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Introduction: Regional stakeholder workshops

The regional stakeholder workshops were designed to give a diverse range of stakeholders the opportunity to collaborate with the project, and influence and broaden its output, by helping to further develop the 16 thematic case studies which had been drafted by GP WIND project partners. These thematic studies are crucial to the project going forward, as they represent a powerful evidence base for the project's output.

Stakeholder mapping had taken place in advance of the last regional workshops, so partners have databases of stakeholders in their regions which are being regularly updated. The case studies were shared with the stakeholders in advance of the workshops. The regional stakeholder workshops were attended by a wide range of stakeholders including industry/developers, national/regional authorities, environmental agencies and NGOs, competing land/sea users, local communities representatives and academia.

Invitations were prepared in national languages and included information about the GP WIND project and the objectives of the workshop.

After holding the workshops, each partner compiled a workshop report including a short summary of the workshop and the main conclusions. The reports are available at the end of this document and attendance levels are summarised below. In view of the worsening economic circumstances since the start of the project, partners are pleased with the turnout and levels of feedback received, both at the workshops and electronically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. of participants in workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different partners took differing approaches to the format of the workshops making use of their local knowledge to make the best use of stakeholders’ attendance. All the workshops involved an update on the project and thematic case studies using slides prepared collaboratively by partners. These can be viewed at Annex B.
Executive Summary

The inputs gathered from the regional workshops will enable the GP WIND project partners (in particular the lead partner, NINA) to refine the thematic case studies. The workshops allow the project to take advantage of stakeholders’ expertise. The events will help ensure that the resulting good practice guidance and “how to” toolkit are useful, practical and comprehensive, that they can effect change to behaviours around wind farm planning and development which promotes deployment and better balances the needs of the environment and communities.

Whilst the workshops identified lots of detailed issues (included in the workshop reports and later iterations of the thematic case studies) there were a number of key themes that emerged across many or all of the participating groups.

The issue of community engagement remains of key importance in all the participating countries. This may seem of obvious importance but the fact that this issue was raised as early as the last round of regional workshops at the end of 2010 and is still being raised makes clear that there is more work to be done. By promoting the examples of good practice identified in this area, the project will hopefully encourage and aid developers and planning authorities to undertake early, proactive and transparent community engagement.

The merits of undertaking social impact assessments are also becoming increasingly evident. Enabling developers to carry out socio-economic impact assessments will in turn put them in a better place to address and mitigate impacts, or maximise benefits, and will allow consenting authorities to come to better informed decisions.

The importance of clear communication extends to all stakeholders in the planning process, from community engagement through to clear interdepartmental communication within public bodies. Transparency of consenting processes is a key factor identified.

With regard to both environmental issues and community concerns, stakeholders have identified the need for an increase in available information, or for information from different sources to be better collated. This information gap was felt particularly keenly in the marine environment. Spatial and sensitivity mapping is frequently identified as an example of good practice.

It is intended that these key themes are emphasised in the good practice guide as simple, key messages “up front”, below which, of course, detailed advice and evidence will be available.

Stakeholders are already beginning to report examples of changes that they are making to their operations to take account of the good practice identified in the case studies. For example, SEAI is has begun working with two key stakeholder groups (BirdWatch Ireland and the Irish Landscape Institute) to support both organisations in implementing some measures they consider best practice i.e. broader roll-out of their pilot Sensitivity Mapping for bird species and the creation of Guidance on Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of Wind Farms in Ireland. The Scottish Government is planning to update its guidance to stakeholders, including by driving the key messages emerging from GP Wind, and developing a stand-alone guidance document for the public to improve transparency of processes. Partners plan to record all such examples as evidence of change which has been driven by the the GP WIND project as it progresses.

In short, the value of these events to the project has been substantial - they have brought a significant level of constructive criticism to bear on the content of the thematic studies, and have
provided a considerable widening of the evidence base and resource base for the outputs of the project, i.e. the tool kit and good practice guidance.
ANNEX A: REGIONAL STAKEHOLDERS WORKSHOPS REPORTS

In this section please find the comprehensive reports of all the regional workshops held in the GP WIND countries. Each of them includes a general summary, conclusions and supporting material (workshop invitations, pictures, etc).

The sole responsibility for the content of this presentation lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EACI nor the European Commission are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.
Please find attached to this report the invitation and the agenda of the Workshop.

Number of invitees : 68

Number of participants: 13 (15 including 2 organisers)

Date and location of the Workshop : 6 October 2011, Brussels

Leading organising partner : APERe (Belgium)

Other partners : None
WORKSHOP SUMMARY

The Belgian Workshop was attended by 13 participants (15, organisers included) that covered quite a broad range of stakeholders from environmental agencies, developers, regional and federal authorities, those with responsibility for the consenting process, interest groups and community representatives involved in wind energy production.

Given that the 16 thematic case studies represented an important reading, we chose to focus the meeting particularly on 8 themes that had a direct link with the issues identified during the first Regional workshop (TCS n°4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14 and 15).

The main Good Practices and Lessons learnt of these case studies were presented in the first part of the meeting, with the rest of the meeting devoted to a discussion of the main recommendations highlighted in the case studies.

The meeting was held in two of the national languages: French and Dutch.

Feedback

- **Case Study Theme n°4 - Tackling cumulative impact issues**

  How might it be improved?

  It was suggested analysis of Wildlife corridors should be integrated in EIEs, so as to be able to have a continuous global insight of the impacts both on fauna and flora.

  Most of existing databases are unsatisfactory: they do not integrate the wind farms to come. Therefore, thorough analysis of cumulative impacts is difficult to achieve.

  The analysis of cumulative impacts should be extended to other sources of impact (power plants, incinerator, etc.)

  The existence of different regulations makes cross-border cumulative impact studies difficult:
  - Wallonia: from 3 MW installed, an EIE is due
  - Flanders: EIE is due from 20 turbines (4 turbines if located in a particularly sensitive area).

  Recommendations

  An on-line consenting process gathering all the documents regarding the different projects should enable to have a more comprehensive approach of cumulative impacts.

- **Case Study Theme n°5 - Systems & processes for monitoring impacts**

  How might it be improved?

  Developers are not specialised in implementation of mitigation techniques. This task could be taken in charge by the authorities or by a skilled organisation. It was thus suggested to create a financing body/ a fund to pay for mitigation measures.

  The funds could be raised from:

  The sole responsibility for the content of this presentation lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EACI nor the European Commission are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.
- a tax paid by the project developers
- part of the money paid by the developers to the municipalities
- the nuclear windfall profit

Recommendations

To create an independent body managed by specialists in environmental issues to manage mitigation measures (identification of measures corresponding to the impact assessed, financing the achievement of the measures, controlling their implementation and effectiveness, etc.)

- **Case Study Theme n°7 - Construction and operation of facilities in the marine environment**

How might it be improved?

No problem raised around the foundations.
No problem of electromagnetic radiation detection.
Problems raised:
- erosion above the cables: the cables could be uncovered and made visible in the bottom of the sea.
- Cables at 2 to 4 m depth: could be damaged by anchors

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

Belgian case: consenting process is relatively supple thanks to regular and efficient monitoring of wind farm deployment. The procedure has already been shortened thanks to the knowledge gained so far.

Main messages

Clear and rigorous zoning for offshore projects has enabled to avoid conflicts with other industrial sectors for siting offshore wind farms.

- **Case Study Theme n°8 - Offshore: human commercial activities**

No particular comment.

- **Case Studies Themes n°9-13-14-15 - Local community concerns**

Recommendations

More transparency in relation with each intermediary's profit margin is required: how much does an electricity supplier earn, same for the TSO and the local distributor.

Implement info sessions for citizens relative to the different possibilities of involvement in wind farm projects.
The developers should not confine themselves to informing the local population only when legally required: the more information to the local community, the better the social acceptance.

Integrate courses on energetic challenges within school programs.
CONCLUSIONS

The workshop was rich in exchanges and points of view. The participants were positive about the project and eager to provide input in the process of gathering material to improve the thematic case studies and nourish the good practice guide.

Some useful information was collected for drafting the recommendations, among others relative to mitigation measures, underwater cables, transparency towards creation of local jobs and positive communication to tackle with systematic misinformation from opponents.

Most participants have expressed the wish to be kept informed of the evolution of the project in order to be able to give extra input to better enhance the GP Guide.
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WORKSHOP INVITATION
(As sent by email - September 7th 2011)

Bonjour,

Le 28 juillet dernier, nous avons eu l’occasion de vous informer de l’évolution de notre projet européen par le biais de notre première Newsletter GP WIND (disponible sur http://project-gpwind.eu/).

Le projet va à présent entrer dans une seconde phase.

En effet, les 16 études de cas thématiques qui constitueront la base du Guide de Bonnes Pratiques (dont 8 études relatives aux enjeux environnementaux, et 8 relatives à l’implication locale) viennent d’être réalisées par les différents partenaires du projet. Ces études aideront à mettre en évidence les solutions et les bonnes pratiques développées en Europe dans le but de surmonter les obstacles environnementaux et liés à la communauté locale qui s’opposent au développement éolien.

Vous trouverez une compilation de ces études en pièce jointe.

S’appuyant sur les opinions échangées lors du premier Atelier Régional, la Belgique, représentée respectivement par l’APERe pour la Wallonie, ODE pour la Flandre et EDORA pour l’offshore, a choisi de réaliser une étude de cas sur le thème « Comment obtenir l’adhésion de la communauté locale aux projets éoliens ? » (étude de cas thématique n°13 dans le document en annexe).

Nous avons maintenant le plaisir de vous inviter au second Atelier Régional qui se déroulera le jeudi 6 octobre prochain entre 9h30 et 12h30 à Bruxelles dans les locaux d’APERe-ODE-EDORA (Rue Royale 35 – 1000 Bruxelles). Nous aurons l’opportunité d’échanger nos idées sur les études de cas réalisées. Pour enrichir un maximum le débat, nous avons cette fois choisi de réunir les stakeholders qui ont participé aux Ateliers Régionaux de l’APERe, d’EDORA et d’ODE VLAANDEREN. Nous discuterons des apports de la Belgique dans les différentes études de cas thématiques européennes ainsi que les enjeux de l’obtention de l’adhésion citoyenne sur base de l’étude de cas n°13.

Etant donné que les 16 études de cas représentent un volume important (85 pages), nous avons sélectionné les études en rapport direct avec les thématiques que vous aviez identifiées lors du premier Atelier Régional. C’est sur cette sélection que nous vous proposons de concentrer votre lecture et autour de laquelle nous articulerons la réunion. Vos éventuels commentaires sur les autres études thématiques seront néanmoins les bienvenues.

The sole responsibility for the content of this presentation lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EACI nor the European Commission are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.
Certains études traitent directement du thème de la communauté locale, d'autres abordent plus certains aspects environnementaux. A ce stade-ci, les études n’ont pas encore pu être traduites en français et néerlandais, et vous sont donc transmises dans leur forme originale, en anglais.

*N°4. Tackling cumulative impact issues*

*N°5. Systems and process for monitoring impacts ; examples of environmental mitigation techniques*

*N°7. Construction and operation of facilities in the marine environment*

*N°8. Offshore – Human commercial activities: fisheries, Marine industries, seabed issues, landfall sites*

*N°9. Communication, awareness, information cascades*

*N°13. Community concerns and acceptance – how to achieve ‘buy in’*

*N°14. Community benefit schemes (including community ownership)*

*N°15. Dealing with complex or entrenched public perception issues.*

Les thèmes 7 et 8 s’appliquent plus particulièrement au secteur de l’offshore.

Nous aborderons pour finir les principales recommandations qui seront distillées à partir des études de cas thématiques et qui serviront de base à l’élaboration du Guide de Bonnes Pratiques.

Etant donné que le nombre de places est limité à une vingtaine de participants, nous vous prions de confirmer sans tarder votre présence à cet Atelier, par mail à l’adresse : bclaessens@apere.org.

Nous nous réjouissons de vous y rencontrer et vous remercions d’avance de votre participation.

Bien cordialement,
WORKSHOP AGENDA

(As presented in the beginning of the Workshop - October 6th 2011)

GP WIND Regional Workshop
6th Oct 2011

Ordre du jour / agenda:

• tour de table / presentaties
• GP WIND en quelques mots
• Historisch overzicht
• Objectieve van de vergadering
• TCS 4 – 5 (environnement / milieu)
• TCS 7 – 8 (offshore)
• TCS 9 – 13 – 14 – 15 (acceptation sociale / sociale draagvlak)
Please find attached to this report the invitation and the agenda of the Workshop.

Number of invitees: 159
Number of participants: 43
Date and location of the Workshop: 29-9-2011, Pampeloponnisiako Stadium, Patras, Greece
Leading organising partner: RWG
Other partners: ADEP, AUTH, SPEED
WORKSHOP SUMMARY

The regional stakeholder workshops are aimed to discuss the results of the case study research delivered under WP3 and provide a comparison of case studies, lessons learnt, and finally to support the identification of success factors and good practice.

The workshop in Patras provided the opportunity to several stakeholders from different organisations to share their views on wind energy development in Greece. The current situation was analysed, the government target concerning wind energy was explained and the main barriers towards achieving this target were discussed at the beginning and the closing section of the workshop in terms of analysis of the case studies provided at European level.

The audience representation covered a wide variety of stakeholders, from regional and local authorities, to technical and economic chambers, NGOs, consultants and private investors.

Participants were provided in advance with the Thematic Case Studies Draft document that was produced by all project partners along with an information letter of the project and the expected results of the workshop.

The workshop started with a general presentation of the Renewable Energy Sources intrusion in Greece, providing facts and figures of the current situation of Wind Energy installations and the targets set at national level for 2020. Then, a general introduction of the GPWIND project was given informing the participants on its partnership, its activities and its goals.

At next, the agenda was split in two sessions, one dedicated to the thematic area “Environment” and the other to the thematic area “Local Communities”. Each session included a brief presentation of the Thematic Case Studies conducted by the project partners, followed by a concrete example case study selected from the specific thematic area (preferably from Greece), and at the end of the session an open discussion on the issues raised in each TCS with the active participation of the audience.

FEEDBACK

The two specific case studies that were selected to be reviewed during the workshop were the Environmental Monitoring System of the Panachaiko mountain (Thematic area “Environment”) and the Case Study of Anavra (Thematic Case study “Local Communities”).

After the meeting participants had the opportunity to visit the Wind Farm of Panachaiko Mountain and discuss on site some of the issues raised during the workshop.

The following, summarise the main points raised in the open discussions and the final conclusions of the workshop.

Main messages of the Thematic Case Studies:

The most important issues (and potential recommendations) that were raised repeatedly during the discussions were 3:

a. Open consultation with local stakeholders at the very early stage of the investment will provide the requested trust for any further development

b. Inclusion of Social Impact Indicators in the Environmental Impact Assessments
c. Spatial Planning enriched with Social Impact Assessment should be delivered at local level

CONCLUSIONS

The overall evaluation of the TCS was positive (ranks between 3 and 5). The participants agreed that the project proceeded to a very comprehensive and thorough examination of the possible issues raised in the two main topics “Environment” and “Local Communities” and they were impressed by the range of examples covered by the research. They also suggested that the final results should be communicated further at national level (i.e. ministry of environment and climate change).

No additional/new topic or case study was suggested by the workshop participants.

Total evaluation sheets filled in: pending
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GP WIND Regional Stakeholders Workshop
Patras, 29th September 2011

Invitation

The President of RDF-RWS and Head of Region of Western Greece, Mr. Apostolos Katsiaras, has the honor to invite you at the GP WIND project event entitled “Regional Stakeholders Workshop” which will be held in the auditorium of the Pampe kosmisiako Stadim Thursday, September 29th, 2011.

The aim of the event is to identify success factors and best practices for the development of wind energy through research of thematic case studies from across the European Union and to implement within the European Project GP WIND: “Good practice in reconciling onshore and offshore wind with environmental objectives”.

The sole responsibility for the content of this presentation lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EACI nor the European Commission are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.
WORKSHOP AGENDA

GP WIND Regional Stakeholders Workshop
Patras, 29th September 2011
Pampepontisiako Stadium of Patras

Workshop Agenda

09:00 – 09:30 Registration
09:30 Welcome / Introduction
09:40 Wind Energy penetration in Greece (S. Papachristopoulos, RDF-RWG)
09:50 Presentation of GP WIND project (C. Tzomakas, RWG)
10:00 Case Studies on the Topic “Environment” (S. Michos, RWG)
10:20 Wind Farms of Panachaikon & Environmental Monitoring of potential impacts (K. Konstandakopoulos, ADEP)
10:40 Open discussion on the case studies of the topic ‘Environment’
11:10 Break
11:30 Case Studies on the Topic “Local Communities” (C. Christoforides, AUT)
11:50 The case of Anavra (D. Tsoukalas, Anavra)
12:10 Open discussion on the case studies of the topic ‘Local Communities’
12:40 Conclusions - Proposals
13:00 Light Lunch
14:30 Study visit on the wind farm of Panachaiko mountain (*)

(*) to be confirmed depending on requests

The sole responsibility for the content of this document lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EACI nor the European Commission are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

The sole responsibility for the content of this presentation lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EACI nor the European Commission are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.
Please find attached to this report the invitation and the agenda of the Workshop.

Number of invitees: 45
Number of participants: 32
Date and location of the Workshop: 21st September 2011, Dublin
Leading organising partner: The Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland Renewable Energy Information Office (SEAI)
Other partners: None
SEAI/REIO hosted the Irish stakeholder workshop. It brought together a unique gathering which doesn't often find a forum to facilitate such a variety of perspectives and professions. The discussions on the day were robust and lengthy. Further, written feedback was facilitated for a fortnight after the workshop to ensure an as complete as possible contribution from Irish stakeholders. This feedback has been collated and forwarded to the project manager for consideration during the final draft.

