

Date: 06 October 2026
Our ref: 559940
Your ref: EN010169



The Planning Inspectorate

BY EMAIL ONLY

Customer Services
Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

T 0300 060 3900

Dear [REDACTED]

NSIP Reference Name / Code: Meridian Solar Farm
Interested Party reference: TBC

Title: Natural England's Deadline 2 Response to the Applicant's Deadline 1 Updates

Examining Authority's submission deadline: 06 October 2026

Natural England (NE) is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Since the submission of Natural England's Relevant Representations (RR-140), the Applicant has provided a range of clarifications, additional information and updated application documents at Deadline 1. Natural England welcomes the constructive engagement undertaken to date and the Applicant's efforts to clearly identify and signpost these updates within the Relevant Representations Report.

Natural England has reviewed the additional information provided and our detailed comments on each of the matters relevant to our previous representations are set out in Annex 1 to this letter.

In addition, an updated Risk and Issues Log has been submitted alongside this letter, summarising the updates to our advice in spreadsheet form.

We trust that the attached Annex & separate Risk and Issues Log provides a clear record of Natural England's updated position in response to the Applicant's Deadline 1 submissions and will assist the Examining Authority in its consideration of the application.

For any further advice on this consultation please contact consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Senior Sustainable Development Officer
East Midlands Area Delivery – Natural England

Annex 1 – Natural England’s Updated Advice at Deadline 2

Table 1: Natural England’s Updated Advice

Issue Ref	Updated Advice	RAG Rating
NE3 - IIWS Qualifying Species	The Supplementary Advice to the Conservation Objectives for the Wash SPA¹ sets out within the 'Waterbird Assemblage, Non-breeding' feature the target to 'maintain the species diversity of bird assemblage'. The supporting notes go on to state that: <i>"To meet the target, the populations of each of the ‘main component’ assemblage species to be maintained or restored are i) those present in nationally important numbers (≥1% GB population); ii) migratory species present in internationally important numbers (≥1% biogeographic population); iii) those species comprising ≥2,000 individuals (≥10% of the minimum qualifying threshold for an internationally-important assemblage); and iv) ‘named components’ otherwise listed on the SPA citation. In addition to the main components, other components should be considered"</i>. Main components not listed in the SPA citation, but which qualify under the definition provided above include <u>Lapwing</u>, <u>Golden plover</u> and <u>Whooper Swan</u>. The HRA has considered Golden Plover as a qualifying species (paragraph 4.4.33), which is welcomed. Any further identification or impact assessment of FLL should continue to consider these species as main components.	Green
NE4 - Impact Pathways Considered	NE welcome the update to HRA Table 4 regarding impact pathways on FLL. No further issue is raised.	Green
NE5 - Identification of FLL	Natural England has reviewed the updated HRA, including the information provided within Appendix 3 regarding the identification of Functionally Linked Land (FLL). Whilst we acknowledge that the Applicant has provided additional justification for the identification of FLL, we do not agree that all of the areas screened out from further consideration should be discounted based on the information presented. The survey data set out within HRA Appendix 3 includes records of SPA/Ramsar qualifying species occurring in some areas in notably high numbers indicating that these locations are used by SPA/Ramsar birds and may therefore provide a functional role in supporting the designated site populations. Of particular note are the numbers of Whooper Swan, Lapwing and Golden Plover identified: Location 'A1 – c.195ha arable land (occasional surface flooding)' supported: - A peak of 76.59% of the Wash WeBS population of Whooper Swan, with the species using the area regularly in 2024/25. - A peak of 1.02% of the Wash WeBS population of Lapwing on one occasion.	Amber

¹ [Designated Sites View](#)

- 10.6% of the Wash SPA's overall waterfowl assemblage, with regular use in 24/25.

Location 'B – c.400ha arable land' supported:

- A peak of 15.32% of the Wash WeBS population of Whooper Swan, with the species using the area intermittently in 2024/25.

Location 'C – 219ha arable land' supported:

- A peak of 1.75% of the Wash WeBS population of Whooper Swan, though only recorded on 2 occasions.

Location 'D – c.280ha arable land' supported:

- A peak of 2.03% of the Wash WeBS population of Lapwing, which were recorded a total of 15 times.
- A peak of 54.70% of the Wash WeBS population of Whooper Swan, with the species recorded here on 6 occasions.

