



Natura 2000 & European Marine Site

**Draft FIFTH
ANNUAL REPORT**

OF

**THE WASH & NORTH NORFOLK COAST
EUROPEAN MARINE SITE
MANAGEMENT SCHEME**

**Produced by P D Rushmer
PROJECT MANAGER**

DECEMBER 2006

Contents:

Preface:	page 3
Non-technical Report:	page 4
<u>1.0 Review of Work Programme 2006:</u>	page 5
1.1 Communication Strategy	
1.2 Good Practice Guide and 4 th Annual Report Leaflet	
1.3 EMS Management Scheme Review	page 6
1.4 Incident Recording Process	page 7
1.5 Integrated Programme of Monitoring	page 8
1.6 Action Plan Review and 5 th Annual Report	page 9
<u>2.0 Constitutional Issues:</u>	page10
2.1 Memorandum of Agreement and Project Manager's Contract	
2.2 Income and Expenditure Profile	
<u>3.0 Work Programme 2007:</u>	page 11
<u>4.0 Conclusion:</u>	page 12

Appendices:

1. Action Plan - click on separate icon herewith.

N.B. Other Appendices to be added when available in due course.

THE WASH AND NORTH NORFOLK COAST EUROPEAN MARINE (EMS) SITE MANAGEMENT SCHEME (MS)

PREFACE:

For the benefit of those reading about the Wash and North Norfolk Coast EMS Management Scheme for the first time, or who have not been involved with it for long, **the following is repeated from previous Annual Reports in order to give context**

On the 25th January 2002 the Wash & North Norfolk Coast EMS Management Scheme was launched by Elliot Morley MP at a public meeting hosted by the Full Management Group.

Mr Morley said:-

“The Wash and North Norfolk Coast is one of the most important marine wildlife areas in the country. It is a pleasure to see people from so many different walks of life come together to create a framework to safeguard this area. I congratulate them on their six years of hard work and their determination to see it through to a successful conclusion.

The Wash is among the ten most important wetland sites in Britain for waterfowl and provides key habitats for a number of species, including oyster catchers, knot and migrating birds. It is also home to one of Europe’s largest populations of common seal.

Several organisations have been involved in the development of the management scheme, including local authorities, English Nature and Eastern Sea Fisheries Joint Committee. Three Advisory Groups, representing local people and organisations with an interest in the site, have also been heavily involved.

The Wash and North Norfolk Coast is designated a European marine site under UK Habitats Regulations. This designation places new and stronger responsibilities on authorities and agencies to work closely together to safeguard nature conservation. The site extends along the coasts from north of Gibraltar Point (Lincolnshire) to just beyond Salthouse (Norfolk) and out to sea for three miles. It takes in the entire Wash and a considerable length of the north Norfolk coastline”.

Mr Morley added, “The Wash and North Norfolk Coast Management Scheme, in particular, has demonstrated, the importance of wider stakeholder involvement and participation, and the value of having an effective chairperson to steer the work of the Management Group”

The process of developing the Management Scheme began in 1996 and the launch followed a particularly intensive period of work taken forward by the then project manager Diana Mortimer, culminating in the first draft in Spring 2001.

This was followed by extensive informal and formal consultation and production of the first edition in winter 2001.

Relevant Authorities (RA) and the three Advisory Groups (AG) were subsequently asked to sign up to the Management Scheme.

The management scheme has the challenging task of maintaining the important wildlife and interest features of the site whilst encouraging sustainable use and maintaining the needs of its many users now and in the future.

**The Wash and North Norfolk Coast European Marine Site
Fifth Annual Report as @ December 2006:**

Non-technical Report

1.0 REVIEW OF WORK PROGRAMME 2006 -The following table is an updated version of that included in the FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT as @ DECEMBER 2005:

Priority areas of work with “at a glance” progress update:

