Section 36 Application
Stakeholder Comment Clarifications

Llŷr Floating Wind Limited

Document Control: For Issue
P11-LYR-3.4.3-PAP-Rev 03 Marine Licence Application Clarifications 2

SIGNATURES					
A3	30/01/2026	For Issue	M Murray		M Murray
A2	12/12/2025	For Issue	M Murray	D Keenlyside	M Murray
A1	25/09/2025	For Issue	M Murray	D Keenlyside	M Murray
Rev	**Date**	**Purpose of issue**	**Prepared by**	**Checked By**	**Approved By**

Gap Analysis - CAS-01352-L3N2P8 - Llŷr 1 Floating Offshore Wind Demonstration Project
Version: A3 **NRW MLT**

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
1	**National Security**	Significant concerns still remain with the Ministry of Defence (MoD) who have objected to the project. This is due to the following: • air traffic control radar systems sited at MoD Hartland Point, and • the impact the export cable routes will have on Military Danger Areas D113A and D113B. As mentioned in the request for further information letter dated 14 February 2025, DEF_01 of the Welsh National Marine Plan (WNMP) states that a consent "will only be granted where the MoD is satisfied that the proposal will not cause unacceptable risk to defence and national security interests'. Whilst we acknowledge that the MoD are still carrying out their review to determine whether these risk are acceptable and can be mitigated, we strongly recommend you continue to discuss the comments made with them directly.	Noted. As confirmed in an email by the DIO, they are considering the use of a legal agreement that will be applied to the consent through a Cable Specification and Installation Plan condition.. Llŷr has provided a proposed an appropriate radar mitigation solution to overcome the Hartland Point radar objection (P10-LYR-4.2.3-PLA-004-Llŷr PSR Mitigation Proposal)..
2	**Offshore**		
2.1	General Comments	There are a number of instances where NRW A have advised that consideration should be given to the provision of an errata document to ensure the information and data associated with the project are clear. Some of the NRW A representation is based on in house assessments which would need to be incorporated into the ES of the project. Moreover, from the perspective of this being a test and demonstration project, and for the avoidance of doubt, we consider that an errata to the ES will be required. NRW A position on this matter is clear and considers this to be required to ensure that the public record is correct and for the benefit of this project and any future projects that might base their assessments on the project (including Llŷr 2 project). See NRW A response in full for further details on the request for an errata document to incorporate all changes to the original ES assessments.	Noted. The project will commit to providing a complete errata document to cover all aspects raised by NRW(A), that can be conditioned for and produced post-consent. This can be provided once the final turbine selection is made and the appropriate collision risk modelling can be undertaken. Similarly on Marine Mammals, following discussions with NRW(A) and the JNCC, we've now provided all the clarifications and updates that NRW(A) and JNCC have requested in relation to the assessment, as needed to inform the determination and including an updated MMMP. Should the project be consented, a complete errata document produced post consent will provide a comprehensive document that will provide the information necessary to feed into future projects.
2.2	Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology	Minor clarification requests relating to the use of concrete versus natural rock cable protection have been raised by NRW A. Please ensure these comments are reviewed and addressed in your response. JNCC have also raised comments which require additional clarification. Please ensure these comments are reviewed and addressed in your response	Noted and agree to consult in writing with the SNCB's on the use of natural rock protection over concrete matressing within the CSIP and CBRA ahead of commencement of works. All comments have been addressed in this response.

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
2.3	Marine Ornithology	Following submission of further information, NRW A now agree with the conclusions of no significant effect at EIA and no AEoSI at HRA for the project alone, and cumulatively and in-combination with other plans and project. However, a number of additional comments and clarification requests, largely related to the turbine parameters that feed into the ornithological collision risk model, have been raised by NRW A. Please ensure these comments are reviewed and addressed in your response. It is worth noting that NRW A has stated that there are some outstanding areas where insufficient information has been provided. However, considering the stage of the consenting process the project is at, and in order to be enabling, NRW A has undertaken their own work to provide MLT with the information required to make an informed decision. JNCC have stated that there is lack of thorough in-combination assessment including all relevant projects for puffin and lesser black-backed gull. JNCC have also reviewed the advice provided by NRW A on this matter, and have stated that the calculated values by NRW A are indicative at this stage and that JNCC is not able to advise on that basis. I therefore ask that you review their response in full and address all comments raised.	Noted. The indvidual comments raised by the JNCC and NRW(A) are provided in this spreadsheet
2.4	Marine Mammals	NRW A consider that there remain some pending material issues that have not been fully addressed by the further information provided. Nonetheless, NRW A consider that with additional commitment with respect to key mitigation measures NRW A would be able to agree with the conclusions of no significant adverse effects at EIA scale and no AEoSI at HRA scale. Please review their responses in order to ensure you can comply with the requested conditions and address any comments they have raised. JNCC agree that mitigation measures for the impact pathways detailed in their response could be finalised post-consent, provided appropriate information is detailed within the outline Marine Mammal Management Plan (oMMMP). Please ensure you review their response in full and address the comments raised through the submission of an updated oMMMP. We therefore request you provide an updated oMMMP which should address JNCC and NRW A comments raised throughout their responses.	Noted - an updated MMMP has been provided and the response to the idnvidual comments raised by the JNCC and NRW(A) are provided in this spreadsheet
3	**Onshore**		

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
3.1	European Protected Species Terrestrial	NRW A cannot agree with a conclusion of no Likely Significant Effect for otters as a feature of the Pembrokeshire Marine SAC and Pembrokeshire Bat Sites and Bosherston Lakes SAC. As no specific otter surveys have been carried out, it is not possible to ascertain whether an otter natal holt is present in close proximity to the cabling landfall works. In the absence of such survey information, significant effects cannot be ruled out. If further surveys can rule out the likely presence of a natal holt within 200m of the works, NRW A would be content to agree with a conclusion of no likely significant effect on this feature of both SACs. Regarding your proposal to leave further protected species surveys to the post-consent pre-construction phase, NRW A have referred to their previous advice dated 28 March 2025 and continue to advise that this approach does not accord with planning policy or case law. With respect to the potential proposals for inclusion of new buffer (exclusion) zones within the application documents for bats, these will need to be formally submitted to MLT for consideration in consultation with NRW A. Any proposal would need to demonstrate that the proposed buffer zones would be sufficient to address any potential impacts on bats, including those from noise, vibration and construction lighting.	A Bat Mitigation Scheme that has been drawn up following consultation with the NRW Advisory Senior Species Officer. The scheme sets out the worst-case scenario assessed in the Llŷr Environment Statement ecology impact assessment and how the proposed mitigation is adequate to address the anticipated impacts of the scheme. An otter survey was undertaken across the onshore cable route between the 10 and 17 November. The survey report is provided.
3.2	Designated Landscapes	Whilst NRW A welcome the commitment to reduce the turbine blade tip height from 325.5m to 300m (above Highest Astronomical Tide), NRW A considers it would still be inside within the low magnitude of effect buffer identified for turbines of this height. As such, NRW A have advised that a reduction in blade tip height to 270m would reduce impacts within the Pembrokeshire Coastal National Park (PCNP) and likely to an acceptable level. Whilst it is noted that the Pembrokeshire Coastal National Park Authority (PCNPA) has removed their objection to the development as a result of further information, the PCNPA maintains concern regarding the outcomes of the Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The PCNPA agrees with NRW A that reducing the blade tip height to 270m would reduce the landscape and visual impacts on the PCNP and would result in less significant effects for the PCNP. NRW A and the PCNPA have requested an updated Seascape and Landscape Visual Impact Assessment and photomontages to be able to conclude that the impacts on the PCNP would be reduced to an acceptable level. The PCNPA has also requested that a landscape and biodiversity enhancement scheme is implemented to secure compensation for the residual impact as a whole on the PCNP.	A technical note on the effect on the SLVIA by reducing the tip height from 325.5m to 300m, a technical report from Aecom has been provided. The project stands by its original technical assessment detailed within the Environment Statement that turbines with a tip height of 325.5m are acceptable and will not result in a significant impact. The technical note presents evidence in the form of additional Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) figures and wireline visualisations comparing 270m and 300m turbines for Llŷr Floating Wind Farm. The evidence supports the conclusions that due to distance and based on the ZTVs and the wirelines in Appendix A, there is no discernible difference in landscape and visual effects from Llŷr Floating Wind Farm turbines of 300m or 270m. It should also be noted that from a technical point of view, 300m is the minimum height achievable to ensure commercial scale turbine technology (up to 18 MW) whilst maintaining the necessary financial margins and turbine technical demonstration parameters needed to maintain the viability of the T&D project. A landscape enhancement scheme has been agreed with the PCNPA and NRW(A). This agreement is being drafted as a Section 106 agreement for signature.

