



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Dogger Bank South
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) – Part 1
Date:	8 April 2025

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

00:00:05:00 - 00:00:31:23

I would like to welcome you to this issue specific hearing in relation to the application made by RWC renewables UK, Dogger Bank South West Limited and RWA renewables UK. Dogger Bank South East Limited for the proposed Dogger Bank South offshore wind farms. Before I proceed any further, can I just check that everybody can see and hear me? If not, can you please raise your hand in teams?

00:00:34:10 - 00:00:42:04

Okay. Thank you. I can't see any hands. Can I also confirm with Mrs. Hopewell that the live stream and the recording of this event have commenced?

00:00:45:04 - 00:01:19:25

I assume that's it. Yes. Um, please, could all participants ensure that they are muted unless invited to speak? And please silence all electronic devices. My name is Laura Ciani. I'm an examining inspector and a chartered town planner. I am employed by the Planning Inspectorate and have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of a panel of inspectors to examine this application. In this introduction, I will be going through the management of today's event and introductions, and one of my colleagues will be taking notes of any actions.

00:01:21:00 - 00:01:24:01

I would now like to ask my colleagues to introduce themselves.

00:01:28:13 - 00:01:34:07

My name is Clare below. I'm an examiner, inspector, Chartered scientist and chartered and water environmental manager.

00:01:36:03 - 00:01:50:09

My name is Jay Dowling. I'm an examining inspector and a chartered town planner, and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of the panel who will examine this application. Good morning. My name is Helena Abramsky. I'm an examining inspector and a chartered town planner.

00:01:51:19 - 00:01:59:20

Good morning. My name is Matt Tandy. I'm an examining inspector and a chartered water environmental manager and also a civil engineer.

00:02:01:25 - 00:02:39:07

I can confirm that all members of the examining authority have made a formal declaration of interests, and that there are no known conflicts of interest with regard to us examining this application. Together we formed the Examining Authority, or Exa, for this application. You have all spoken to Mr. Burney, who is our case officer in the joining conference. I would also like to mention Mrs. Hopewell, who is the case manager for this project. Together they are the case team. There are also other colleagues from the Planning Inspectorate with us today, and technicians from CVS who are attending solely for the purpose of managing the recording and live streaming of the hearing.

00:02:40:03 - 00:03:14:17

If you have any questions regarding the application process in general, could I ask that you please email the case team who will be happy to help? This meeting is being held on Microsoft Teams platform and is being live streamed. Participants should not use the chat function as it is not being monitored today. Should you wish to make a comment. Please switch your camera on and use the Microsoft Teams hand up function. And please wait to be invited to speak. If you participate in the meeting, it is important that you understand that you will be recorded and live streamed and that the digital recording will be published.

00:03:14:28 - 00:03:52:24

If you do not want your image to be recorded, you can switch off your camera. The planning Inspectorate's practice is to retain recordings for five years, from the Secretary of State's decision on the Development Consent Order, to avoid the need to edit the digital recordings. We would ask that you try your best not to add information to the public record that you wish to be kept private and confidential. If you feel that personal information is necessary, please provide this in a written document that we can redact before publication. No requests have been made for any special measures or arrangements to enable participation in this hearing, but I would just like to confirm that this is correct.

00:03:54:18 - 00:04:21:00

I can't see anyone. Okay. Um, if at any point in the meeting you can't hear us or wish to speak, can I ask that you turn on your camera if it is turned off and use the raise hand function in teams? There may sometimes be a delay before we can acknowledge this. The information contained in your joining instructions includes what to do if you lose your connection, and we are able to adjourn for a short period of if there are more significant connection problems.

00:04:22:15 - 00:04:54:14

We will adjourn for a short break at a convenient point, usually no more than every hour and a half or so. If for medical or other reasons anyone requires a break at a specific time, could you please let the case team know and we can hopefully adjust the program to meet your needs for the purpose of identification and for the benefit of those who may listen to the digital recording later. Could I ask that at every point in which you speak, please give your name. And if you're representing an organization or individual who it is that you represent.

00:04:55:08 - 00:05:00:20

Does anybody have any questions or concerns about the technology or the general management of today's event?

00:05:02:17 - 00:05:36:06

I can't see any hands. Um, rule 14 two of the examination procedure rules requires that at the start of the hearing, the examining authority shall identify matters to be considered at the hearing. These are listed in the agenda for today's meeting, which was placed on the Inspectorate website on Friday 28th of March, 2025 and can be found in the examination library at EVT 8001. For expediency, I do not intend to repeat them now, but please note that today's agenda item is for guidance only.

00:05:36:10 - 00:06:06:24

We may add other issues for consideration as we progress. In addition, to accommodate the availability of the applicants commercial fishing specialists. We'll be swapping out agenda items three and five. So we're taking agenda item five. Commercial Fishing after agenda item two. And shipping and navigation, which was due to be considered at agenda item three, will be considered after infrastructure and other uses. Agenda item five. Can I just check if anyone has any comments on this? On this?

00:06:10:22 - 00:06:51:13

Okay then that's great. Um, finally, it is important that we get the right answers to the questions that the examining authority are going to ask. At this stage, it is worth reiterating that this is a predominant, predominantly written process. Therefore, if you cannot answer the questions that are being asked or required time to get the information requested, then rather than giving us restricted or potentially incorrect answer, please indicate that you need to respond in writing. We can then defer the response either to an action point to be submitted at deadline for which is the 25th of April, 2025, or to a written question at a or a later hearing.

00:06:52:04 - 00:06:59:09

So before we move on to deal with the items detailed in the agenda, are there any questions at this stage about the procedural side of today's hearings?

00:07:01:09 - 00:07:32:26

No. Okay. So the case team has provided me with a list of those interested and other parties who have expressed a wish to be heard today. Those persons are people representing the following organizations and the applicants and their representatives. The Maritime and Coastguard Agency and legal representatives for the Dogger Bank project and Orsted IPPs. Before I ask people to introduce themselves, can I check that I haven't inadvertently missed anyone of this list of participants for today?

00:07:35:21 - 00:08:04:18

No. So I'm going to now ask those of you who are participating in today's hearing to introduce yourselves to the examining authority and the people who are watching the live stream of this event. When I say your organization's name. Please switch on your camera and microphone and introduce yourself, including how you would like to be referred to. For example. Doctor. Mrs.. Miss. Mr.. And if you're representing someone who is at that who it is that you represent. So could I start with the applicants, please?