'Land between Austendyke Road and West Gate' supported:

- A peak of 2.27% of the Wash Ramsar population of Golden Plover, with the species recorded here on 5 occasions.

'Land north of A151' supported:

- A peak of 1.02% of the Wash WeBS population of Lapwing, with the species recorded here on 3 occasions in 2025.

Natural England notes an apparent inconsistency between the conclusions reached for these areas and the precautionary approach described in paragraph 4.4.10 of the HRA. This paragraph recognises that the use of supporting habitats by wintering and migratory birds can vary considerably between years and seasons and that the absence of consistently high numbers does not necessarily indicate that land is not functionally linked. It is therefore unclear why the same precautionary approach has not been applied to those areas where substantial numbers of SPA birds have been recorded, particularly where bird activity appears comparable to, or in some cases greater than, that recorded within areas identified by the Applicant as FLL.

Natural England's preference would be for the Applicant to adopt the precautionary approach set out in paragraph 4.4.10 and retain these areas within the FLL assessment. The potential effects of disturbance and habitat loss on birds using these areas should then be considered within the Appropriate Assessment, together with any necessary mitigation measures, as discussed under NE7. In particular, consideration should be given to whether disturbance of these areas could adversely affect the integrity of the relevant SPA/Ramsar populations through impacts on the wider network of supporting habitat.

Alternatively, should the Applicant wish to maintain its conclusion that these areas (or some of these areas) are not FLL, further information should be provided. This should include a clearer spatial explanation of the location of identified FLL fields, the location

	of bird records in relation to the proposed works, and a more robust justification as to why the areas screened out are not considered to provide functional value to SPA/Ramsar populations. However, given the significant numbers of SPA birds recorded within some of these areas, Natural England advises that any such justification would need to be supported by compelling evidence.	
NE6 - Direct Loss of FLL	Appendix 3 has considered a number of additional areas of potential Functionally Linked Land (FLL). However, insufficient information has been provided regarding the location of these areas in relation to the Order Limits. We therefore request that mapping is provided to clearly show the extent and location of all potential FLL considered within the assessment. Referring to our comments at NE5, this information is necessary to determine whether any newly identified areas of FLL fall within the Order Limits or could be otherwise subject to significant disturbance effects arising from the Proposed Development. Where areas of FLL are identified within the Order Limits, Natural England considers that the Habitats Regulations Assessment should be updated to assess the implications of the long-term or permanent loss of this habitat resource for SPA bird populations, considering any potential mitigation measures, and whether the loss of these areas could adversely affect the integrity of the relevant SPA populations. This would need to include an update to the in-combination assessment.	Amber
NE7 - Noise and Visual Disturbance to FLL	Natural England welcomes the applicant's decision to take the potential effects of noise and visual disturbance on SPA/Ramsar qualifying bird species through to Appropriate Assessment. Given the potential for construction activities to affect birds using Functionally Linked Land (FLL), we consider this to be an appropriate and precautionary approach. <u>Lighting</u> Natural England also welcomes the inclusion of lighting mitigation measures within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP). Whilst these measures appear to have been developed primarily for bats, the proposed controls are also relevant to SPA/Ramsar bird species using FLL within and surrounding the Order Limits. In particular, Section 2.6 of the oCEMP sets out a number of lighting principles, including the use of lighting only where absolutely necessary. This commitment is welcomed. However, Natural England recommends that security cameras operate using night-vision technology wherever possible to avoid the need for sudden or bright artificial illumination. Such an approach would help reduce the risk of disturbance and disorientation of birds migrating or commuting through the area at night, particularly during periods of poor visibility such as fog. It would also provide benefits for invertebrate populations, which can be adversely affected by artificial lighting through disruption to behaviour and life-cycle processes. <u>Avoidance</u> With regard to the proposed seasonal avoidance measures, it is not clear whether the generic winter period identified for avoidance reflects the survey data collected within the FLL areas. Information should be provided on the timing of peak bird usage of the relevant FLL parcels and whether this supports the proposed seasonal restriction period. It is noted that reliance on seasonal	Amber

avoidance alone may not be sufficient to ensure disturbance effects are avoided, particularly where construction programme constraints limit flexibility.