Gap Analysis - CAS-01352-L3N2P8 - Llŷr 1 Floating Offshore Wind Demonstration Project
Version: A3 MoD / DIO

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
	Castlemartin Range Danger Areas	In the MOD's response to the Marine Licence consultation dated 20th January 2025, the MOD objected to the proposed export cable route element of the proposed development. The reason for the objection was due to the proposed route of the export cable running through designated military Danger Areas D113A and D133B. These Danger Areas are in place to protect the military training activities undertaken at Castlemartin Range. A cable on the sea floor of a Danger Area would be at risk of damage from the live firing activities that take place at the range. In addition, the laying of the cable and pre-commencement activities such as surveys and UXO clearance would cause range activities to stop. It is for these reasons that the MOD lodged an objection to the export cable route. The applicant has contacted the DIO Safeguarding team about this objection, and they have also been discussing their proposal with a Range Safety Officer based at Castlemartin Range. The applicant has proffered a condition to be applied to the Marine Licence for an Access and Communications Protocol to be submitted and adhered to. In light of the applicant's engagement with Castlemartin Range's Range Safety Officer, the MOD is currently reviewing its objection position. The MOD is considering whether an export cable could be located in the Castlemartin Range Danger Area. Consideration is being given to the impacts of current and future weapons trialling on a cable within the Danger Areas. Until this review is completed, the MOD maintains its objection to the parts of the export cable route which run through Danger Areas D113A and D113B.	As confirmed in an email by the DIO, they are considering the use of a legal agreement that will be applied to the consent through a Cable Specification and Installation Plan condition.
	Hartland Point Air Traffic Control Radar	The Llŷr array area, as shown on drawing Figure 1.1 Site Location, falls outside of D113A and D113B. We therefore have no concerns with the array area with regards to the safeguarding of Castlemartin Range. However, the MOD does have concerns with the wind turbines within the array area due to the unacceptable impact they will cause to a military radar. The proposed turbines would be located approximately 72.6km from, detectable by, and will degrade aviation safety by causing unacceptable interference to the ATC radar sited/deployed at MOD Hartland Point. Wind turbines have been shown to have detrimental effects on the performance of Primary Surveillance Radars. These effects include the desensitisation of radar in the vicinity of the turbines, shadowing and the creation of "unwanted" aircraft returns which air traffic controllers must treat as aircraft returns. The desensitisation of radar could result in aircraft not being detected by the radar and therefore not presented to air traffic controllers. Controllers use the radar to separate and sequence both military and civilian aircraft, and in busy uncontrolled airspace radar is the only sureway to do this safely. Maintaining situational awareness of all aircraft movements within the airspace is crucial to achieving a safe and efficient air traffic service, and the integrity of radar data is central to this process. The creation of "unwanted" returns displayed on the radar leads to increased workload for both controllers and aircrews. Furthermore, real aircraft returns can be obscured by a turbine's radar return, making the tracking of both conflicting unknown aircraft and the controllers' own traffic much more difficult. Therefore, on the basis of the information provided, and until a suitable mitigation scheme has been submitted, assessed, and accepted, the MOD must object to this proposal due to the impact it will have on aviation safety by impacting on the operation and capability of the ATC radar sited at MOD Hartland Point. This objection was communicated to Planning and Environment Decisions Wales in the MOD's response to the Section 36 consultation dated 28th March 2025. The applicant is therefore already aware of the MOD's radar objection and has engaged with the MOD with a view to overcoming the objection. The applicant has submitted a mitigation proposal to address the unacceptable impacts of the development on the ATC radar sited at MOD Hartland Point. This proposal is currently being assessed by the MOD. Should the mitigation proposal be accepted by the MOD, then we would then be in a position to consider relacing the ATC radar objection with an appropriate technical solution agnostic suspensive planning condition for a radar mitigation scheme to be provided. Until the results of the mitigation proposal assessment are known, the MOD will continue to object to this proposal.	Llŷr has provided a proposed radar mitigation solution to overcome the Hartland Point radar objection (P10-LYR-4.2.3-PLA-004-Llŷr PSR Mitigation Proposal). The Hartland Point PSR was excluded from Project Marshall and, as per a Freedom of Information (FoI) response in 2015 , was previously intended to be decommissioned by 2018. The MoD subsequently reversed this decision, opting to maintain PSR coverage at Hartland Point. Consequently, this radar has not benefited from replacement by a Thales STAR-NG or the Watchman Enhancement (upgrades delivered to the remainder of the MoD Watchman fleet) under Project Marshall. The Llŷr project assumes that this policy reversal – the decision to retain rather than decommission the Hartland Point PSR - has prompted the MoD's objection to the permit application. Notably, the MoD did not object to the nearby Erebus or Whitecross floating offshore wind projects who equally impact the radar coverage. Given the policy direction established in Project Marshall, the MoD should logically assume responsibility for replacing this end-of-life PSR, having retained it for sovereign tactical purposes (regardless of windfarm development in the region). This position aligns with the recently adopted National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1, especially sections 5.5.4, 5.5.27 and 5.5.28. Section 5.5.28 in particular stipulates that Communications, Navigation and Surveillance (CNS) owners and operators should deploy wind turbine tolerant replacement technologies when infrastructure reaches end-of-life, thereby futureproofing aviation safety against further wind development. The Llŷr project proposes replacing the Hartland Point PSR with a new Hensoldt ASR-NG system (or the MoD's preferred equivalent system), which will mitigate the impacts of the Llŷr Offshore Wind Farm whilst minimising radar coverage loss. Should the project be operational before the new radar is deployed, the Llŷr project is willing to implement a temporary radar blanking and TMZ solution. Both the Llŷr project and the technical equipment supplier believe this an appropriate long term solution to the direct project impact and the wider issues raised by offshore wind development in the Celtic Sea. The Llŷr project will contribute to the reasonably and demonstrably incurred costs of mitigation, recognising that the MoD retains ultimate responsibility for replacing this end-of-life sovereign tactical asset. Given the broader regional benefit of the proposed radar upgrade, implementation costs should be shared equitably across beneficiary sites.

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
	Physical Obstruction	In this case the development falls within areas that may be used to conduct military low flying training designated Low Flying Areas 2 and 7 (LFA 2 and LFA 7). Within these areas fixed wing aircraft may operate as low as 250 feet or 76.2 metres above surface level to conduct low level flight training. The addition of turbines in this location would introduce a physical obstruction to low flying aircraft operating in the area. In the event that the applicant is able to overcome the objections listed above, the MOD would require that conditions are added to any consent issued requiring the submission, approval and implementation of an aviation lighting scheme, and that sufficient data is submitted to ensure that structures can be accurately charted to allow deconfliction. The applicant has acknowledged within Volume 3, Chapter 27, table 27-11 of the submitted Environmental Statement the requirement for MOD accredited aviation safety lighting. The MOD acknowledge that, as this development includes structures which exceed a height of 60m above Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT), it would be subject to the lighting requirements set out in the Air Navigation Order 2016. However, in addition to any CAA requirements, the MOD will require the submission, approval, and implementation of an aviation safety lighting specification that details the installation of appropriate MOD accredited aviation safety lighting.	Noted and agreed
	Onshore Safeguarding	The export cable route makes landfall at Freshwater West and the proposed grid connection is at Pembroke Power Station. The route between Freshwater West and Pembroke Power Station does not occupy any onshore MOD statutory safeguarding zones. The MOD therefore has no safeguarding concerns with the onshore route of the export cable.	Noted
	Conclusion	For the avoidance of any doubt, MOD objects to the proposal on the grounds of the unacceptable impact that the development would have on: • air traffic control radar systems sited at MOD Hartland Point; and • the impact the export cable routes will have on Military Danger Areas D113A and D113B.	As addressed above

Gap Analysis - CAS-01352-L3N2P8 - Llŷr 1 Floating Offshore Wind Demonstration Project
Version: A3 MCA

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
		We note that the new information submitted by the applicant is largely of an environmental/wildlife focus and as such does not directly come under our remit of shipping and navigation. The revised boundaries that have also been attached concern the landward area and as such also have a limited effect on the safety of shipping and navigation	Noted
		Having reviewed our recent response to NRW regarding the Environmental Statement and Navigation Risk Assessment that was submitted in January 2025 and after considering the additional information provided by the applicant, we remain content with our comments and have nothing further to add at this time.	Noted

Gap Analysis - CAS-01352-L3N2P8 - Llŷr 1 Floating Offshore Wind Demonstration Project
Version: A3 Heneb

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
		We note that, in respect to safeguarding the historic environment (onshore), a revised Historic Assets consent boundary plan has been issued. This is a relatively minor amendment, and we advise that our initial response (13/12/2024) remains unchanged.	Noted

Gap Analysis - CAS-01352-L3N2P8 - Llŷr 1 Floating Offshore Wind Demonstration Project
Version: A3 PCNPA

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
1	Objection withdrawal	As a result of further information submitted to the Authority by the applicants, the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority wishes to withdraw the objection to the development. This information is appended to this letter and includes a commitment to reduce the height of the turbines to 300 metres and to adjust the navigational safety lighting to integrate a detection system to detect when visibility is greater than 5km and dim the aviation lights to 10% of the 2,000 candela maximum on these occasions.	Noted
2	Landscape impact	The Authority maintains concern regarding the outcomes of the Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and it remains the view of the Authority that adverse effects on the National Park seascape, landscape and special qualities would result from the proposed development that cannot be mitigated, and these should be balanced in determining the application against its benefits.	A technical note on the effect on the SLVIA by reducing the tip height from 325.5m to 300m, a technical report from Aecom has been provided. The project stands by its original technical assessment detailed within the Environment Statement that turbines with a tip height of 325.5m are acceptable and will not result in a significant impact. The technical note presents evidence in the form of additional Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) figures and wireline visualisations comparing 270m and 300m turbines for Llŷr Floating Wind Farm. The evidence supports the conclusions that due to distance and based on the ZTVs and the wirelines in Appendix A, there is no discernible difference in landscape and visual effects from Llŷr Floating Wind Farm turbines of 300m or 270m Further clarification and information in relation to the need for the Llŷr project has been submitted for consideration
3	Landscape enhancement scheme	The Authority requests that should the decision maker be minded to approve the application that they consider securing a landscape and biodiversity enhancement scheme to be approved and implemented by the Developer to secure compensation for the residual impact as a whole on the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park. It is accepted that this would not mitigate for the adverse effects but would provide other benefits and potentially enhance the identified receptors and their special qualities, in accordance with Policy SOC_06 of the Welsh National Marine Plan. Such a scheme could also enable consideration of any necessary compensation and enhancement scheme to address any impacts on the bird population of the Skomer, Skokholm and Seas off Pembrokeshire SPA. Members of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority have considered a need to condition post-operational review and mitigation.	A landscape enhancement scheme has been agreed with the PCNPA and NRW(A). This agreement is being drafted as a Section 106 agreement for signature.