A key point from the consultation came from Meitheal na Gaoithe and IWEA wind industry groups who expressed some concern about the GP WIND project and its potential to impact on the delivery of individual projects.

Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Case Study</th>
<th>Specific Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Species impact offshore and onshore: Fish, Mammals, Birds</td>
<td>Comments by BirdWatch Ireland:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re 1st Bullet Point...on Page 3. Important to note that it is not just the activity of the blades that can impact bird/bat populations, but also the turbine columns themselves (e.g. Ptarmigan fatalities at Smola Windfarm, Norway). Offshore Windfarm Construction can have significant impacts during the construction phase in particular on cetacean and fish populations with disturbance and avoidance of known feeding areas during the initial pile driving phase of construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE 3rd bullet point on page 4 – mitigation hierarchy – needs to clarify that ‘unavoidable impacts’ are not legally permissible in relation to species (&amp; habitats) protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives., (unless the development fulfills the criteria of Article 6.4 of the Habitats Directive of having overriding public interest though this is unlikely to succeed with a wind energy development). As it reads this is misleading as readers will think that the hierarchy applies to protected species and habitats, whereas it is not aligned with article 6 of the habitats directive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On page 6: implications for policy.... Following on from the good practice example cited of sensitivity mapping, there is a pressing need to develop sensitivity mapping tool and associated guidance for priority bird species in Ireland in order to allow the needs of priority bird species to be better understood. Sensitivity mapping is designed to facilitate good planning for infrastructure, including wind energy, for use in strategic planning and by third parties to avoid the conflicts such as is possible in the planning phase for wind energy developments in areas of significance for protected and priority bird species. Sensitivity mapping phase 1 pilot for whooper swan has been completed by BWI. BWI is seeking the resources to develop a consolidated (phase 2) bird sensitivity map for Ireland. This would provide assistance and improve decision making in achieving the targeted expansion of wind energy in Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE: ‘The existence and scale of collision and displacement effects are highly variable depending on the location of the wind turbine development and the species involved’ It’s not just the location of the turbines but also the size of the turbines that can determine impacts on known vulnerable species.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                     | Another example apart from White-tailed Eagles is in Spain where research
indicated a detrimental impact on certain raptors and steppe birds, as a result windfarm developments are now restricted within specific areas which are important for breeding, feeding and dispersal of Spanish Imperial Eagle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments by Environmental Pillar of Social Partnership:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask National Parks and Wildlife Service and the National Biodiversity Database to agree formats for presentation of survey (data (where applicable). Then outline as best practice for these formats to be provided as part of EIS survey work. This may be applicable for other sectors. Make it best practice guidance for EIS results to feed into the NBDB archives for consequent uploading to their GIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask NPWS and An Taisce (key objections sources) to become aware that micro siting is primarily constrained by non ecological factors (e.g. noise, shadow flicker).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision Risk Modeling for birds (raptors e.g. hen harrier) should be identified to NPWS and their comments on this form of assessment should be found out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar survey attention should be recommended for bats as it is generally impossible to cover large wind farm site with small surveys. Developers will not pay for large scale bat surveys unless the details are outlined by NPWS, otherwise it is impossible to convince them that bats are a major issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More clear direction for peat lands needed, especially NPWS must acknowledge the ability for these habitats to be rehabilitated and their ability to exist harmoniously around wind farm infra-structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would consider any plan for biological or habitat trading as unnecessary for wind farms &lt;9 turbines (although cumulative issue here)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments by Irish Wind Energy Association:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Killing of Bats indicated throughout Theme 1 - This has not been proven in Ireland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Impact on habitats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments by BWI:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An additional example that should be cited under the 2\textsuperscript{nd} bullet point on page 3 is loss of and damage to blanket peat bog habitat as a result of wind farm construction and access roads: Examples of impacts during the operational phase include: - drying of peat and resultant habitat degradation arising from hard infrastructure – access roads and turbine foundations. This could also be addressed by revisiting the description under the 3\textsuperscript{rd} bullet point on page 9, where the text describes interference of hydrology of the bog. This should clarify that drainage ditches are not necessary to result in drying out of the surface layer of the peat bog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In terms of impacts on priority species/habitats (and with ref to ‘Tackling Cumulative Impact Issues below’, it is important to note the importance of strategic planning when it comes to siting of wind farms. Sensitivity mapping is a key tool to aid planners but it is not foolproof and the potential cumulative impacts of many turbines/wind farms in areas deemed ‘more suitable’ for wind farms can be tricky to quantify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When assessing impacts on habitats, including cumulative impacts, it is...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
important to cite that the precautionary principle must be applied to all assessments of impacts and to the interpretation of data collected as part of the assessment in keeping with European legal requirements.

RE description of the Derrybrien Peat Landslide on page 11: the description that Consenting guidelines specifically for wind energy in Ireland were published in 2006, two years prior to the judgment in this case’ inaccurately suggests that the consenting guidelines were sufficient to address all of the issues raised by the Derrybrien landslide, whereas two further serious peat landslides occurred since, in 2008, one of which again resulted in the developers being prosecuted through the courts, this time in local courts by the NW Fisheries board for impacts on fisheries resulting from the peat landslide. The cases collectively make a strong case for the need to introduce up to date ‘Peat landslide hazard risk assessment’ guidelines to help avoid the occurrence of peat landslides and associated on site and downstream habitat loss. Such technical guidance on Peat landslide hazard risk assessment and clear guidance on how conclusions of risk level should be arrived at are needed if further incidences of peat landslides are to be avoided. This recommendation could be reiterated in the second bullet point under ‘implications for policy and practice’ also on page 11.

Comments by leading Geotech consultant:

Prior to commencing the EIA, it is recommended that a geotechnical peat stability site assessment is carried out to screen and identify any potentially critical impacts on habitat.

Prior to and as part of the EIA process, peat stability assessments carried out for a development should follow the Scottish Executive – Peat Landslide Hazard & Risk Assessments, Best Practice Guide for Proposed Electricity Generation Developments (2006).

Due to the often very technical and specialised nature of peat stability assessment, consideration should be given by consenting authorities to the review of peat stability assessments by independent 3rd parties. Current practice in Scotland is such that an independent consultant reviews and comments on peat stability assessments for EIA’s on behalf of the Scottish Government. The reviewing Consultant’s position is publically tendered and runs for a contract period of 2 to 3 years.

The independent review considers whether or not adequate and appropriate field survey, peat sampling and analytical methods have been employed to provide a sound basis for assessing peat stability and the risk of peat slides within the development.

The maximum timeline for assessment reports to be presented to the Scottish Government is 4 weeks.

Best practice during construction is outlined in significant detail in the Scottish Natural Heritage document – Good Practice during Wind Farm Construction (2010).

Comments by Environmental Pillar of Social Partnership:

The sole responsibility for the content of this presentation lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EACI nor the European Commission are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.
Recognize involvement of geotechnical specialist working with an ecologist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments by IWEA:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Examples of Impacts during Operational Phase&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Disturbance to Fauna during operation from noise pollution”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is it proven that operational noise impacts Fauna?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Noise Pollution” - Negative Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ongoing loss of food sources that would have been produced by plants that have been destroyed”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How could this be? Operational Wind Farm does not erode the vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Collision risk: Birds and bats may collide with various parts of the wind turbine, or with associated structures such as electricity cables and meteorological masts.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Direct Killing of Bats- This has not been proven in Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Electricity Cables – Is this within the remit of the GP?? Orange discs are used on Electricity Cables to highlight overhead lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of good practice: Plan dei Corsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Extending an existing well-sited windfarm may be more acceptable environmentally, as well as more economic, than trying to develop on a new site”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very restrictive comment; all applications to be considered on its own merits. This comment could easily be used as a stick to object to all new sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Measures taken to overcome....”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Close tower spacing to reduce windfarm size”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need to adhere to manufactures spacing guidance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Biodiversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments by BWI:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on impacts in the past has been on bats, birds and marine mammals, which is to be expected but it is important to note that monitoring in some countries now includes monitoring of key insect and moth populations, which might be very much site specific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a more general comment the document would benefit from more info on the EIA consultant process, its shortcomings, difficulties around the lack of capacity of stakeholders to engage, weighting of resources in favour of the developer and suggested improvements, some of which were discussed on the consultation day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments by Environmental Pillar of Social Partnership:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask National Parks and Wildlife Service to provide better guidance re terrestrial species to avoid excessive information demands and objections in this area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Tackling Cumulative Impact Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments by BWI:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of particular significance for Annex 1 species requirements in the ‘wider countryside’, and for national priority species (red and amber listed).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Comments by Environmental Pillar of Social Partnership: |
| Clear guidance needed here especially in the areas of ecology and visual impacts. Very inconsistent opinions are found in the internal letters of area planners/ environment section to the executive planner. |

5. Systems and process for monitoring impacts; Examples of environmental mitigation techniques

| Comments by BirdWatch Ireland: |
| A Strategic approach to addressing information gaps and robust assessment of impacts on ecological needs of wild bird species is required. |
| There is a need to monitor post construction impacts once wind farms are in place to assess impacts on species and habitats. Monitoring should include fatality searches, surveys to explore changes in habitat status, etc. These are not standard practice in Ireland although they should be. The application of consistent monitoring approaches across the EU based on site sensitivity should also be considered. |

| Comments by Environmental Pillar of Social Partnership: |
| There is plenty of existing guidance and expertise available here with the exception of cumulative impacts. |

6. Carbon Accounting Issues

| Comments by Environmental Pillar of Social Partnership: |
| Not sure if information derived here to illustrative positive impacts of a project would even be read by an LA planner. |
| Comments by IWEA: |
| There is only 1 mention of the considerable GHG emission offset potential of generating electricity from wind rather than conventional fossil fuels. While it is suggested that the overall carbon emission savings should be considered during the planning consent stages there is no recognition in the document that there is generally a very large positive GHG emission saving with the installation of wind turbines for producing electricity, that this is by far the most commercial renewable energy source at present in Europe and that an ambitious programme of installing wind turbines is required if RE targets (both National and EU) are to be achieved. The document should clearly state and restate this fact. |

| Comments by IWEA: |
| The freely available RETScreen Clean Energy Project Analysis Software is available to use to calculate the equivalent of CO2 savings. |

7. Construction and operation of facilities in the marine environment

| Comments by Environmental Pillar of Social Partnership: |
| We need guidance here, consultation with industry body should be initiated by stakeholder agencies |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Case Study</th>
<th>Specific Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Communication, awareness, information cascades</td>
<td>Comments by Environmental Pillar of Social Partnership:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work here needed to help avoid the situation where hardcore objectors with vested interests try to derail the credibility of EIS work via scaremongering.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dealing with Noise Issues – including underwater</td>
<td>Comments by Environmental Pillar of Social Partnership:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non technical guidance/ explanation notes should be provided to help give credibility to the noise assessment process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Comments by IWEA:

It states that noise issues can be exacerbated by the fact that wind capture is often higher at night than in daytime. **This is not true and should be corrected.** Wind is caused by changes in pressure, which in turn is caused by temperature gradients (ie air moving from an area of low temperature to an area of high temperature) which tend to be highest during the daytime, as the sun heats different surfaces over the course of the day. Therefore winds are typically greater during the daytime. Windfarm activity and human activity are generally compatible. In addition the energy is produced during the day when there is demand.

Comments by IWEA:

“Associated infrastructure such as transmission lines”
- Outside the remit of the GP??

“Overall there is little or no evidence of direct adverse effects on human health from noise generated by wind farms. There is some evidence that wind farms can generate infrasound and low frequency sound and amplitude modulation, (AM), of aerodynamic noise, which can be detected at considerable distances and which may cause problems for some people. However, the balance of opinion would seem to indicate that such people may have similar problems from other sources of infrasound and low frequency sound, such as air-conditioning. These findings were contained in reports for the DTI and others published in 2005 and 2007 in the light of press claims of adverse health effects from wind farms.”
- The above statement does not help to alleviate the issue of noise. Could be used as a stick in third party objections.

13. Community concerns and acceptance – how to achieve ‘buy in’

Comments by Environmental Pillar of Social Partnership:

Again major work need to tackle scaremongering. Any work should focus on identifying sources of misinformation and transparently analyzing them.

15. Dealing with complex or entrenched public perception issues.

Comments by Environmental Pillar of Social Partnership:

Again major work need to tackle scaremongering. Any work should focus on identifying sources of misinformation and transparently analyzing them.

Significant problem in Ireland with County Councilors lending their professional/political opinion to objectors. The problem is that councilors frequently back up objectors concerns without any attention to EIS scientific study or any notable review of the issues. In leading their opinion/agreement with the objector they further polarize the public opinion without attention to scientific finding/thresholds etc. this also provides a platform for further negative public press in local media.

The Irish Wind Energy Association also offered the following general comment on the case studies:

_We are not clear as to whether these examples (of best practice) provided have been approved by the Commission (where/if necessary). I know the commission had concerns re some examples presented previously by EWEA in relation to wind farm developments in Natura as their view of some of them were not the Commission’s view of best practice._

**CONCLUSIONS**
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The national workshop proved to be a big success with a unique and wide range of stakeholders offering their time to participate. It has resulted in SEAI meeting separately with two key stakeholder groups (BirdWatch Ireland and the Irish Landscape Institute) and it looks like we may be able to support both organisations in implementing some measures they consider best practice i.e. broader roll-out of their pilot Sensitivity Mapping for bird species and the creation of Guidance on Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of Wind Farms in Ireland. So it could be said that whilst we are not strictly in the 'actions' phase of the project the other deliverables of the project are facilitating and initiating action.
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The Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland invites you to

**Good Practice Wind Energy Workshop**

Ballsbridge, Dublin

Wednesday 21st September 2011

The Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland is engaged in a number of activities which focus on the interrelated areas of social acceptance\(^1\) and planning of renewable energy projects. The activities include participation in the International Energy Agency Task 28 on Social Acceptance of Wind Energy, participation in the European project on Good Practice Wind, hosting a steering group to develop a template for local authority renewable energy strategies and commissioning a guide to fostering community acceptance\(^2\) in Ireland.

Much has been achieved in recent years to implement national energy policy and overcome challenges in relation to planning, designing, connecting and operating wind farms in Ireland. However, significant hurdles remain on the path to 2020 and beyond. One such challenge is the social acceptance of wind energy and associated grid infrastructure. This broad area is the subject of the workshop in September. It remains to be seen how a positive general attitude to wind energy can be maintained as various factors evolve e.g. the economy, planning policy, site selection criteria, technology choice, cumulative impacts, ownership of projects, community gain etc.

SEAI believes good practice can be identified and shared to the benefit of all concerned. Initially the workshop will bring together, for discussion, environmental and community engagement good practice examples from around Europe and beyond.

**Workshop Topics**

**Good Practice Wind**

The Good Practice Wind (GP Wind) project was initiated by the Scottish Government and brings together 17 partners in eight countries. SEAI is the sole Irish partner. It is financed by the European Commission’s Intelligent Energy Europe fund. The objective of the project is to address challenges to the further deployment of wind energy (onshore and offshore), in support of national and European energy targets for 2020. GP Wind hopes to reconcile wind energy objectives with environmental and community objectives.

In the final quarter of 2010, SEAI circulated a survey and hosted regional workshops to source early input from stakeholders. Since then, SEAI and its partners have gathered case studies of good (and indeed bad) practice from around Europe. The forthcoming

---

\(^1\) For the purpose of these activities ‘social acceptance’ refers to acceptance by all stakeholders; individuals, consumers of electricity, students, community groups, planners, elected representatives, Government agencies, NGOs and policy makers etc.

\(^2\) For the purpose of these activities ‘community acceptance’ refers to acceptance by individuals and groups living close to or somehow affected by individual wind energy projects.
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workshop will present the findings of that research under 16 thematic headings and will seek stakeholders’ views on the conclusions to be drawn prior to embarking on the next stage of the project i.e. the development of a guide to good practice and a ‘how to…’ toolkit. The 16 thematic areas under which case studies will be presented are:

- Local Authority Management
- Planning Officials and Consultants
- Professional/Trade Bodies
- National and Regional Dev. Authorities
- Regulatory Bodies
- State Agencies
- Wind Industry Associations

We welcome further suggestions on groups or individuals who should be invited.

**Registration**

Participation is by invitation only and places are strictly limited by design and by resources. Multiple representatives from an organisation/group will be considered subject to uptake from other invitees. Please click on this link to register: Registration for 21st of September. Pre-registration is necessary to assist in planning the day. A separate but related conference is also taking place on the following day, please click on the following link to view the programme and registration details: [https://www.eventelephant.com/windenergy2011](https://www.eventelephant.com/windenergy2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:40</td>
<td>Arrival Tea/Coffee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10:00 | **European Project: Good Practice Wind**  
Introduction to the GP Wind Project  
Martin McCarthy, SEAI REIO |
| 10:15 | **Presentation of Thematic Case Studies**  
Environmental Topics  
Q&A, Discussion |
| 11:30 | Tea Break |
| 11:45 | **Presentation of Thematic Case Studies**  
Community Engagement Topics  
Q&A, Discussion |
| Followed by lunch |  |

**Who is invited?**

The workshop is intended to be a relatively small gathering of approximately 25 people. All of the groups with a stake or interest in wind energy will be invited to nominate a representative to attend. Invitee groups include:

- Charity and Community Groups
- Elected Representatives
- Electricity Grid Owners and Operators
- Environmental and Heritage NGOs
- Farming and Land Owner Associations
- Government Departments

For more information on GP Wind, including specific objectives, please consult our project website.

---

**Agenda**
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Please find attached to this report the invitation and the agenda of the Workshop.

Number of invitees: 24
Number of participants: 17
Date and location of the Workshop: Building of the Province of Savona, 29th September 2011
Leading organising partner: Province of Savona
Other partners: ASEA
WORKSHOP SUMMARY

The aim of the workshops was to present the first results of the case study research from the Province of Savona and Benevento.

