. Harbour porpoise diets overlap extensively with diets of other piscivorous marine predators (notably seals) and many of the main prey species are also taken by commercial fisheries, although porpoise tend to take smaller fish than those targeted by fisheries (Santos and Pierce 2003).</p> <p>The overlap between commercial fisheries and harbour porpoise prey is unknown within the site. Further research is required to establish whether any management will be required.</p> |

6.2 Limitations of the evidence

It is important to note that the information used to catalogue activities occurring within the site is not complete. The available data are drawn from existing monitoring programmes (e.g. the UK's Bycatch Monitoring Scheme for Protected Species and other European datasets linked to VMS monitoring of fishing vessels) but these have limitations, including availability and accessibility of data at the time of preparing this advice. Caveats with how the data have been collected also need to be understood to correctly interpret the information. This has resulted in the use of expert judgement where sufficient evidence is lacking but risk is implied. Below are some points to consider alongside the above table to ensure the information is not taken out of context:

- **Data availability**

- Globally, the marine environment, particularly in offshore areas, is generally far behind the evidence levels for the terrestrial environment, mainly due to scale and difficulty/cost of data acquisition.
- There can be sensitivities surrounding data that have been gathered by industry, and some data are not available for use for advice and management purposes. Often these data can become available, but not in time to inform management decisions.
- **Fishing: Limitations of fishing Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data**
 - VMS positional data are transmitted at approximately 2 hour intervals. There is no information transmitted regarding precise vessel activity, therefore assumptions about activity, based on logbook returns and vessel speed profile, are often made.
 - Vessel positional data (VMS) cannot inform regulators regarding extent of static gear deployment or soak times.
 - Fishing vessels under 12m long, (and until 2013, vessels under 15m long) are not required to use the VMS, and therefore VMS data tells us nothing regarding the activity of this segment of the fleet. However, local information can be obtained from fisheries management authorities and will be used to develop more detailed guidance to assist with identification of any management measures where considered necessary.
 - In Wales, the Scallop fishing fleet (mostly <12m long) have vessel tracking devices (Succorfish). There is no evidence of harbour porpoise bycatch associated with this fleet.
- **Contaminants**
 - Although use of many of the relevant substances (e.g. PCBs) has been heavily regulated for many years, including a ban on further production, re-suspension or reintroduction of pollutants may occur. It is difficult to identify sources of contamination when dealing with highly mobile species.