Gap Analysis - CAS-01352-L3N2P8 - Llŷr 1 Floating Offshore Wind Demonstration Project
Version: A3 NATS

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
1	Mitigation Agreement	I can confirm that we have identified a mitigation, involving modification to our radar infrastructure, that would ameliorate the impact of the proposed windfarm. At this stage we don't have any formal agreement in place to ensure delivery of the mitigation in advance of the turbines being erected so work is still required on both the commercial and planning side to ensure appropriate contracts and conditions are agreed.	A draft mitigation agreement has been drafted and submitted by NATS to the Llŷr project. This has been agreed by the project team and are progressing a formal agreement with NATS.

Gap Analysis - CAS-01352-L3N2P8 - Llŷr 1 Floating Offshore Wind Demonstration Project
Version: A3 **JNCC**

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
1	**Marine Ornithology Comments**		
1.1	**Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3 – Collated cumulative / in-combination figures for EIA and HRA**		
1.1.1	Presenting full results	The applicant should provide enough information for the consenting authority to make an assessment. As previously stated in our response direct to the Applicant on 21/05/2025, "…as a minimum the Llŷr Applicant could consider referring to these Population Viability Analyses (PVAs) and presenting information including the output metrics (counterfactuals of population size and growth rate, growth rates, final population size etc.) and reach conclusions based on these in any updated assessment". The results of the relevant in-combination PVAs (e.g. counterfactuals of population size and growth rate, growth rates, final population size etc.) carried out by Mona should ideally be provided in order to show that there are no significant population-level consequences predicted, rather than just stating that there were no significant population-level consequences.	An update to Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3 (18 September 2025) has been provided to address the JNCC request
1.1.2	Need for in-combination PVA assessment	We previously advised that "There may be site/species combinations relevant for the Llŷr assessment where the Mona Applicant has not presented an in-combination assessment (e.g. Skomer, Skokholm and the Seas off Pembrokeshire (SSSP) Special Protection Area (SPA) puffin and lesser black-backed gull)".	Noted
		Page 4 states that "Lesser black-backed gull and puffin did not require any cumulative PVA for the Mona application, as the apportioned estimates to SSSP SPA populations were < 0.05% of baseline mortality". To clarify, the position taken by Mona was that, where the impact of the Mona Offshore Wind (OWF) Project, alone on a feature of a designated site, was predicted to result in a <0.05% increase in baseline mortality then no in-combination assessment was presented, as the change predicted from the Mona OWF Project alone was considered to have a 'non-material' contribution to the in-combination risk. If the same logic is applied to the Llŷr OWF Project, then Llŷr OWF Project's impact mortalities alone and the associated increase in baseline mortality would need to be used to assess whether an in-combination assessment is needed, and then if a PVA is needed. That the Mona OWF Project did not require a PVA does not automatically rule out Llŷr OWF Project from requiring a PVA as this threshold was based on the relevant project's alone impact, not one	Noted
		Given the lack of thorough in-combination assessment including all relevant projects for puffin and lesser black-backed gull, we recommend the Applicant's assessment be updated to enable the NRW-L to fully assess the potential impacts. See our detailed comments below.	This information has previously provided for these two species (dated 21 May 2025 and this allowed NRW (A) to conclude their advice as confirmed in their final response on Llŷr, dated 29 July 2025. However this information is now support by the inclusion of Figure 1 (mapping the location of the developments considered under cumulative HRA as presented in Appendix 8E: HRA RIAA of the submitted Llŷr project application), and Figure 2 (providing a plot of the 'at sea' distance calculation between SSSP and Mona) and is now provided in the upddated clarification note 3 of 18 September 2025.
		Lesser black-backed gull Given the lack of thorough in-combination assessment including all relevant projects (those within foraging range during the breeding season and within the biologically defined minimum population scales (BDMPS) region during the non-breeding season), it was unclear from the documents submitted by the Applicant whether there would be a significant impact on lesser black-backed gull and that an Adverse Effect on Site Integrity (AEoSI) on the SSSP SPA could be ruled out. Tracking data from Skokholm Island indicates that lesser black-backed gulls tend to travel south from the colony on migration for winter (Thaxter et al., 2019), therefore there is unlikely to be connectivity with OWFs in the Irish Sea and Liverpool Bay regions in the non-breeding seasons. We note the limitation of this tracking which only covers one year with 25 birds tracked, but consider it best available evidence. The Irish Sea and Liverpool Bay regions are also outside of mean max plus 1Standard Deviation (SD) foraging range during the breeding season. We are minded to note that the population abundance of lesser black-backed gull at the SSSP SPA is in decline. The latest census indicates a 47% decline: Seabird 2000 (1998-2002) = 15,748 Active Occupied Nests (AON); Seabirds Count (2015-2021) = 8,347 AON (Burnell et al., 2023). The most recent population count from 2024 suggests a current population of 6,064 (BTO & JNCC, 2024), whilst the conservation objective is for the breeding population to be stable or increasing, aiming for at least 20,300 pairs (NRW, 2008).,A combination of further declines in population abundance and increased impact from future development may increase mortality to a level where more detailed assessment (such as through PVA) is required for those future projects. Consideration should therefore be given to the inclusion of measures to reduce collision mortality at future projects to allow the maximum realisation of renewable energy for the minimum environmental impact.	This has been discussed with the JNCC and addressed in the updated Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3 (18 September 2025)
		Atlantic puffin We note that Mona OWF Project's in-combination total at 60% displacement and 2% mortality (111 mortalities) is similar to Llŷr OWF Project's in-combination total at 70% displacement and 10% mortality (111.63). However, Mona OWF Project's in-combination total at 70% displacement and 10% mortality was 648 mortalities. These are clearly significantly different totals at the same displacement and mortality rates, and is due to the Mona OWF Project's values being Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)-scale, not apportioned between colonies, and Llŷr OWF Project's values apportioned to SSSP SPA. Therefore, these are not comparative metrics. We have previously advised the Applicant on the methodology for in-combination assessment, including the use of mortality estimates presented by the Mona OWF project Environmental Statement (ES), and the consideration of need for PVA (e.g. letter to Applicant dated 21st May 2025). The PVA carried out by the Applicant assuming 111 mortalities in-combination (Table 22F-5 and Table 22F-9, Llŷr 1 Floating Offshore Wind Farm Environmental Statement Volume 6: Appendix 22F – Marine Ornithology Population Modelling) does not include all relevant projects (those within foraging range during the breeding season and within the BDMPS region during the non-breeding season) and may not therefore present the worst-case scenario. As with lesser black-backed gull, given the lack of thorough in-combination assessment including all relevant projects it was unclear from the documents submitted by the Applicant whether there would be a significant impact on puffin and that an AEoSI on the SSSP SPA could be ruled out. We recommend the Applicant's assessment be updated to enable the NRW-L to fully assess the potential impacts.	This has been discussed with the JNCC and addressed in the updated Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3 (18 September 2025)