00:08:07:17 - 00:08:37:21

Morning, madam. My name is Julian Boswell. I'm a solicitor and partner with Burgess Sam. And we're representing the applicant, Mr. Julian Boswell. I'm assuming that given that we're going through a series of topics, it makes sense to only introduce the people that are relevant to the first topic, aviation and radar. So there's one of those people sitting on my left, and then there are two online. So I'm not going to invite everyone sitting at the table to introduce themselves at this point.

00:08:38:05 - 00:08:39:03

Yeah that's fine.

00:08:41:07 - 00:08:41:24

Good morning.

00:08:41:26 - 00:08:47:07

I'm Daniel Goldstone, offshore consents manager, on behalf of RWA.

00:08:49:20 - 00:08:55:03

And then online, we should have, um, Alan MacDonald and Simon Macpherson.

00:08:58:29 - 00:09:01:06

Ali MacDonald representing the applicant.

00:09:04:11 - 00:09:10:00

Good morning. I'm Simon Macpherson, an aviation consultant representing the applicant on item two.

00:09:14:09 - 00:09:23:19

Thank you. Okay. Could I then ask representatives from the Maritime and Coastguard Agency now to introduce themselves, please?

00:09:26:19 - 00:09:41:23

Yes. Good morning everybody. My name is Vaughn Jackson. I'm the offshore renewables project lead at the Maritime Coastguard Agency. Uh, referred to as Mr. Jackson. That'd be fine. And I'm here for any any questions that might come my way for agenda item five shipping and navigation. Thank you.

00:09:42:24 - 00:09:49:26

Thank you. And finally, could those legal representatives for the Dogger Bank project and all that I please introduce themselves, please.

00:09:52:02 - 00:10:01:15

Good morning, Sir Robert Garden with with CMS. I'm here representing the Dogger Bank project. Today I'm happy to refer to as Mr. Garden.

00:10:05:23 - 00:10:25:03

My name is Alex Dresden. I'm an associate at Pinsent Masons LLP. Um, Mr. Dresden is absolutely fine. I'm acting on behalf of the Orsted IPPs, and I anticipate only speaking at this hearing in relation in relation to agenda item four. If it's helpful, I can list out the companies that comprise the term Orsted IPPs or happy to proceed on that basis. If you if you like.

00:10:26:18 - 00:10:28:03

No that's fine, thank you.

00:10:28:11 - 00:10:30:04

Take us all some time. Thank you.

00:10:32:28 - 00:10:38:22

Thank you everyone. Is there anyone else who is expecting to participate in this hearing and who has not introduced themselves?

00:10:41:11 - 00:10:48:22

Okay. Thank you. I'm now going to pass it over to Mr. Tandy, who will deal with the next item on the agenda.

00:10:51:09 - 00:11:02:04

Thank you. Good morning. We'll deal with, uh, aviation and radar item now. And, uh, specifically moves into the helicopter operation. Mitigation.

00:11:03:29 - 00:11:24:28

The examining authority understand that the helicopter access report has been updated since the version that was submitted into the examination. That's examination library reference number EP 129. Could the applicants confirm when the updated version will be submitted into the examination? And could you provide a brief overview of what the updates are, please?

00:11:27:04 - 00:11:41:28

Okay. So on behalf of the applicants, yes, we'll be submitting the updated reports. Uh, and that will be coming in at deadline for um. Can I hand it over to Ali to give a brief overview of the updates means.

00:11:50:13 - 00:12:27:06

Allie MacDonald on behalf of the applicant. We carried out an update of the Helicopter Access study based on the search and rescue comments on search and rescue from the Maritime and Coastguard Agency, and that was in relation to, um, the commercial the use of Cat helicopters, commercial air transport helicopters, uh, potentially in a precautionary down mining scenario. Um, but with regard to this, uh case, the distance between the Cygnus platforms and the Dogger Bank projects is not significant, uh, in terms of proximity.

00:12:27:08 - 00:12:33:00

So in this context, the update is not of any significance with regard to the project.

00:12:36:07 - 00:12:44:05

So the more addressing the MCAS comments as opposed to the impacts specifically with regard to the Dogger Bank project.

00:12:49:09 - 00:12:53:17

Thank you. Thank you. And those are the only updates that are being included.

00:12:54:02 - 00:12:54:21

Correct.

00:13:00:00 - 00:13:07:29

Would Mr. Jackson like to make anything, uh, on this particular point or not? I know you'd mentioned you would only probably going to speak on the shipping and navigation, but.

00:13:09:02 - 00:13:30:06

Well, I was good at getting early. Yeah. Yeah. Good morning once again. Uh, one for the Maritime Coastguard Agency. Yeah. We have received the, uh, the updated helicopter access report. We have, uh, we have. So we are happy with that at this time. Um, the the updates that were asked for by my colleague in, hmm, Coastguard, uh, have been, uh, have been addressed. Thank you.

00:13:35:22 - 00:13:39:27

Okay. Thank you. Does anyone else have anything they would like to add on this before I move on?

00:13:45:12 - 00:14:16:27

Okay. So, uh. Yes. Chapter 15. So that is examination library number app 125. And it was specifically referring to table 1514. This assesses the creation of an aviation obstacle environment by the proposed development. And it would have a moderate adverse effect. Mitigation to reduce a significant effect is presented in the form of consultation with offshore platform and helicopter operators to agree the appropriate measures

00:14:18:13 - 00:14:33:25

in response to XQ1 reference a ms. 1.4, the applicants explained that the final impact will only be understood once the final design information is available, and only then could the discussions with the operator operators progress further.

00:14:35:14 - 00:14:41:08

The response goes on to state the requisite information will not be available for the examination.

00:14:43:15 - 00:14:55:01

In light of this, can the applicants explain how this measure can be relied upon to mitigate the moderate adverse effect, given the immature information that's been submitted and the lack of certainty of what would actually be delivered?

00:15:00:09 - 00:15:31:20

Thank you. On behalf of the applicants. Um, we have obviously the worst case, uh, this virus, the impacts to, um, helicopter platforms goes. Um, and yes, you're right, we did identify the need to engage with, um, any affected platform operators. Uh, in this case, there were, uh, basically four spatially relevant, uh, platforms the Cavendish platform, the road platform, and the Cygnus A and B platforms. Cavendish platform has been decommissioned.

00:15:31:22 - 00:15:57:24

So that's, uh, not an issue. The Monroe platform, I understand is oriented. That's such an angle that we shouldn't have any impact upon that platform as far as the same platform goes. We have, um, shared our helicopter access port with them, and they have not identified any, uh, concerns or need for mitigation in relation to the impacts based on our worst case.