Natural England notes the applicant's assessment identifying a disturbance distance of up to 1,100 m for piling activities. In our view, alternative piling methodologies (for example Auger piling) should be the default approach wherever works are proposed within this distance of identified FLL.

Additional Mitigation

Where works cannot be scheduled to avoid sensitive periods for SPA/Ramsar birds in proximity to FLL, Natural England welcomes the applicant's commitment to additional mitigation measures. However, we have concerns regarding both the effectiveness and practical implementation of some of the proposed measures. In particular, reliance on an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) to identify bird disturbance during construction activities may not adequately prevent disturbance effects. Once disturbance has occurred, the impact has already taken place. The role of the ECoW should therefore be focused on preventing works from commencing until the relevant area has been checked and an appropriate clearance has been given. Nonetheless, this ECoW approach may cause significant programme delays should birds remain present for multiple days or over an extended period.

We also have concerns regarding the feasibility of reducing construction noise to below disruptive levels through measures such as acoustic fencing. The noise contour modelling presented in HRA Appendix 1 Figure 6 indicates that noise levels in excess of 85 dB may occur within areas identified as FLL. On the basis of the information currently provided, it is unlikely the proposed mitigation would be capable of achieving the reductions necessary to avoid behavioural disturbance to qualifying bird species.

These uncertainties emphasise the importance of avoiding disturbing works in proximity to identified FLL during the winter period.

Precautionary Assessment

As a result of these uncertainties, Natural England also advises that the Appropriate Assessment should include a precautionary worst-case scenario assessment. This should assume that construction activities cannot always be delayed or halted, and that some level of disturbance to birds using FLL will occur. The assessment should then consider the implications of such disturbance for the integrity of the SPA/Ramsar site, taking into account the temporary nature of the disturbance, the distance from the designated site, the availability of alternative habitat, and the effectiveness of the proposed avoidance and mitigation measures. Whilst these factors may indicate that an adverse effect on site integrity can be ruled out, it is unlikely that all disturbance effects can be completely avoided.

As an alternative approach, the applicant may wish to investigate opportunities for the temporary enhancement or provision of habitat outside the predicted disturbance zones to offset any temporary reduction in the availability or suitability of FLL during

	construction. Such measures could provide additional confidence that the functional habitat resource available to SPA/Ramsar bird populations would be maintained throughout the construction period. <u>Cumulative Assessment</u> Finally, the cumulative effects assessment should be updated to reflect any residual disturbance effects that remain following the implementation of avoidance and mitigation measures. This is necessary to ensure that the potential for in-combination effects on SPA/Ramsar bird populations has been fully considered within the Appropriate Assessment and so future developments can appropriately consider their own in combination effect with this project.	
NE8 - Predator Shadows	As set out in our comments at NE6, insufficient information has been provided regarding the location of potential FLL areas in relation to the Order Limits. We therefore advise that mapping is provided to clearly show the extent and location of all potential FLL considered within the assessment. This is also important in the context of the predator shadow assessment as the applicant's conclusion that significant effects can be ruled out is based on the assumption that all identified FLL lies beyond the zone of influence of the proposed pylons and is therefore not subject to predator shadow effects. However, where additional areas of FLL are identified, particularly those located closer to the proposed pylons, this assumption may no longer be valid. In such circumstances, the predator shadow assessment should be revisited and updated to consider the potential effects on birds using these areas.	Amber
NE14 - Stage 1 Screening Conclusions	Natural England welcomes the inclusion of noise and visual disturbance effects in the Appropriate Assessment in response to our previous comments. However, as set out under NE5, further consideration is still required regarding the identification and screening of potential Functionally Linked Land (FLL). Until the extent and location of all areas of potential FLL have been clearly established, Natural England does not consider it possible to conclude that all relevant effects have been adequately assessed. In particular, where additional areas of FLL are identified, consideration may be required of the operational effects associated with the long-term or permanent loss of supporting habitat available to SPA/Ramsar bird populations.	Amber
NE15 – Collision Risk	The inclusion of consultation with Natural England on the detailed design of bird diverters within the oOEMP is welcomed. DCO Requirement 13 does not specify consultation with Natural England on the oOEMP, however, consultation on the entirety of the OEMP is not likely to be necessary. Nonetheless, NE query whether the requirement could be amended to secure consultation on the diverters, or whether the inclusion of the commitment within the oOEMP is sufficient, given <i>‘The operational environmental management plan must be substantially in accordance with the outline operational environmental management plan’?</i>	Yellow