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from LlŷrFloating Wind
1.1.3	Conclusions on adverse effect for SSSP SPA	We were previously unable to make conclusions regarding AEoSI in combination with other plans and projects, for SSSP SPA. However, based on: • Section 2 of Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3: Collated cumulative / in-combination figures for EIA and HRA, • PVA outputs provided in Mona OWF project's Deadline 7 HRA Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment Part Three: Special Protection Areas and Ramsar sites Assessments Annex E1.3.1: Offshore ornithology ISAA supporting information (REP7-020), we conclude that AEoSI can be ruled out for Manx shearwater qualifying feature of SSSP SPA in combination with other plans and projects. These documents also provide information on guillemot, razorbill, Manx shearwater, and kittiwake components of the breeding assemblage feature, and we advise that an AEoSI on the breeding assemblage feature can also be ruled out. However, we consider that there is currently insufficient information provided by the Applicant for NRW (L) to make conclusions on AEoSI on the breeding lesser black-backed gull and puffin qualifying features of SSSP SPA in combination with other plans and projects. In conclusion, we advise that adverse effect cannot be ruled out for SSSP SPA.	This has been discussed with the JNCC and addressed in the updated Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3 (18 September 2025)
1.1.4	Conclusions on the significance of impacts at EIA	We were previously unable to make conclusions regarding the EIA of Llŷr on marine birds cumulatively with other plans or projects. However, based on: • Section 1 of Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3: Collated cumulative / in-combination figures for EIA and HRA, • PVA outputs provided in Mona OWF Project's Deadline 7 Environmental Statement Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology (REP7-033) we are able to conclude no significant adverse impact on all relevant seabird species with the exception of great black-backed gull, for which we are unable to rule out a significant adverse effect cumulatively with other plans and projects.	This has been discussed with the JNCC and addressed in the updated Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3 (18 September 2025)
		Great black-backed gull moved to the Red list in UK Birds of Conservation Concern (BoCC) 5a owing to a severe breeding population decline of 56% since Operation Seafarer (1969–70). It was Green-listed in the first two BoCC assessments and Amber-listed in BoCC 3 and BoCC 4 (Stanbury et al. 2024). In the GB IUCN2a assessment it moved from 'Least Concern' in IUCN1 to 'Critically Endangered' (Stanbury et al. 2024). Seabirds Count (Burnell et al. 2023) reported a 43% decline since Seabird 2000. We agree with the Applicant (response to ExQ1 Q1.17.16, REP3-062) that the revised status does not affect the species' sensitivity, but we do consider that it provides context to the potential consequences of any impact. The revised status demonstrates a prolonged and severe decline in the species in the United Kingdom, supported by both the IUCN assessment and monitoring coordinated by JNCC. While they are unlikely to be the sole cause of the declines experienced, the cumulative impact from OWF has the potential to worsen that decline, or to inhibit to some extent any recovery effort and we therefore do not agree with the conclusion of a minor adverse effect at EIA scale. In our letter to the Applicant of 21st May 2025, we advised that '*Mona PVAs can be considered to represent best available evidence at this time, and hence as a minimum the Llŷr Applicant could consider referring to these PVAs and presenting information including the output metrics (counterfactuals of population size and growth rate, growth rates, final population size etc.) and reach conclusions based on these in any updated assessment. '* We note however that while the Applicant has referred to the PVA undertaken by the Mona OWF Project, the outputs of those assessments have not been presented in the application. PVA metrics presented in Appendix D "Great black-backed gull PVA inputs – cumulative impacts, starting population 17,742" of the Mona OWF project's Offshore Ornithology Cumulative Effects Assessment and In-combination Gap-filling Historical Projects Technical Note (REP3-044) demonstrates a reduced growth rate as a result of the cumulative impact of the multiple OWF projects, including Llŷr, than would be experienced by an unimpacted population. We are not aware of any evidence to suggest that the population is likely to increase during the lifetime of the project, therefore we consider that the Llŷr OWF, cumulatively with other OWF projects, is likely to have a Moderate significant adverse impact. Additionally, the uncertainties around demographic rates for the species, with juvenile and immature survival rates unknown (Horswill & Robinson 2015), require a more precautionary approach to interpreting modelling results. We are therefore unable to rule out a significant adverse impact on great black-backed gull from cumulative collision mortality at an EIA scale. In such circumstances, JNCC would ordinarily advise mitigation measures should be applied, such as increasing the air gap, in order to reduce great black-backed gull collision. However, in this case with project alone great black-backed gull collision mortalities estimated at 1.61 annually, increasing the air gap will likely make little difference and would be disproportionate. However, JNCC is concerned that the impact on great black-backed gull within the southwest and Channel population BDMPS is likely to increase as further OWF projects are developed, notably those that will form part of The Crown Estate's Round 5 leasing round within theCeltic Seas area. Without major project-level mitigation being applied to all relevant projects coming forward, there is a significant risk of large-scale impacts on seabird populations. JNCC therefore recommends that for all relevant future projects raising	These aspects have been discussed with the JNCC and the Mona OWF project PVA data is now provided in the updated Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3 (18 September 2025)
1.2	**Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 4 – Further Clarification on HiDef's 'Non-ID Apportioning' Method**		
1.2.1	Comments on Adverse Effect on Site Integrity	We thank the Applicant for providing further clarifications on the apportioning of non-identified birds. There are still outstanding questions and unknowns regarding the method used (see below). However, we are of the opinion that this does not make a material difference to the overall outcomes of the assessment and can be picked up outside of this project. We have explored the potential worst-case scenario of assigning all relevant non-identified birds to Atlantic puffin to consider the impact on the assessment of Atlantic puffin, which is a named qualifying feature of Skomer, Skokholm and the Seas off Pembrokeshire / Sgomer, Sgogwm a Moroedd Penfro SPA. There was a total of 55 'Auk / shearwater species', 'Auk / small gull species' and 'Auk species', which in theory could all be assigned as Atlantic puffin. Added to the 77 identified puffin would result in a total of 132 puffin. Whilst this change in relative terms is large, once displacement and mortality rates are applied and impacts apportioned to SPAs, this results in a very small difference in the impact on an SPA population. Therefore, we are content that, even in the worst-case scenario, our concerns regarding apportioning of un-identified birds would not materially change the assessment of displacement mortality of auk species or Manx shearwater.	Noted

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
1.2.2	Revised Turbine Parameters	We note that the Applicant has made a commitment to limit the turbine tip height to 300 meters above Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT) in recognition of the concerns raised by NRW and the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority (PCNPA) (as described in cell G19 in the "NRW(A) SLVIA" tab within "ORML2465 P11-LYR-3.4.3-PAP-Rev01-Marine Licence Application Clarifications A2"). We note that this change in Project Design Envelope has not been communicated to JNCC, nor how this may have an impact on the assumptions within Collision Risk Models (CRM) previously carried out. The assumptions under the previous CRM were a rotor radius of 142.5m and an air gap of 22m, giving a maximum turbine tip height of 307m (Environmental Statement Volume 6: Appendix 22C – Marine Ornithology Collision Risk Modelling, Table 22C-1). In the commitment to reduce the turbine tip height no other changes to turbine parameters are mentioned, therefore we assume that the 22m air gap will remain, given that this is a navigational safety requirement, thereby reducing the rotor radius to 139m. As proportionally more birds fly closer to the sea surface than at higher elevations, the air gap height can have a considerable influence on collision mortality estimates and is a crucial input parameter to Collision Risk Modelling. Similarly, there is no indication as to whether the rotation speed will change, given this reduction in rotor radius (our working assumption is that a reduction in blade length generally results in an increase in rotation speed). The mechanics of the stochastic CRM means that a reduction in rotor radius may decrease estimates of seabird collisions while an increase in rotation speed may increase collisions. Whilst a potential increase in rotation speed at the Llŷr OWF project may not make a significant difference to the collision estimates, we recommend that the Applicant re-run CRMs using revised turbine parameters and provide updated assessments to the Licencing Authority. In addition to this information being available to the Licencing Authority for a decision on this application, application, it is vital that revised collision estimates are available for future projects and plans to include in cumulative and in-combination assessments.	We confirm that the indicative worst-case for SLVIA (max turbine height to upper blade tip), does not affect the ornithological CRM as it does not alter any of the worst-case parameters that are material in this modelling, i.e., air gap, rotor radius/rotor diameter, or number of turbines. The Llŷr project is not proposing to reduce the modelled air gap (22m), nor to increase the blade length (rotor radius), nor increase the number of turbines beyond the worst-case parameters already modelled under CRM. As requested by JNCC and NRW (A), we will undertake a further round of post-consent CRM, at the appropriate time, once we've confirmed the final turbine selection (which will fall within the worst-case, as assessed, for all receptors)
1.3	**NRW record of a Habitats Regulations Assessment of a project**		
1.3.1	Skomer, Skokholm and the Seas off Pembrokeshire/ Sgomer, Sgogwm a Moroedd Penfro Special Protection Area	We have the following comments on the NRW-Licencing (NRW-L) Draft Record of a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) with respect to this protected site.	Noted
1.3.1.1	Use of SeabORD	Page 168 – the "Assessment in view of conservation objectives" column refers to SeabORD modelling being carried out to predict collision and displacement/barrier effects for lesser black-backed gull, Manx shearwater, kittiwake, and razorbill. However, SeabORD was only used, and can only be used, for estimating displacement of kittiwake, guillemot, razorbill, and puffin. As described in our original comments on this project, we have based our conclusions regarding displacement impacts on specific species/sites on displacement matrix outputs as provided by the Applicant, not on the outputs from SeabORD.	Noted
1.3.1.2	Mitigation measures – entanglement	Page 180 – the "Description of mitigation measures, and how they would be applied (e.g. contractual obligations, consent conditions)" column for SSSP SPA describes mitigation for entanglement with mooring lines and cables as "Regular inspection of the mooring lines to be implemented during operations and maintenance via the Project Environmental Management Plan". Whilst monitoring is a crucial first step in mitigation, monitoring does not by itself reduce the severity of an impact. Effective mitigation measures also require a mechanism to prevent or reduce an impact, such as that set out by the Applicant: "Any inspected or detected debris on the floating lines and cables will be recovered, based on a risk assessment which considers the impact on the environment, risk to asset integrity, and cost of intervention" (ID E232, Environmental Statement Volume 6: Appendix 32A – Mitigation Register). We therefore advise the wording of the HRA is modified to better reflect that removal of debris is included in the measure.	The draft MMMP has been updated to include a commitment to address entanglement risk and will monitor for, and remove, marine debris caught on cables as part of the regular surveys of subsea infrastructurein line with the JNCC recommendations.
		We advise that the Project Environmental Management Plan and the need to both inspect and remove debris is secured through a Marine Licence Condition, and that the Marine Licence also requires the Applicant to provide regular reports detailing inspection results, debris entangles and removals, and wildlife entanglements, to the Licencing Authority and relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCBs), given that the project is a demonstration for floating offshore wind.	A draft Llŷr Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) has been submitted to include a commitment to address entanglement risk and will monitor for, and remove, marine debris caught on cables as part of the regular surveys of subsea infrastructurein line with the JNCC recommendations.
1.3.1.3	Incomplete in-combination assessments provided by the Applicant	Pages 165 to 169 and pages 198 to 200 – We highlight that despite SNCB advice throughout pre-and post-application, insufficient information has been provided by the Applicant on the in-combination impacts of qualifying features of the SPA, in particular: • Collision Risk Modelling with revised turbine parameters; • Full in-combination assessments for the breeding lesser black-backed gull and Atlantic puffin qualifying features of SSSP SPA; and • PVA where necessary.	We confirm that the indicative worst-case for SLVIA (max turbine height to upper blade tip), does not affect the ornithological CRM as it does not alter any of the worst-case parameters that are material in this modelling, i.e., air gap, rotor radius/rotor diameter, or number of turbines. The full PVA outputs relevatn to the IA and HRA have been provided in the updated clarification notes.
1.3.1.4	Conclusions on Adverse Effect on Integrity:	JNCC agrees that a conclusion of no AEoSI for the breeding Manx shearwater and breeding seabird assemblage features of the Skomer, Skokholm and the Seas off Pembrokeshire/ Sgomer, Sgogwm a Moroedd Penfro Special Protection Area can be reached, alone and in-combination. JNCC considers there to currently be insufficient information provided on the in-combination impacts on the breeding lesser black-backed gull and Atlantic puffin qualifying features of SSSP SPA on which to draw conclusions on AEoSI. Therefore, JNCC currently disagrees that an AEoSI can be ruled out for the Skomer, Skokholm and the Seas off Pembrokeshire/ Sgomer, Sgogwm a Moroedd Penfro Special Protection Area.	To confirm we agree with NRW (A)'s in-combination mortality calculations and the NRW (A) 's in combination mortality calculations are presented in the updated Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3 – dated 07 November 2026, as appendix 1
1.3.2	Irish Sea Front SPA	We agree that an adverse effect can be ruled out on the Irish Sea Front SPA alone and in-combination for all qualifying features.	Noted
2	**Marine mammal comments**		