Time-scale 2006	Work Area and Action	Progress @ 31.12.06
1st quarter	1.1 Communication Strategy: Update in liaison with Norfolk Coast Project and Wash Estuary Strategy Officers	Completed on target
1st half & remainder	Pursue wide strategy using the ESRC model (postscript - strategy for 2006 included public consultation on draft 2 nd edition EMS Management Scheme)	Completed on target except for stalled public consultation
All quarters	1.2 Good Practice Guide (and postscript - 4th Annual Report Leaflet): Continue to promote and distribute – consider need to review in 2007	Completed on target, plus 4 th Report leaflet produced
1st quarter	1.3 EMS Management Scheme Review: Update review programme following AFMB December '05 Develop pre consultation 1 st re draft, consulting internally.	Completed on target
remainder	Develop public consultation 2 nd edition redraft, consulting externally. Using website as both holding and access facility	Stalled and slipped to '07
1st quarter	1.4 Incident Recording Process: Consolidate 2005 results onto spreadsheet Agree 3 rd party resource for interpretation & compiling to database & GIS	Completed on target
remainder	Review process with working group, update and re-launch for 2006 Review results with working group, management and advisory groups	Review of '06 results slipped to Spring '07
1st half	1.5 Integrated Programme of Monitoring (IPM): Develop as programmed following AFMB December 2005, delivering Tranche 1 and Tranche 2 draft Conservation Objectives, consulting with advisory, stakeholder and management groups.	Started on target, then stalled and slipped to '07
remainder	Develop Condition Assessment consulting as above and report to EU	
3rd quarter	1.6 Action Plan Review (APR) and Fifth Annual Report (AR): Review progress and draft report	APR started Oct '06. AR slipped to Jan '07

N.B. More detail of progress made during 2006 is reported in the following text.

1.1 Communication Strategy:

This will be available on the website in support of the Fifth Annual Report.

Actions - Update in liaison with Norfolk Coast Partnership (NCP) and Wash Estuary Strategy (WES) Officers and Pursue wide strategy using the ESRC model

The initial communication strategy was put together in draft form in 2004. It is based on the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) model and has been developed further to enable evaluation of success for annual reporting purposes.

Early consultation was undertaken with NCP and WES Project Officers to review mutual opportunities for promoting respective plans, their relationship to each other and to demonstrate co-operation.

Internal and external communication between partners and other stakeholders has remained comprehensive during 2006, there being a major emphasis upon the two way flow of information into and out from the project in order to meet and progress EMS Management Scheme review programme.

The variety of external publicity opportunities and events engaged with has included presentations to the Hunstanton Civic Society, Springwood High School and PIL Membranes, the latter two both in King's Lynn, and the national EMS Officers' Workshop at Bawdsey in Suffolk. Publicity displays have also been undertaken at Green Quay during Wash Week in the summer and at the Wash Wide Conference and South Holland District Council's Environment Day in the autumn. Other opportunities have been taken to engage with the NCP's Sustainable Tourism Workshop at Hunstanton and their Quiz Night at Brancaster Staithe.

A major opportunity has, however, been postponed with the slippage of the public consultation for the draft 2nd edition EMS Management Scheme and the associated promotional "roadshow", originally planned for Autumn 2006, prior to publication of a definitive 2nd edition Scheme scheduled for 2007.

With the latter exception, evaluation has nonetheless shown a high rate of success at meeting objectives set and designed to reach a wide cross section of target audience.

1.2 Good Practice Guide (GPG) and 4th Annual Report Leaflet:

Actions - Continue to promote and distribute and Consider need to review in 2007

Raising awareness of the importance and fragility of the marine site and its interest features remains of fundamental importance to the EMS management project.

The GPG remains an important tool in achieving this and has been in constant use as project publicity since its launch in 2004 and its wide distribution has continued in association with the Communication Strategy.

Though the general message it carries remains relevant, it is felt wise to review both its format and content in 2007 to take account of any necessary change of emphasis.

This will be taken forward by the advisory groups with a view to re-publication (if necessary) in 2008, at a similar time to the start of the 3rd Memorandum of Agreement underwriting the project (due April 2008).

To quote from the 4th Annual Report (December 2005):

"Launched in Spring 2004 with an order of 25,000 copies, 22,500 (approx) copies were distributed in first year and response was very favourable from a variety of sources,12,000 more copies were ordered to top up demand for 2005....7000 (approx) copies have been distributed across the site in 2005...."

Of the total number of copies purchased (37,000), very few now remain undistributed.

In 2005, the Full Management Board (FMB) considered the format of the fourth annual report, recognising the need to produce a brief and interesting document to satisfy their aspiration to more effectively disseminate the achievements of the management project to the general public.

The FMB also agreed it should drop the 2005 action plan review when it became clear this would duplicate and possibly be counter productive to some work being undertaken on the management scheme review.

The FMB therefore gave its agreement to the production of a concertina style leaflet carrying brief bullet point style and punchy messages in an attractive pictorial format (including cartoons). This was felt to be the ideal opportunity to use this medium to summarise achievements over the previous three years and look forward to the future.