7 References

- Article 17 Report, 2013. European Community Directive on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (92/43/EEC) Third Report by the United Kingdom under Article 17 on the implementation of the Directive from January 2007 to December 2012 Conservation status assessment for Species: S1351 - Harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*). Available at: http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/Article17Consult_20131010/S1351_UK.pdf
- Camphuysen, C.J., Scott, B.E. and Wanless, S. 2006. Distribution and foraging interactions of seabirds and marine mammals in the North Sea: multispecies foraging assemblages and habitat-specific feeding strategies. Top Predators in Marine Ecosystems: Their Role in Monitoring and Management (eds Boyd, I, Wanless, S, and Camphuysen, C.J.), pp. 82–97. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Deaville, R. (2011:2017). Annual reports for the period 1st January to 31st December. UK Cetacean Strandings Investigation Programme (CSIP). <http://ukstrandings.org/csip-reports/>
- Deaville, R. and Jepson, P.D. (Eds). 2011. Final Report for the period 1st January 2005 – 31st December 2010. Cetacean Stranding Investigation Programme CSIP, Defra contracts CR0346 and CR0364. Available at: [http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Document.aspx?Document=FinalCSIPReport2005-2010_finalversion061211released\[1\].pdf](http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Document.aspx?Document=FinalCSIPReport2005-2010_finalversion061211released[1].pdf)
- DETR. 2000. A UK conservation strategy for the harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*). Department for the Environment Transport and the Regions; Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food; Scottish Executive Rural Affairs Department; Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (Northern Ireland); National Assembly for Wales Environment Division; Department of the Environment in Northern Ireland
- De Pierrepont, J.F. Dubois, B., Desormonts, S., Santos, M.B.A. and Robin, J.P. 2005. Stomach contents of English Channel cetaceans stranded on the coast of Normandy. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom. 85:1539-1546.
- EC, 2012. Commission Note on Setting Conservation Objectives for Natura 2000 Sites. http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/legislation/habitatsdirective/docs/commission_note2.pdf
- Heinänen, S. and Skov, H. 2015, The identification of discrete and persistent areas of relatively high harbour porpoise density in the wider UK marine area, JNCC Report 544, Peterborough, ISSN 0963 8091.
- IAMMWG, 2015. Management Units for cetaceans in UK waters (January 2015). JNCC Report No. 547, JNCC Peterborough. http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/Report_547_webv2.pdf
- IAMMWG. Camphuysen, C.J. & Siemensma, M.L. 2015. A Conservation Literature Review for the Harbour Porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*). JNCC Report No. 566, Peterborough. 96pp
- ICES, 2014. OSPAR request on implementation of MSFD for marine mammals. General Advice, May 2014. http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2014/Special%20Requests/OSPAR_Implementation_of_MSFD_for_marine_mammals.pdf
- Law, R.J., Bolam, T., James, D., Deaville, R., Reid, R.J., Penrose, R. and Jepson, P.D. 2012. Butyltin compounds in liver of harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) from the UK prior to and following the ban on the use of tributyltin in antifouling paints (1992-2005 & 2009) Marine Pollution Bulletin, 64: 2576-2580.
- JNCC, 2013. Third Report by the United Kingdom under Article 17 on the implementation of the Directive from January 2007 to December 2012. Conservation status assessment for Species: S1351 - Harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*). http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/Article17Consult_20131010/S1351_UK.pdf
- Northridge, S., Kingston, A., Thomas, L. 2016. Report to the European Commission on the implementation of Regulation 812/2004 by the United Kingdom for the calendar year 2015. Annual report on the implementation of Council regulation (EC) No 812/2004 for the Member

- State United Kingdom. Sea Mammal Research Unit / Scottish Oceans Institute and the Centre for Research into Ecological and Environmental Monitoring, University of St Andrews
- Rojano-Doñate, L., McDonald, B. I., Wisniewska, D. M., Johnson, M., Teilmann, J., Wahlberg, M., Højer-Kristensen, J and Madsen, P. T. High field metabolic rates of wild harbour porpoises. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 2018 221: jeb185827 doi: 10.1242/jeb.185827 Published 6 December 2018
- Santos, M.B. and Pierce, G.J. 2003. The diet of harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) in the northeast Atlantic. *Oceanography and Marine Biology: an Annual Review*, 41, 355-390.
- Southall, B. Southall, A. E., Bowles, W., Ellison, T., Finneran, J.J., Gentry, R. L., Greene Jr. C. R., Kastak, D., Ketten, D.R., Miller, J. H., Nachtigall, P. E., Richardson, W. J., Thomas, J. A., Tyack, P. L. 2007. Marine Mammal Noise Exposure Criteria: Initial Scientific Recommendations. *Aquatic Mammals*, Volume 33, Number 4.
- Wisniewska, D. M., Johnson, M., Teilmann, J., Rojano-Doñate, L., Shearer, J., Sveegaard, S., Miller, L. A., Siebert, U and Madsen, P. T. Ultra-High Foraging Rates of Harbor Porpoises Make Them Vulnerable to Anthropogenic Disturbance. *Current Biology*. May 26, 2016 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2016.03.069>.