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
2.1	**NRW record of a Habitats Regulations Assessment of a project**	In line with JNCCs offshore remit, our advice is restricted to Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) designated for harbour porpoise. We defer to NRW-A for inshore sites designated for seals. We do not agree with the conclusions of NRW-L's Appropriate Assessment that an AEoSI can be ruled out on West Wales Marine SAC and Bristol Channel Approaches SAC alone and in-combination. This is because we do not believe the information provided by the Applicant and subsequently used by NRW-L, is sufficient to support conclusions of no adverse effect on these sites. We recommend the applicants assessment be updated to enable the NRW-L to fully assess the potential impacts to these sites (see section 2.1.1).	To confirm the worst case scenario is 20 full days of piling over a 45 day period (the additional 25 days provides contingency in the construction scheduling to allow for periods of down-time due to poor weather potential, moving of piling equipment from one turbine location to another, etc). iPCoD is unable to accommodate piling durations of less than a day, so that the modelled 'worst case' for Llŷr (as submitted) assumed 10 days of continuous piling, i.e., 24 hours per turbine for the maximum ten turbine scenario. The iPCoD 10 day piling activity model output identifies the number of Harbour porpoise impacted population as being less than 3 animals (99.99 % of un-impacted population after 12 years) and 0 animals (100% of un-impacted population after 12 years) for Grey Seal - source Llŷr 1 Floating Offshore Wind Farm, Environmental Statement, Volume 3 : Chapter 21 – Marine Mammals - "Table 21-36 Harbour porpoise iPCOD modelling results" and "Table 21-38 Grey seal iPCOD modelling results 20 days of full piling would represent a doubling of the impact assessed which would result in no more than 6 Harbour porpoise being impacted and even from an ultra-precautionary stance of quadrupling the impact (i.e. 4 x 10 days impact), this would result in no more than 12 Harbour porpoise and even fewer Grey seals being impacted, which is less than 1% of the total population of both species, which is of negligible significance. As a consequence, the worst-case scenario for disturbance from piling has been assessed for the Bristol Channel Approaches Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the West Wales Marine SAC and has resulted in a negligible significance outcome. A mitigation zone will be determined through consultation with SNCBs and informed by relevant JNCC guidelines for mitigation of impact to marine mammals from piling, geophysical surveys and explosions, as well as relevant EDRs. For the purpose of the draft MMMP, standard JNCC mitigation zones have been used.
2.1.1	Section 3. Likely significant effect (LSE)	These sites are; - West Wales Marine SAC (0km) - Bristol Channel Approaches SAC (1.94km) - North Anglesey Marine SAC (174km) - North Channel SAC (279km). JNCC are aware of the NRW (2022) guidance regarding HRA and note all four sites have been identified as being subject to a significant effect from the proposed project (using the colour coded system detailed in Table 3.2.3).	Noted
2.1.2	Section 4. Appropriate Assessment alone	We agree with the approach to focus on the West Wales Marine and Bristol Channel Approaches SACs due to their distance from the proposed project. *Impact pathway 1 Effects of underwater noise (construction, operation and decommissioning)* JNCC disagree with the conclusion of this assessment, that an AEoSI can be ruled out once mitigation measures, conditions or restrictions are accounted for (Section 4.2). Conservation objective 1 **Site abundance** The variability of harbour porpoise distribution and abundance within any site is, in part, due to their mobility and wide-ranging nature as well as natural and anthropogenic changes in habitat and prey. Therefore, SNCB advice on operations (JNCC, 2019) highlights the need to contextualise any apparent deterioration of harbour porpoise presence in the site in terms of natural variability and the abundance and distribution patterns at the population level (i.e. management unit). The relevant harbour porpoise management unit (MU) in this case is the Celtic and Irish Seas MU. Abundance estimates for the cetacean MUs were updated in 2022 (JNCC, 2022). **Mortality** JNCC agree there is no need to have a separate analysis of cetacean mortality from underwater noise as mitigation for auditory injury will also mitigate the potential for mortality. This is because the range within which mortality could occur will be within the range that auditory injury could occur. We highlight, however, that without such mitigation there is a risk of mortality to animals within close range of some noise sources. This is because mortality does not necessarily occur as a direct result of the exposure e.g. as would expect if close to an explosive detonation. Underwater noise can result in physical injury aside from auditory, which can weaken the animal and result in death. **Auditory injury (Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)-onset)** JNCC disagree with only considering the Sound Pressure Level peak (SPLpeak) metric when assessing impacts from auditory injury to cetaceans. JNCC stated this pre-application, at the fitness check stage and again when responding to the ES. JNCC require both metrics to be considered and the most precautionary used to determine mitigation requirements. Information is provided in the appendices which is sufficient to do this however the applicant chose (against JNCC advice) to only present the SPLpeak in the ES chapter. Without this, JNCC cannot confirm mitigation contained within the outline mitigation plan (Appendix 4A: outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP)) is sufficient to reduce the risk of auditory injury to harbour porpoise (see below for further comment). **Disturbance** NRW-L have referenced the Applicant's use of Interim Population Consequences of Disturbance (iPCOD) in this assessment. We highlight two issues relating to the disturbance assessment in view of the conservation objectives. 1. The information provided in Chapter 4: Description of the Proposed Project outlining the worse-case scenario for impact piling duration does not reflect what has been assessed in Chapter 21. Chapter 4, section 4.5.1, paragraph 85 states that the minimum number of days spent piling will be 20. However, the marine mammal disturbance assessment for impact piling in both the ES and the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) has used a maximum of ten days for the piling duration as the worst-case scenario. The design envelope should not exceed that assessed. We advise that the disturbance assessment be re-visited to reflect the worst-case scenarios as outlined in the project design. 2. iPCOD is a useful tool for an assessment, however, the outputs, while informative, must be interpreted with caution. The input parameters are understood to be difficult to estimate with certainty and do not account for regional or temporal differences in vital rates. It is also understood that there are challenges around predicting a piling schedule within the model, which creates uncertainty during an in-combination assessment.	Noted An updated Llŷr Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) has been discussed with the JNCC to address the aspects they have raised and is submitted fr consideration. Noted Noted The updated Llŷr Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) includes a commitment to agree with the regulator the size of the Mitigation Zone prior to installation activities being carried out. This includes a commitment to consider the un-weighted peak Sound Pressure Level, the weighted Sound Exposure Level, along with operational feasibility. (1) To confirm the worst case scenario is 20 full days of piling over a 45 day period (the additional 25 days provides contingency in the construction scheduling to allow for periods of down-time due to poor weather potential, moving of piling equipment from one turbine location to another, etc). 20 days of full piling would represent a doubling of the impact assessed which would result in no more than 6 Harbour porpoise being impacted and even from an ultra-precautionary stance of quadrupling the impact (i.e. 4 x 10 days impact), this would result in no more than 12 Harbour porpoise and even fewer Grey seals being impacted, which is less than 1% of the total population of both species, which is of negligible significance. As a consequence, the worst-case scenario for disturbance from piling has been assessed for the Bristol Channel Approaches Special Area of Conservation (SAC) ant the West Wales Marine SAC and has resulted in a negligible significance outcome. (2) We acknowledge the JNCC concerns relating to the iPCOD limitations, however it remains a useful tool for assessing impacts. The results provided are being treated as pre-cautionary and this approach reflect the measures proposed within the revised Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003)