So, the 4th Annual Report leaflet was born in the Spring of 2006. It has been distributed widely with the GPG and has met its objectives well, proving a useful and popular tool for disseminating appropriate messages and engaging with the public. It was designed to remain valid for two years, cost a £1,000 for design, artwork and cartoonery and £1,400 to print 15,000 copies, of which only 5000 remain.

Whether this approach is followed in the future depends on later debate and the outcome of the management scheme review process.

1.3 EMS Management Scheme Review:

**Actions - Update review programme following AFMB December '05
Develop pre consultation 1st re draft, consulting internally.**

The EMS Management Scheme Review process commenced with a workshop in April 2005. Following this, a detailed programme was developed for the agreed in-house review and instigated in July 2005, with an acknowledgement that the timescale was ambitious, yet pragmatic. Following good, if slower than anticipated, progress being made the original programme was reviewed and revised in the light of experience and a more realistic programme developed. This was presented at the Annual FMB 2005 and subsequently further revised, with the objective of delivering a 2nd edition of the Wash and North Norfolk Coast European Marine Site Management Scheme in late 2006/early 2007 (see reviewed Timescales and Programme in on the project website homepage).

In December 2005 EN's Tranche 1 draft Conservation Objectives were published and under consideration by the management and advisory groups and other work progressed as planned thereafter. By mid April 2006 the project manager had worked up a roughcut first redraft of the 2nd edition Management Scheme, which was on the website for internal consultation; the target having been the beginning of April. This draft was to be revised in the light of comments received from the internal consultation and revalidated once the conservation objectives and associated condition assessment had been carried out.

By then, however, it was clear EN were experiencing increasing difficulties delivering the Tranche 2 draft Conservation Objectives for consideration by the Management and Advisory Groups and that the review programme might slip significantly. It was, however, noted that the Joint Nature Conservancy's Condition Report to the EU was not due until mid 2007 and not 2006 as had initially been thought.

A review of the position for the July 2006 FMB concluded that the first redraft of the 2nd edition Management Scheme was about a month behind schedule following the internal consultation and subsequent updating, though certain textual detail and maps were still required from EN. It was, however, also noted that the (Integrated Programme of Monitoring (IPM)) Conservation Objectives review and associated Condition Assessment had slipped indefinitely as a consequence of the severe workload pressure and lack of resource being experienced by EN. It was recognised this was critical to completing the management scheme

review, with at the very least some qualifying text being essential and available for inclusion within a short timescale in order for the process to move forward.

By the end of August none of the outstanding information was to hand, so the project manager put the following proposals firstly to the Core Management Group (CMG) and subsequently to the FMB, which were agreed and confirmed at the October 2006 FMG meeting:

Proposal 1:

That we publish the rigorously reviewed and updated Annexes and Action Plan within the management and advisory groups and our stakeholder network, and press on with implementation and the review of progress in the normal way.

Proposal 2:

We should postpone going to public consultation with the draft 2nd edition Management Scheme text, till at least the middle of 2007.

**Actions - Develop public consultation 2nd edition redraft, consulting externally
Using website as both holding and access facility**

As a consequence of the above difficulties, the review process is frozen until such time as a robust plan can be made for completing and delivering a draft 2nd edition Management Scheme for public consultation in 2007. This action is taken, as agreed at the October 2006 FMG meeting, on the understanding that the management groups and project manager will assist Natural England (previously English Nature until October 2006) where ever possibly to set up the required robust programme and arrangements. The intention is to make real progress with the draft Conservation Objectives review and associated Condition Assessment at the earliest opportunity.

1.4 Incident Recording Process:

Actions - Consolidate 2005 results onto spreadsheet

Agree 3rd party resource for interpretation & compiling to database & GIS

Review process with working group, update and re-launch for 2006

Review results with working group, management and advisory groups

The Incident Recording Process (IRP) results for 2005 were again collated by the project manager in the new year and presented in digital spread sheet format with a summary to the working group for analysis.

This year the results included those reported on part-time or unmanaged areas in addition to fully managed areas thus making the picture comprehensive; the latter were also presented in map form.

Review meetings were not held this year with all recorders. Instead, informal digital conferencing of the data, project manager's summary and a review of the process was carried out.

The general feeling is that results continue to be useful when considering or reviewing management measures and actions and when engaging with authorities, recreational and other site users and it was agreed the process should continue in the same manner for the 2006 season. The 2006 process was subsequently launched in May, with returns being submitted through the autumn.