The Workshop was attended by 17 persons: 5 from local Authorities, 10 from private companies and 2 from Local Non profit Associations.

Stakeholders also had the opportunity to exchange point of views and make suggestions for the case study.

Stakeholders were invited to participate to at the transnational workshop that took place last 25th October 2011 in Brussels.

FEEDBACK

The partners and stakeholders had the opportunity to discuss the results of the research and to identify lessons learnt, factors for success and examples of good practice.

CONCLUSIONS

The workshop was very successful. There was a presentation of the project and the activities developed so far as well as the case studies developed by Savona and Benevento. Stakeholders were very important to gather the information required to prepare this documents. There were also space for other interventions of local developers which illustrated some good practices. The Stakeholders were pleased to confront with the representatives of Benevento some questions and experiences regarding the wind energy.
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<td>WWF Italia</td>
</tr>
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<td>Enrico Richeri</td>
<td>Energycom SAS</td>
</tr>
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<td>Mariano Rosasco</td>
<td>SV. Portservice Srl</td>
</tr>
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<td>Giovanni Cacciano</td>
<td>ASEA SpA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabio Tamburrino</td>
<td>ASEA SpA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gianfranco Tolace</td>
<td>Euro Service Group Srl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Calzone</td>
<td>ASEA SpA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabetta Barberi</td>
<td>Provincia di Genova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietro Pera</td>
<td>I.P.S. ScpA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annalisa Molle</td>
<td>Tecnocivis/Provincia di Savona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincenzo Gareri</td>
<td>Provincia di Savona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabio Tognetti</td>
<td>Provincia di Savona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulo de Melo</td>
<td>Provincia di Savona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Buongiorno a tutti,

negli ultimi mesi abbiamo lavorato nella preparazione del nostro Caso di Studio nell’ambito del progetto GPWIND e vorremmo innanzitutto ringraziarvi per la vostra preziosa collaborazione.

Siamo lieti di invitarVi a partecipare al secondo workshop Regionale del progetto GPWIND che si terrà il 29 settembre alle 9.30 presso il palazzo della Provincia di Savona.

Il Workshop servirà a presentarVi i due casi di studio elaborati dai partner italiani del progetto:

- Il Caso di Studio N.2 "Impatto dell'energia eolica sugli Habitat" (Provincia di Savona)
- Il Caso di studio N.10 "La gestione dell'impatto visivo degli impianti eolici sui paesaggi" (Agenzia ASEA di Benevento)

Seguiranno altri interventi e un dibattito. All'evento sono stati invitati anche gli stakeholders dell'Agenzia ASEA.

Il Workshop servirà inoltre per aggiornarVi sulle prossime attività previste dal progetto tra cui il Workshop transnazionale degli stakeholders che si terrà a Bruxelles il 25 ottobre 2011, al quale sarete inviati a partecipare (spese di viaggio non coperte dal progetto).

Vi chiedo cortesemente un riscontro via e-mail della vostra partecipazione se possibile entro il 23 settembre.

Grazie.

Cordiali saluti,

Paulo de Melo

Tel: 019 8313556
WORKSHOP AGENDA

Provincia di Savona
PROJECT GP WIND
Regional Workshop
29th September 2011 Sala Ridotto, building of Provincia di Savona

Moderator: Dr. Ing Gareri Vincent, Head of Territory and Environment Preservation Department

9,30 – Welcome Speech- Environment Alderman, Paolo Marson
9,45 - Presentation of the Intelligent Energy Europe project GPWIND, activities developed so far and to be developed in the near future
   Dott. Ing. Vincenzo Gareri/ Dott. Paulo Rondo de Melo - Provincia di Savona
10,00 – Presentation of Case study n°10. “Landscape and managing Visual impact”
   Dott. Giovanni Cacciano - ASEA Benevento
10,30- Presentation of Case study n°2 "Impact on Habitats”
   Ing. Fabio Tognetti - Provincia di Savona
10,45- Coffee Break
11,00 – Sustainable exploitation of wind energy
   Dott.ssa Paola Solari, Regione Liguria
11,15  - The experience of wind energy in Liguria since 1999 - Environmental, logistical and technical issues
   Enrico Richeri – Technical advisor
   - The experience of the Municipality of Erli
   Candido Carretto – Mayor of Erli
   – Installation in port area
   Ing. Mariano Rosasco - SV Port Service
Ore 12,00- Issues related to natural wind energy
   Dott. Marco Piombo - Associazione ambientalista WWF
Ore 12,15- Debate
Ore 12,45 – Conclusion
Lunch
Please find attached to this report the invitation and the agenda of the Workshop.

Number of invitees: 46
Number of participants: 13
Date and location of the Workshop: Various
Leading organising partner: Projects in Motion Ltd. (PIM)
Other partners: None
WORKSHOP SUMMARY

During various meetings with stakeholders it was agreed that since the Government of Malta has still not yet decided in favour of any wind turbine installations until it has the Environmental Impact Assessments reports in hand for the three proposed sites; there is an understandable reluctance to undertake any public workshops until the first EIA results. The wind plans are a highly contentious issue socially in Malta due to the high population density on the island; which needs to be treated carefully. Consequently it was decided that any public efforts in this regard would be counteractive until the EIA facts are in hand.

The one-to-one meetings held resulted in a number of interesting observations that should be addressed in the final deliverable. As predicted most of the stakeholders are specifically focused on their domain with clear vested interests to ‘protect their turf’, however it was interesting to note that due to the multi-disciplinarity of the case studies a lot of relevant feedback was received on areas that are usually out of their domain. This made discussions more interactive and raised a number of holistic considerations from a spatial planning point of view.
Feedback

- **Case Study Theme n°4 - Tackling cumulative impact issues**

Case Study 1
Species impact offshore and onshore

**How might it be improved?**

- Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

*In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere.* Wind farms can actually create new habitats (habitat gain) ex. [http://www.intechopen.com/articles/show/title/the-potential-for-habitat-creation-around-offshore-wind-farms](http://www.intechopen.com/articles/show/title/the-potential-for-habitat-creation-around-offshore-wind-farms)  

**Score: 8/10**

- Readability, clarity, relevance?

*Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context.*  
**Score: 8/10**

- Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

*Yes*  
**Score: 8/10**

**Main messages:**

No further comment.

**Recommendations**

- Perhaps focuses too much on avifauna.

- It would be interesting to include best practice related to the mitigation of avifauna migratory paths/patterns and to ecological corridors.

- Also interesting to see best practice related to impact of wind measuring masts.

- Important that CS 1, 2 and 3 are assessed together in order to avoid duplication and overlap.

- Examples/links of EIA requirements for assessing species impacts.
Case Study 2
Impact on habitats

_How might it be improved?

► Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere. Again here as in Case Study 1 wind farms can actually create new habitats (habitat gain) ex. [http://www.intechopen.com/articles/show/title/the-potential-for-habitat-creation-around-offshore-wind-farms](http://www.intechopen.com/articles/show/title/the-potential-for-habitat-creation-around-offshore-wind-farms) or [www.hull.ac.uk/iecs/pdfs/wilsonmsc2007.pdf](http://www.hull.ac.uk/iecs/pdfs/wilsonmsc2007.pdf)

Score: 8/10

► Readability, clarity, relevance?

Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context.
Score: 8/10

► Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes
Score: 8/10

_Main messages:_

No further comment.

_Recommendations_

- References to Scottish carbon calculator in Section 3 not relevant here and better addressed in CS 6 – Carbon Accounting.

- Links to Scottish HRA effort mentioned in Section 4 would be appreciated.

- Similarly links to good practice related to Appropriate Assessment methodology would be appreciated.

- Links to the study referred to by ASOIM for the first example of lessons learnt would be appreciated.

- Important that CS 1, 2 and 3 are assessed together in order to avoid duplication and overlap.

- Bibliography is very poor.

Case Study 3
Biodiversity

_How might it be improved?

► Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?
In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere.

Score: 9/10

► Readability, clarity, relevance?

Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context.
Score: 9/10

► Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes. It would be interesting to learn if other best practice exists for south Mediterranean areas, within drought resistant habitats however we appreciate that space is limited.
Score: 9/10

Main messages:

No further comment.

Recommendations

- Important that CS 1, 2 and 3 are assessed together in order to avoid duplication and overlap.
- Bibliography can be improved.

Case Study 4
Tackling cumulative impact issues

How might it be improved?

► Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere.

Score: 9/10

► Readability, clarity, relevance?

Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context.
Score: 9/10

► Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes. It would be interesting to learn if other best practice exists related to spatial planning techniques in other countries.
Score: 9/10

Main messages:

No further comment.

Recommendations
• One assumes that CIA refers to cumulative impact assessment - should be spelled out clearly.

Case Study 5
Systems and process for monitoring impacts; Examples of environmental mitigation techniques

_How might it be improved?_

► Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

_In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere._

Score: 9/10

► Readability, clarity, relevance?

_Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context._

Score: 9/10

► Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes
Score: 9/10

_Main messages:_

No further comment.

_Recommendations_

• Bibliography needs to be elaborated further, and superscripts for references revisited.

Case Study 6
Carbon accounting for wind farms

_How might it be improved?_

► Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

_In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere._

Score: 9/10

► Readability, clarity, relevance?

_Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context._

Score: 9/10

► Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes. Score: 9/10
Main messages:

No further comment.

Recommendations

- No further comment.

Case Study 7
Construction and operation of facilities in the marine environment

How might it be improved?

► Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere.

Score: 9/10

► Readability, clarity, relevance?

Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context.
Score: 9/10

► Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes. Score: 9/10 It would be interesting to learn if other best practice exists related to geotechnical techniques in other countries that could address problems like this: http://www.um.edu.mt/research/scienceeng/discovery_of_collapsed_caves.

Main messages:

No further comment.

Recommendations

- Would help if a definition is given for scour protection.

- More in-text links would be advisable

- Some typos have been pointed out by readers.

- Weblinks should be referenced properly following correct citation.

Case Study 8
Offshore - Human commercial activities: fisheries, marine industries, seabed issues, landfall sites

How might it be improved?

► Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere.
Score: 9/10

► Readability, clarity, relevance?

Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context. Score: 9/10

► Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes. Score: 9/10

Main messages:
No further comment.

Recommendations

 Not clear the relevance of the section dedicated to floating foundations to human commercial activities.

 What about other commercial activities like shipping, fish farming, military, aviation etc?

Case Study 9
Communications, awareness, information cascades

How might it be improved?

► Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere.

Score: 9/10

► Readability, clarity, relevance?

Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context. Score: 9/10

► Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes. Score: 9/10

Main messages:
No further comment.

Recommendations

 Very good document. Pleasure to read

Case Study 10
Landscape & managing visual impact
How might it be improved?

► Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere.

Score: 8/10

► Readability, clarity, relevance?

Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context.
Score: 8/10

► Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes. Score: 8/10

Main messages:

No further comment.

Recommendations

- Would be interesting to also discuss the reduction of visual impact from grid infrastructure like pylons.

Case Study 11
Dealing with noise issues

How might it be improved?

► Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere.

Score: 8/10

► Readability, clarity, relevance?

Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context.
Score: 8/10

► Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes. Score: 8/10

Main messages:

No further comment.

Recommendations

- A lot of studies that are mentioned are not referenced and linked. It is a bit difficult to ascertain who wrote these papers and where to find them.
Case Study 12
Conflict with other economic interests including tourism

How might it be improved?

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere.

Score: 9/10

Readability, clarity, relevance?

Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context. Score: 9/10

Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes. Score: 9/10

Main messages:

No further comment.

Recommendations

- Document remains a bit disjointed and could be improved in the way it flows rather than skips from one argument to the next.
- Examples to practical and tangible guidelines related to the various issues raised like good spatial planning would help.

Case Study 13
Community concerns and acceptance - how to achieve buy-in

How might it be improved?

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere.

Score: 9/10

Readability, clarity, relevance?

Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context. Score: 9/10

Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes. Score: 9/10

Main messages:
No further comment.

**Recommendations**

- No further comment.

**Case Study 14**

**Community benefit schemes**

**How might it be improved?**

- Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere.

*Score: 9/10*

- Readability, clarity, relevance?

Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context.

*Score: 9/10*

- Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes. *Score: 9/10*

**Main messages:**

No further comment.

**Recommendations**

- No further comment.

**Case Study 15**

**Dealing with complex or entrenched public perception issues**

**How might it be improved?**

- Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere.

*Score: 9/10*

- Readability, clarity, relevance?

Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context.

*Score: 9/10*

- Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes. *Score: 9/10*
Main messages:

No further comment.

Recommendations

- No further comment.

Case Study 16
Undertaking socio-economic impact assessment

How might it be improved?

► Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

In Malta there are no relevant good practices and the report covers adequately good practices elsewhere.

Score: 9/10

► Readability, clarity, relevance?

Reads well, delivers case studies in a clear way and is relevant to the local context.

Score: 9/10

► Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes. Score: 9/10

Main messages:

No further comment.

Recommendations

- Pleasure to read, and perhaps CS 12 should include some of the approaches suggested here like for instance those related to tourism.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the first drafts were received very positively by the stakeholders consulted. It is important to note that due to the geographical proximities of the Maltese Islands it was possible to discuss the deliverable with all the key players involved in Malta’s wind energy plans, and it is safe to say that all major actors are aware of what GPWIND is trying to do and its preliminary deliverables.

Various points have been raised that should be addressed in order to ensure that Malta’s particular circumstances are addressed. It is interesting to note that the first draft was also accessible to non-technical stakeholders like the affected Local Councils, who in most cases do not have the necessary technical expertise on board, but are still capable of extracting the salient points and good practices
raised. This is crucial for Malta which is still in its early stages of Wind energy considerations, and such documents empower the local community to achieve a better understanding of wind implications, while learning from best practice elsewhere.
## WORKSHOP ATTENDEE LIST

**GPWIND LIST OF CONSULTATIONS CONTACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact and Organisation</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>1st Consultation</th>
<th>2nd Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1 - Affected locals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Aquilina (Resident)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:susan82@live.ca">susan82@live.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peppi Gauci (Bahrija Oasis)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:peppizen@yahoo.co.uk">peppizen@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Micallef (Resident)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.micallef86@gmail.com">david.micallef86@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Sammut (resident)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rayragg@maltanet.net">rayragg@maltanet.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Grech (resident - Bahrija LC sub-committee chairman)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul.d.grech@gov.mt">paul.d.grech@gov.mt</a></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Bonello (resident)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alex@3dmalta.com">alex@3dmalta.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Buhagiar (resident)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:salpress@maltanet.net">salpress@maltanet.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2 - Resource users</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Schaa (Mosta)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stefan.schaa@gmail.com">stefan.schaa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniele Cop (Naxxar)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:daniele.cop@mamotcv.com">daniele.cop@mamotcv.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Alamango (B’kara)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alamango@engineria.com">alamango@engineria.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damian Ellul (Bidnija)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:damian@turnpro.com.mt">damian@turnpro.com.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Tabone (Sliema)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patricktabone@smc.edu.mt">patricktabone@smc.edu.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (Location)</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Restall (Bidnija)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brian.restall@pim.com.mt">brian.restall@pim.com.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Busuttil (Swieqi)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fbusuttil@gmail.com">fbusuttil@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3 - Government and other local agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Alexander Craus (Mayor Rabat Local Council)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alexander.craus@gov.mt">alexander.craus@gov.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ms. Orietta Masini Cardona</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:rabat.malta.lc@gov.mt">rabat.malta.lc@gov.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Mifsud (Malta Resources Authority)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:peter.mifsud@mra.org.mt">peter.mifsud@mra.org.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godwin Sant (Climate Change Committee)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:godwin.sant@mra.org.mt">godwin.sant@mra.org.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Spiteri (The Ministry for Resources and Rural Affairs)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:matthew.spiteri@gov.mt">matthew.spiteri@gov.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illona Sultana (The Ministry for Resources and Rural Affairs)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ilona-anne.sultana@gov.mt">ilona-anne.sultana@gov.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frans Mallia (Malta Environment Protection Agency)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Frans.Mallia@mepa.org.mt">Frans.Mallia@mepa.org.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Galea (Malta Communications Authority)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adrian.c.galea@mca.org.mt">adrian.c.galea@mca.org.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix Grech MRRA (CAMD - (The Ministry for Resources and Rural Affairs))</td>
<td><a href="mailto:felix.a.grech@gov.mt">felix.a.grech@gov.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonio Sant ((The Ministry for Resources and Rural Affairs/ University of Malta)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tonio.sant@um.edu.mt">tonio.sant@um.edu.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graziella Galea (St. Paul’ Bay Local Council)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sanpawlii-bahar.lc@gov.mt">sanpawlii-bahar.lc@gov.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Debono (Mellieha Local Council)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mellieha.lc@gov.mt">mellieha.lc@gov.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eman Vella (Mgarr LC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vellaeman@hotmail.com">vellaeman@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 - Non-governmental organizations (NGOs),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Attard (Nature Trust)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@naturetrustmalta.org">info@naturetrustmalta.org</a></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing. George Camilleri (Din l'Art Helwa)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:george@dinlarthelwa.org">george@dinlarthelwa.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolga Temuge (Birdlife)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tolga.temuge@birdlifemalta.org">tolga.temuge@birdlifemalta.org</a></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Barbara (Birdlife Malta)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nicholas.barbara@birdlifemalta.org">nicholas.barbara@birdlifemalta.org</a></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romano Cassar (Ramblers)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ram205@gmail.com">ram205@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin De Giovanni (Friends of the Earth)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:george@dinlarthelwa.org">george@dinlarthelwa.org</a></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 5 - Scientific community</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Edward Mallia (University of Malta – Department of Physics)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sicilian@maltanet.net">sicilian@maltanet.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Farrugia (UoM - Institute for Sustainable Energy)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robert.n.farrugia@um.edu.mt">robert.n.farrugia@um.edu.mt</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Louis Cassar (UoM–International Environment Institute)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:louis.f.cassar@um.edu.mt">louis.f.cassar@um.edu.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Elisabeth Conrad (UoM–International Environment Institute)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elisabeth.conrad@um.edu.mt">elisabeth.conrad@um.edu.mt</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Maria Attard (UOM - Institute for Sustainable Development)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maria.attard@um.edu.mt">maria.attard@um.edu.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Alan Deidun (UoM – Biology Department)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alan.deidun@gmail.com">alan.deidun@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yury Zammit (ADI Associates)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yury.zammit@adi-associates.com">yury.zammit@adi-associates.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonio Sant (MRRA/UoM)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tonio.sant@um.edu.mt">tonio.sant@um.edu.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Lucio Mule Stagno (UoM - Institute for Sustainable Energy)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:luciano.mule-stagno@um.edu.mt">luciano.mule-stagno@um.edu.mt</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Bilocca (AIS Environmental)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:richard.bilocca@ais.com.mt">richard.bilocca@ais.com.mt</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Zammit (AIS Environmental)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.zammit@ais.com.mt">mark.zammit@ais.com.mt</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Vella</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stevenvella@gmail.com">stevenvella@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Methodological Deviations

During various meetings with stakeholders it was agreed that since the Government of Malta has still not yet decided in favour of wind turbine installations until it has the Environmental Impact Assessments reports in hand for the three proposed sites; there is an understandable reluctance to undertake any public workshops until the first EIA results. The wind plans are a highly contentious issue socially in Malta due to the high population density on the island; which needs to be treated carefully. Consequently it was decided that any public efforts in this regard would be counteractive until the EIA facts are in hand.