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
		Mitigation We disagree that the applicant has considered best practice mitigation measures as they have ruled out the use of noise abatement and acoustic deterrents based on SPLpeak predictions only. While the applicant has committed to employing a marine mammal mitigation plan (as stated in Appendix 04A: OCEMP), the measures contained within the draft provided only mitigate predicted injury ranges using the SPLpeak metric. As highlighted pre-application, and at the fitness check stage, JNCC do not agree with this approach and advise it is not current industry best practice. The applicant has assessed injury using both the peak pressure (SPLpeak) and cumulative exposure (Sound Exposure Level cumulative (SELcum)) metrics as agreed pre-application. However, they only presented the peak pressure results in the ES chapter and only used this metric when determining mitigation requirements. JNCC require both metrics to be considered and the most precautionary used to determine mitigation requirements. Appendix 21B – underwater noise impact study, Table 21B-16 (page 54) indicates that auditory injury (PTS) may occur in harbour porpoise within 5.8km of piling. This distance overlaps with both the West Wales Marine and Bristol Channel Approaches SACs and cannot be mitigated with marine mammal observers and/or acoustic monitoring alone. Additionally, the applicant choosing to only mitigate injury ranges using the SPLpeak metric has been used as justification to not consider the use of noise abatement or acoustic deterrents during piling. We highlight an announcement by Welsh Government (Decision Report, 6 March 2025) to publish a noise policy paper similar to that published by Defra in January 2025. The Defra policy requires renewable developments in English waters to undertake best endeavours to use noise abatement during piling from January 2025.	An updated Llŷr Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan has been discussed with the JNCC to address the aspects they have raised and is submitted fr consideration.
		Conservation Objective 2 We are aware of NRW-As advice (NRW ref PS017) regarding the use of Effective Deterrent Ranges (EDRs) and the preference for noise modelling using fixed noise thresholds for disturbance in HRA. While using EDRs will not change the overall conclusion regarding the disturbance thresholds for these sites, we highlight that JNCC favours the use of fixed EDRs based on empirical evidence as noise modelling carries considerable uncertainty. In particular: • There are no agreed quantitative thresholds for disturbance as there are for auditory injury (see Southall et al, 2021 for discussion). • Depending on the choice of numerical models to estimate sound source and propagation one can end up with several orders of magnitude different predictions for disturbance ranges. • Received sound levels are not the single most influencing factor in triggering disturbance, other characteristics of sound and how they propagate with distance will influence how an animal perceives the noise. • Behavioural context, individual animal motivation and previous exposure will also all play a role in determining response. JNCC requested the applicant present an assessment using EDRs in addition to that requested by NRW-A (email to NRW-L dated 4th August 2023) as the two harbour porpoise sites within the Bristol Channel are jointly managed by JNCC and NRW. JNCC highlighted at the fitness check (27 September 2024) this had not been applied as agreed. While the Applicant subsequently provided additional information in the form of a table in the Llŷr 1 Floating Offshore Wind Farm Addendum to the Environmental Statement' (Table 8-17), the EDRs were not applied correctly. We refer to our comment in response to Section 8.5.3, paragraph 388, page 129 of Volume 6 Appendix 8E: HRA RIAA in our advice dated 22nd January 2025 (OIA-10573).	Table 1 of the JNCC (2025) guidance on updated EDRs for harbour porpoise SACs gives the pin-pile EDR, no noise abatement, as 20 km. Within the HRA for Llŷr, we have based our assessment on the following pin-pile impact ranges (Table 8-22 of the Llŷr RIAA) to calculate the spatial overlaps with each SAC (Table 8-23): •Summer impact range for West Wales Marine SAC: 20 km •Winter impact range for Bristol Channel Approaches SAC: 39.2 km Although the impact ranges calculated for the Llŷr RIAA are based on NRW (A)'s advised noise threshold metric – Fixed (143dB re 1 mPa2.s) – the impact ranges thus derived are equivalent to the pin-piling EDR stated in the JNCC (2025) guidance, indeed the one we've used for the Bristol Channel Approaches SAC is more precautionary. Therefore, there is no material update required to the Llŷr assessment in regard to this matter. The additional new EDRs given in the JNCC guidance for geophysical surveys, UXOs and ADDs will be accounted for in the final MMMP at the appropriate stage post-consent (if required*), as agreed with JNCC at the meeting held on 17 September 2025. *i.e., depending on geophys activity and associated equipment; and/or if UXOs are confirmed present; and/or if ADDs are selected as a pre-piling mitigation. The mitigation zone will be determined through consultation with SNCBs and informed by relevant JNCC guidelines for mitigation of impact to marine mammals from piling, geophysical surveys and explosions, as well as relevant EDRs. For the purpose of the draft MMMP, standard JNCC mitigation zones have been used.
		Impact pathway 2: Accidental pollution or contamination (construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning) JNCC agree with the conclusion of this assessment, that an adverse effect on site integrity can be ruled out provided the applicant complies with relevant guidance and regulations relating to pollution prevention. JNCC recommend compliance with this is secured through a licence condition.	Noted
		Impact pathway 3: Collision with project vessels (construction, operation and maintenance, decommissioning) JNCC agree with the conclusion of this assessment, that an adverse effect on site integrity can be ruled out once mitigation is accounted for. We agree that without mitigation, there is the potential to compromise the sites conservation objectives. We agree such mitigation is available e.g. defined transit routes and limits to vessel speed. We recommend these are secured as conditions of consent.	Noted
		Impact pathway 4: Potential for indirect effects through impacts upon prey species (construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning) JNCC agree with the conclusion of this assessment, that an adverse effect on site integrity can be ruled out. However, we highlight that the potential for floating wind turbine generators (WTGs)s to function as artificial reefs and potentially increase foraging opportunities could result in an increased risk of entanglement with mooring lines and cables, or debris attached to the mooring lines. This adds greater importance to the need for a robust entanglement monitoring plan.	Noted, The draft MMMP has been updated to include a commitment to address entanglement risk and will monitor for, and remove, marine debris caught on cables as part of the regular surveys of subsea infrastructurein line with the JNCC recommendations.
		Impact pathway 5: Effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) emissions JNCC agree with the conclusion of this assessment, that an adverse effect on site integrity can be ruled out. However, we highlight that previous research relating to EMF from cables has focussed on cables buried underground or placed on the seabed. In the case of floating turbines, these cables will be suspended in the water column. The difference this will make is a current evidence gap.	Noted
		Impact pathway 6: Barrier effects from mooring lines and cables between platform and anchor (page 154) We acknowledge that the array area is located 13.65 km from the West Wales Marine SAC and 12.11 km from the Bristol Channel Approaches SAC. Therefore, we agree with the conclusion of this assessment, that an AEoSI can be ruled out as there is no risk of barrier effects within the SACs. However, as NRW-L correctly highlights, the presence of the structures may affect the movement of harbour porpoise to and/or from the SACs. JNCC note the lack of information specific to barrier effects resulting from floating WTGs but advise that caution should be taken when considering studies focused on this impact on marine mammals at fixed-turbine wind farms. Fixed-turbine wind farms do not have mooring lines and cabling infrastructure.	Noted

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
		Impact pathway 7: Entanglement with mooring lines and cables (page 154) JNCC disagree with the conclusion of this assessment, that an adverse effect on site integrity can be ruled out. We agree that, without mitigation, secondary risk of entanglement for harbour porpoise could compromise the conservation objectives of these sites. A secondary entanglement risk is considered to exist should lost or discarded fishing gear ('ghost gear') become caught on the moorings or cables. We disagree that the applicant has considered best practice mitigation measures or provided sufficient detail regarding what will be adopted as part of the project. The information provided within the assessment, the outline Marine Mammal Management Plan (MMMP), and the embedded mitigation ID E232 in Volume 6: Appendix 32A is insufficient to provide confidence in how the risk of entanglement will be mitigated. Without such detail, we cannot agree there will be no adverse effect on these sites. We acknowledge that a commitment has been made to regularly inspect the moorings and cables and remove any ghost gear found. However, there has been no outline of regularity, nor any methods presented that demonstrate how inspections might take place. We advise NRW-L seek further information to ascertain the definition of 'regular' and suggest the maximum duration of intervals between inspections is sought as this will provide the worse-case scenario for which this risk can be assessed. This information should be included in the OCEMP, and compliance secured as a condition of consent. In addition, an assessment of the risk of tertiary entanglement has not been considered (by the applicant and in this HRA) which has been identified as a potential risk in a report for Natural England on the environmental impacts for floating offshore wind farms (Genesis, 2024). Tertiary entanglement is the risk of entanglement when derelict fishing gear already attached to an animal subsequently becomes attached to mooring lines and cables as the animal travels through the array area.	Noted, The draft MMMP has been updated to include a commitment to address entanglement risk and will monitor for, and remove, marine debris caught on cables as part of the regular surveys of subsea infrastructurein line with the JNCC recommendations.
2.1.3	Section 5. In-combination assessment	***Impact pathway 1: Effects of underwater noise (construction, operation and maintenance, decommissioning)*** Our comments from the project alone assessment are of relevance here. Until our concerns regarding the project alone assessment are addressed, we cannot agree with the conclusion of no likely significant effect in-combination for this impact pathway. JNCC highlight that two projects are missing from the other plans/projects in-combination assessment for marine mammals - Llŷr 2 and Valorous. We note that these have been assessed for benthic and ornithology receptors but not for marine mammals.	Noted - the comments raised by the JNCC are addressed here and in the JNCC2 tab
		Impact pathway 2: Collision with project vessels JNCC agree with the conclusion of no likely significant effect in-combination for this impact pathway, provided all projects adhere to vessel management plans. We recommend that when this project finalises their vessel management plan, they review those of the projects considered in this assessment for areas of overlap e.g. overlapping transit routes. If any are identified, we recommend these are discussed in the management plans and consideration given to whether any actions are required to reduce in-combination impacts.	Noted, the project is content to consider areas of overlap within the Vessel Management Plan to coniders areas of overlap with other transit routes, including whether any actions are required to reduce in-combination impacts.
		Impact pathway 3: Entanglement with mooring lines and cables Our comments from the project alone assessment are of relevance here. Until our concerns regarding the project alone assessment are addressed, we cannot agree with the conclusion of no likely significant effect in-combination for this impact pathway. We also note that while Llŷr, Erebus and White Cross as a combined scale of development will not cover a significant area in comparison to the Celtic and Irish Seas Marine Mammal Management Units, they are all to be located within proximity of one another and, in or next to harbour porpoise SACs. This should be considered as an increase in risk of entanglement.	Noted, The draft MMMP has been updated to include a commitment to address entanglement risk and will monitor for, and remove, marine debris caught on cables as part of the regular surveys of subsea infrastructurein line with the JNCC recommendations.
		Impact pathway 4: Accidental pollution or contamination JNCC agree with the conclusion of no likely significant effect in-combination for this impact pathway, as all projects will be required to comply with the same guidance and regulations relating to pollution prevention.	Noted
		Impact pathway 5: Potential for indirect effects through impacts on prey species JNCC agree with the conclusion of no likely significant effect in-combination for this impact pathway.	Noted
		Impact pathway 6: Effects of EMF JNCC agree with the conclusion of no likely significant effect in-combination for this impact pathway	Noted
		Impact pathway 7: Barrier effects from mooring lines and cables between platform and anchor JNCC do not agree with the conclusion of no likely significant in-combination effect, in view of the West Wales Marine SAC and Bristol Channel Approaches SAC conservation objectives. We do not feel that the risk of this impact has been adequately assessed in combination with other projects. The justification provided to rule out this impact in combination relies on studies of fixed-turbine wind farms but three of the projects being considered in this assessment are floating offshore wind (FLOW) farms. Fixed-turbine wind farms do not have mooring lines and cabling infrastructure. We advise a more robust and evidenced assessment is undertaken, which draws upon developments of a similar nature, for example, aquaculture, seaweed farms, and other FLOW sites. We also note that while Llŷr, Erebus and White Cross, when considered alone, may not occupy a significant space, they are all to be located within relatively close proximity of one another and, in or next to one of the two harbour porpoise SACs in the Bristol Channel.	Noted, The draft MMMP has been updated to include a commitment to address entanglement risk and will monitor for, and remove, marine debris caught on cables as part of the regular surveys of subsea infrastructurein line with the JNCC recommendations.