Since then it has continued to enable timely follow up action for military, civilian and recreational flying incidents and has generated discussion and development of informal good practice guidance (e.g. by local paragliders). It has also facilitated fact based dialogue with the BBC about their filming practices and continued dialogue with the CAA over the need for enhancing information in air navigation publications about the EMS interest features. A draft proposal has recently been received from the CAA in this respect for the working group's comments.

A majority of returns for the 2006 recording season were received through the autumn of 2006. Recognising their value and following the initiative started last year, they have been referred to the School of Biological Sciences at the University of East Anglia. The objective is to take their advice on how best they can become involved in the process and assist the project to improve the interpretation and application of the data, utilising their expertise for the benefit of both the Management Scheme and also their students.

1.5 Integrated Programme of Monitoring (IPM):

**Action - Develop as programmed following AFMB December 2005, delivering Tranche 1 and Tranche 2 draft Conservation Objectives, consulting with advisory, stakeholder and management groups.
Develop Condition Assessment consulting as above and report to EU**

The IPM is the process through which updated Conservation Objectives for the EMS interest features and their condition assessment are delivered. This is the responsibility of Natural England (NE) (formerly English Nature (EN) prior to October 2006).

This condition assessment then informs the EMS Management Scheme management measures, but also the Joint Nature Conservancy Council (JNCC) who have a duty to report on condition to the EU every six years (but in 2007, not 2006 as was understood this time last year).

Over recent years, EN have been heavily involved in preparing the ground for the delivery of draft conservation objectives to the advisory and management groups for consideration and comment and in developing the associated condition assessment. Start up meetings were held in late 2004 and early 2005 to gather groups of relevant parties and organisations together, to assess and review what and where monitoring results exist. These groups were set up to cover three main subjects; biological, physical and bird interest features, the latter being covered by the Waterbird Study Group.

In 2005 delivery of the Conservation Objectives to the advisory and management groups, slipped as a result of EN's overriding priorities firstly associated with Windfarm proposals and secondly a Public Inquiry called for June 2006 concerning an application by Wash Mussel Fishermen to control predatory Eider Duck. The impact of this was addressed by the FMB and a revised timetable agreed.

EN's Tranche 1 draft Conservation Objectives were subsequently published and circulated for consideration by the management and advisory groups in December 2005, as reported in the Fourth Annual Report. By April/May of 2006, however, it was clear EN were again experiencing increasing difficulties delivering the Tranche 2 draft Conservation Objectives for similar treatment, a situation they attempted to address under scrutiny of the CMG. At the July 2006 FMB:

"it was, however, noted that the (Integrated Programme of Monitoring (IPM)) Conservation Objectives review and associated Condition Assessment had slipped indefinitely as a consequence of the severe workload pressure and lack of resource being experienced by EN. It was recognised this was critical to completing the management scheme."

As reported in 1.3 above, this has led to the freezing of the EMS Management Scheme Review:

"as agreed at the October 2006 FMG meeting, on the understanding that the management groups and project manager will assist Natural England....where ever possibly to set up the required robust programme and arrangements. The intention is to make real progress with the draft Conservation Objectives review and associated Condition Assessment at the earliest opportunity."

In the spirit of this agreement, a workshop of specialists has been set up for January 2007 to kickstart the process by reviewing the requirement, considering the Intertidal Flats attributes and conservation objectives and developing a robust plan for the way forward.

Notwithstanding this, concern has been expressed within the FMB that this will be too late to influence JNCC's assessment for their report on condition to the EU. It was established in September 2006 that this information would need to be on the NE ENSIS database and accessible by JNCC by December 2006 if it was to be taken account of in their assessment. The implication of it not being there in time is that a potentially erroneous condition assessment could be made by JNCC based on out of date data and reported to the EU. This, would give a misleading picture and could undermine the positive work of the management project to date and its potential to build on current achievements for future success. JNCC have advised that they will be reporting on the macro marine environment rather than individual sites, so this may be less of a concern than initially thought. JNCC have also advised they will consult on their proposed report to EU before submitting it, so there should be opportunity to challenge any erroneous or out of perspective findings. As has been debated in management meetings, it would most certainly be unreasonable, not to mention disappointing and demoralising, if misleading assessments pertained purely through the lack of progress made hitherto with reviewing site conservation objectives and making a condition assessment.

Should this be the case, the FMB is likely to want to make robust representations at the highest level.

1.6 Action Plan Review and Fifth Annual Report:

Action - Review progress and draft report

The Annual Report (AR) for as at December 2005 was published in early 2006 and made publicly available on the project website homepage.