Any efforts to discuss the way forward on Malta’s wind plans without the EIA conclusions in hand and at such a sensitive point in time would antagonise public engagement efforts since the EIAs might actually deem the sites chosen unpractical in the first place, or give the impression to stakeholders that the wind plans are going to happen anyway, thus undermining the EIA and permitting process while creating unnecessary suspicion or confusion.

Consequently on the 21st October 2010 Projects in Motion proposed to the Scottish Government (project coordinators) that instead of specifically running a workshop we undertake a one-to-one interview and feedback methodology with all the relevant stakeholders. Albeit this is more time-consuming, results obtained in the first round of consultations where more ‘intimate’ and detailed since more time is allocated to individual contributions as against a group approach.

Due to the nature of the meetings (as explained) there was no set agenda.

Below one can find a typical invitation that was sent to all stakeholders.

From: Brian Restall (PIM) [mailto:brian.restall@pim.com.mt]
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2011 9:17 AM
To: mellieha.lc@gov.mt
Subject: FW: request for meeting.

Dear Sir/Madam,

We would like to setup a meeting with the Mayor or his delegate to discuss work we are currently doing for an EU funded project called GP Wind http://www.project-gpwind.eu/.

The GP WIND project aims to share good practice in reconciling wind energy objectives with wider environmental objectives and actively involving communities in planning and implementation.

I would like to setup a meeting with you in order to discuss the deliverables we are working on, namely a number of good practice case studies and guidelines which you can find here:

http://www.project-gpwind.eu/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=74&Itemid
It would be important for us to get your feedback on this material so that we can address the particular circumstances in Malta with these deliverables, while helping the Mellieha LC and Community get learn more about Wind projects.

I thank you for your attention.

Regards

Brian

Brian Restall

_________________________________________________
Projects in Motion Ltd.           Executive Officer
One  Triq il-Plejju  Iklin  IKL 1830  Malta

tel/fax +356 21 420 852  mob +356 9984 7540

http://www.pim.com.mt Building on Ideas!

Our sister company www.renewablehabitats.com

Please consider your environmental responsibility before printing this mail.

The carbon footprint for one kg of paper consumed is around 1.907 kg CO2-e.
The water footprint for one A4-sheet of paper made from wood is between 2-30 litres of water.
Please find attached to this report the invitation and the agenda of the Workshop.

Number of invitees: 13

Number of participants: Cancelled following discussion with Giulia Camozzini (coordinator, SG)

Date and location of the Workshop: - (planned for 29th September, Trondheim)

Leading organising partner: NINA

Other partners: None
WORKSHOP SUMMARY

12 stakeholder organisations were invited to participate in the workshop. 10 did not reply, although a reminder was sent, one sent apologies, and Statkraft explained that they did not consider the participation, involving flights and hotel stays given the distances in Norway, as well as staff time, sufficiently cost-effective. In their view any EU guidelines or rules resulting from the programme were unlikely to apply in Norway, as a non-member with no prospect of joining in the forseeable future and where the Norwegian regulators, NVE, have pursued a strongly independent line in wind farm planning procedures hitherto. They did however provide written feedback.

FEEDBACK

Statkraft sent written feedback to the draft case studies:


- Theme 1, Example of lessons learnt: for å være korrekt varierer det årlige antallet døde havørner i Smøla vindpark mellom 2 og 11. Det står i same avsnitt: "The developers, Statkraft, and the authorities instituted..." Statkraft er vel her lik utbyggeren ("the developer").

- Theme 2, The main barrier, Examples of impacts during operation: Jeg mener at indirekte effekter som skyldes drift og vedlikehold (menneskelig aktivitet, biltrafikk, maskiner etc) samt økt menneskelig ferdsel i friluftslivsøyemed som følge av økt tilrettelegging bør nevnes her. (En av konklusjonene på den egne work shop'en om vindkraft og pattedyr på konferansen i mai var nettopp det at installasjonene og produksjonene i seg selv ikke utgjør noen stort problem for pattedyr, mens aktivitet og infrastruktur som følger med kan være et problem. Det finnes flere eksempler på dette, bla fra Portugal (ulv)). Examples of lessons learnt: Det første eksempelet fra Italia gir meg lite anvendelig kunnskap.

- Theme 12: Vind – tamrein, burde det ha vært nevnt noe om dette under theme 12, knyttet til Agriculture and animal husbandry? Eller blir tamrein for sært? Hovedtemaet er uansett økonomisk kompensasjon for et eller annet dokumentert tap, og her knyttes det i tillegg opp til sosiale/kulturelle spørsmål.

In translation:

General: Great to have the links available in the text, but it appears visually somewhat distracting to the reader. Propose that the links are collected in an appendix. The enormous number of links will require much maintenance / updating. Maybe a good idea with a redevelopment, and the distribution of links and bibliographies.

- Theme 1, Example of lessons learnt: to be exact the annual number of dead eagles in Smøla wind farm has varied between 2 and 11 It is in the same paragraph: "The developers, Statkraft, and the Authorities instituted ..." Statkraft is the developer (the "developer").

- Theme 2, The main barrier, Examples of impacts hum operation, I believe that the indirect effects
resulting from the operation and maintenance (human activity, traffic, machinery, etc.) as well as increased human traffic in outdoor recreation purposes as a result of increased facilitation should be mentioned here. (One of the conclusions of its own work our shop on wind and mammals at the conference in May was just the fact that the installations and productions in themselves poses no great problem for mammals, while the activity and infrastructure provided may be a problem. Several examples of this phenomenon from Portugal (wolf)). Examples of lessons learnt: The first example from Italy gives me little useful knowledge.

- Theme 12: Wind - domestic reindeer should have been mentioned in Theme 12, related to Agriculture and animal husbandry? Or are tame reindeer too specific (to Norway)? The main issue is whether financial compensation should be paid documented losses, and this connects it in addition to social / cultural issues.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The major problem in Norway in stakeholder consultations is the difficulty in persuading stakeholders that an EU programme such as GPWind is likely to affect them in practice. In Scotland, for example, where the intention of the Scottish Government to apply results from GPWind is clear (and the sector much larger), the stakeholder meeting was very well attended. Norway, as a non-member of the EU and where, given wider events within the EU since the inception of GPWind, there is no prospect for the foreseeable future of an application for membership, is at the opposite extreme.

In addition relevant stakeholders are scattered across a long, mountainous, and decentralised country, from Stavanger and Oslo in the south to Tromsø in the north (Stavanger is about 14 hour's drive from Trondheim, Oslo 8, Tromsø more than 20). Attendance at these meetings usually requires air flights and hotel attendance, and in addition to these costs much more staff time, than would be the case for attendance in most of Europe.

We have concluded from these factors that we should wherever possible arrange future stakeholder events, including dissemination activities, at industry events, such as conferences and meetings of other wind energy fora of a national nature, where attracting stakeholder participation/attention will be much easier than to a stand-alone GPWind event.
Innbydelse til Good Practice Wind ‘Stakeholder Meeting’, NINA, Trondheim 29. september 2011

Dere inviteres herved til å delta i det norske "stakeholder meeting" om innholdet i de tematiske case-studiene om god praksis i utviklinger av vindkraftanlegg. Dokumentet er en viktig del av EUs politikk om vindkraftutvikling, og skal publiseres av EUs Intelligent Energy Europe Programme (se http://project-gpwind.eu). Endelige beslutninger i tilknytning til Norges og de andre deltakerlandenes anbefalinger for teksten i sluttdokumentet blir tatt på det internasjonale møtet i Brussel 25. oktober.

Et foreløpig utkast av teksten ble sendt til dere på e-post 02.09.2011. I tilfelle dere ikke har mottatt denne så ta kontakt slik at vi får sendt den på nytt. Vi vil gjerne ha kommentar selv om det ikke er mulig å stille opp på møtet.

Dette er en mulighet til å påvirke et dokument som EU planlegger skal ha stor innflytelse på planleggingsprosessen gjennom hele Europa. NINA er leder av arbeidspakken som foretar tekstutformingen og hovedansvarlig for skriving av den endelige teksten, i samarbeid med de andre europeiske samarbeidspartnerne.

En mer detaljert agenda sendes i løpet av neste uke; prosessen består hovedsakelig av en systematisk review av de ulike tematiske case-studiene og innspill fra stakeholders til innholdet. Deretter skrives en rapport om møtet som skal sirkuleres til stakeholders til kommentar før det sendes til GPWinds sekretariat for bruk i Brüssel-møtet. En innbydelse til møtet i Brüssel sendes i løpet av de nærmeste dagene.

Møtet blir på NINAs hovedkvarter, Tungasletta 2, Trondheim, kl.10-kl.15 torsdag 29. september (lunsj serveres). Vil dere delta så ta kontakt og bekreft deltagelse innen 24. september 2011.

Mvh
Kjetil Bevanger
Duncan Halley

http://project-gpwind.eu/

Dr. Duncan Halley Researcher I Norwegian Institute for Nature Research - NINA
Postal address: PO Box 5685 Sluppen, NO-7485 Trondheim, NORWAY Delivery/Visiting address: Tungasletta 2, NO-7047 Trondheim, NORWAY Phone: +47 73 80 14 00 • Fax: +47 73 80 14 01 • www.nina.no
Please find attached to this report the invitation and the agenda of the Workshop.

Number of invitees: 77
Number of participants: 10 (plus 2 representatives from LEITAT)
Date and location of the Workshop: 28/09/2011, LEITAT Technological Center, C/ de la Innovació, 2-08225, Terrassa (Barcelona, Spain)
Leading organising partner: LEITAT
Other partners: None
WORKSHOP SUMMARY

77 organizations between industries, national and regional authorities, environmental agencies, NGOs, universities and community representatives were invited by e-mail to the Spanish workshop, in addition to further general diffusion. In the end, 10 stakeholders attended the workshop though practically every area of interest was successfully covered.

With the aim of examining all 16 TCS, the workshop was organized in 4 separated sessions, each of one for analyzing 4 TCS. After each session, stakeholders were distributed into 4 working groups (one by TCS) to discuss upon the exposed TCS, to answer the given questions (regarding ‘How might it be improved?’) and to share good practice and concerns.

During the workshop, other good examples for sharing were mainly released in relation to species impact, biodiversity, tackling cumulative impacts, monitoring impacts, carbon accounting and community benefits schemes. With regard to communication issues, stakeholders from the industry sector pointed that TCS have not addressed so far the lack of communication between authorities and within different departments from the same public administration, which is considered a relevant concern to be addressed, since this lack of communication implies a significant delay for consenting processes.

The full contents of all sessions and the main workshop outputs are set out below.

FEEDBACK

Stakeholders highlighted that all 16 TCS are much interconnected; therefore an additional TCS (nº17) was suggested to be added in order to address such connectivity.

The suggestions by TCS are presented in the following pages, in blue colour:

TCS-1. Species Impact

Are there other related key issues not identified in the TCS?

- Difficult to know all species involved in the marine environment.
- When mapping and developing specific study of species, not all species have the same behaviour.
- The collision is not the main problem for certain species, but loss of habitats which is more difficult to address.

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?


- It has been suggested to be care on the example given on habitat management (on Montagu's harrier), since one habitat has been destroyed to save to one particular species, but this habitat was such for other species (as prey...). Therefore, habitats and species should not be separated; the defence of a species should not involve the destruction of any habitat, and vice versa.

Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?
Yes.

In regard to the example given on habitat management (on Montagu's harrier), the possibility of replication should be monitored, since the defence of a species should not involve the destruction of any habitat, and vice versa.

**Recommendations**

What needs to be added?

- Definition in the wind farm projects on how much mortality we are willing to accept.
- Importance of tracking the effectiveness of measures taken (monitoring of species before and after starting the wind farm).

What does it need to improve and be more useful?

- Promoters should promote rigorous studies to avoid problems later.
- Joint cooperation between consultants, researchers and authorities.

**TCS-2. Habitats**

Are there other related key issues not identified in the TCS?

- There is an excessive focus on those most studied groups of organisms (birds, etc...), with contempt for those species and ecosystems which are unknown or 'less attractive'.
- Not to separate habitats and species has been suggested.

Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes

**Recommendations**

What needs to be added?

Since all disciplines are difficult to be integrated as a whole for analyzing the habitat, as an approximation, the greatest possible number of specialists should be sought, but not only of large groups of species (birds, etc.).

What does it need to improve and be more useful?

Strategic studies should be made in a broad geographic level in order to contextualize each particular case within the global scenario.

**TCS-3. Biodiversity**

Are there other related key issues not identified in the TCS?

- Need of close collaboration between wind farm developers and environmental consultants.
- Impact on the lifestyle of birds (migratory routes, feeding areas, etc.)

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?
- Training programmes for monitoring species. For example, Internship Program developed by ‘Fundación Migres’ to study phenomena migratory of birds in the Strait of Gibraltar (Spain).

- Monitoring of measures taken.

- Prioritize species for each other and/or assess mortality.

**TCS-4. Tackling Cumulative Impact Issues**

Are there other related key issues not identified in the TCS?

- Cumulative Impacts are important not only to local and regional level, but also to global level. For example, when analyzing a possible displacement / disruption of the migratory route of a particular bird when it passes through an area, consideration must be given full path (eg., From northern Europe to Africa), since the repeated small changes in the route alter the total flight time. Impact on the migratory route may vary greatly depending on the number of obstacles in the whole route.

- Need to improve the quality of the zero alternative evaluation (no construction of the WF) within EIA procedures.

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

- Submission to joint EIA to the modification of wind farms «Páramo de la Mesuca», «Valdemarona» and «Monte Soto» in Palencia (Spain), which implies the reduction of turbines within the three neighboring wind farms.

Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes

**Recommendations**

What needs to be added?

- Need of greater monitoring of WF projects which do not reach to the minimum nominal power required for the EIA procedure, since in many cases large wind farms are built through the accumulation of several small-scale wind farms which require less restrictive environmental conditions.

What does it need to improve and be more useful?

- Authorities play a crucial role in the detection of cumulative impacts of different activities.

**TCS-5. Systems and process for monitoring impacts; Examples of environmental mitigation techniques**

Are there other related key issues not identified in the TCS?

- Training for monitoring.

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

- Preliminary study for the location of each turbine (micrositing), in order to install only those who in principle do not have much impact.

- Training programmes for monitoring species. For example, Internship Program developed by ‘Fundación Migres’ to study phenomena migratory of birds in the Strait of Gibraltar (Spain).
- Using artificial vision software for automatic control on bird behaviour. For example, DTBird system, which detect and records potential collisions: it continuously monitors surveillance area and detects flying birds in real time, it emits warning and dissuasion signals to birds flying in moderate/high collision risk areas, and it sends a stop signal to the wind turbine according to collision risk of birds.

- In regard to the example 5 given on mitigation and aviation lights on turbine towers (within the revision of revision TCS5 draft (2)), another article can be added.

Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes.

Recommendations

What needs to be added?

- Continue to improve the pre-studies based on monitoring.

What does it need to improve and be more useful?

- The proposed measures must be reasonable for both environment and promoters.

What does it need to make it more applicable and relevant to the reality?

- The commitment of stakeholders must be honest.
- Provide specific and actual changes to the program depending on the percentage of rejection of a certain barrier. For example, as the case of RF transmitters in power airlines to prevent the passage of birds.

TCS-6. Carbon accounting for wind farms

Are there other related key issues not identified in the TCS?

- Clear methodology for CO₂ accounting.

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

- Accounting of CO₂ emissions for all energy sources (renewable and non renewable) in order to make a comparison between them. To ensure that comparison is accurate, the scope of accounting for CO₂ emissions should be the same (in all types of energy, emissions should be accounted from the associated infrastructure, transport, possible removal of fuel, etc.)

- Survey of total emissions within a WF, from generation of raw materials, transport, installation, maintaining, etc. For example, through a LCA (Life Cycle Assessment of a Wind Farm: “Life cycle approaches to assess emerging energy technologies Final report on offshore wind technology” output from the NEEDS project (FP6).

Recommendations

What needs to be added?

- CO₂ storage in the subsurface of wind farms.

TCS-7. Construction and operation of facilities in the marine environment

Are there other related key issues not identified in the TCS?
- Sea as global habitat, since it constitutes most of the planet.