	Natural England note the applicant's statement that it is not appropriate to rely on monitoring as mitigation; agree with this. NE concur with the conclusion drawn in the HRA, but continue to advise that the project should include a scheme of monitoring as a matter of best practise. It is noted that the oOEMP includes ongoing checks and replacement of diverters, which is welcomed, however, monitoring and incident logging is only included in year 1 post installation. Monitoring and incident reporting should, ideally, continue for the operational lifetime of the development, or be undertaken at intervals when the Overhead line is new & then later when it is an established feature. It is acknowledged that it is likely not proportionate to undertake extensive VP survey work; instead focus should be on identification of collision victims on the ground. The purpose of this monitoring would be to establish the effectiveness of mitigation by collecting evidence on bird mortality, enabling an adaptive management approach whereby additional bird flight diverters or other mitigation measures can be installed in locations where unforeseen collisions are identified. Natural England therefore recommends the establishment of a clear and accessible reporting mechanism to facilitate the recording of collision incidents. This should enable landowners, environmental NGOs, local bird groups and members of the public to report suspected collisions, thereby contributing to a comprehensive evidence base to inform adaptive management measures and the timely removal of carcasses where required.	
NE16 – Collision Risk Modelling	Natural England note the applicant's rationale but have no further comment to make on this matter & our advice remains unchanged.	Yellow
NE18 - Appropriate Assessment Conclusions	Natural England's position remains unchanged. Further consideration of both disturbance effects and the loss of Functionally Linked Land (FLL) is required within the Appropriate Assessment before it can be concluded that there would be no adverse effect on site integrity.	Amber
BMV3 - ALC Survey Methodology – Cable Corridor	NE's advice on the ALC survey methods in the cable corridor remains unchanged.	Yellow
BMV4 - ALC Survey Methodology – Incomplete Survey	Natural England welcomes the commitment included within Section 3.1 of the Outline Soil Management Plan to complete the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey for those areas that were not accessible during the pre-application stage, including due to UXO presence. This commitment will help ensure that a complete ALC evidence base is available to inform the detailed Soil Management Plan.	Green

	In general, where there are legitimate constraints preventing survey access, the use of predictive mapping or professional interpretation to inform the assessment is considered appropriate, provided that the outstanding survey work is secured and completed post-consent to verify land quality and inform any necessary management measures.	
BMV5.1 - ALC Survey Findings – Mapping	NE does not advocate mapping every isolated auger observation as a discrete polygon. However, neither does NE consider field-average mapping to be an appropriate basis for determining the spatial extent of BMV land. ALC mapping should instead be derived from professional interpretation of the survey evidence, ensuring that coherent areas of higher quality agricultural land are identified and represented where they can reasonably be expected to occur. NE does not consider that the evidence presented demonstrates that field boundaries consistently coincide with changes in soil type or ALC grade across the Site. Agricultural field boundaries are management features and do not necessarily reflect changes in soil properties, wetness, droughtiness or land quality. The use of field boundaries as grade boundaries therefore risks introducing artificial mapping units that do not accurately represent the distribution of agricultural land quality. This concern is reinforced by the Applicant's own findings which identify local variability in topsoil depth, wetness limitations and ALC grade sufficient to produce materially different outcomes between the field-average and auger-by-auger analyses (paras 5.6.15-5.6.17). NE considers that ALC boundaries should be derived from interpretation of the soil survey evidence, landform, drainage characteristics and soil-landscape relationships, rather than being aligned to field boundaries unless there is clear evidence that the field boundary coincides with a genuine change in agricultural land quality. Accordingly, NE remains concerned that the mapped extent and distribution of BMV land may not be fully representative of the survey evidence presented.	Amber
BMV5.2 - ALC Survey Findings – Mapping	Natural England notes that the post-1988 ALC survey available through the Access to Evidence database cannot be meaningfully compared with the submitted survey due to the absence of detailed profile descriptions, soil logs and field data. However, Natural England's Access to Evidence records state that "<i>Unedited sample point soils data and soil pit descriptions are also available for some surveys</i>". Consequently, it is not clear that the information currently available through the public-facing records represents the full extent of the survey evidence. When requested, Natural England can seek access to the underlying survey records, including sample point data and soil pit descriptions, to facilitate further technical review and comparison. In addition, the Applicant acknowledges that the post-1988 survey identified a mix of Grade 2 and Grade 3a land within the area surveyed, whereas ES Appendix 5-3 reports a mixture of Grades 1, 3a and 3b for the same broad area. This discrepancy reinforces, rather than diminishes, the need to understand the basis for the differing ALC interpretations and grading outcomes. While Natural England accepts that the post-1988 survey covers only part of Parcel B, the survey nevertheless represents a relevant historical evidence source which should not be discounted solely on the basis that supporting field records are not presently published alongside the mapping.	Amber