8 Annex A: Assessment of the level of impact risk from operations (activities) on UK harbour porpoise populations

The relative level of risk of impact to harbour porpoise from a range of pressures was assessed at UK level (Table A1) as part of the 3rd reporting round for Article 17²². See Annex B for the definitions of pressures as used for the harbour porpoise assessments. For the assessment the relative importance of the pressure was assessed by considering the evidence available of an impact and the nature of that impact (direct/indirect) together with the area over which the pressure is acting in UK waters in relation to the species distribution. The relative levels are assigned according to the Article 17 guidance (Evans and Marvela, 2013) as:

| Code | Meaning | Comment |
|------|--------------------------|---|
| H | High importance/impact | Important direct or immediate influence and/or acting over large areas |
| M | Medium importance/impact | Medium direct or immediate influence, mainly indirect influence and/or acting over moderate part of the area/acting only regionally |
| L | Low importance/impact | Low direct or immediate influence, indirect influence and/or active over small part of the area/acting only regionally |

Table A1 Full assessment of level of the impact risk from operations (activities) on harbour porpoise in UK waters based on considerations for Article 17 assessment for harbour porpoise conservation status²³.

| Operations | Pressures | Impacts | Relative level of risk of impact | Evidence | | Key references |
|---|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | | | | Spatial overlap (species & pressure) | Post-mortem examination | |
| Commercial fisheries with bycatch (predominantly static nets) | Removal of non-target species | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mortality through entanglement/by catch | High | ✓ | ✓ | Deaville and Jepson, 2011; Morizur <i>et al</i> 1999; Read <i>et al</i> 2006; Northridge, S. and Kingston, A. 2010; Northridge <i>et al</i> 2016; ICES 2015b |
| Discharge/run-off from land-fill, terrestrial and offshore industries | Contaminants | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects on water and prey quality Bioaccumulation through contaminated prey ingestion | High | | ✓ | Jepson <i>et al</i> 2005; Jepson <i>et al</i> 2016; Deaville & Jepson, 2011; ICES, 2015a; Van De Vijver <i>et al</i> 2003; Law <i>et al</i> 2012; Pierce <i>et al</i> 2008; Murphy <i>et al</i> 2015. |

²² <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-6564>

²³ Article 17, harbour porpoise report: http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/Article17Consult_20131010/S1351_UK.pdf

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------------|---|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health issues (e.g. on reproduction) | | | | |
| Noise from shipping, drilling, dredging and disposal, aggregate extraction, pile driving, acoustic surveys, underwater explosion, military activity, acoustic deterrent devices and recreational boating activity | Anthropogenic underwater sound | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mortality Internal injury Disturbance leading to physical and acoustic behavioural changes (potentially impacting foraging, navigation, breeding, socialising) Habitat change/loss | Medium | ✓ | | Deaville & Jepson, 2011; Stone & Tasker, 2006; Stone, 2015; Jepson <i>et al</i> 2005; Fernandez <i>et al</i> 2005; Würsig & Richardson, 2009; WGMME, 2012. |
| Shipping, recreational boating, renewable energy installations | Death or injury by collision | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mortality Injury | Medium/Low | ✓ | ✓ | Deaville & Jepson, 2011; Dolman <i>et al</i> 2006; ICES 2015a |
| Commercial fisheries, bycatch | Removal of target species | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in food availability Increased competition from other species Displacement from natural range Habitat change/loss | Medium | | ✓ | Simmonds and Isaac, 2007; OSPAR QSR 2010; MacLeod <i>et al</i> 2007a, b; Thompson <i>et al</i> 2007; Santos and Pierce, 2003; Pierce <i>et al</i> 2007; ICES 2015b |
| Agriculture, aquaculture, sewage | Nutrient enrichment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects on water quality Increased risk of algal blooms may present health issues Habitat change/loss | Low | ✓ | ✓ | Craig <i>et al</i> 2013 |
| Agriculture, aquaculture, sewage | Organic enrichment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects on water quality Increased risk of algal blooms may present health issues Habitat change/loss | Low | ✓ | | Craig <i>et al</i> 2013 |
| Waste disposal - navigational dredging (capital, maintenance) | Physical change (to another seabed type) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in availability of prey species Habitat change/loss | Low | | | |
| Bridges, tunnels, dams, installations, presence of vessels (shipping, recreation) | Water flow (tidal current) changes - local | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in location of prey species Displacement of harbour porpoise Habitat change/loss | Low | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|-----|---|---|--|
| Terrestrial and at-sea 'disposal' | Litter | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mortality through entanglement • Ingestion | Low | ✓ | ✓ | Deaville and Jepson, 2011 |
| Bridges, tunnels, dams, installations, presence of vessels (shipping, recreation) | Barrier to species movement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat inaccessible • Potential physiological effects • Habitat change/loss | Low | ✓ | | WGMME., 2012; ICES 2015a |
| Sewage | Introduction of microbial pathogens | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased risk of disease | Low | | ✓ | Harvell <i>et al</i> 1999; Gulland and Hall, 2007; Van Bressem <i>et al</i> 2009 |