No hardcopies were printed following an earlier decision by the FMB that those who wished to do so could download and print one from the website.

It comprised a Non-technical report, supported by the usual detail in the form of appendices for the benefit of Members, but with the exception of the standard Action Plan Review (APR).

It had become clear that working on an APR would duplicate some effort being undertaken on the management scheme review and could possibly detract from it. The FMB therefore agreed the APR should be dropped in 2005 in favour of the digital equivalent of an eye-catching information leaflet, designed to work with the AR or stand-alone (see 1.2 above and Fourth Annual Report leaflet). This was on the understanding that it would celebrate and summarise the importance of the EMS and the progress of the management scheme over the previous three years in a succinct style that would be attractive to the public.

Hardcopies of this document were also approved and have been made publicly available through the year with the Good Practice Guide and separately. They have also been used in support of a variety of presentations and events, all to good effect. The Fourth Report Leaflet was designed to remain valid for at least two years and will continue to be used separately until the limited supply is exhausted, when its value and future will be reviewed.

The 2006 AR follows a similar style to that for 2005, except that this year it does include an APR in a supporting appendix and will not include a digital information leaflet. It was recognised by the FMB in Autumn 2006 that, in spite of the fact that completion of a 2nd edition Management Scheme had stalled, the Action Plan had by then been updated significantly and was being put into effect. Compliance monitoring could therefore be undertaken in time for reporting on progress in the Fifth AR. Progress against the Action Plan has therefore been assessed as at the 30th November 2006 and an AP updated with this information supports this report in the appendices.

The new revised AP format has proved its value as a flexible, straightforward and visual tool for tracking, recording and updating actions. Analysis and interpretation of the data can readily be undertaken for the FMB at either a summary, or more in-depth, level and the arising information used to ensure management actions remain appropriate.

Summary of Action Plan Progress during 2006:

Actions stalled (Red)	Actions with a problem (Amber)	Actions on track but with issues (Green & amber)	Actions on track (Green)	Total number of Actions
1	11	15	130	157
0.6%	7%	9.6%	82.8%	100%

The above will be considered in more detail by the CMG for the FMG/FMB early in 2007.

2.0 Constitutional Issues:

2.1 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and Project Manager's Contract:

The current second MOA (SMOA) covering the project period 2005-2008 expires on 31st March 2008 and the project manager's contract also expires at the same time.

Agreeing the detail of the SMOA took the FMB some time and it was therefore suggested at the December '06 Annual FMB that the Board should begin to consider the future of the management project and redefine its focus, initially considering if indeed a management project was necessary. It would then be appropriate to work up the desired Third MOA (TMOA), project manager's job description and contract as required.

It was agreed this work should be started and progressed by the CMG from their first meeting of the new calendar year in January '07, feeding back recommendations to the FMB for consideration and development at subsequent FMB, FMG and CMG meetings.

2.2 Income and Expenditure profile FY '05-'06:

Income and Expenditure for the financial year 2005-2006 has followed the trend forecast in the Fourth Annual Report (December 2005).

Cash Income (i.e. excluding PIK) has fallen to £36,400 consistent with the SMOA, reflecting reduced contributions agreed as a consequence of financial stringency (the previous year it had been £41.5k).

Expenditure has increased to £41,400 (approx) leading to an over spend of some £5,000 (approx). The over spend was, however, covered by reserves totalling some £44k; an accumulation from under spending in previous years.

The increase in expenditure results from the following:

costs incurred for the Management Scheme Review Workshop held in early FY '05-'06, a second batch of Good Practice Guides (this time unsubsidised), a contribution to the cost of running the promotional Biodiversity event in the summer of 2005 (shared with the Wash Estuary Strategy Group and the Norfolk Coast Partnership), the upgrading of IT kit and the design and printing of the 4th Annual Report Leaflet in early 2006.

The longstanding debt owed to the project by Fenland District Council (FDC) remains outstanding as at the 31st December 2006, in the sum of £2.5k. This relates back to the second year of implementation, but the project is assured it will be discharged soon, therefore it is being carried forward in the accounts and not written off at this stage.

It should be noted that FDC are meeting their current commitments fully.

Income for FY '06-'07 should total in the region of £37k, having made adjustments for inflation accounting. Making no allowance in FY '06-'07 for major spending on a public consultation exercise and the production of hardcopies of a 2nd edition Scheme, etc., the project could break even if the outstanding debt from year two of the project is paid by FDC.