	Accordingly, Natural England maintains that the post-1988 survey remains a material consideration and, should uncertainty persist regarding the grading of the land, it may be appropriate to obtain and review any underlying survey records held within the Access to Evidence archive to better understand the reasons for the differing ALC classifications reported across the site.	
BMV6 - ALC Survey Findings – Wetness Class Calculation	NE notes the Applicant's clarification that calcium carbonate testing using 10% hydrochloric acid was undertaken in accordance with ALC guidance and that positive reactions were limited and spatially discontinuous. NE further notes the Applicant's conclusion that most observations did not indicate calcium carbonate contents exceeding the 1% threshold required for application of the naturally calcareous soil provisions within Table 6 of the ALC Guidelines. On this basis, NE considers that the carbonate issue has been substantially clarified. However, NE continues to seek clarification regarding the interpretation of gleying, given the widespread recording of grey and ochreous mottles within soil profiles and the conclusion that gleying was absent from the upper profile. NE considers that this matter remains relevant to confirmation of the reported wetness classifications and associated ALC grades.	Amber
BMV7 - ALC Survey Findings – Soil Auger Records	NE welcomes the provision of additional pit descriptions, auger logs and photographs. However, concerns remain regarding the consistency between the evidence presented and the conclusions drawn from that evidence. The auger logs record remarkably similar horizon depths, colours, structures and profile descriptions across extensive areas and separate land parcels. This appears inconsistent with the level of variability described elsewhere in the assessment. In particular, Chapter 5 states that local variation in soil characteristics is sufficient to generate materially different ALC outcomes between the field-average and auger-by-auger analyses, increasing BMV land from 35.2% to 39.2% (paras. 5.6.15-5.6.17). NE also notes an apparent contradiction between the Applicant's position on soil variability. In BMV5.1, local variation is presented as insufficiently meaningful to warrant separate mapping units, whereas elsewhere the Applicant relies upon variation in topsoil depth and profile characteristics to explain differing ALC grades over relatively short distances. The pit photographs and descriptions suggest greater variability in soil horizons than is reflected in many of the auger logs (paras 5.4.9, 5.6.15-5.6.17). NE further notes that the revised reports rely upon archaeological trench exposures to describe soil structure and wetness characteristics. NE accepts that the use of archaeological pits can be appropriate where conventional pit excavation is not practicable. However, the methodology should have been more fully described within the ALC reports and ES Chapter 5. Limited information is provided regarding trench preparation, profile exposure, orientation and confidence in the observations used to determine structure, biopore abundance and slowly permeable layers.	Yellow