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
2.2	**P11-LYR-3.4.3-PAP-Rev 01 – Marine Licence Application Clarifications A2**	The Applicant has not provided any updated documents and no new information is provided in the clarification spreadsheet (ORML2465 P11-LYR-3.4.3-PAP-Rev01-Marine Licence Application Clarifications A2) to support responses to marine mammal comments. Justifications provided by the Applicant in response to our identified issues lack evidence and are not deemed robust enough to satisfy our concerns. In principle, we could potentially agree with several of the applicant's conclusions for marine mammals in the ES but the supporting evidence and information in its current form is not robust enough for JNCC to agree at this stage. As this a test and demonstration project, the ES submitted will likely set a precedent for future applications. We strongly advise the applicant is required to submit updated documents to the regulator rather than providing additional information in spreadsheets or addendum. Key outstanding issues for marine mammals are; - The impact assessment has not been based on the worse-case scenario due to piling duration being up to 45 days (presented in the project design envelope) and the assessment being based on 10 days. - The impact assessment has not used the most precautionary densities for common dolphins. - Insufficient detail is provided for entanglement mitigation (Volume 6: Appendix 32A – Mitigation Register: Entanglement - Embedded Mitigation ID E232). - Removal of impact pathways from the Cumulative Environmental Assessment due to conclusions being made at the project alone assessment. - The RIAA does not present the percentage of harbour porpoise SACs affected by noise disturbance i.e. inconsistent use of EDRs (JNCC et al, 2020), which have only been applied for geophysical surveys.	Noted - the comments raised by the JNCC are addressed here and in the JNCC2 tab
2.2.1	Comments 29, 34, 69, 71	***Report to Inform Habitat Regulations Appraisal (RIHRA)*** We maintain our position that the assessment of adverse effect due to noise disturbance within the West Wales Marine or Bristol Channel Approaches SACs has not been assessed correctly and the applicant has not provided sufficient justification to support their approach. JNCC previously advised that EDRs be used when assessing noise disturbance within harbour porpoise sites. However, the applicant has only used these when assessing impacts from geophysical surveys (Table 8-22). This approach has not been applied for any other noise source for which EDRs are available. The two harbour porpoise sites within the Bristol Channel that may be impacted by this project are jointly managed by JNCC and other SNCBs. Pre-application, JNCC advised that EDRs should be used for HRA purposes (email to NRW-L dated 4th August 2023) but agreed these could be presented alongside other methods required by NRW-A for comparison purposes. JNCC highlighted this again during the fitness check (OIA-10438, 27th September 2024) as the use of EDRs had not been applied as agreed. While the Applicant has provided additional information in the form of a table in the Llŷr 1 Floating Offshore Wind Farm Addendum to the Environmental Statement' (Table 8-17), the EDRs have still not been applied consistently. Our advice relating to HRA as outlined in our previous response dated 22nd January 2025 (OIA-10573) remains. We also highlight a statement throughout the latest document submitted by the Applicant (ORML2465 P11-LYR-3.4.3-PAP-Rev01-Marine Licence Application Clarifications A2) which relates to comments 29, 34, 63. *"The Llŷr project considers that the state of knowledge around most impact pathways for marine mammal interests, is too uncertain to be able to make any meaningful judgement in terms of numbers of animals impacted, certainly for the qualitative impact pathways. As density of animals at any project site will also vary over time, the Llŷr project gave consideration to the status of the species, and whether it occurs consistently or irregularly on-site, as more informative criteria rather than using an arbitrary number."* JNCC agrees there are knowledge gaps for marine mammals and acknowledge the challenges faced when determining impacts within environmental impact assessments (EIA). However, density estimates and evidence SNCBs request for projects are done so to provide some level of confidence in assessments. Our advice considers whether an application has used the best available evidence while considering the context of remaining evidence gaps. We do not feel that this has been demonstrated for Project Llŷr.	Table 1 of the JNCC (2025) guidance on updated EDRs for harbour porpoise SACs gives the pin-pile EDR, no noise abatement, as 20 km. Within the HRA for Llŷr, we have based our assessment on the following pin-pile impact ranges (Table 8-22 of the Llŷr RIAA) to calculate the spatial overlaps with each SAC (Table 8-23): •Summer impact range for West Wales Marine SAC: 20 km •Winter impact range for Bristol Channel Approaches SAC: 39.2 km Although the impact ranges calculated for the Llŷr RIAA are based on NRW (A)'s advised noise threshold metric – Fixed (143dB re 1 mPa2.s) – the impact ranges thus derived are equivalent to the pin-piling EDR stated in the JNCC (2025) guidance, indeed the one we've used for the Bristol Channel Approaches SAC is more precautionary. Therefore, there is no material update required to the Llŷr assessment in regard to this matter. The additional new EDRs given in the JNCC guidance for geophysical surveys, UXOs and ADDs will be accounted for in the final MMMP at the appropriate stage post-consent (if required*), as agreed with JNCC at the meeting held on 17 September 2025. *i.e., depending on geophys activity and associated equipment; and/or if UXOs are confirmed present; and/or if ADDs are selected as a pre-piling mitigation. An appropriate mitigation zone will be determined through consultation with SNCBs and informed by relevant JNCC guidelines for mitigation of impact to marine mammals from piling, geophysical surveys and explosions, as well as relevant EDRs. For the purpose of the draft MMMP, standard JNCC mitigation zones have been used.
2.2.2	Comments 30, 40	***Worse-Case Scenarios: Project Design Envelope*** The Applicant has confirmed that the project envelope identifies the minimum number of days piling to be 20 but the marine mammal disturbance assessment for impact piling in both the ES and the RIAA has used a maximum scenario of 10. The justification provided is that underwater modelling was carried out early in the assessment process, with the project envelope updated after the modelling had been completed. We also note that the Applicant states '20-45' days duration, meaning the 20-day scenario is not the worst-case. JNCC acknowledge the Applicant's explanation in relation to this matter however an assessment of the worst-case scenario is required. The applicant claims it is 'reasonable to state' that conclusions from iPCOD population modelling would not change i.e. the population impacts would remain negligible. However, no justification or evidence is provided to support this. Without this, we cannot agree with conclusions regarding impact piling operations. We also reiterate our previous advice (OIA-10573, 22nd January 2025) in relation to iPCOD. While iPCOD is a useful and informative tool for an assessment, the outputs must be interpreted with caution. The input parameters are understood to be difficult to estimate with certainty and do not account for regional or temporal differences in vital rates. It is also understood that the challenges around predicting a piling schedule within the model creates uncertainty during a cumulative assessment. JNCC advise that the Applicant updates the assessment in line with the maximum project design parameters. This is of particular importance as it is likely that the Project's ES will be used to inform future FLOW projects.	To confirm the worst case scenario is 20 full days of piling over a 45 day period (the additional 25 days provides contingency in the construction scheduling to allow for periods of down-time due to poor weather potential, moving of piling equipment from one turbine location to another, etc). iPCoD is unable to accommodate piling durations of less than a day, so that the modelled 'worst case' for Llŷr (as submitted) assumed 10 days of continuous piling, i.e., 24 hours per turbine for the maximum ten turbine scenario. The iPCoD 10 day piling activity model output identifies the number of Harbour porpoise impacted population as being less than 3 animals (99.99 % of un-impacted population after 12 years) and 0 animals (100% of un-impacted population after 12 years) for Grey Seal - source Llŷr 1 Floating Offshore Wind Farm, Environmental Statement, Volume 3 : Chapter 21 – Marine Mammals - "Table 21-36 Harbour porpoise iPCOD modelling results" and "Table 21-38 Grey seal iPCOD modelling results 20 days of full piling would represent a doubling of the impact assessed which would result in no more than 6 Harbour porpoise being impacted and even from an ultra-precautionary stance of quadrupling the impact (i.e. 4 x 10 days impact), this would result in no more than 12 Harbour porpoise and even fewer Grey seals being impacted, which is less than 1% of the total population of both species, which is of negligible significance. As a consequence, the worst-case scenario for disturbance from piling has been assessed for the Bristol Channel Approaches Special Area of Conservation (SAC) ant the West Wales Marine SAC and has resulted in a negligible significance outcome.