Reference List for sources in Annex A

- Craig, J.K., Crowder, L.B., Gray, C.D., McDaniel, C.J., Kenwood, T.A. and Hanifen, J.G. 2013. Ecological effects of hypoxia on fish, sea turtles, and marine mammals in the Northwestern Gulf of Mexico, in Coastal Hypoxia: Consequences for Living Resources and Ecosystems (eds Rabalais, N.N. and Turner, R.E.), American Geophysical Union, Washington, D. C.
- Deaville, R. and Jepson, P D. (Eds). 2011. Final Report for the period 1st January 2005 – 31st December 2010. Cetacean Stranding Investigation Programme CSIP, Defra contracts CR0346 and CR0364.
[http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Document.aspx?Document=FinalCSIPReport2005-2010_finalversion061211released\[1\].pdf](http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Document.aspx?Document=FinalCSIPReport2005-2010_finalversion061211released[1].pdf)
- Dolman, S., Williams-Grey, V., Asmutis-Silvia, R. and Isaac, S. 2006. Vessel collisions and cetaceans: what happens when they don't miss the boat. WDCS Science Report. Chippenham. 25pp
- Evans, D and Marvela, A. (2013). Assessment and reporting under Article 17 of the Habitats Directive: Explanatory notes and Guidelines. 123pp.
<https://circabc.europa.eu/faces/jsp/extension/wai/navigation/container.jsp>
- Fernandez, A., Edwards, J.F., Rodrigueau, F., Espinosa de los Monteros, P., Herraiez, P., Castro, P., Jaber, J.R., Martin, V. and Arbelo, M. 2005. Gas and fat embolic syndrome involving mass stranding of beaked whales (Family Ziphiidae) exposed to anthropogenic sonar signals. Veterinary Pathology 42: 446.
- Gulland, F.M.D. and Hall, A.J., 2007. Is marine mammal health deteriorating? Trends in the global reporting of marine mammal disease. Ecohealth, 4: 135-150
- Harvell, C.D., Kim, K., Burholder, J.M., Colwell, R.R., Epstein, P.R., Grimes, D.J., Hofmann, E.E., Lipp, E.K., Osterhaus, A.D.M.E., Overstreet, R.M., Porter, J.W., Smith, G.W. and Vasta, G.R. 1999. Emerging marine diseases--climate links and anthropogenic factors. Science, 285: 1505-1510
- ICES 2015a. Report of the Working Group on Marine Mammal Ecology (WGMME). ICES Advisory Committee, ICES CM 2015/ACOM:25. 9–12 February 2015 London, UK.
http://ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Expert%20Group%20Report/acom/2015/WGMME/wgmme_2015.pdf
- ICES. 2015b. Report of the Working Group on Bycatch of Protected Species (WGBYC), 2-6 February 2015, ICES Headquarters, Copenhagen, Denmark. ICES CM 2015/ACOM:26. 82 pp.
- Jepson, P.D. Deaville, R., Patterson, I.A.P., Pocknell, A.M., Ross, H.M., Baker, J.R., Howie, F.E., Reid, R.J., Colloff, A. and Cunningham, A.A. 2005. Acute and chronic gas bubble lesions in cetaceans stranded in the United Kingdom. Veterinary Pathology, 42: 291.
- Jepson, P. D., Deaville, R., Barber, J.L., Aguilar, A., Borrell, A., Murphy, S., Barry, J., Brownlow, A., Barnett, J., Berrow, S., Cunningham, A.A., Davison, N.J., Doeschate, M.t., Esteban, R., Ferreira, M., Foote, A.D., Genov, T., Gimenez, J., Loveridge, J., Llavana, A., Martin, V., Maxwell, D.L., Papachimitzou, A., Penrose, R., Perkins, M.W., Smith, B., Stephanis, R.d., Tregenza, N., Verborgh, P., Fernandez, A. and Law, R.J. 2016. PCB pollution continues