00:15:59:11 - 00:16:02:21

So we don't foresee any need for any additional mitigation.

00:16:05:19 - 00:16:13:22

So would it be useful then to update the chapter, to actually have that in writing and get that confirmed that that's the case?

00:16:15:10 - 00:16:17:15

Yes, we can do that. Okay.

00:16:18:10 - 00:16:40:14

Okay. We have an action point for that then please. And you briefly mentioned about the Monroe offshore platform and saying that that mitigation wasn't going to be required because of the orientation. I did have something I was going to ask about that. So in effect, you're saying that the decommissioning work for the Monroe platform won't be affected by the proposed development?

00:16:43:02 - 00:16:53:02

But I believe that's the case. So I believe that's the case. And I don't know if you've got any further information on that one.

00:17:00:08 - 00:17:18:01

Sorry, I don't have much on on behalf of the applicant. Um, I'm sorry, I don't have any further information, but I do believe that my Cavendish certainly has been decommissioned. And, um. But, no, I don't think there was from them. There was no impact on the Monroe from the overflight or limited impact. I think it was mainly Cygnus Cab.

00:17:22:25 - 00:17:25:15

I do believe that that Monroe will be decommissioned.

00:17:29:07 - 00:18:00:03

Yes, but I think the point is whether there is any adverse effects on those, uh, offshore platform operators from the proposed development at the moment. The environmental statement says that this would be mitigated through ongoing discussions, but it would seem that the update we've just received is that those on those have already happened, and there won't be a need for any more mitigation. So I think what I'm looking for is, if that is the case for the ES to be updated accordingly.

00:18:05:28 - 00:18:51:03

On behalf of the applicants, um, we don't propose to update these chapters, but we could submit an updated notice four times. So Julian Julian was on that. And I guess we're very keen to avoid a situation where we're constantly updating the actual the S itself. The ES is a point to document and obviously provide further information to address the issue that you're flagging. And the EIA rates are written in a way that, um, the environmental information that has defined very much includes that kind of additional information that comes forward as part of the process and is then taken into account by by the NSA in its recommendation and ultimately by the Secretary of State.

00:18:55:03 - 00:19:23:05

Yes. That's fine. So the action point is for the further information to be provided that confirms what you've just confirmed to me, which is that the mitigation isn't going to be required. That'll be fine. There will be a point at which we'll need to discuss around the updating of chapters, and how all of

this extra information is going to be brought together into one coherent place. But we can discuss that later. Uh, not underneath this agenda item.

00:19:31:02 - 00:19:36:07

Before I move on to item 2.2. Is anything else anyone would like to add to item 2.1?

00:19:43:00 - 00:20:10:14

Nope. Thank you. So moving on to Radar effects then. Um, in response to action 0.9 of agenda item three, from issue specific hearing to the applicants explained they were liaising with the Defense Infrastructure Organization to explore design and mitigation measures to overcome the effects to military radar. Could the applicants provide an update on their latest position, please?

00:20:12:08 - 00:20:47:21

I'm speaking of your consent. Manager. The applicant. Um, so the applicants have had an initial meeting with the Mod since, um, the last hearings. Uh, that meeting took place on the 6th of March 2025. Um, there were no official specialists present from the mod side, so a progression of discussion was limited regarding the mitigation and understanding of a solution that would be suitable for both parties. During the meeting, the applicants presented four key questions to the energy on radar, which they have agreed to engage relevant colleagues with.

00:20:48:07 - 00:21:26:21

The four key questions we presented that we are keen to understand were the appropriateness of the draft requirement wording for any impacts caused by the South-West array, and that draft requirement is already included in our draft DCO, and the extent to which the Mod agrees that the programme will resolve mitigation required for the impact of South-West on the starter world, and that's based on an earlier generation of 2030 to 2031. Um, we were keen to understand that assuming programme, we will provide mitigation for Southwest over the long term, but not may not be delivered in time.

00:21:26:23 - 00:22:06:06

To cover our first power. Weather mitigation discussions need to be held in relation to an interim solution. Um, and we then concluded the meeting to ask what next steps would be in terms of progressing these discussions between both ourselves and the mod. Um, that you have agreed to engage relevant colleagues on those questions, but not provide us with the time frame for a response as a result. Uh, the applicants are still awaiting further engagement. And from the MDA, um, we understand from the outside housing examination, however, that the Mid have provided a um, preferred requirement wording which would meet their needs.

00:22:06:14 - 00:22:18:02

Um, to allow that. The objection with regards to Saxonwold um for advertising to be removed. Um, that agreed wording is very similar to what we've gotten presently included in our draft DCO.

00:22:28:09 - 00:22:29:09

Okay. Thank you.

00:22:33:03 - 00:23:00:12

So not much progression on mitigation but some progression on agreeing. The wording on the requirement is the kind of the part I took away from that. Um, and just something I'd like to confirm, if it was my understanding from what you've just said there, that the mitigation may not be in place for the first operation of the turbines. Was that what you said?

00:23:01:15 - 00:23:08:20

Yeah. So it's our understanding and from the the Clean Power Action Plan that, um,

00:23:10:06 - 00:23:18:15

our defence mitigation will be, um, put in place by the Mod and funded by the government. That's part of.

00:23:18:24 - 00:23:19:09

The they.

00:23:19:11 - 00:23:19:26

Keep telling.

00:23:23:01 - 00:23:50:03

And that's that's part of the program, George. Um, at the moment, we're aware of when that solution will be put in place by the end of day. So we are keen to understand from engagement with the emoji, whether we would need an interim solution whilst they're inputting that between our generation and the under the mods mitigation being put in place.

00:23:53:06 - 00:23:56:17

That is one of the questions that we've we've asked them to engage with us on.

00:23:59:21 - 00:24:10:06

Okay. And the wording of the requirement would be that the turbines couldn't operate until that mitigation is in place. Is that correct?

00:24:10:29 - 00:24:14:12

Uh, Stephen, right on time with the applicant. Yes. That's correct.

00:24:36:01 - 00:24:50:15

And then you mentioned about an interim sort of measure that may be required between the strategic solution coming online. What what might that include? Have you got any sort of suggestions at the moment or any ideas of what that would be?

00:24:52:16 - 00:25:08:07

And then the applicants we referred to Simon. Firstly, please provide an overview on the kinds of technical mitigation that might be scope for impacts such as those caused by DBS.