What does it need to improve and be more useful?

- Global vision.

**TCS-8. OFFSHORE - Human commercial activities: fisheries, Marine industries, seabed issues, landfall sites**

Are there other related key issues not identified in the TCS?

- Other collateral activities related with needs from offshore wind, such as technological development and training.

**TCS-9. Communications, Awareness, Information Cascades**

Are there other related key issues not identified in the TCS?

- Lack of Interdepartmental Communication within Public Administration.
- Reluctance of the community to large wind farms.

**Recommendations**

What needs to be added?

- Trying to give voice to those who favour with wind projects, instead of just listening to dissidents.
- Encourage also the "small" projects (micro-generators) and not only large wind farms.
- Improve the internal communication between governments and between different departments of a single administration.

**TCS-10. Landscape & Managing Visual Impact**

Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes, always when areas are appropriate to the environmental conditions to install the WF.

**Recommendations**

What needs to be added?

- Closer collaboration between training and employment in areas where there are no wind farms.
- Technical and economic comparisons could be carried out with other alternative energies.

What does it need to improve and be more useful?

Broadcast nationally in the educational field.

**TCS-11. Dealing with noise issues**

Are there other related key issues not identified in the TCS?
- Relationship noise-perception. There are frequency bands no detectable for humans but they do for some species.
- Most common sources of noise are proposed to be added.

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?
- Examples should be included on technical solutions against noise (isolate, eliminate).

Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?
Yes, but each are has its own peculiarity.

**TCS-12. Conflicts with other economic interests including tourism**

Are there other related key issues not identified in the TCS?
- The marking of turbines for aviation safety can lead to social unrest (complaints on lighting, glare, etc.)

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?
- The use of flashing red lights for harmonizing wind farms with the enforcement of aviation safety and the protection of the night environment. (Example given within TCS5).

**TCS-13. Community concerns and acceptance - how to achieve buy-in**

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?
- To visit other similar wind farms
- Photomontages

Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?
Yes, but each area and each community is a world.

Special care is suggested when offering as good practice example of WindVision and Enervest upon the granting of subsidies / economic compensations to landowners where the turbines are located, because it could encourage the establishment of wind farms in the most economically depressed areas.

**Recommendations**

What needs to be added?
- To explain benefits = to convince. To enhance awareness of the community instead of giving economic returns (especially in those most deprived areas, since they could have a risk of supporting more wind farms).

What does it need to improve and be more useful?
- To enhance the social awareness not only towards sustainable production (based on renewable sources) but also on minimizing energy consumption.

**TCS-14. Community benefit schemes**

Are there other related key issues not identified in the TCS?
- To consider the benefit limits based not only on the location of the wind farm.

Otras buenas prácticas y lecciones aprendidas:

- **Wind Farms in ‘Vilalba dels Arcs’** (Tarragona, Spain): there are three WF in the municipality (33 turbines in total), of whose income the City Hall subsidizes social / community benefits such as childcare grants, free pool and local festivals.

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

Yes

**Recommendations**

What needs to be added?

- Special attention to bribes. There are problems to confuse aids or compensations with bribes. Special care is suggested when offering as good practice example (within TCS13) the granting of subsidies / economic compensations to landowners where the turbines are located, because it could encourage the establishment of wind farms in the most economically depressed areas.

**TCS-15. Dealing with complex or entrenched public perception issues**

Are there other related key issues not identified in the TCS?

- There is a general perception that there is an industrial monopoly in regard to the wind generation. A less rigid administration is requested in order to facilitate procedures for small developers, builders, etc.

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

- Technical-economic dissemination at all population levels.

Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Yes.

A specific study must be applied to a particular region or locality.

**Recommendations**

What needs to be added?

- The predisposition may be the reason for openness to alternative energy.

What does it need to improve and be more useful?

- Based on experience, public aids have worked to break this barrier.

What does it need to make it more applicable and relevant to the reality?

- General measures must be adaptable in terms of concerns.

**TCS-16. Undertaking Socio-Economic Impact Assessment**

Are there other related key issues not identified in the TCS?

- Exhaustive Socio-Economic Analysis.
- Intercommunication between public administrations involved.

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

- Creation of local enterprises for the wind farms maintenance.

CONCLUSIONS

All the Thematic Case Studies were examined and discussed by stakeholders during the Spanish workshop and a high interconnection between all 16 TCS was noted. The importance of strong cooperation between authorities, researchers, consultants and communities was strongly emphasized within all sessions.

Good practice and lessons learnt regarding species, habitats and biodiversity were highlighted to be difficult to separate, since all three themes are integrated in a same concern and are understood as a whole. Strategic surveys were proposed to be carried out at European level in terms of analyzing the global scenario for particular migratory species and detecting possible behaviour changes within their migratory routes due to wind farms. Moreover, pre-studies based on monitoring were noted to be very important as well as the encouragement of training programmes implementation for monitoring species. New good examples were showed on monitoring and also for addressing species impacts by the development of a sensitive rate for seabirds in wind farms.

In regard to cumulative impacts, authorities were identified to play the main role for its detection. They should carefully attend to small-scale wind farms whose environmental procedures for approval are less restrictive, since they are often implemented in 'lots' which agglomerate large wind farms and which have not been evaluated and approved by a proper environmental impact assessment. Good practices upon this were proposed to be shared and also related to technical solutions against noise.

All stakeholders agreed upon the importance of transparency/honesty in communications and the community engagement from the early stage. A good example was added related to this.

In addition, good practice were required to be included within the GPWIND outputs in order to solve the lack of communication between authorities/regulators, which was pointed as a significant cause of delay for the consenting processes of wind farms.

Finally, further examples in good practice have been incorporated to the workshop outputs by LEITAT, in response to the main requirements raised from stakeholders about adding more examples to some specific TCS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raquel Villalba</td>
<td>LEITAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta Escamilla</td>
<td>LEITAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pep Tatché</td>
<td>ANORTEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuela de Lucas</td>
<td>CSIC. Doñana Biological Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordi Solina</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY, Catalan Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mª Teresa de Ugarte</td>
<td>FCC ENERGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvador Esquius</td>
<td>INS SANTA EULALIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesc Peralta</td>
<td>J.V. FOIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Blanco</td>
<td>CATALAN OFFICE FOR CLIMATE CHANGE (OCCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Saez</td>
<td>SEMSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Cama</td>
<td>SEO BirdLife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Luis Marín</td>
<td>TÜV Rheinland Ibérica Inspection, Certification &amp; Testing SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INVITACIÓN WORKSHOP SOBRE BUENAS PRÁCTICAS EN ENERGÍA EÓLICA

Apunta la fecha: 28 de Septiembre 2011
En la sede del Centro Tecnológico LEITAT, en C/ de la Innovación, 2 08225, Terrassa (Barcelona)

Desde el consorcio del proyecto europeo GP-WIND le invitamos a participar en el próximo workshop sobre Buenas Prácticas en Energía Eólica que celebraremos el próximo 28 de Septiembre en Terrassa, Barcelona.

Reuniremos a organizaciones implicadas en el desarrollo del sector eólico en España, tales como promotores eólicos, administración pública, agencias medioambientales y ONGs para dar a conocer los resultados de la investigación de estudios de caso realizados en GP-WIND. Debatiendo sobre factores de éxito y buenas prácticas para el sector de la energía eólica en Europa.

Presentaremos los objetivos del proyecto y del workshop transnacional que celebraremos el próximo 25 de Octubre en Bruselas, al que aspiran stakeholders o partes interesadas desde diversos puntos de Europa, con la participación de miembros de la Comisión Europea, de EWEA y de la Agencia Europea de Medio Ambiente, entre otros.

¡Le esperamos!

Rogamos confirmación de asistencia antes del 22 de Septiembre a la atención de:

Raquel Villalba
rvillalba@leitat.org
Tel. 937886500

Un cordial saludo

www.projectgpwind.eu

GP-WIND - Good Practice in reconciling onshore and offshore Wind with environmental objectives
Buenas prácticas en la conciliación de las objetivos medioambientales con la implantación de parques eólicos terrestres y marinos

Le invitamos a este encuentro en cooperación escrita de sus intereses. El caso de no servirnos en tiempo cierto se considerará como responsable del caso que pueda interesar a información aquí contenida.
Objetivos del Workshop:
1. Presentar estudios de caso realizados
2. Ofrecer diálogo para optimización de los resultados
3. Adaptación de las herramientas de GP WIND a las necesidades de las partes interesadas

PROGRAMACIÓN DE LA JORNADA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hora</th>
<th>Actividad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:30 - 10:00</td>
<td>Bienvenida y presentación del Proyecto GP WIND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 - 11:30</td>
<td>Resumen / visión general de los estudios de caso realizados. Identificación de factores de éxito y buenas prácticas relacionados con cuestiones medioambientales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 - 11:55</td>
<td>Pausa / Café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:55 - 13:45</td>
<td>Resumen / visión general de los estudios de caso realizados. Identificación de factores de éxito y buenas prácticas relacionados con cuestiones de la comunidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45 - 14:00</td>
<td>Presentación del próximo Workshop en Bruselas y siguientes etapas de GP WIND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 - 14:30</td>
<td>Conclusiones y comentarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>Comida</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please find attached to this report the invitation and the agenda of the Workshop.

Number of invitees: 186
Number of participants: 48
Date and location of the Workshop: 13 September 2011, Glasgow
Leading organising partner: Scottish Government
Other partners: CnES, RSPB, SQW, SPR, SSE
WORKSHOP SUMMARY

The workshop was split into the following three parts:

Part 1 – Opening by Mr Ewing, Minister for Energy, Enterprise and Tourism
Part 2 – Scene setting and presentations
Part 3 – Discussion groups

Each part is summarised below.

Part 1 – Opening by Mr Ewing, Minister for Energy, Enterprise and Tourism

The Scottish Minister for Energy, Enterprise and Tourism, Mr Fergus Ewing, opened the event with a speech, in which he underlined the importance of the GP WIND project. After attending the workshop, he signed a letter in support of the project to demonstrate the Scottish Government’s commitment to the project.

Part 2 – Scene Setting

During the scene setting, following the Minister’s speech, each partner briefly introduced themselves, explaining the reasons for their organisation’s involvement in the project.

Part 3 – Discussion groups

During this part of the workshop, participants broke out into 8 discussion groups, each discussing 4 of the case studies in 4 separate discussion sessions, so that each of the 16 case studies was discussed by two different groups.

The groups were asked to grade the case studies with grades from 1 to 5 and to address the following questions:

- Are the issues described well?
- Are there useful conclusions, examples of good practice and guidance?
- How might it be improved?
  - Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?
  - Readability, clarity, relevance?
  - Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?
- Main messages:
- Recommendations
  - What needs to be added?
  - What does it need to improve and be more useful?
  - What does it need to make it more applicable and relevant to the reality?
The facilitators of each group wrote up all the comments separately for each case study and passed them to the project coordinator, either directly after the workshop or later on in electronic version. These comments were then collated and passed to the partner leading WP3 as a basis for revising the case studies. The comments were very diverse and included a lot of suggestions of additional best practice examples and links, but also some general questions comments to be addressed.

FEEDBACK

General information: Each Case Study was discussed in two breakout groups. The groups were asked to grade the Case Study from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent).

Thematic Case Study 1 – Species impact offshore and onshore

The Case Study was graded as 2 and 3

Issues

- Lots of overlap between themes.
- Picture should be changed (and referenced).
- Main barrier – first section needs to be changed – not most animal species.
- General “toning down” of language required.
- Need list of web links in bibliography (for hard copy).
- Last paragraph on page 3 – statements too general (urban areas vs. vulnerable species).
- Disturbance/ displacement could be more clearly defined.
- Indirect impacts should be explored.
- Generally needs better clarity of meaning.
- Case studies (geographic) could be left until end.
- Some concern about clarity of purpose and audiences.
- High-level general reference material, not specific guidelines for stakeholders.
- “good evidence base”, “pretty good”
- “Offshore and renewables, deploy and monitor uncertainty. Willing to provide London Array case study.” DECC
- Text:
  - There is more emphasis (including in the general points) on onshore than on offshore.
  - Information is limited to four pages and might be too restrictive.
Moving from case studies to generalisations.

Language is a little harsh in places: “direct killing”, TAGGART. “collision risk” instead.

Key issues

- Use of EIA
- Spatial planning
- Scoping

How might it be improved?

- Bristol Docks case study could be used.
- Spatial plans are important and useful but shouldn't hold development back.
- COWRIE – doesn't fit as not spatial/mapping.
- PAN 45 (spatial locational guidance) – could add in.
- Red-throated diver example – needs to be changed or re-worded.
- Thames Array? Case study around phasing of development could be included – DECC willing to provide.
- Bat or fish-based case study.
- Danish and Scottish EIA negatives – need to be expanded.
- Scoping (EIA) could be more explicit.
- Mitigation hierarchy – take out, as difficulties exist with compensation in terms of Appropriate Assessment. Also, not realistic in many terms. Industry will equate with “buying” schemes. Compensation is not a requirement.
- Pg5 – ‘Moratorium’ – another word should be used as this is inflamatory.
- Tourism reference – not relevant to this project.
- Differences between onshore and offshore could be brought out more clearly.
- Scottish Government Ornithological Steering Group.
- Misses importance of monitoring.
- Good quality information required. Mitigation is key - see worked up model in tracked changes.

Recommendations

1. First paragraph page 6 – implies sequential test. Would need to be reworded.
2. Better resourcing of statutory and non-statutory consultees. Political will is one thing but resources are required.
3. Importance of good survey work to inform spatial planning.

4. Needs to refer to appropriate assessments and guidelines of competent authority/high level.

5. Could do with more case study material on early engagement.

**Thematic Case Study 2 - Impact on habitats**

The Case Study was graded as 1 - 2 and 4

**Issues**

- Well described. The three conclusions provided are good, straightforward and clear. 3 messages are clearly laid out in conclusion.

- The current examples of good practice are not useful.

- The guidance is implicit, not explicit.

- Significant overlap TCS 2 (Habitats) and TCS 3 (Biodiversity).

- Significant focus on “collisions” within TCS 2 (Habitats) whilst this is also addressed in TCS 1, and is NOT relevant to “habitats” (flora) per se, but to ornithological issues (fauna). Even if collisions are deemed to be relevant to “habitats” then why is there no mention of avoidance rates?!

- Ongoing monitoring: is habitat management working?
  : can this inform future projects?
  : help build evidence base

- How quick are areas re-colonised?
  - Habituation?
  - How quickly does restoration succeed?

- Could be more on mitigation?
  - Possible example of mitigation that has made development acceptable.
  - Spatial identification of habitat creation/mitigation. Close to site or far away.
  - Finding right land
  - Local or regional or national
  - [also good issue re jobs]

- Could we make sensitivity of habitats more clear?
  - Eg. restorability of habitats

- Can one habitat type replace another?

- In terms of credibility – relatively good – one of better ones.

**How might it be improved?**

- Other examples of good practice and guidance should be chosen.

- Clarity and relevance should be improved.
• Making local people aware of what practical steps may be possible.
• Use of mitigation hierarchy?
• Highlight key parts of potential input ie. When data available.
• Key strength – presents options for potential mitigation.
  - Can see what has been done elsewhere.
• Shetland – crow control example – possibility.
• Bring out importance of learning from monitoring.
• Peatland works – possibility of using peat to restore degraded habitats.
• Resourcing – key researching requirements.
• Possible to use any examples from oil and gas sector to offshore renewables?
• Any other sectors we could use examples from?
• Any monitoring from oil and gas for offshore?

Better Case Study examples:
(incorporation of some or all, as appropriate, should be seriously considered)

**Habitat sensitivity mapping during the design phase** - (using habitat survey and hydrology information at an early stage in the design process to minimise loss of sensitive peatland habitats) examples include Clyde Extension contact Gillian Wilson SSE or Kilgalloch Windfarm contact Peter Robson, Peter.Robson@ScottishPower.com 0141 568 3396 (NOTE BOTH THESE EXAMPLES ARE NOT YET CONSENTED)

**Micrositing to avoid sensitive habitats during construction** – Whitelee (amendments to track layout agreed with Ecological Clerk of Works to further reduce habitat loss) – contact Peter Robson, ScottishPower

**Larger scale examples of Restoration of blanket bog habitat** – (removal of inappropriate plantings of non-native conifer species, restoration of hydrology through ditch-blocking) – examples include Black Law Habitat Management Plan, Whitelee Habitat Management Plan – contact Peter Robson, Peter.Robson@ScottishPower.com 0141 568 3396

**Smaller scale restoration of raised bog habitat** – (as above but on smaller raised bogs, often with deeper peat) examples include Muirhall Wind Farm Habitat Management Plan – contact myself or Chris Walker (Muirhall Energy) 01501 785114 or Pates Hill Wind Farm Habitat Management Plan, contact myself or Mark Hamilton, Mark Hamilton Landscape Services 01506 630439, mark@mhlandscapeservices.co.uk

**Species-specific habitat work** - Creation/Restoration of habitat for black grouse – (planting native woodland, management of vegetation and control of livestock grazing to create suitable conditions for this locally declining species) Hagshaw Hill Habitat Management Plan or Greenknowes Habitat Management Plan - Peter Robson, Peter.Robson@ScottishPower.com 0141 568 3396

**Recommendations**

1. Relevant Case Studies / examples to be provided.
2. Better definition of what “habitats” are.


**Thematic Case Study 3 - Biodiversity**

The Case Study was graded as 3 and 4

**Issues**

- The issues are described well. The conclusions are useful.
- There are useful examples of good practice. The examples proposed are transferable in other geographic areas. There is useful guidance.
- Readability, clarity, relevance is good.
- Page 15 - some text works better under key issues.
- Overlap - topics 1, 2, 3 - need to be merged. Worth looking at order of summary - case purpose before main barrier. Could one case study purpose be used for all topics? (and for methodology as all very similar).