- to impact populations of orcas and other dolphins in European waters. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 18573; doi: 10.1038/srep18573
- Law, R.J., Barry, J., Barber, J.L., Bersuder, P., Deaville, R., Reid, R.J., Brownlow, A., Penrose, R., Barnett, J., Loveridge, J., Smith, B. and Jepson, P.D. 2012. Contaminants in cetaceans from UK waters: Status as assessed within the Cetacean Strandings Investigation Programme from 1990 to 2008. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* **64**: 1485–1494
- MacLeod, C.D., Santos, M.B., Reid, R.J., Scott, B.E. and Pierce, G.J. 2007a. Linking sandeel consumption and the likelihood of starvation in harbour porpoises in the Scottish North Sea: could climate change mean more starving porpoises? *Biology Letters*, **3**: 185-188
- MacLeod, C.D., Santos, M.B., and Pierce, G.J. 2007b. Starvation and sandeel consumption in harbour porpoises in the Scottish North Sea. *Biology Letters*, **3**, 535-536.
- Morizur, Y., Berrow, S.D., Tregenza, N.J.C., Couperus, A.S. and Pouvreau, S. 1999. Incidental catches of marine-mammals in pelagic trawl fisheries of the northeast Atlantic. *Fisheries Research*. **41**: 297–307.
- Murphy S, Barber JL, Learmonth JA, Read FL, Deaville R, Perkins MW, Brownlow, A., Davison, N, Penrose, R, Pierce, GJ, Law, RJ and Jepson, PD. 2015. Reproductive Failure in UK Harbour Porpoises *Phocoena phocoena*: Legacy of Pollutant Exposure? *PLoS ONE* **10**(7): e0131085. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0131085
- Northridge, S. and Kingston, A. 2010. Annual report on the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 812/2004 – 2009. Sea Mammal Research Unit, University St Andrews. Report prepared to the European Commission.
- Northridge, S., Kingston, A. and Thomas, L. 2016. Annual report on the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 812/2004 – 2015. Sea Mammal Research Unit, University St Andrews. Report prepared to the European Commission
- OSPAR QSR. 2010. Quality Status Report 2010 for the northeast Atlantic. [Available from <http://www.ospar.org/>]
- Pierce, G.J., Santos, M.B. and Cervino, S., 2007. Assessing sources of variation underlying estimates of cetacean diet composition: a simulation study on analysis of harbour porpoise diet in Scottish (UK) waters. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, **87**: 213-221.
- Pierce, G.J., Santos, M.B., Murphy, S., Learmonth, J.A., Zuur, A.F., Rogan, E., Bustamante, P., Caurant, F., Lahaye, V., Ridox, V., Zegers, B.N., Mets, A., Addink, M., Smeenk, C., Jauniaux, T., Law, R.J., Dabin, W., Lopez, A., Alonso Farre, J.M., Gonzalez, A.F., Guerra, A., Garcia-Hartmann, M., Reid, R.J., Moffat, C.F., Luckyer, C. and Boon, J.P., 2008. Bioaccumulation of persistent organic pollutants in female common dolphins (*Delphinus delphis*) and harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) from western European seas: Geographical trends, causal factors and effects on reproduction and mortality. *Environmental Pollution*, **153**: 401-415.
- Read, A.J; Drinker, P., Northridge, S., 2006. Bycatch of marine mammals in U.S. and global fisheries. *Conservation Biology*, **20**:163-169.
- Santos, M.B. and Pierce, G.J. 2003. The diet of harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) in the northeast Atlantic. *Oceanography and Marine Biology: an Annual Review*, **41**: 355–390.
- Simmonds, M.P., and Isaac, S.J. 2007. The impacts of climate change on marine mammals: early signs of significant problems. *Oryx* **41**(1): 19-26
- Stone, C.J. 2015. Marine mammal observations during seismic surveys from 1995-2010. JNCC Report No: 463a. JNCC, Peterborough, 64pp. Available at: http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/JNCC%20Report%20463a_Final.pdf
- Stone, C.J. and Tasker, M.L. 2006. The effects of seismic airguns on cetaceans in UK waters. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management*, **8**: 255-263.
- Thompson, P., Ingram, S., Lonergan, M., Northridge, S., Hall, A. and Wilson, B. 2007. Climate change causing starvation in harbour porpoises? *Biology Letters* **3**, 533-534.