00:25:10:18 - 00:25:44:04

Um, Simon Macpherson, on behalf of the applicant. Um, the Staxton world radar has recently been upgraded and it is. It's known to have some inbuilt, um, windfarm mitigation capabilities. Um, it may

be that the, the Mod would, would use those capabilities, um, to mitigate the impact of DBS West. Um, on an interim basis until an enduring mitigation solution was found.

00:25:44:28 - 00:26:08:24

Um, I don't have any, um, details on the, uh, on how the radar works. Um, specifically. Um, and I don't know how effective the, um, the inbuilt mitigation capabilities are. Um, but that may be, um, a possible solution. Um, a temporary solution until the injury mitigation is put in place.

00:26:21:03 - 00:26:22:12

Okay. Thank you.

00:26:30:00 - 00:26:33:17

Anything else anyone would like to add on this particular point?

00:26:39:23 - 00:26:40:27

No. Okay.

00:26:42:17 - 00:27:04:00

In examining this application, the examining authority will be considering the environmental impact assessment mitigation hierarchy and whether the information submitted evidences that this hierarchy has actually been followed. The first level of that hierarchy is to actually avoid any negative impacts, and actually explore the understanding of the proposed development approach to this.

00:27:06:00 - 00:27:15:28

The Airspace Analysis and Radar Modelling report, which is Examination Lab number 8128 and it would be useful to have that on screen if possible.

00:27:19:05 - 00:27:22:04

Believe the applicant sir, will be loading that.

00:27:31:18 - 00:27:35:14

If we could just maybe zoom in a little more so it's clearer for people.

00:27:38:26 - 00:27:45:23

So this figure 18 identify identifies the radar line of sight coverages and

00:27:47:20 - 00:28:05:12

which is quite useful to understand what the impact would be at Staxton Wold. Can the applicants explain how the proposed West Array area avoids effects on the Saxonwold radar? Given the maximum design parameters allow for a maximum blade height of 394m.

00:28:18:27 - 00:28:59:04

And on behalf of the applicants. Um, I guess we have undertaken some work since, uh, preliminary environmental information report to refine our array areas. And also, uh, the envelope, um, update the rate area. So we have refined the south western boundary in the western area and moved that further to the east, uh, reducing impacts on these stacks involved radar. And we are also undertaking a

reduction of our overall timeline since, um, the early days of the project, which, again, will have had the benefit of reducing impacts on steps involved.

00:28:59:11 - 00:28:59:26

Right.

00:29:03:29 - 00:29:34:01

In addition to that, when siting an offshore wind farm, as I'm sure you appreciate any developer is balancing a range of considerations. It simply wouldn't be possible to avoid, um, impacts on multiple sort of topics. And so it's inevitably the case that an overall judgment has to be reached as to siting and balancing the the different effects. That is that's what's been done in this case.

00:29:34:21 - 00:29:46:06

Therefore, yes, I suppose we could have moved this to completely avoid any impact. But, um, we would have simply run into a different set of issues if we had done so.

00:29:48:26 - 00:29:49:16

Thank you.

00:29:51:02 - 00:29:56:12

If you want to just scroll up to the next page, which is 31, looking at table three.

00:30:01:01 - 00:30:02:02

Uh, you've only.

00:30:05:07 - 00:30:14:22

You've just taken that particular page of you. If we could get table three of app 1 to 8, that would be useful.

00:30:33:24 - 00:30:35:05

Is that something you have to hand?

00:30:44:27 - 00:30:48:27

Okay. We've got it to hand. If that would be useful for the time.

00:30:56:20 - 00:30:57:17

We might have it.

00:31:01:04 - 00:31:31:15

Yes. That's useful. So table three there. So as an example, just building on what we've just been discussing there, it would seem that, for example, a 349 meter blade tip height could be built in 81% of the West Ray area without affecting the Saxonwold radar. Can the applicant explain why the maximum design parameters should not be restricted to a lower blade height?

00:31:40:07 - 00:31:41:00

Thank you very much.

00:31:43:25 - 00:31:46:03

Sorry. Can you hear me? Okay. I'm not sure how.

00:31:47:25 - 00:31:52:15

It's not brilliant, actually. It's a little bit, uh, difficult.

00:31:54:03 - 00:32:27:07

Okay, I'll speak up a bit. Um, the wind turbine has obviously working with an envelope. We're seeking to develop the most commercially viable projects. Typically large set of lines to deliver. The most commercially viable projects, or at least that's how it's been seen historically. We also consume a construction period for the project. The timeline may change as a consequence of delays by material construction in the build up to construction, delays to securing the route to market.

00:32:28:02 - 00:32:30:27

If we're unsuccessful, for instance, in a CFD round.

00:32:33:15 - 00:33:05:21

So really working with it, we're able to keep options open to allow for the uncertainty of the inherent uncertainties in developing wind farms such as this one. And we feel that hopefully restricts the wind turbine height at this stage with no overall provided benefit, particularly when there's something such as this which can be mitigated by other means, um, through okay, potentially expensive mitigations in terms of these very large mitigations. But there are options available that can support us in the battle.

00:33:06:06 - 00:33:07:25

That's what we're keen to emphasize here.

00:33:12:28 - 00:33:25:18

It's going back to the earlier point that we will need to consider whether the environmental impact assessment mitigation hierarchy has actually been followed, and initially looking at whether impacts have been avoided.

00:33:27:11 - 00:33:34:13

The placement and height of the turbines is, of course, something that will have a direct effect on Saxonwold radar.

00:33:37:04 - 00:34:02:24

So I'm just looking for that a little bit more in terms of the evidence and the reasons why the blade height is being presented at 393m, where when the figure that we had on screen before is able to demonstrate, um, large areas of the proposed West array area could be built in at a height not all that dissimilar. Without the effects.

00:34:11:18 - 00:34:50:06

Impossible for the algorithm. I'd like to sort of set the context a little bit, because from from the developer's perspective and from the offshore wind industry's perspective, there's been a long running

sort of dialogue between the industry and government and the Mod in particular, obviously, on this subject. And the whole purpose of that has been to facilitate the government's ambitions on renewable energy target, which has missed the net that it's just been talking about involves maximising the capacity.

00:34:50:08 - 00:35:44:22

And the M3 has some particular references to, to to developers being encouraged to to maximize the capacity. The whole project. Your engagement has been proceeding for literally years. Um, in terms of, um, high level engagement, uh, between the mod and business and, and industry and everything about that has been around facilitating, maximizing, uh, the renewable energy generation, um, and facilitating that through this sort of evolving question as to what are the available mitigation techniques and different approaches to, um, national security in the context of military range.