This assumes £1.5k is spent on producing hardcopies of the Revised Action Plan and Annexes for publication as agreed, but does not include for additional quantities of the Good Practice Guide that may prove necessary to supplement stocks before the document is revised. The cost of running a public consulting and publishing a definitive 2nd edition Management Scheme is currently estimated to be in the region of £10k.

3.0 WORK PROGRAMME SET FOR 2007:

Time-scale 2007	Work Area and Action
1 st half & remainder	<p>Communication Strategy: Update in liaison with Norfolk Coast Project and Wash Estuary Strategy Officers Develop and pursue wide strategy using the ESRC model, linking with consultation and launch of 2nd edition Management Scheme</p>
1 st half 2nd half	<p>Good Practice Guide and Fourth Report Leaflet: Review whether GPG is still fit for purpose through advisory groups Progress strategy for revision and/or development of alternatives for 2008 launch</p>
1 st half remainder	<p>EMS Management Scheme Review: Undertake Score Card Assessment (through NE Maritime) of process progress Reset 2nd edition publication programme as IPM process develops and allows Apply revised data to incomplete 1st redraft of Scheme Develop public consultation 2nd redraft and consult externally using website as holding and access facility</p>
1 st quarter remainder	<p>Incident Recording Process: Consolidate 2006 results onto spreadsheet Review process with working group, update and re-launch for 2007 Review results with working group, management and advisory groups and use to revalidate management actions Use 3rd party resource for interpretation & compiling to database & GIS</p>
1 st half remainder	<p>Integrated Programme of Monitoring (IPM): Develop programme to deliver Tranche 2 draft Conservation Objectives, summarise both Tranches, develop Condition Assessment and consult with advisory, stakeholder and management groups. Report agreed condition to JNCC. Apply all data to management scheme review for revalidating and completion</p>
1 st half remainder	<p>Third Memorandum of Agreement (TMOA): Review need and direction of management project Begin drafting appropriate TMOA for April 2008</p>
3 rd quarter	<p>Action Plan Review (APR) and Sixth Annual Report (AR): Conduct APR, assess progress and draft AR</p>

4.0 Conclusion:

In last year's conclusion it was noted that:

“The Management Scheme is presently at a crucial stage....during which time its success at achieving favourable condition of the EMS interest features will be assessed and reported to the EU and management measures revised for the future....a significant amount of effort is required to be input to a variety of different inter-dependant work areas,....by a variety of different representatives, organisations and groups if the review process is to achieve its objective.

It is fundamentally important that all involved in this process maintain their commitment to resource the agreed programme, if it is to be successful.”

A good deal of valuable work has been undertaken on the Management Scheme Review through 2006, capitalising on that undertaken in 2005. Notwithstanding this, certain links in the inter-dependancy chain regrettably failed to deliver necessary information, largely because of a major increase in workload, conflicting priorities and insufficient resources to deal with them all. This caused the review programme to slip significantly and the process to stall, as reflected earlier in this report.

This does not mean, however, that the work undertaken to date on the review has been nugatory, merely that the process needs to tread water while the crucial information is developed through a renewed focus and impetus.

The information that has yet to come forward is essential in that it will validate, or help revalidate, the work that has so far been undertaken and the assumptions so far made during the review process based on experience to date.

A process to bring this information forward is now firmly set in place and the FMB should feel optimistic about the prospect of achieving a 2nd edition EMS Management Scheme, though the time-scale for doing so is presently uncertain until the full scope of the task is understood. This will only happen as it develops.

At this stage it is not possible to be quite so confident about the conclusions of the JNCC's condition report to the EU. It is a concern that the above difficulty will lead to a misleading report being made based on out of date data. This is, however, being monitored and appropriate action will be taken as and if necessary.

In spite of these concerns, the work of implementing the EMS Management Scheme has continued to forge ahead, benefiting from what has been learnt from the comprehensive and complex effort put into revising the Scheme Annexes and Action Plan.

In the light of this and in parallel with working up the outstanding information to complete the Management Scheme Review, it is important that the Management Board now begins to consider the future direction and focus of the management project. The principal drivers for this are that the current Second MOA underwriting the project, and the project manager's contract, both terminate on the 31st March 2008.

There is, therefore, once again a great deal of work to do over the coming year, to which the commitment of all involved must remain constant and focussed if we are to ensure management objectives are both pertinent and capable of being achieved.

Peter Rushmer,

Project Manager for the Wash and North Norfolk Coast European Marine Site Management Scheme. December 2006