	Finally, the pit descriptions and logs repeatedly record grey and ochreous mottling within clay subsoils, yet the wetness assessment concludes that gleying is absent within the upper profile. The basis for this interpretation is not clearly explained within the reports & clarification is requested (as per our advice on BMV6). NE does not seek additional survey work in relation to these matters but wishes to draw them to the attention of the Examining Authority when considering the overall robustness of the ALC assessment.	
BMV8 - ALC Survey Findings – Soil Lab Analysis	Natural England notes that the laboratory testing undertaken has provided the information necessary to inform the ALC assessment. Although it differs from the standard testing approach typically used for ALC surveys, no further issue is raised. Natural England considers the matter relating to HCI testing to be clarified & remove our request for a worst-case scenario assessment assuming all soils are calcareous. However, the further information requested within BMV6 regarding soil wetness class is still required.	Green
BMV10 – ALC Survey Results	Natural England's advice regarding the robustness of the ALC surveys (BMV 5-8) is set out above. NE continue to have concerns regarding the ALC survey results which inform the ES assessment, which must be considered in the decision making process.	Amber
BMV11 - Permanent Loss of BMV Land for Hardstanding	Natural England welcomes the revisions made in paragraphs 5.8.9 to 5.8.12, which now assess all Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land beneath permanent hardstanding as a permanent loss, in line with our previous advice. We note that this has resulted in the significance of effect being revised from a moderate adverse effect to a major adverse effect (significant) in respect of the permanent loss of BMV land.	Green
BMV12 - Downgrading of effect magnitude	NE disagrees with the Applicant's decision to reduce the magnitude of effect associated with the permanent loss of BMV land arising from tree and shrub planting. Whilst NE acknowledges that the revised Scheme no longer includes woodland blocks and that permanent habitat creation has been reduced principally to field boundary planting and scattered trees, this does not alter the fact that the planting would result in the permanent withdrawal of areas of BMV land from agricultural production. The affected land would no longer be available for agricultural use and, once established, the planting is acknowledged by the Applicant to represent a permanent land use change that is unlikely to be reversed at decommissioning (paras. 5.7.3, 5.8.14, 5.8.25-5.8.31). The Applicant's assessment identifies approximately 8.3 ha of Grade 1 and 2 land and 10.8 ha of Subgrade 3a land affected by permanent tree and shrub planting, amounting to approximately 19.1 ha of BMV land being permanently removed from agricultural use (Table 5-16; paras. 5.8.14, 5.10.6). The Applicant's adopted methodology defines:	Amber

	• Medium magnitude impacts as permanent irreversible loss of between 5 ha and 20 ha; and • High magnitude impacts as permanent irreversible loss exceeding 20 ha. (Table 5-6; para. 5.4.16) Notwithstanding these thresholds, the Applicant has applied professional judgement to reduce the magnitude of effect associated with permanent tree and shrub planting to a low magnitude impact, principally because the planting is confined to field boundaries and because the habitat features would provide wider environmental benefits (paras. 5.8.3, 5.8.14, 5.8.19). NE does not agree that these factors justify a reduction in magnitude. The purpose of the agriculture and soils assessment is to assess the effect on the agricultural land resource. Whilst biodiversity, landscape and soil-function benefits may be relevant to the overall planning balance, they do not reduce the extent of agricultural land that would be permanently removed from agricultural production. Similarly, the location of the planting on field boundaries may influence agricultural management & benefit surrounding land, but does not negate the permanent loss of the agricultural land itself (paras. 5.8.3, 5.8.14). NE therefore considers that the permanent conversion of approximately 19.1 ha of BMV land should be assessed in accordance with the thresholds established within the Applicant's own methodology and that a medium magnitude effect would be more appropriate than the low magnitude effect reported (Table 5-6; paras. 5.8.3, 5.8.14). Consequently, NE does not agree with the Applicant's conclusion that the permanent loss of BMV land resulting from tree and shrub planting represents only a minor adverse effect. In NE's view, the magnitude assigned understates the scale of permanent agricultural land loss and is not fully consistent with the assessment framework presented in Chapter 5 (Table 5-6; Table 5-16; paras 5.8.3, 5.8.14).	
BMV13 - Overall Permanent Loss of BMV Land	As stated at BMV12, the purpose of the agriculture and soils assessment is to assess the effect on the agricultural land resource. Whilst biodiversity, landscape and soil-function benefits may be relevant to the overall planning balance, they do not reduce the extent of agricultural land that would be permanently removed from agricultural production. Similarly, the location of the planting on field boundaries may influence agricultural management & benefit surrounding land, but does not negate the permanent loss of the agricultural land itself (paras 5.8.3, 5.8.14). As a result, Natural England continue to advise that the ES conclusions need to be based on <u>overall permanent loss</u>.	Amber
BMV15 - Soil Management	Natural England welcomes the clarifications provided and amendments made to the oSMP in direct response to each of our comments. We raise no further concerns on this matter.	Green