00:35:45:12 - 00:36:37:23

And so, um, I do think there is quite a bit of tension between that theme, um, or potentially some tension between that theme and, um, and uh, and how the mitigation hierarchy might be, um, might, might be, uh, applied on the kind of avoid stage. So we, we, we very much think that we are responding to some very clear, strong signals from government to, to maximize, um, the renewable energy generation and the capacity of projects, whilst at the same time acknowledging that there is and and has been for many years now, um, an ongoing, uh, industry sort of issue.

00:36:38:01 - 00:37:12:21

And so we think it's very important to understand that context when applying the, the, the, the, the mitigation hierarchy in the way that you've all been doing. We also think it's highly relevant that, um, government has has now shifted its position in terms of or has clarified, you can say its position in terms of the Mod taking the lead and and and the government, i.e. the public purse funding, the the delivery of the mitigations through through project.

00:37:15:25 - 00:37:34:02

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Boswell. Getting back to the particular project that we're examining then and looking at the effects that it could have attached and rolled. Can you confirm then that the project would be unviable if it was built at lower heights?

00:37:43:08 - 00:37:44:26

You said, could you confirm?

00:37:47:24 - 00:37:53:29

If the project would be unviable at lower height, which is what was being suggested in the earlier remarks.

00:37:59:06 - 00:38:12:09

And you know best engineering manager. It's it's difficult to confirm what is unreliable at a particular point in time. It will depend upon to some extent which um CFD.

00:38:12:11 - 00:38:13:01

Auction we may.

00:38:13:03 - 00:38:21:11

Be in who we are competing against. What turbine technology is available at that time as to whether we can remain competitive?

00:38:23:15 - 00:38:52:14

So our review of turbines at the moment would obviously be different to our view of turbines in, um, in a few years time as the technology develops. That's really the opportunity, really to keep it open for us. So please, for the applicant, just to add another point here. Um, there is obviously a tension in terms of the height of our turbines and pressure to reduce those from a radar perspective,

00:38:54:01 - 00:39:20:06

which is countered by pressure from impacts to birds, which is working against us in the other direction. Um, whereby specifically, um will benefit from higher air gaps between sea level and the base of, uh, turbine blades. Um, so we are working to balance those two council professions and some of the design choices.

00:39:21:29 - 00:39:46:05

Yes, I'm aware of that. And of course, um, it's probably worth, therefore noting that within the maximum design parameters are sort of various options, one of which would be a hundred small wind turbines, which would be built at 291.8m. They would still be able to meet the 34 metre air gap.

00:39:47:27 - 00:39:58:16

So the point that you are unable, um, to reduce the height of the blade tips because of the air gap seems a bit of a moot point.

00:40:01:08 - 00:40:26:08

I think what I'm looking for here is that somewhere between the hundred small wind turbines and the 57 large, the large being the 394, there is probably a point at which the effects on military radar are able to be avoided sufficiently. And that's the kind of information I'm looking for from you.

00:40:54:27 - 00:40:56:17

And impossible for the applicant.

00:41:00:03 - 00:41:22:06

I guess the concern I have with the line of questioning is that it's fundamental to this project and to and to other projects in the offshore wind space that that the full envelope that we have that we are seeking is available to us. Um, and so

00:41:23:23 - 00:42:03:12

it would be a very, very serious if that was if there was an attempt to restrict that in, in the form of the, the DCO that's granted. We can we can consider the specific point that you've made. But what we absolutely can't do, um, is Make decisions in the context of this process, this examination, as to where in the envelope we are potentially specifically landing or restricting our ability within the envelope.

00:42:04:08 - 00:42:30:12

That is fundamental. So the character envelope approach is supported by M3, has been promoted and consented numerous times in offshore wind and in terms of maintaining our, uh, competitiveness as a member of that business reference, which is fundamental to, to any to any project, um, that we we.

00:42:32:16 - 00:42:46:28

That is essential that we preserve the envelope that we have, that we have got valuable to us, rather than any attempt to to restrict that by linking topics in a way that your question implies.

00:42:50:08 - 00:42:55:10

Thank you, Mr. Boswell. Looking at the information that's submitted into the examination.

00:42:57:23 - 00:43:18:09

It would seem that, uh, 57 large wind turbines. They've been suggested to be able to generate 20MW installation capacity. So a quick multiplication of that would suggest about 140MW installation capacity.

00:43:19:28 - 00:43:26:17

That would seem as if that's a sort of lower threshold would still be viable for the project.

00:43:28:06 - 00:44:08:23

And of course, the larger, uh, sorry, the smaller wind turbine option with 100 would meet the 1500 megawatt installation capacity in accordance with the license. So it would seem that there is some upper and lower thresholds in terms of installation. The capacity which the proposed project is looking to work within, and therefore I think that the the action point probably off the back of this um, line of discussion this morning is to for the applicants to go away and look at what those capacities would be at the Heights, which are currently on screen there, which we can see.

00:44:08:25 - 00:44:29:15

So, uh, for example, building underneath the 350 metre height would perhaps still enable you to build in 81% of the array area, but without having an impact on the radar, would that seem a sensible action to take away? To conclude the point this morning.

00:44:33:02 - 00:44:35:07

For the applicant, um,

00:44:37:05 - 00:45:09:28

I, I feel I need to to manage your Or expectations. I don't think there are any circumstances in which we will be agreeing to, um, restrict the the height in the way that you're, um, you I think you're trying to take this this discussion. Um, as I said a moment ago, Rochdale below is fundamental to the commercial competitiveness of the project.

00:45:10:09 - 00:45:40:18

And you can think about the line of questioning that you're putting to us. But in terms of sort of designing different variations within the overall envelope by reference to on the hoof considerations. So the liability, um, is is not something that, um, I think that we're going to be able to assist with that.

00:45:41:18 - 00:45:50:06

We will we will reflect on this and and respond as as we think best explains our position.

00:45:58:11 - 00:46:24:12

Okay. Yes. If you would like to submit, um, your position on this, that would be useful. Well of course. Remind which I'm sure you're aware that the examining authority will need to report on this to the Secretary of State in terms of how the environmental impact assessment mitigation hierarchy has or has been applied. Um, so any information to support that would be useful.

00:46:25:29 - 00:46:27:01

You have your hand up.

00:46:27:21 - 00:46:33:25

Sorry. The applicant just just made this point already. But just to reiterate,

00:46:35:18 - 00:46:42:19

given the the whole process of engagement that is taking place with Project Imboden and so on.