**Key messages**

Same as topic 1

- Locational guidance.
- EIA

**How might it be improved?**

- Merge it with TCS 2 (Habitats)!
- Use bullets more often.
- Offshore-heavy.
- SNH - other project level guidance which could be referred to.
- SNH - locational guidance useful (but overlap with topic 1). Windfarm footprint map not so relevant (shows locational guidance works well but not good practice in itself).
- More habitat management examples.
- FAIME - seabird trading
- Figure 3 needs integrated into text - not linked to rest.
- Scottish Ornithological Steering Group - similar model could be applied to other species/topics - to share data.
- Defra bat work - joint funded by industry and statutory consultees.
Recommendations

1. Overlap with topic 1.
2. Rename recommendations, not implications.
3. Last paragraph – needs moved forward into document.

Thematic Case Study 4 - Tackling cumulative impact issues

The Case Study was graded as 3

Issues

1. Text better than number 1.
2. Community CI could be mentioned.
3. Could use a bit less jargon.
4. Who is it aimed at?
5. CI more appropriate for local authorities to deal with in most cases.
6. TAN 8 issue in text is not example of good practice, incomplete and controversial.
   - Leave it out?
7. Document ignores SEA, particularly for offshore.
8. Is cumulative impact (visual) bad or good. Who says?
9. “Noise” perceived as an issue: Good information required.

How might it be improved?

1. Cumulative impact and Rochdale envelope.
   - Need for more thinking through.
2. SNH maps of wind scoped, consented, etc. could be referenced.
   - Cluster or not to cluster, that is the question?
   - Local circumstances can determine what is cumulative and what is not?
3. There should be more focus on landscape and visual impacts.
4. Could there be guidance on how to deal with multiple proposals?
5. There should be better examples, illustrated with actual solutions.

Recommendations

1. Zonal planning can be positive.
2. What about the impact of offshore with regenerating fish stocks and preventing dredging. Could look at emerging evidence. Reference?

3. Spatial frameworks incomplete but quality needs to be improved.

Need to recognise design flexibility for offshore

**Thematic Case Study 5 - Systems and process for monitoring impacts; examples of environmental mitigation techniques**

The Case Study was graded as 1 and 2

**Issues**

- Language is very strange and confrontational. Not publishable. Who is it aimed at?
- Not clear what title is about? Seems to be two separate topics.
- Some overlap from suggested mitigation techniques from CST 2 – could be use of links between two themes.
- Could be wider range of examples
- Could possibly use some examples referred to in feedback to theme 2.
- Aviation example
  - Transferable lessons
  - Doubt about success of possible solutions
  - Difficulties of getting engagement/advice from telecons/airport operators.
- Need to get developers and operators – eg. Mobile network – to work together to agree issues before coming to application.
- Telecoms examples where developer paid to deal with specific link interference – easy solution.

**Good Practice and Lessons Learnt**

- Ended up having quite limited scope despite broad topic.
- Not enough examples of where monitoring actually helped guide policy.
- Could be more on where technological taxes have helped mitigation.
  - Eg. Television – digital less of a concern.
  - But – need to make sure information is passed back to all parties – developer may know but planning authority may not.
- Mouse – what are results vs predictions?
- Test centres? – opps to monitor and feed back on various potential impacts.
- Mouse – actual measurements?
- Need to emphasise importance of monitoring as developing and dynamic industry.

**How might it be improved?**

1. Needs to distinguish between monitoring and mitigation.

2. Misses all the positive Habitat Management Plans etc.
3. Could consider the use of collaborative approaches to monitoring, e.g. Scottish Windfarm Bird Steering Group.

4. Deploy and monitor approach could be emphasised, particularly for offshore.

5. A monitor and additional mitigation approach should be considered/encouraged where there is a degree of uncertainty.

6. Early engagement with stakeholders leads to more effective mitigation.

**Recommendations**

1. Needs to be reworked.

2. Recommendations not very clear.

3. Two different topics?
   (consider using very positive Beauly-Denny additional mitigation in Cairngorm

4. Could do with being more precise format sooner to TCS? Esp if add additional case studies.

5. Need to add additional case studies.

6. Not as clearly dealing with mitigation techniques as could be.


**General comments**

Could consolidate some of the TCSs or group into broad headings to help readers identify relevant areas and much more accessible and useable.

**Thematic Case Study 6 - Carbon accounting for wind farms**

The Case Study was graded as 4

**Issues**

- The issues are described well. The conclusions are useful. There are useful examples of good practice. There is useful guidance.

- Only Scottish examples which are probably not transferable in other geographic areas (peat only GB and Ireland). Is this really and EU-wide issue?

**How might it be improved?**

- More emphasis on good construction methods including micrositing;

- Empirical data – even from other developments – assumptions;

- Caveat assumptions – especially PEAT, WIND SPEED, FORESTRY

**Recommendations**
8. EU relevance needs to be added.
9. Encourage EU members to consider CO2.
10. It needs more context to be more applicable / relevant.

Thematic Case Study 7 - Construction and operation of facilities in the marine environment

The Case Study was graded as 2 and 3

Issues

1. No inclusion of the “Rochdale Envelope” guidance which underpins UK approach.

   This approach has many advantages but also leads to
   
   Consultation with many unknown factors
   
   Based on assumption of worst case, which may result in underachieving against potential

2. Nature of marine environment is not fixed – changes due to natural forcing and human impact

3. Lack of examples of best practice

4. Cumulative impact of construction noise
   
   - Purpose/methodology – move to front of doc. Start with key issues.
   
   - Costs and health and safety should be included.
   
   - Habitats and Birds Directives – relationship to Natura 2000 needs clarification.
   
   - Underwater noise – 1st paragraph – language/tone needs to be changed.
   
   - Better structure but longer than need to be.
   
   - Indirect impacts on birds (prey species?)
   
   - Need to clarify role of regulator.
   
   - Need to expand how been proven.
   
   - Language generally needs toned down.

Key messages

More than just two issues.

Implications should cover all issues.

Need to be restructured.

How might it be improved?

   - Oil and Gas examples?
• J NCC examples?
• 1st example – where is good practice lesson? Did it work?
• 3rd example – First part, don't necessarily need.
• Need more specific examples.
• Liverpool Bay example needs better integrated into text. Is this the same project? Has it been monitored?
• Include Rochdale envelope case study to include
  
  Investigate worth of constant review of cumulative impacts
  Compulsory feedback from monitoring go projects
• Data capture and sharing - suggest monitoring and documentation to improve future consenting process

Lessons learnt
• How to access local experts?
• Rhyl Flats – move to good practice – combine with point two good practice.
• Dynamic Positioning – seal deaths in engines. SMRU research.
• Alpha Ventus – need to follow up lessons learnt.
• Scroby Sands – need to better link good practice and lessons learnt. Applicability elsewhere?

Recommendations
 1. Constant review of project specifications post consent as projects reach final spec.
 2. Ensure adequate monitoring and documentation
 3. Data gathered through project lifetime should be made available, at least to consenting bodies, but preferably to other developers consultants as well.
 4. Include examples of best practice
 5. No noise policy and best practice.

Thematic Case Study 8 - Offshore – Human commercial activities: fisheries, Marine industries, seabed issues, landfall sites

The Case Study was graded as 4

Issues

New issues emerging – recreational users (jet skies surfers etc) not fully considered.
Landfall sites – may involve major installations with significant impact on human and or commercial activities

More active participants (e.g. Surfers Against Sewerage) and better resources and professional than before

Have any of the “opportunities” (e.g. aquaculture) been tested?

How might it be improved?

Collection and refinement of knowledge for different stakeholders and different member states


Benefits of floating platforms to fisheries may be overstated.

Thematic Case Study 9 - Communications, awareness, information cascades

The Case Study was graded as 2 as it stands and 4

Issues

Are the issues described well?

Not really answered as there were so many concerns with the scope and content

Are there useful conclusions, examples of good practice and guidance?

As above, although several suggestions were made as to further content.

- Statistically – not consistent with others.
- Lots of good examples
- Good to have hyperlinks
- How comparable are different consenting systems – eg. front loading. Community involvement
- Community benefit - difficult to deal with through process – examples would be useful.
- Difficulty of getting representative feedback from communities/individuals – can backfire otherwise
- Could do with more research findings into public acceptance from Govt – any specific examples?
- Google earth visualisation done by Amec for Stornoway work – lets folk see visualisation from own homes
- ENERTRAL example – tree planting for screening - Expected community council to remove objections.

How might it be improved?

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

- Scottish Planning Equals Effective Engagement & Delivery (Communication, consultation, partnership)
• VOICE is planning and recording software that assists individuals, organisations and partnerships to design and deliver effective community engagement.

• National Standards of Community Engagement

• An audit tool for assessing the effectiveness of the engagement process (contact Chris Whitehead, Scottish Government).

• Local authority pre-application form asking the developer to detail all communication activities. Do developers need to do more than this?

Readability, clarity, relevance?

• Good but would benefit from bullet point presentation.

• It was felt that the case study was written from the developers and planners perspective (and in that language) and not that of the community. However, agreed it should be a balance ie not written from only community perspective

• It would help to have clearer objectives for the developer’s communication strategy stated eg “to deliver to all concerned members of the public accurate information about the wind farm”

• Link to TCS 9 and 15 about the wider benefits not just project specific

Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

• Not sure but it was suggested the transnational context both good practice and bad practice would be useful

Main messages:

• Case Study needs substantial strengthening.

• The case study should be about consultation not just information cascades – ie two way communication. Also suggested it was combined with TCS 15

• Should provide examples of how to engage effectively and not just the minimum requirements

Recommendations

What needs to be added?

• The Renewable Energy Foundation should be mentioned and used as a source

• It would be useful to check what local authorities think of this, some may see it as their role to communicate as it is their role to make the planning decision

• A benchmark of good practice would be useful.

• Mention the role of intermediaries for impartial communication

• A mechanism whereby people can make a representation to the Council

• Strengthening of the feedback loop on decisions following consultation (example given that the report to ministers is not in public domain before the decision is made)
• Examples of timing of communication – at what stage in planning process?
• The ‘statement of community involvement’ by developers is asking developers to police themselves on this matter – are there examples where the community or an intermediary is involved?
• good to have examples of feedback to communities etc to let them know changes etc.
• Quality of visualisation key – good to have more on this.
  - UK/Scotland practice very good.

What does it need to improve and be more useful?

• Case study could look at how communication is managed over the lifetime of a project, not just pre-planning but right through to repowering and decommissioning
• Examples of involving community in the design of the communication plan
• Stakeholder mapping – how do you identify the people to speak to?
• Communication – how is this recorded? Where is it fed back to? What media should be used?
• There is no legal mechanism for community consultation to be material in decision making - suggest that there is a need for a toolkit for the decision making body

What does it need to make it more applicable and relevant to the reality?

• Some felt that they didn’t learn that much from it. Expected more guidance of the processes to go through (facilitator explained the toolkit would do this)

Thematic Case Study 10 – Landscape & Managing Visual Impacts

The Case Study was graded as 2

Issues

• There are not any really useful conclusions. There are no useful examples of good practice and no useful guidance.
• Readability, clarity, relevant in part, but not really.
• Regional interpretation of proposed examples might differ.
• Definitions and terminology used do not seem to reflect current UK guidance – which may not be a requirement or relevant given that the document’s pan European context, but it highlights the difficulty for the whole document in identifying what is “common ground” and relevant across diverse countries, each with their own legislative and guidance contexts, as well as culturally defined attitudes towards landscape. (E.g. there is reference to the “importance or relevance” of landscape features – but not sensitivity; use of term “significance” (in quotation marks in the document) in relation to landscape rather than the changes in the landscape that would derive from wind farm development.)
• Case study examples appear to be translated from language of country where the case study is located. Definitions and terminology may reflect local standards/guidance or be “lost in
translation”. This raises question of how the document is intended to be used, by whom (developers/consultants/planners?) and language(s?) in which it will be published.

- The case study purpose does not seem to be reflected in the case study.

- The photographs are not clearly referenced and it is not clear whether these are supposed to illustrate “good” or “bad” practice. There is an illustration of Hills of Fortore which is then noted as an example of good practice, with reduction in number of turbines from 30 to 12. The illustration seems to be the former and show the “jungle effect” to be avoided. However, this is not stated.

- Final para – Implications for policy and practice – community involvement probably is critical, but is not either a fundamental, nor any aspect of landscape and visual assessment methodology, as appears to be currently stated in the text.

How might it be improved?

- Emphasise management by design and visualisation tools.

- Visualisation techniques.

- Natural heritage v. cultural heritage.

- Cover the assessment guidelines.

- (cumulative impact?) liaison.

- Example of how good practice has solved a problem could usefully be included.

- Involve a landscape architect.

- Need to factor in landscape factors – design.

- Add other examples of good practice or guidance, e.g. SNH and LVIA.

Recommendations

- Regional guidance / context should be added.

Thematic Case Study 11 – Dealing with noise issues

The Case Study was graded as 1

Issues

- Move key issues up.

- Generic section on purpose and methodology at beginning of main document.

- “Bad practice” – Another phrase should be used instead.

Key issues

- First two bullets could be combined.
• Remove last bullet.
• ‘Phenomenon’ should be removed.
• Transmission line noise – reference?
• Too long
• Language – needs to be reviewed.
• Gearless turbine reference should be taken out.
• Top of page 58 – relevance to noise.
• Decibel levels – don’t mean much to the average reader.

How might it be improved?

1. Scottish examples – How / why good practice?
2. Greek example – good that it says it can be replicated but need more detail.
3. Considering removing Belgium example.
4. ETSU – UK wide, not just England and Wales.

Recommendations

1. Some implications not fully discussed in text.
2. First two could be merged.
3. Five – not discussed in text.

Thematic Case Study 12 - Conflicts with other economic interests including tourism

The Case Study was graded as 3

Issues

• Focus on tourism but not so much on other areas.
• Risk to house prices – some owners are very worried.
  - There is a need for revised research to show this is not a real issue
• Real need for revised and more recent examples. Examples from the early 2000s are a bit
too dated now.
• Context issues? – depending on nature of existing environment and relationship to area.
• “Conflicts” may be inappropriate for title.
• May be possible to use an example showing economic benefits from development locally to
help acceptance.
• Look to community benefits?
• Developments can provide funding to carry out positive local projects.
• Fairly good style and presentation.
• Could usefully highlight local benefits better.

Good practice and Lessons Learnt

• Electromagnetic interference – comments in relation theme 5 relevant.
• “socio-economic capacity” needs to be re-defined to make understanding simpler.

Thematic Case Study 13 – Community concerns and acceptance - how to achieve buy-in

The Case Study was graded as 2

Issues

Are the issues described well?

As with TCS 9 this study represents partner bodies as industry and government and does not include the community (however, another member of the group considered that these partners had to drive the project as it was looking to speed up the process and remove barriers). The premise that we can achieve community acceptance and efficient wind farm deployment was questioned. It was thought that this made an assumption that the correct sites could be chosen and that community acceptance and deployment can be reconciled.

It was mentioned that there needs to be much greater public confidence in the outcome of the planning process such that the public feels that there is a fair outcome. A proper conversation about energy policy (in Scotland) was suggested, for example what is the contribution of onshore wind – is it needed? Scotland needs spatial planning that supports renewables, such as the previous Highland Renewables Strategy at the national level with sub-regional targets. It was suggested that Scottish renewables targets should be subject to SEA.

Are there useful conclusions, examples of good practice and guidance?

Not answered.

How might it be improved?

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

The case study’s starting point should be ‘why do concerns arise? The case study should then focus on how best to deal with these concerns.

What is the definition of acceptance? Accepted by whom? One definition offered was:

“No objections and no delays in the consenting process”

Examples of consistency between local government and national government would be a useful addition.

Norway provides an example of strengthened spatial planning at a national level.
The contractor for road widening at Gordonbush, RK MacLeod produced a loose leaf folder of all the conditions, contractor proof of compliance and technical reports to support compliance. This was suggested as good practice that should be more widely applied providing accessible information of how planning conditions are complied with.

Griffin wind farm was given as an example of bad practice where due to a change in contractor the sensitive management of timber removal was not followed through. This raises issues of the ‘chain of custody’ from planning to implementation and the need for stronger assessment of the implementation process before consent.

Readability, clarity, relevance?

No comment

Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Unsure

Main messages:

Case Study needs strengthening.

The case study raised the concern that the ‘salami slicing’ of different consents and licensing made it difficult for the community. For example, offshore wind and associated onshore infrastructure being consented by different bodies and processes. SEPA and SNH assessments may be deferred to a later stage and reduced in scope so these are not available in detail at the time of decisions. There are increasing resource issues within the statutory consultees, especially landscape and biodiversity. It was thought that this was significant as the more difficult sites are proposed which require more challenging assessments.

- Spatial planning (planning authorities).
- Forms and styles of communication and reaction to concerns.
- Promotion/ examples of more sustainable and equitable community benefit model.
- Involvement of communities in scoping process for individual developments.
- ‘Perception’ of buying consent.
- Objection to ‘nimby’ phrase.
- Title – community concerns and how to achieve acceptance.

Recommendations

What needs to be added?

Community ownership and its relationship with acceptance. Community Energy Scotland is supporting 150 renewable projects and achieving community buy in. This is not in place of larger projects but could the learning at community level be scaled up?

Legacy of windfarms should be included – what will happen when they are repowered, or decommissioned.
Is there a role for Section 75 agreements – who is responsible for these – the landowner or developer or Special Purpose Vehicle operating the wind farm?

Are there similar transnational issues that we can learn from?