- Van Bresse, M.F., Raga, J.A., Di Guardo, J., Jepson, P.D., Duignan, P., Siebert, U., Barrett, T., Santos, M.C.O., Moreno, I.B., Siciliano, S., Aguilar, A. and Van Waerebeek, K., 2009. Emerging infectious diseases in cetaceans worldwide and the role of environmental stressors. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms*. 86: 143-157
- Van De Vijver, K.I., Hoff, P.T., Das, K., Van Dongen, W., Esmans, E.L., Jauniaux, T., Bouquegneau, J., Blust, R. and De Coen, W. 2003. Perfluorated chemicals infiltrate ocean waters: link between exposure levels and stable isotope ratios in marine mammals. *Environmental Science and Technology*, 37: 5545-5550.
- WGMME 2012. Assessment of the marine renewables industry in relation to marine mammals: synthesis of work undertaken by the ICES Working Group on Marine Mammal Ecology (WGMME). Available at http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Stefan_Braeger/publication/265728493_Assessment_of_the_marine_renewables_industry_in_relation_to_marine_mammals_synthesis_of_work_undertaken_by_the_ICES_Working_Group_on_Marine_Mammal_Ecology_%28WGMME%29/links/541a09080cf2218008bfa5ec.pdf
- Würsig, B. and Richardson, W.J. 2009. Noise, effects of. Pp. 765–772. In: Perrin, W.F., Würsig, B., and J.G.M. Thewissen, Eds. *The Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals*, Ed. 2. Academic/Elsevier Press, San Diego, Ca. 1316 pp

9 Annex B: Definitions of Pressures as applied within harbour porpoise SAC Advice on Operations

| Pressures | Definition in the context of harbour porpoise advice |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Removal of non-target species | The removal of species not targeted by the fishery; in this case the bycatch (and probable mortality) of harbour porpoise |
| Contaminants | Introduced material capable of contaminating harbour porpoise, prey or habitat important to harbour porpoise, with a negative impact directly or indirectly on porpoises |
| Anthropogenic underwater sound | Introduced noise with the potential to cause injury, stress or disturbance of harbour porpoise |
| Death or injury by collision | Introduction of physical objects; mobile or immobile, that may collide with or result in potential collision of harbour porpoise resulting in injury or mortality |
| Removal of target species | Removal of harbour porpoise prey, resulting in increased competition amongst porpoise and other species, and/or displacement from their natural range |