00:46:44:10 - 00:47:10:12

The core point of that is to bring mitigation to the table, to facilitate the maximization of of, of renewable energy generation. And so I think that in those circumstances that that how one approaches the avoid stage of the mitigation hierarchy needs to be very mindful of, of,

00:47:12:04 - 00:47:28:03

of the very strong signal that the government as, as has has been said through its engagement and its funding of of project yield by the rails. The government is accepting that the resolution of this is at mitigation stage, not at the avoid stage.

00:47:32:03 - 00:48:02:27

Thank you, Mr. Boswell. Yes, I am aware of what the MPs States and the government support for renewable energy projects. I think what part of the examination is around the information that's been submitted and based upon which I won't reiterate now, but based upon some of the figures I've just relayed to you, I think, um, perhaps the it would be restricting of the generating capacity at installation, um, because there's clearly upper and lower thresholds.

00:48:03:18 - 00:48:16:18

I think we've agreed that there'll be an action for you to submit further information around your position on this, and I'm happy to conclude on that point and move on for this morning, unless anyone else would like to mention anything else.

00:48:33:25 - 00:48:44:23

Okay. Before I move on from item two. Is there anything at all that anyone would like to mention in relation to aviation and radar that hasn't already been covered?

00:48:50:18 - 00:49:10:08

No. So as set out earlier by Mrs. Seany, I'm now going to take agenda item five, which is commercial fishing. Agenda item three. Shipping and navigation will now be considered after infrastructure and other users. If you need to reshuffle your seats, please do so now and let me know when you're ready.

00:49:40:14 - 00:49:44:07

Would you briefly like to just introduce who's now at the table? Mr. Boswell?

00:49:45:19 - 00:49:58:27

Yes. Um, the main, uh, the main speakers are going to be online. So particularly, uh, Richard. Joseph. Sorry, Richard. Forgive me. And, uh.

00:50:02:08 - 00:50:11:26

Sorry. Forgive me. Mr. Joseph Ryan will introduce himself. It's possible that Mr. Bruto will contribute on both on one aspect.

00:50:12:22 - 00:50:16:13

Good morning. Uh, Richard Joseph, Commissioner of fisheries.

00:50:26:18 - 00:50:27:08

Thank you.

00:50:29:06 - 00:50:57:11

So, item 5.1. So, based on the concerns raised by the National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation, the examining authority asked at the SSC reference CF 1.2 for the applicants to provide justification for how the sensitivity of magnitudes of impact have been defined in s chapter 13. That's examination library number EP 117. Similar requests had also been made during issue specific hearing to.

00:50:59:13 - 00:51:29:19

In response to EXC reference CF 1.2 and that's in examination library reference number rep three. Hyphen 027. The applicants have provided some further explanation, and that's been useful. Has there been any further discussion with the NFO that can be reported on this morning? And does that include resolving the concerns that they raised with how those are.

00:51:29:29 - 00:51:32:26

Sensitivities of magnitude of impact have been defined.

00:51:35:26 - 00:52:15:23

Suggestion from the applicant. Yes. Uh, we've held meetings with the NFO and moved on on those items. Uh, within the statement of common ground, um, baseline environment. And now. Agreed. Um, um, the, uh, cumulative effects assessment has been agreed with no material impacts. That's a caveat, as this is, um, you know, the bow's position is still that the EIA methodology is is not appropriate for, uh, commercial fisheries assessment.

00:52:16:02 - 00:52:33:18

And although they cannot find evidence within the restrictions of the data to prove otherwise, so they need to move on on those, Effects of assessment with agreed and noted material impacts.

00:52:35:17 - 00:52:36:08

Um,

00:52:38:06 - 00:52:45:28

obviously the NFF could not be here today. I think you've seen the letter. Um.

00:52:51:05 - 00:53:01:09

Yes. Thank you. So do you feel that there will be an ability to meet agreements on those points by the end of the examination?

00:53:02:27 - 00:53:18:23

Um, yes. Um, we moved on from all the agreements. The only outstanding, uh, disagreement now is, um, we've been embedded mitigation measures in the state and.

00:53:20:27 - 00:53:27:12

Uh, which will come through with, um, further development of the Nine Fisheries Leagues and coexistence.

00:53:36:07 - 00:53:36:29

Thank you.

00:53:39:13 - 00:53:49:23

In accordance with MPAC and three, I just want to be clear that relevant industry input has been obtained to influence the assessment and the design of the proposed project

00:53:51:12 - 00:54:22:03

in response to EPC reference CF 1.2. Again, that's examination live number rep 3027. The applicants explained a meeting was held on the 22nd of November, 2022 with the Commercial Fisheries Working Group, where the sensitivity and magnitude of impact descriptions were shared with this group. However, a note from this meeting, which is contained in app zero 43 identifies only three working group members were in attendance and the NFO was not one of them.

00:54:23:15 - 00:54:34:13

Firstly with the applicants like to confirm that this was the correct meeting. They were they were referring to, and if so, should the examine authority be concerned with the lack of representation from that working group?

00:54:38:01 - 00:55:00:15

On behalf of the applicant? Um, that reference to the commercial fisheries crew? Um, yeah, certainly. Come back with that. I'm sure after that, because the the phone couldn't attend. We we held a separate meeting with the, um, uh, Pi on stage.

00:55:18:18 - 00:55:22:01

Do you have a date for when that was said? It wasn't. Um.

00:55:22:25 - 00:55:26:24

But sorry about this. The NFF, um,

00:55:28:17 - 00:55:32:29

commented on the working group on the 27th of November.

00:55:35:25 - 00:55:39:03

You just repeat that. Sorry you were slightly breaking out on the sound.

00:55:39:05 - 00:55:47:21

Yeah. So did you agree to those, um, measures? Uh, Commercial Fisheries Group on the 27th of November?

00:55:57:07 - 00:56:26:00

Okay. And as were you aware that we've had a number of sort of representations from the FAO about the sensitivity and the magnitude of impact and how they've been defined. And, of course, they underpinned the assessment. Um, so going back to the earlier point, um, of you've been able to agree and resolve those concerns with the NFL. I think that will would be really helpful. So we can continue to have movement on that. That would be good.

00:56:33:19 - 00:56:40:24

Thank you. Thanks. Um, we're obviously working to continue to update our statements and common ground, uh, one.

00:56:40:26 - 00:56:41:11

Of which.

00:56:41:13 - 00:57:04:14

Is with NFO. Uh, we'll be submitting, um, those updated statements, common ground deadline for. We have had discussions with NFO over the course of the last week in relation to certain common ground with them, and we have another meeting planned with them, uh, next week to further, um, progress that position in relation to commercial fisheries matters.