*What does it need to improve and be more useful?*

Further peer review required to understand contentious issues and examples of consented wind farms where buy-in has still not been achieved. Eg Griffin Wind Farm (P&K and SSE). Problems at implementation stage and decisions/conditions being followed through even with changing contractors etc. – this raises further concerns and weakens community acceptance

*What does it need to make it more applicable and relevant to the reality?*

See suggestions above

Plus post-evaluation research of community concerns after a project has been built.

---

**Thematic Case Study 14 - Community benefit schemes**

The Case Study was graded as 3

**Issues**

*Are the issues described well?*

Reasonably but some key questions remain.

There is no overview of different law/guidance/practice/culture in member states, therefore difficult to draw comparisons

There is a lack of consideration of wider socio economic benefits – local/national context, taxation issues etc

Definition of community benefit – unclear and seems to vary?

*Are there useful conclusions, examples of good practice and guidance?*

The group thought that community benefit should legally play no part in the planning process. There was some debate that CST14 should not be included as a case study theme but it was later agreed to be relevant to the project. However, if the good practice toolkit is about the planning consent process it should possibly be excluded from there.

*How might it be improved?*

See under readability etc.

Suggest a clear definition of community benefit as opposed to wider socio economic benefits

Provide more context between member states

*Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?*
It was mentioned that some councils in Scotland were looking at centralising benefits (Perth and Kinross, Moray and Highland). It was thought that Highland Council’s position was that benefit over a certain amount would go to the council.

Examples of ‘social investment’ may be useful eg Tesco offered a swimming pool to get the best site in Dunblane.

The Scottish Community Foundation was suggested as an intermediary for community benefit.

It was mentioned that in Shetland the oil investment goes into an education fund to send children away to schools on the mainland. This was seen as a conflicting position as the investment was leaving the community.

It was thought that community benefit should reflect the demographic of the area (with links to the socio economic assessment). Vattenfall was quoted as example where robust SIA profiling of the area had helped target the fund appropriately.

Readability, clarity, relevance?

There needs to be more clarity and differentiation around the different elements, ie community ownership, community benefit, community shareholding, community engagement.

Some questioned why benefit was only considered for wind farms and not for other developments (eg motorways).

It was suggested that one of the key issues was that the purpose of community benefit is not clear. Developers tend to give this voluntarily and wish to avoid it being viewed as compensation. However, the community that benefit usually experience some impacts, hence the idea of compensation.

From the developer’s perspective it was felt that guidance would be useful.

It was thought that many questions (in the wider debate) were unanswered; for example, if a scheme is in the national public good should those adversely affected be compensated by the government (not the developer).

Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

Unsure

Main messages:

- The concept needs clearer definition.
- Provide a ‘how to’ guide with examples.
- Provide guidance on options for distribution of funds.

Recommendations

What needs to be added?

More international case examples good and bad.

Define what this study means by community benefit.

Include member state/region issues in each case study as context.
What does it need to improve and be more useful?

The following suggestions were made;

- Guidance on how to map the stakeholders and define the community.
- Guidance on a proper cross cutting assessment of all groups to ensure equitable buy-in and benefit and avoid dividing communities (for example by drawing lines on a map some members of the community may be excluded eg included Nairn but excluded Ulness)
- Explore community benefit in the context of corporate social responsibility and in particular the long term relationship that developers and communities may enter into. Examples could be taken from other industries such as Graham's Dairies. However, issues may arise where for example, industry is providing something that the public sector should and where investment may conflict with planning processes (eg Forth Ports saw the timing of local investment as conflicting with the Biomass consent application)

What does it need to make it more applicable and relevant to the reality?

Please see above

Thematic Case Study 15 - Dealing with complex or entrenched public perception issues

The Case Study was graded as 3

Issues

Are the issues described well?

The media backlash over wind energy has not been tackled and presents a significant barrier to changing perception

Are there useful conclusions, examples of good practice and guidance?

No comment

How might it be improved?

Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?

Centre for Sustainable Energy have produced document Common Concerns about Wind Power (May 2011)


The role that children play could be explored. For example, Planning Aid Scotland has a Youth Ambassador

It was suggested that John Constable's team at the Renewable Energy Foundation could provide useful information http://www.ref.org.uk/uk-renewable-energy-data

The Viking Energy Group was also mentioned as an example of a supporters' website presenting positive information.
A new website has been launched to gather support for the proposed £800 million Viking Energy windfarm. The site www.windfarmsupporters.org belongs to the Windfarm Supporters Group which was formed by a number of individuals last year to help counter the efforts of the anti-Viking pressure group Sustainable Shetland.

Visitors to the site can sign up to the group. Once Viking has published its revised plan for the windfarm - due in the next few weeks - the group intends inviting people to use its website to publicly register their support for the development, which will be passed on to the council and the Scottish government.

The revised plan, or addendum, is expected to propose fewer turbines and other significant modifications to its previous configuration of 150 turbines on Mainland hills.

The new website carries information about the windfarm and the interconnector cable and provides links to other renewable energy websites. A spokesman said the group hoped it would provide clear and balanced information to help people make up their minds about Viking's plans.

http://www.shetlandtimes.co.uk/2010/07/20/pro-viking-windfarm-group-sets-up-website

Readability, clarity, relevance?

No comment

Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

No comment

Main messages:

It doesn’t address why there are entrenched attitudes.

It was suggested that this was linked to people's perception of climate change, if this is changeable or they remain unconvinced then wind energy as a solution will have mixed reactions.

It was suggested that after 15 years of wind farm development in Scotland there was little knowledge amongst the public of the results. A solution to this might be if Scottish Government published specific targets for wind energy and communicated specific results against these.

Renewable Obligation Certificates – information of how such a mechanism supports renewables was suggested as being useful and the community’s role in this.

Recommendations

What needs to be added?

See suggestions above

What does it need to improve and be more useful?

To consider combining TCS 9 and 15 as one Communication case study

What does it need to make it more applicable and relevant to the reality?

Please see above
Thematic Case Study 16 – Undertaking socio-economic impact assessment

The Case Study was graded as 4

Issues

1. Appears to make sense, on issue that needs further attention.
2. Good opportunity to focus on the positives. – jobs etc.
3. Case is well made – paper from 1993 described as long being considered poor relation – and nothing has changed!
4. Clear that this is a large issue and that proper socio economic impact assessment can be very powerful tool of value to developer, wider community, decision makers.
5. Excellent reference list.

How might it be improved?

1. NPF 2 could be usefully referred to.
2. Skills development could do with more emphasis.
3. Study identifies role of national guidelines in setting standards and requirements. – The recommendations should therefore be much stronger.

Recommendations

- as above - strengthen wording of recommendations
- 1st bullet: DELETE
- 2nd bullet: Amend as text marked.
- + explore localisations of business rates to increase local benefit. (look at case studies?). England?

CONCLUSIONS

There was a good turnout at the workshop and partners were pleased to note how familiar stakeholders were with the drafts of the thematic case studies, indicating the seriousness with which the project is being taken. Contributions were wide ranging and insightful.

There was an appetite among stakeholders to take on board the lessons and good practice identified in the thematic case studies, with several stakeholders already identifying changes that they are making to their practices.

A very considerable amount of feedback was received an has been fed into the further development of the thematic studies.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Kelly</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Le Roux</td>
<td>SEPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>ENERTRAG</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Milner-Smith</td>
<td>SSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarina Naseem</td>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Community Energy Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Pickering</td>
<td>Ecotricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Pratt</td>
<td>Marin Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Rieley</td>
<td>Scottish Renewables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Robinson</td>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aedan Smith</td>
<td>RSPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Taylor</td>
<td>SNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Thompson</td>
<td>Royal Haskoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosie Vetter</td>
<td>PNE WIND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Ward</td>
<td>The Crown Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>SQW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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WORKSHOP INVITATION

Dear Madam / Sir,

Please find below your invitation to the GP WIND Project (Good Practice Wind) Regional Stakeholders’ Workshop taking place in Glasgow on September 13th 2011.

This workshop aims to bring together all the UK based stakeholders interested in offshore and onshore wind energy. Your participation and contribution is valued as we research theme studies aimed at reconciling onshore and offshore wind development with environmental objectives, with a particular focus on community engagement in support of the achievement of 2020 EU emissions targets.

If you are able to attend, please reply to this email.

We look forward to seeing you in Glasgow!

Giulia Camozzini

GP Wind Project Manager
REGIONAL STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

September 13th, 2011 – 9.00 am / 5.00 pm (including buffet lunch)
Scottish Government - Room 609 Europe Building
450 Argyle Street - G2 8LG Glasgow

With the participation of Fergus Ewing MSP, Minister for Energy, Enterprise & Tourism.

About the workshop

You will have the opportunity to play a role in developing the following Thematic Case Studies addressing environmental and community issues in relation to wind farms:

1. Species impact offshore and onshore: fish, mammals, birds (including migratory routes)
2. Impact on habitats
3. Biodiversity - The degree of variation in life forms within a given ecosystem
4. Tackling cumulative impact issues
5. Systems and process for monitoring impacts: examples of environmental mitigation techniques
6. Carbon accounting issues
7. Construction and operation of facilities in the marine environment
8. Offshore - Human commercial activities: fisheries, marine industries, seabed issues, landfill sites
9. Communication, awareness, information cascade
10. Landscape & managing visual impact issues (visualisation techniques/ mitigation actions)
11. Dealing with noise issues – including underwater
12. Conflicts with other economic interests including tourism
13. Community concerns and acceptance – how to achieve ‘buy in’
14. Community benefit schemes (including community ownership)
15. Dealing with complex or entrenched public perception issues
16. Undertaking socio-economic analysis for developers

The workshop is organised by: The Scottish Government, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds - Scotland, SQW Energy, the Western Isles Council, Scottish Power Renewables and SSE Renewables.

Wish to attend? Contact Giulia Camozzini at giulia.camozzini@scotland.esi.gov.uk or by phone at +32 2 2828342

The sole responsibility for the content of this invitation lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.
WORKSHOP AGENDA

GP Wind Project Stakeholder Event
13 September 2011
Conference Room G09, Europa Building

Agenda

0900 – 0930 – Arrival and registration
0930 – 0945 – Opening by Mr Ewing, Minister for Energy, Enterprise and Tourism
0945 – 1015 – Scene setting
1015 – 1115 – Discussion Group 1
1115 – 1215 – Discussion Group 2
1215 – 1315 – Lunch
1315 – 1415 – Discussion Group 3
1415 – 1515 – Discussion Group 4
1515 – 1545 – Wrap up
1545 – Close
LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR GP WIND

(Good practice in reconciling offshore and onshore wind energy with environmental objectives - IEE 09/941/SI2.558383)

The drive to decarbonise energy is one the most important challenges facing Europeans today. The European Union and Member State governments have set ambitious targets for the production of clean energy and the reduction of emissions. The development of onshore and offshore wind energy is contributing to these targets but this must happen alongside the conservation of the natural environment and landscape and the welfare of local communities.

These challenges also offer opportunities to develop innovative ways of working, making full use of the expertise and enthusiasm of our workforces and driving economic growth and job creation.

The GP WIND project, funded by the Intelligent Energy Europe Program, is bringing together developers, local communities, NGOs, local authorities and other relevant stakeholders to address barriers to the development of onshore and offshore wind generation. By recording and sharing good practice, GP WIND will help stakeholders minimise adverse environmental impacts and to involve communities in planning and implementation. The successful implementation of the GP WIND project will result in the production of a “how to toolkit” and a good practice guide.

I, the undersigned, Fergus Ewing MSP, in the capacity of Minister for Energy, Enterprise and Tourism representing the Scottish Government, hereby confirm its support for the GP WIND partnership in achieving the following objectives:

- To build evidence based support for the design, planning and implementation of projects that are sensitive to the environment and community concerns;
- To increase the decision making rate for on and offshore wind projects, and reduce the processing period for applications;
- To increase the efficiency of processing applications, thereby reducing process costs;

- To assist quicker, more transparent and less costly deployment of wind energy across Europe, contributing to the achievement of 2020 targets for renewable energy generation.

Furthermore, I can confirm the interest of the Scottish Government in spreading the GP WIND good practice and results among its constituent members and its network.

Edinburgh, 18 October 2011

Fergus Ewing MSP, Minister for Energy, Enterprise and Tourism
ANNEX B: SLIDES USED AT WORKSHOPS

GP Wind

Good practice in reconciling onshore and offshore wind with environmental objectives

IEE 09/941/SI2.558383
August 1st 2010 / July 31st 2012

Regional Stakeholders Workshops
September 2011

The sole responsibility for the content of this presentation lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor the European Albert Einstein Centre is responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

IEE 09/941/SI2.558383
August 1st 2010 / July 31st 2012

GP Wind Summary

OBJECTIVE: sharing and recording best practice in reconciling objectives on wind energy with wider environmental objectives, actively involving communities in planning and implementation

GP WIND addresses barriers to deployment of onshore and offshore wind generation

GP WIND will develop a guide to good practice and a ‘how to’ toolkit, which will be used to facilitate deployment of renewable energy in support of the 2020 targets.

GP WIND includes developers, regional and local government, environmental agencies and NGOs from differing countries to share experiences

GP WIND will secure commitment from partner countries to adopt and to deploy the GP WIND recommendations.

16 Thematic Case Studies (TCS)

1. Species impact onshore and offshore
2. Impact on habitats
3. Biodiversity
4. Cumulative Impact
5. Systems and process for monitoring impacts; Examples of environmental mitigation techniques
6. Carbon Accounting issues
7. Construction and operation of facilities in the marine environment
8. Offshore – human commercial activities: fisheries, marine industries, seabed issues, landfall sites
9. Communication, awareness, information cascades
10. Landscape & Managing visual impact issues (Visualisation techniques/Mitigation actions)
11. Dealing with Noise Issues – including underwater
12. Conflicts with other economic interests including tourism
13. Community concerns and acceptance – how to achieve ‘buy in’
14. Community benefit schemes (including community ownership)
15. Dealing with complex or entrenched public perception issues
16. Undertaking Socio-Economic Analysis for developers
TCS 1 – Species Impact

Summary of the issue

Potential adverse effects on particular species through, e.g., collisions or habitat alteration. This issue frequently slows planning process, or leads to denial of planning consent.

Good Practice and Lessons Learnt

| Indicative advice/planning | Micrositing of turbines |
| Clear and good quality EIA standards | Habitat management |
| Early scoping | Mitigation hierarchy |

Recommendations

- Attention to potential species impacts and appropriate siting based on this knowledge before formal planning process commences. Best achieved by early scoping on regional/national scale.
- Clear guidelines from authorities, including indicative planning and clear, transparent, credible EIA requirements.
- Mitigation schemes carefully planned, species specific, and effectiveness assessed.

TCS 2 – Habitats

Impact on habitats

This thematic case study’s main objectives are to:
- ensure a sharing of knowledge,
- to identify good practice and identify lessons learnt in relation to impacts on habitats
- underline the attempts already made to overcome the barriers presented by such impacts.

Good Practice and Lessons Learnt

1-Plan dei Corsi wind farm in the municipality of Calice Ligure (Savona, Italy)
2-The wind farm of Erli (Savona, Italy)
3-Wind energy development on peatland habitat in Scotland.
4-Scotland: Sectoral Marine Plan for Offshore Wind in Scottish Territorial Waters – Habitats Regulations Appraisal.
5-Terpandros and Antissa Wind Parks in Lesvos Island, Greece

It is important to identify the direct and indirect impacts on the habitat which may be caused by the project during construction and operation phase.

• Applicant, prior to commencing the project should consider and screens the critical relevant habitat impacts.
• Governments should work with the renewables industry to improve understanding of the impact of windfarms on habitats and recommend the development of Government or EU good practice guidelines on windfarm construction.
**TCS 3 – Biodiversity**

Poorly designed/situated wind farms pose a threat to vulnerable species and habitats:
- Failing to properly consider impacts on biodiversity can slow or prevent proposed developments;
- Failure by authorities to undertake proper assessments of impacts on European Natura sites can lead to infringement proceedings.
- Shortcomings in research and knowledge offshore addressed as a matter of urgency.

**Recommendations**
- Encourage developers to engage early with environmental consultees, rigorous EIAs and develop mitigation strategies;
- Take a strategic, locational approach;
- Keep guidance under review;
- Be sensitive to the differing requirements of different regions.

**Good practice and lessons learnt:**
- Development of guidance on best practice and monitoring tools;
- Examples of the harmonious integration of wind farms into the natural environment;
- Studies on the impact of wind farms on species and habitats;
- Scottish Natural Heritage’s wind farm locational maps and guidance;
- Strategic approaches and comprehensive engagement between all stakeholders.

**TCS 4 – Cumulative Impact**

Cumulative Impacts (CI) encompass the combined effects of multiple developments or activities on a range of receptors.

- Legislative requirement but difficult to assess
- Influenced by range of factors including sensitivity and location of receptors, intensity and nature of development
- Current consenting regimes are set up primarily to consider an individual developments - CI are overlooked

**Good practice and lessons learnt:**
- Clear guidance
- Strategic Planning
- Sensitivity Mapping
- Stakeholder engagement

**Recommendations**
- Strategic spatial planning
- Explicit definitions & robust methodology
- Early, effective stakeholder engagement
- EU wide code of for site selection
- Assessment at development management stage
- Robust decision-making
- Joint working between stakeholders
- A coordinated approach to data collection
**TCS 5 – Monitoring and Mitigation**

**Systems and Process for monitoring impacts – environmental mitigation techniques**

- To avoid environmental damages, power station applications need a "non-disingenuous" environmental statement.
- The purpose of this case study is to show how conditions can be used to manage complex post-consent work streams to the satisfaction of key stakeholders.

**Good Practice and Lessons Learnt**

1. In Scotland, 1,251 turbines were being held up based on objections. With the addition of a single new radar, 1,033 of the 1,251 turbines could be used without problems. The success was that Scottish Government found solutions and move forward.
2. Biomonitoring on Mount Panachaiki in Greece of 2 wind farms, measuring impacts on species living there.

**Recommendations**

- From Scottish approach, governments must consider the benefits of such an approach against other alternatives.
- Greek approach enlightens all aspects that remain in the "dark" side of the procedure for an investor to take the wishful license to construct and operate a wind farm.
- Both approaches allow for systems and processes for monitoring impacts and provide environmental mitigation techniques.

---

**TCS 6 – Carbon Accounting**

One concern raised about electricity generation using wind power is whether the expected saving in carbon emissions during the lifetime of the wind farm will be compensated by carbon losses associated with their development and installation.

Emissions arising from the fabrication (steel smelting, forging of turbine columns, the manufacture of blades and the electrical/mechanical components) and construction (transportation of components, quarrying, building foundations, access tracks and hard standings, commissioning) of wind farms is only part of the carbon emissions potentially released.

The Scottish Government developed a methodology and tool for assessing carbon emissions from wind farms and includes:

1. Loss of carbon due to production, transportation, erection, operation and dismantling of the wind farm components (the infrastructure overhead)
2. Loss of carbon due to backup power generation
3. Loss of carbon stored in peat and forest
4. Loss of carbon stored in peat lands (by removal or changes in drainage) and forest
5. Carbon savings due to improvement of peat lands habitat
6. Loss and/or saving of carbon-fixing potential as a result of forestry clearance
TCS 6 – Carbon Accounting…

SUGGESTED BEST PRACTICE TO IMPROVE WIND FARM CARBON SAVINGS

- Consider the time of year and scheduling of wind farm construction to minimise emissions.
- Minimise impacts from the site compound facilities.
- Ensure good traffic management.
- Where possible site the wind farm on a mineral soil.
- When excavating areas of peat, layer turfs should be kept as intact as possible and prevented from drying out.
- Stockpiling of peat should be in large amounts and should be restored as soon as possible after disturbance.
- Ensure adequate woodland removal techniques.
- Keep in mind emissions when designing the wind farm electrical collection system, route and trenching method.

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE

Methodological development still leaves scope for interpretation and improvements, which implies that methodologies need to be transparently documented and must remain open to scrutiny in order to be credible, generate trust and win acceptance.

TCS 7 – Construction and operation of facilities in the marine environment

Constraints surrounding the construction phase of the project in particular tough consent conditions being implemented by the regulator due to unknown impacts on the environment.

Underwater Noise – environmental sensitivities in an area can impose piling restrictions on the construction phase i.e. 6 months of the year “NO PILING” to protect spawning grounds.

Scour Protection – Unknown impacts on coastal processes causes restrictive monitoring conditions on Consents.

Consultation – Poor consultation can result in lengthy consent timetables with financial implications to the project.

Good Practice and Lessons Learnt

Early, clear and focused consultation with the regulator and key stakeholders can reduce the time pressures on both the developer and the regulator.

Up to date Mitigation measures can be introduced to reduce the impacts of construction.

Recommendations

Implementation of clear research driven guidance on all monitoring requirements to reduce impacts on the environment.
TCS 8 – Offshore - human commercial activities

Initial experiences in developing European offshore wind farms have revealed the conflicts with the various commercial activities which are carried out in offshore waters including fisheries, marine industries and also with seabed issues and landfall sites. The purpose of this case study is to cite experiences and attempts already made to overcome this barrier in the future.

Main issues:
- Multiple uses
- Grid issues
- Identifying areas related to fishery areas
- Grid issues
- Policy conflicts
- Cumulative impacts
- Depth of water
- Environmental value of location

Good Practice
- Marine Spatial Planning for siting potential Offshore Wind development areas:
  - "Roadmap for Marine Spatial Planning" Key instrument for the EU Integrated Maritime Policy
  - "European Strategic Study of the Spanish Coast for the Installation of Offshore Wind Farms, First planning document for Offshore Wind in Spain"

- High engagement with fisheries and other users of the sea
  - Blue Seas Green Energy (Spain): Stakeholder Engagement Plan to support its Strategic Environmental Assessment
  - "Suitability of Offshore Wind Farms as Aquaculture Sites", Marine Institute of the University of Plymouth (UK)

- Finding synergies with other maritime activities and organizations
  - "Future Offshore Wind Power Sites 2020" 23 specific suitable sites in Denmark

Lessons Learnt
- The projects "The crosses of the sea" and "Trafalgar Sea" (Spain) were rejected through associations created for sea defence, mainly organized by tourism sector and other economical associations existent in the area. Opinion surveys should be developed in the area.

Recommendations
- Marine planning including information on fisheries, navigation routes and opinion surveys from human commercial activities in the area.
- Regulatory rules should include siting guidelines, with measures for avoiding environmental impacts and mitigating visual impacts of landfall sites.
- Stakeholders must be fully involved from the early stages.
- Preliminary knowledge of the fishing activities, simulations.
- Sharing offshore experiences across EU.

TCS 9 – Communication, awareness, information cascades (1)

Key Issues Identified:
- It can be difficult for stakeholders to reconcile global, national and local benefits with potential, real or exaggerated local impacts.
- It can be difficult for stakeholders to filter large amounts of information, factual or inaccurate, leading them to adopt a default position objecting to a project.

TCS 9 attempts to assist stakeholders in answering, at a high level, the following questions:
- How can national &/or regional policies be better communicated to local decision makers?
- How can communities become fully engaged in the project planning process?
- How can developers better understand the concerns of other stakeholders?
- How can the facts about wind energy projects be communicated in an effective manner?
- How can misinformation be addressed?
Good Practice Examples

**Planning Guidelines for Wind Energy, Ireland**
- Established a requirement for local wind energy strategies which included wind zones
- Energy Desk, Savona, Italy
- Information support on the authorisation process and funding options for projects
- Rumeurs et Réalités, APERe, Belgium
- Wind energy information leaflet created by a publicly funded office
- The Real Truth about Wind Energy, The Sierra Club, Canada
- Charity conservation group publication addressing increasing misinformation
- Informal planning consultations prior to formal application
- Minimizing the risk of failure or objection
- Estinnes Wind Farm, Belgium
- Optional design and consultative approach to the Environmental Impact Assessment
- DkIT, Munster Joinery
- Building on existing goodwill and local benefits, adding clean energy to a developed site
- Whitlee Wind Farm visitor centre, Global Wind Day, open days
- Demystifying large wind turbines and showing how the facilities can be integrated
- Monaghan Forum, WindProtocol and CWEA guide
- Detailed advice on community consultation and engagement
- Wind of Change, Fintry Development Trust, UK
- Short film outlining the community benefits and gain from a local wind farm

Selected recommendations:

- Given the importance of energy to society, general schools curricula should include energy topics.
- Government and consenting authorities should communicate a framework for the implementation of European, national and regional policies and targets.
- Independent or state agencies and NGOs can assist with the debunking of myths and allaying of fears.
- Project promoters must engage in meaningful and real ways with local stakeholders at the earliest possible opportunity.
- Avoid an adversarial approach to engagement.
- Avoid a process which is designed to simply convince rather than truly consult.
- Engagement should be tailored to individual stakeholder groups.
- The project should be set out in comparison to impacts of other energy options and human activities.
- Local impacts and benefits should be identified and presented in detail, avoid generalities.
- Wind energy’s technical disadvantages should not be ignored in communications.

Trust takes years to build, seconds to destroy and forever to repair.
## TCS 10 – Landscape and Visual Impact

**Landscape and visual impact of Wind Farms (WF)**
- Examination and analysis of good examples of solutions and mitigation – How landscape and visual impact issues were successfully overcome across Europe
- Lessons for the future: how “these solutions” can help the development of wind energy

**Good Practice and Lessons Learnt**
- The bottom up approach
- Siting, layout, spacing and density of WF
- Height of Wind Turbines
- Enhance positive attributes of WF
- Hiding-mitigating negative attributes of WF
- Careful selection of colour and materials of WF

**Recommendations**
- Landscape character assessment on a regional basis
- Understanding and rating all potentially relevant values of landscapes;
- Involving hosting communities of wind farms from the earliest stages of the planning phase.

## TCS 11 – Noise (including underwater)

Wind farms, both offshore and onshore, can give rise to noise mainly during operation, but also during construction. Such noise should be minimised.

- Little evidence of direct adverse effects of noise from wind farms on human health
- Perception of noise nuisance is important
- Siting of wind farms relative to human activity is critical
- Distance of wind farms from human activity and especially housing is critical
- Size and type of turbine are important
- Background noise level and urban/rural/maritime nature are important
- Noise from offshore wind farms, including low frequency underwater emissions, may be significant during construction and during operation
- On-going monitoring and further research are needed

**Recommendations**
- UK experience seminal
- More recent work highlights need for on-going stakeholder consultation and continual review of standards, methodology and policy
- Scottish experience includes updating of national policy and advice frameworks
- Belgian example highlights need for full consultation backed up by monitoring and change
- Greek example highlights benefits of good design and consultation in a scenic/tourist area
TCS 11 – Noise (including underwater)

**NEED**
- Best possible design and pre-construction assessment
- Careful siting
- Continual review of methodology, standards, design and policy
- On-going monitoring
- Co-ordinate research and policy at EU level

TCS 12 – Conflicts with other economic interests including tourism

Conflicts with other economic operators are often detected as barriers to the deployment of onshore and offshore wind generation. This thematic study examines any potential economic interests that are typically in conflict with wind farm developments while offering possible solutions for overcoming them.

**Main issues:**
- Tourism
- Electromagnetic interference
- Agriculture and animal husbandry
- Electro-magnetic field
- Impact on property prices

**Good Practice**
- To include the wind farm into a tourist route of its municipality (Examples at: ‘Les Colladetes’, ‘Las Calobres’ and ‘Conca de Barcera’, in Spain / ‘Terpandros’ and ‘Antissa’ wind farms in the Lesvos Island [Greece])
- Spatial planning systems (helps to avoid potential conflicts between different activities sharing the same area)
  - Wind Atlas of Spain (to support Spanish Public Administrations on wind farm planning and other wind-related studies)
  - Blue Seas Green Energy Sectoral Marine Plan for Offshore Wind in Scotland. (Examples on marine spatial planning are within TCS8)
  - To promote coexistence with other renewable energy industries in the same area
  - ‘El Hierro Hydro-Wind Power Plant’ project (Canary Islands, Spain): it will generate sufficient power to cover all of El Hierro’s electricity requirements using only renewable energy
- Measures on Radar interferences
  - Study on Wind Farms Impact on Radar Aviation Interests by Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) of the UK Government
  - Horns Reef offshore wind farm in Denmark: capability to clearly differentiate air traffic from wind turbine blades

**Lessons Learnt**
- ‘Mount Panachaikos’ (Greece): successfully operating, but organizations in the area are still dissatisfied. Conflicts could be reduced through enhanced communication with stakeholders during the planning phase.
- ‘Peña Lugar’ project (Spain): disapproved by negative environmental impact statement; conflicts with other economic interests were demonstrated, including tourism. It probably would have gone forward in any other area, if a proper siting plan had been done.

**Recommendations**
- Priority development areas for installing wind farms and the use of spatial planning systems.
- Promotion of socio-economic capacity during the granting of wind energy permits, checking suggestion of complementary investments.
- Special attention to the socioeconomic studies included in the EIA.
- Open communication channel between investors and local stakeholders from the initial phase of the project.
Main issue of the TCS:
- communicate broadly about the positive effects of wind energy
- diffuse successful local initiatives (cooperatives)
- create trust between parties with early communication on project
- implement fair and transparent decision-making process
- enable equitable profit sharing through benefit scheme mechanisms
- adopt consistent spatial planning

Good Practice
- Wallonia: strict rules in the decision making process + consultation of 15 official bodies + public enquiry = process perceived as fair
- Scotland and Ireland: thorough list of EIA specifications
- Belgium (North Sea): adequate spatial planning: 200 m² offshore zone was divided into 7 concessions, with no interaction with human activities => good social acceptance
- Wallonia: published a brochure “Rumors and realities” which addresses mis-information
- Luceole cooperative (Belgium): positive communication on successful experiences
- Portugal: two assembly factories built in the framework of a tender created 3,000 jobs
- Ireland: Munster Joinery (local biggest employer) installed two 2MW turbines, which will help them remain competitive on the international market.
- Norway (Smøla and Hitra projects): an open dialogue with the community was created at the onset. This improved social acceptance and secured dialogue with resistance groups.
- Wallonia (Sivry-Rance): an “Energy Action Plan” succeeded in leveraging other renewable energy projects
- Ireland (Ballynagran EnergyPlus Community Project): illustrates synergies between sustainability and infrastructure development
Lessons Learnt

• In Flanders, commercial developers are sometimes faster than cooperatives because the latter wish to discuss the project with the local authorities and communities before beginning to secure land.
• To hold a second public information meeting (non-compulsory) when the results of the EIA are released, with a view to improving the transparency of the process, can further draw attention of anti-wind farm lobbies.
• Financial mechanisms (Green Certificates and feed-in tariffs) to sustain wind energy are questioned by several energy intense industries and consumer groups because of their growing costs.

Recommendations:

• A broad positive communication is probably the most efficient way to obtain citizen support.

• Large communication of experiences and feedback is also important. The public needs to hear positive experiences from cooperatives and similar citizen initiatives.

• Citizens’ buy-in is conditioned to a large extent by the distribution of the financial revenues from wind farms: community funds providing indirect community benefits, equitable benefit schemes, and electricity price reductions create the basis of community acceptance.
The main objective of community benefit schemes is to allow for local communities to be more substantially engaged in and also to receive specific benefits from wind farms deployment in the community region.

**Main issues**
Potential benefits for local communities:
- **Community Funds**: lump sum or regular payments for the benefit of local residents
- **Benefits in Kind**: facility improvements, environmental improvements, visitor facilities, school and educational support, etc
- **Local Ownership**: purchase shares in the project. Through own investment, through a profit-sharing or part-ownership scheme.
- **Local Employment**: local employment opportunities during construction and operation.

**Good Practice and Lessons Learnt (1/2)**
Good practice examples in Greece:
- **The Anavra, Magnesia project**:
  - excellent example of wind farm development.
  - Local communities embraced the development.
- **The Mount Rodopi case**:
  - Pioneering large-scale installation.
  - Thoroughly endorsed by the local communities.
  - Significant enhancement of local economic and employment prospects.
  - Enrichment of knowledge-based local skills.
In Belgium:

- **“Allons-en-Vent” initiative – Vents d’Houyett project:**
  - The developer of the project set up an innovative cooperative structure.
  - Shareholding model which is restricted to children.

- **Enercity cooperative – “Villers-le-Bouillet”:**
  - First Belgian PPP project of wind energy in a rural area.
  - Cooperation: draw sufficient earnings from the operation of a 2 MW wind turbine (out of a total of 5 wind turbines)
  - Investment in various renewable energy projects, including photovoltaics and district heat networks.

**Recommendations**

Integrated approach to overcome barriers on the part of:

- **Legislator and Policy Makers:**
  - Appropriate legal framework
  - Facilitating the design and implementation of such schemes
  - Ensure the delivery of identifiable benefits for the communities

- **Developers and Operators of wind farms:**
  - Actively collaborate with all affected parties
  - Discuss concerns and resolve emerging issues at early stages

- **Local Authorities:**
  - Collaborate with developers
  - Arrange informal seminars and educational programmes
  - Tackle issues of public misinformation and misconception
TCS 14 – Community benefit schemes (5)

Local Community Group:
- Engage and participate in the development
- Work with local authorities and developers/operators
- Promote views on wind power generation
- Negotiate benefits from substantial and sustainable gain for local societies

Educational institutions, techno-socio-economic expert groups and environmental organisations:
- Implementation of successful community benefit schemes
- Integrated approach
- Social, economic and environmental objectives in the context of wind energy development in Europe.

TCS 15 – Dealing with complex or entrenched public perception issues

Summary of the issue

Entrenched negative public perceptions are a barrier to successful development. The case study identifies examples from across Europe of efforts to successfully promote accurate, experience-based evidence to help overcome these perceptions.

Good Practice and Lessons Learnt

- **Meteo Renouvable and Energiz’AIR – Belgium** - a weekly broadcast, after the weather forecast, of the amount of energy produced thanks to the sun and the wind
- **Common concerns about wind power – UK** - a Centre for Sustainable Energy publication that provides factual information to refute popular wind farm myths.
- **Whitelee Windfarm Visitor Centre – UK** - The visitor centre, at one of the largest onshore windfarms in Europe and only 20km from the centre of Glasgow, has proved highly successful, with over 100,000 visitors per year and over 90% positive feedback from the public, and the local community uses the visitor centre as a resource. Whitelee recently won the Queens Award for Enterprise, Sustainable Development.
TCS 16 – Undertaking Socio-Economic Analysis for developers

The ‘human’ element of the EIA is poorly represented, relatively unsupported by legislation, has little agreement on scope and lacks collectively agreed guidance for the impact assessment.

Poorly examined socio-economic impacts tend to be superficial and product of non-specialist input

Quantitative analysis very brief and basic – project employment, direct economic contributions and tourism impacts.

Good Practice and Lessons Learnt

Policy guidance (DECC) – states that local and regional impacts assessed as part of the ES

Project examples (Mill Dune – tourism assets; Bold Hills – visual impacts; SE – post-evaluation)

Recommendations

Analysing the TCS - some questions

Grade the Case Study - 1(Poor) to 5 (Excellent)

• Are the issues described well?
• Are there useful conclusions, examples of good practice and guidance?

How might it be improved?

• Are there other examples of good practice or guidance out there?
• Readability, clarity, Relevance?
• Are the examples proposed transferable in other geographic areas?

What are the 3 main messages you take from the study?

Finally, Your Recommendations

• What needs to be added?
• What does it need to improve and be more useful?
• What does it need to make it more applicable and relevant to the reality?