00:57:08:00 - 00:57:09:21

Thank you. Good to hear.

00:57:13:06 - 00:57:16:17

Moving on to item 5.2 then alternative fishing grounds

00:57:18:09 - 00:57:48:12

in response to EXC reference CF 1.3, the applicants explained that alternative fishing grounds have not been assessed. However, commercial fishing activity has been assessed across the wider area of the study. For clarity, can you confirm that the alternative fishing grounds referred to in chapter 13,

which is EP 117, are within the wider sort of study area? Uh, included in the assessment or are they beyond the study area?

00:57:52:02 - 00:58:26:01

Richard Jones on behalf of the applicant? Um, that depends on the receptor, obviously. Um, flagship fisheries, um, have a very large grounds. Um, and then the inshore usual 300m, they're fishing grounds, um, laterally so along the coast and not out. So yeah, the main receptor within the assessment is under ten meters.

00:58:26:13 - 00:58:40:05

Static plots and traps. Um, the this the alternative fishing grounds are properly assessed within the commercial fisheries working area.

00:58:44:27 - 00:58:51:13

So the inshore static gear receptor alternative fishing grounds are within the study area.

00:58:52:01 - 00:58:58:23

Yeah. And then the Atlantic to me shores um Scott vessels.

00:59:02:04 - 00:59:13:06

They range obviously is outside of the economic zone as well UK. So the non UK vessels as well within those receptors.

00:59:15:13 - 00:59:18:04

And then the mutual netting fleet.

00:59:20:14 - 00:59:28:22

That receptor, um, their alternative fishing grounds are within the commercial fisheries study area.

00:59:35:02 - 01:00:08:03

Um, and then there's restrictions within those areas. Um, if I can direct you to the, uh, commercial Fisheries technical report, uh, section 2.1.5 highlights that the commercial fisheries restrictions within those areas and those restrictions include, um, um, permitted fisheries. So, um, demersal trawlers are prohibited.

01:00:08:05 - 01:00:40:21

There's a prohibition on scallop dredging. There's prohibition Eviction on pot investments over ten metres in length. And those prohibitions are within the. All these bylaws allow those receptors to fish um and disrupted along the whole latitude of the coast. In that area all year round. So there's there's no restrictions from other receptor groups.

01:00:51:02 - 01:00:51:23

Thank you.

01:00:55:03 - 01:01:24:26

So just building on that then for a second, and in response to EQC reference CF 1.7, the applicants explained that increased transit to alternative fishing grounds has not been assessed. Given that, we've just established that some of these alternative fishing grounds are outside of the study area and could be at some distance. Could the applicant explain why the increase in transits to alternative fishing grounds has not been assessed for this case?

01:01:27:14 - 01:02:05:26

Richard Joseph, on behalf of the applicant, um, the data simply isn't available to know that what you would need to, um, identify individual vessels. Those vessels sometimes do not enter the commercial fishery study area, especially the classic vessels. Um, maybe once a decade. They're following large, mobile, um, target species. Um, and you'll see within um, especially pelagic data, you'll get massive, um, spikes of landings in terms of weight and value.

01:02:06:07 - 01:02:22:11

And they sometimes only appear once a decade or Data once every five years. So yeah, the, the data to, to track those individual vessels and those receptors just simply is not available.

01:02:31:06 - 01:03:13:09

Okay. You might just need to help me understand a little bit more. So um, part of the mitigation of the effects of displacement of fish of the fishing receptors outside of the proposed development area is that they can go and fish alternative fishing grounds, some of which are within the study area and some of which are outside. But it just seemed to provide much further information other than that, and you just sort of explain it to me now that you don't have the data as to where those alternative fishing grounds would be for those receptor groups which fish at a larger scale.

01:03:14:17 - 01:03:21:18

So I'm just trying to understand how you've got to the point of the assessment of effects without that information.

01:03:26:11 - 01:03:49:11

The commercial fisheries study area. It's agreed to upon by stakeholders, um, during the consultation, um, and within those working groups, the, the mobile uh vessels. Um, so, uh, German, Dutch, Swedish, um,

01:03:50:28 - 01:04:24:09

um, sorry, Belgian, um receptors. Um, they've all said that the footprint of the development does not affect their fishery, and therefore we did not assess those large boat argues for alternative grounds. The quota, for instance, that covers the whole of the North Sea region. So quota for herring sprats. Uh, Sandy. All those quota areas to assess the catch are huge.

01:04:25:04 - 01:04:25:19

Um.

01:04:27:25 - 01:04:36:15

And so within those areas, they can bring hundreds, if not thousands of miles to, uh, solicit the catch.

01:04:46:12 - 01:04:54:18

Okay. Would anyone else like to add a point there somewhere if there's no other interested parties registered to speak on this? But I will ask anyway.

01:04:59:08 - 01:05:29:00

No, I shall move on to 5.3, which is the coexistence Agreements and cooperation agreements. The Outline Fisheries Liaison and Coexistence Plan, which is examination Library rep two zero 54, paragraph 54, explains. Alternative dispute resolution may be activated where agreements aren't reached, who would usually fulfill the role of the arbitrator, and would they be independent as the applicants that please?

01:05:55:16 - 01:06:05:29

Tune in for the applicant. Depart immediately. We may be able to look that up and give you an answer in a few minutes. It otherwise will respond in writing, if that's okay.

01:06:09:15 - 01:06:12:21

Okay, I'll give you a few minutes and come back to you about it.

01:06:19:24 - 01:06:37:20

Uh, continuing on along this line and so is chapter 13 examination living on BPP 117 reports that cooperation agreements would mitigate the moderate adverse effect for certain receptor groups. How and when would these agreements be reached?

01:07:00:21 - 01:07:15:19

My And apologies to Julian. We got distracted by that other question. Um, we can't immediately find an answer. We will come back to you in writing on it. But if you could, if you wouldn't mind repeating your last question, we'd be very grateful. Yeah.

01:07:16:03 - 01:07:35:25

Sure. No problem. There's an action point there for confirming who the role of the arbitrator would be, and whether and whether they would be independent. Then there's a follow up to that particular question, which I was going to come back to, which would what would happen if The Undertaker didn't agree to refer the dispute to ADR?

01:07:37:10 - 01:07:50:14

The wording at the moment within the Online Fisheries Liaison and Coexistence plan suggests that both parties have to agree. So I'd like to understand what happens if the Undertaker doesn't agree.

01:07:52:27 - 01:08:13:17

We confer. We can kind of come back in writing to the. I'll repeat the other question then, which was in chapter 13, app 117. It reports that cooperation agreements would mitigate the moderate adverse effect for certain receptor groups. How and when would these agreements be reached?

01:08:39:11 - 01:08:51:24

Because these agreements will obviously be entered into prior to the undertaking of works relevant to the individual fisheries groups. So we would look at the geography

01:08:53:16 - 01:09:04:20

or impact of the plans and the fishers that might be affected. And then we support student strike agreements in a timely fashion ahead of the commencement of any disruption.

01:09:16:09 - 01:09:22:27

Thank you. So. If there need to be agreed prior to the commencement of the disruption,

01:09:24:27 - 01:09:30:21

do they need to be secured appropriately so that they can be relied upon to mitigate this moderate effect?

01:09:35:18 - 01:09:36:14

On the.

01:09:38:07 - 01:09:38:22

Fine.

01:09:38:24 - 01:09:40:08

Standing of these agreements is that they.

01:09:40:26 - 01:09:49:26

Could potentially change the life of the project, so that they may vary depending on activities that are being undertaken at any given time. So there is a degree of

01:09:51:20 - 01:09:59:23

humility in relation to them, which is why we only council don't have any agreements drafted.

01:10:06:04 - 01:10:21:26

So they could be iterative throughout the life of the project, I think is what you were saying there these agreements. But would it seem a sensible approach to have at least the initial agreement secured ahead of when the disruption occurs?

01:10:32:26 - 01:10:34:08

Yes, that's correct. That would.

01:10:34:10 - 01:10:34:25

Be.

01:10:34:27 - 01:10:35:29

The intention.

01:10:53:16 - 01:10:55:14

Okay. Thank you for confirming that.

01:11:02:25 - 01:11:07:27

I'll move on to the final item then underneath agenda item five, which is 5.4.

01:11:10:15 - 01:11:40:26

Can the applicant advise how the assessment of effects on commercial fisheries would be undertaken should an extension to, or a creation of a new SAC be implemented? This is referred to within appendix three of the Rear Air Examination Library Rep 2012 and I do appreciate information on the strategic compensation is not currently available. It would be useful to understand when the assessment you would suggest would be undertaken.

01:11:44:11 - 01:11:44:26

During.

01:11:48:23 - 01:12:04:27

This. Given that this process is going to be led That by following the normal procedures for Sortation and then designation on a new marine protected area.

01:12:06:21 - 01:12:40:10

And I think there's a limit to what we can say that will assist, because it's definitely the case. And we could briefly outline what that process is, that Deptford will give a Catholic consideration to what the whole range of impacts would be rising from, um, a, uh, a new designation. But given that as a particular project that expects to benefit from that process.

01:12:41:07 - 01:13:17:09

As you'll appreciate, we we don't have the legal power to make a designation. That's why it has to be different. But also we are essentially a um, a spectator on on that process, even though we're going to be a beneficiary and even though we're going to be a part funder of that process. So we acknowledge that it's always the case with the new designation that there will be a range of impacts, and that those would often include, to a greater or lesser extent, always include, um, potential for commercial fisheries impact.

01:13:18:01 - 01:13:48:07

Um, and we we acknowledge that. But given the unique circumstances of what is now going to happen where it's never been the case before us, I'm sure you appreciate that, that, um, that, uh, strategic compensation of this kind has been delivered by a government department in this way. There's there's very little sort of detail that we can we can provide beyond explaining the process.

01:13:52:02 - 01:14:19:26

So in essence, would you say that there is an existing regime in place for that would assess these, uh, sorts of impacts that will occur as and when that strategic program comes forward? Is that how you envisage it will be progressed, or do you envisage that the project would need to do its own assessment as part of its involvement with that programme?

01:14:22:29 - 01:14:24:13

Julian, again.

01:14:26:24 - 01:14:57:18

Don't take the full detail of exactly what the government has in mind is fully available, but it would seem extraordinary if any of the projects, because there are going to be a number of projects that will be intended to benefit from, from the new designation would be expected to have any any role in terms of the assessment, I guess. Clearly those projects are

01:14:59:12 - 01:15:31:04

on that process to be successful. There's a secondary issue which may come up during the HRA discussion that the quantum of um, compensatory uh, area required, um, is, is is is important a because that is bound to be limited to it's bound to be related to how much each project will be paid. But we I don't want to stray. I just want to make one point briefly.

01:15:31:15 - 01:16:11:04

We are very the one major point of disagreement between us and Natural England at the moment is on whether or not, um, so-called disturbance should be part of the calculation of the quantum of the compensation area. We say that it shouldn't. They say that it should. But the impact of that in terms of the scale of the compensation area is considerable. And then if it were the case that Defra were, as we saw it, are taking much larger area than they actually needed on a proper consideration of what the actual justification was.

01:16:11:10 - 01:16:44:00

That, in turn would have a greater than needed, we say, impact on commercial fisheries potentially, and other other affected, um, stakeholders. So coming back to your specific point, do we expect to have any kind of meaningful role as a particular project in the assessment? Our current strong expectation is no. Will we be interested in that process? Absolutely. We want it to be a successful process. And because we are going to be, uh, paying for part of it.

01:16:44:04 - 01:16:59:18

We're very keen to understand exactly how that payment mechanism operates, and we want that to be a fair mechanism so that we are only, um, paying what what is, uh, what is, uh, justified? Justifiable.

01:17:08:02 - 01:17:09:21

Thank you. That's useful too.

01:17:11:14 - 01:17:21:10

Right. Before I conclude on agenda item five, can I just check if there's anything else that the applicants wish to discuss under this item?

01:17:29:02 - 01:17:33:27

I know, I don't think there's anything we were intending to grace or hoping that you would raise.

01:17:36:27 - 01:17:39:13

Thank you. And does anyone else have anything they would like to raise?

01:17:50:03 - 01:17:53:02

Okay. At this point, I shall hand back to Mrs. Ciani.

01:17:55:06 - 01:18:11:08

Thank you. Um, I think this would be an appropriate point. Now, to take a short break. Um, the time is now 1048, and I would suggest that we take a break for 15 minutes, but be okay with everyone.

01:18:12:27 - 01:18:13:23

Yes. Yeah.

01:18:15:00 - 01:18:36:04

Okay. So that would mean that we come back at, uh, 11:03, um, while we adjourn. Can I just ask that all participants turn off their cameras and mute their microphones? Those people watching the live stream will need to refresh their browser. This meeting is now adjourned and will be resumed at 11:03. Thank you.