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
2.2.3	Comments 31, 73, 77, 99	***Entanglement*** The key concern JNCC identified with regards to potential entanglement with mooring lines is tertiary entanglement (Genesis, 2024) however secondary entanglement is also a concern. We note that ID E232 embedded mitigation states "*Mooring lines and floating inter-array cables will be inspected during the operation and maintenance phase using a risk-based adaptive management approach. Mooring line and cable inspections are expected to occur at a higher frequency initially and then reduce in frequency over a number of years, with changes to inspection periods based on evidence of risk garnered from the inspections.* " However, examples of how this will work in practice are necessary to demonstrate the efficacy of methods being considered. To base conclusions of negligible significance on the assumption that mitigation will be employed but not demonstrate or discuss what types of mitigation could be effective makes any agreement with conclusions a challenge. We maintain our previous advice regarding the mitigation plan. The embedded mitigation as highlighted is not sufficient to support the Applicant's conclusions nor does it demonstrate any commitment to reducing this risk. We advise potential options need to be included in the outline MMMP to provide confidence in the efficacy of any proposed methods and support the conclusions of the impact assessment. JNCC recommend engagement with SNCBs about any proposed methods pre-submission of the MMMP. In addition, evidence shows that FLOW infrastructure has the potential to increase biodiversity in areas around the site which could lead to an increase in marine mammals (Section 21.9.2.291, volume 3 Llŷr ES Chapter 21_Marine Mammals). This further increases the risk of entanglement. We agree a monitoring plan and adaptive management plan is essential to understanding and reducing the risk of any entanglements that could occur. Monitoring and managing entanglement risks will then help to ensure that the environmental benefits of the project are not inadvertently detrimental to marine mammal populations. With regard the provided information in Volume 6: Appendix 32A – Mitigation Register: Entanglement - Embedded Mitigation ID E232, JNCC request a definition of 'regular' when determining frequency of inspection of the mooring lines, for secondary and tertiary risks to marine mammals. As a minimum we expect the Applicant to identify the maximum duration between inspections as this will provide a worst-case scenario. We would also like to see a description of the methods the Applicant is exploring to inform the final monitoring plan and how an adaptive plan will be implemented. Currently the embedded mitigation ID E232 is too high level to support the assessment conclusions. We note the Applicant has mentioned (comment 73) that project monitoring may include load cells attached to the mooring lines, ROV surveys and reporting entanglement incidents to the Regulator. JNCC recommend the Applicant reads publicly available documents of monitoring plans to inform their own, current examples that JNCC are aware of include; Seaweedology Macroalgae Farm, Hywind, CÂR-Y-MÔR and Erebus Finally, we advise that the Applicant should support any regional-scale strategic studies on the interactions between marine mammals and FLOW arrays, as project development in this area grows. The Erebus project has already committed to this. We believe this project provides a key opportunity, as a test and demonstration site, to help fill evidence gaps.	A draft MMMP (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) has been provided that includes a commitment to address entanglement risk and will monitor for, and remove, marine debris caught on cables as part of the regular surveys of subsea infrastructurein line with the JNCC recommendations.
2.2.4	Comment 33	***Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA)*** We note the Applicant's justification for scoping out impact pathways for auditory injury, disturbance from unexploded ordnance (UXO) clearance, collision with vessels, barrier effects, and entanglement from this assessment is on the basis that the project alone assessment concluded that they were of negligible significance. We do not agree with this decision and advise insufficient evidence has been provided to support this. The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2017 require all characteristics of the project should be assessed cumulatively with other projects within the zone of influence. While it can be agreed some impact pathways do not need to be considered cumulative, we do not agree with the decision to scope out the impact pathways highlighted. It is widely understood that impacts alone may be of negligible significance but when combined with other projects can result in a significant impact to marine mammal receptors. Exposure to repeated disturbance and overlapping injury events could result in repeated recovery processes from multiple stressors. The Applicant refers to applying the same approach used by Erebus, we highlight our advice was also the same for that project (OIA-08510, 22nd April 2022).	Noted
2.2.5	Comments 35, 85, 87, 89	***Density estimates for common dolphin*** JNCC maintains our previous advice (OIA-10573, 22nd January 2025) that density estimates based on the site-specific surveys are used when assessing impacts to common dolphin as this is the more precautionary density. The Applicant has not based their assessment on the most precautionary density estimates for common dolphin and has not provided a robust justification outlining why this decision has been made.	Noted
2.2.6	Comment 36	***Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan*** JNCC are unsure about the Applicant's reference to sonar in their response to our previous advice. Our advice relates to the Applicant's approach to only use instantaneous PTS (i.e. SPL) to determine mitigation requirements to reduce the risk of auditory injury to negligible levels. It is best practice to consider both the cumulative sound exposure levels (SELcum) in addition to the SPL and to mitigate the largest, most precautionary injury ranges predicted. We uphold our position in that we disagree with the decision to rule out noise abatement technology for piling, or the use of acoustic deterrents as stated in our previous advice (OIA-10438, 27th September 2024 and OIA-10573, 22nd January 2025).	A draft MMMP (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) has been provided that includes a commitment to address entanglement risk and will monitor for, and remove, marine debris caught on cables as part of the regular surveys of subsea infrastructurein line with the JNCC recommendations.
2.2.7	Comments 45, 94, 96, 97	JNCC are unclear why the Applicant is highlighting sonar and individual equipment spec sheets. Our comment relates specifically to the Applicant's decision to not present both peak pressure (SPLpeak) and cumulative exposure (SELcum) metrics in the ES even though both injury metrics have been assessed. JNCC maintains our position and strongly advises that both metrics are considered and presented within the main assessment, injury ranges were omitted from this section of the assessment. Then the most precautionary is used to determine mitigation requirements.	The draft MMMP has been updated to include a commitment to use the dual metrics for impusive noise assessments in line with the JNCC recommendations.
2.2.8	Comment 47	We request further explanation as to why the Applicant has decided to present only the stationary model for VHF Volume 3 Chapter 21: Marine Mammals - Section 21.9.1, paragraph 188, page 82. While the injury ranges here are precautionary, it is widely understood that this is an unrealistic metric and can result in over-precautionary results. We advise fleeing animal response ranges are more representative and request these are presented within the ES not the technical appendices.	The draft MMMP has been updated to include a commitment to use the dual metrics for impusive noise assessments in line with the JNCC recommendations.
2.2.9	Comment 49, 57	We thank the Applicant for clarifying that the 168 additional transits during operation and maintenance relates to the project lifetime. We question if this figure has included transits for entanglement monitoring (i.e. removal of debris from mooring lines and cables)? If not, we would request this figure is increased to account for monitoring and/or mitigation requirements against the risk of entanglement (i.e. site inspections and remedial operations if a marine mammal becomes entangled). However, separating out the different operations which contribute to the overall number is useful.	Entanglement monitoring is currently considered to part of the normal O&M activities and is included in the transit figures.
2.2.10	Comment 55	JNCC are disappointed with the Applicant's response regarding our concerns relating to entanglement as identified in Volume 3 Chapter 21: Marine Mammals - Section 21.9.2, paragraph 274, page 94. The Applicant has not indicated that they have understood our concerns relating to the risk of tertiary entanglement. Secondary entanglement is where an animal becomes entangled to the mooring lines and cables due to interaction with derelict fishing gear attached to the infrastructure. This is recognised as a significant risk to marine mammals. Tertiary risk relates to the risk of an animal with derelict fishing gear already attached becoming entangled with FLOW mooring lines or cables as it travels through the site. Tertiary, as well as secondary entanglement was identified in the Genesis, 2024 report referenced in our previous advice to the Regulator (OIA-10573, 22nd January 2025).	The draft MMMP has been updated to include a commitment to address entanglement risk and will monitor for, and remove, marine debris caught on cables as part of the regular surveys of subsea infrastructurein line with the JNCC recommendations.
2.2.11	Comment 61	JNCC welcome the Applicant's commitment to including the Defra noise policy and the joint JNCC, Natural England and Cefas position statement regarding the use of noise abatement systems during piling. The Applicant has committed to engagement with NRW-A regarding this and JNCC request we are included in discussions as the statutory advisor for Welsh offshore waters.	Noted and the project is content to include the JNCC as part of these discussions

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
2.2.12	Comment 62, 94, 96, 97	The applicant has assessed injury using both the peak pressure (SPLpeak) and SELcum metrics as agreed pre-application. However, they only presented the peak pressure results in the ES chapter and only used this metric when determining mitigation requirements. JNCC do not agree with this approach. The applicant has assessed injury using both the peak pressure (peak SPL) and cumulative exposure (SELcum) metrics as agreed pre-application. However, they only presented the peak pressure results in the ES chapter and only used this metric when determining mitigation requirements. JNCC require both metrics to be considered and the most precautionary used to determine mitigation requirements. Without this, JNCC cannot advise measures described in the OCEMP are sufficient to reduce the risk of auditory injury to marine mammals. Additionally, the applicant choosing to only mitigate injury ranges using the SPLpeak metric has been used as justification to not consider the use of noise abatement or acoustic deterrents during piling. We highlight an announcement by Welsh Government (Decision Report, 6 March 2025) to publish a noise policy paper similar to that published by Defra in January 2025. The Defra policy requires renewable developments in English waters to undertake best endeavours to use noise abatement during piling from January 2025.	The draft MMMP has been updated to include a commitment to use the dual metrics for impusive noise assessments in line with the JNCC recommendations.
2.2.13	Comment 63	The applicant states both Llŷr 2 and Valorous are at the pre-application stage and insufficient data is available to enable them to be considered in the marine mammal cumulative assessment. However, they have been included in benthic and ornithology assessments. We highlight the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment states that "*where baseline data about other existing and, or approved development is incomplete, a precautionary but reasonable approach should be taken based on the best available evidence, with an explanation as to how the applicant has attempted to source data* ." Further justification is required to support not including these projects for marine mammals. We are satisfied with the statement referring to Rampion 2.	Noted
2.2.14	Comment 92	JNCC reiterates our advice from 22nd January 2025 (OIA-10573) that injury ranges for each functional hearing group should be presented within the ES to provide clear information to inform the assessment. The role of the ES is to present all key information that relates to the conclusions of the assessment of impact on marine mammals. Without knowing the range within which injury could occur it is not possible to ascertain what mitigation is needed to reduce the risk of this occurring. As all cetaceans are European Protected Species, we advise this information should be summarised in the ES and the appendix should reflect supplementary technical information to expand further on the details of how key information has been calculated.	As per the comments addressed within the JNCC 2 tab, the draft MMMP has been updated to include a commitment to use the dual metrics for impusive noise assessments in line with the JNCC recommendations.
2.2.15	Comment 93	If, as stated, Erebus has been used as a proxy for the piling parameters used to assess auditory injury and disturbance, because the same activities and methods will be used for Project Llŷr, the Applicant must outline the exact parameters that makes Erebus an appropriate project for this purpose. A clearer justification of the comparison is required. JNCC raised many concerns in relation to the Erebus application dated 22nd April 2023 which underpins our need for robust and clear evidence in support of using this project as a proxy.	Similar to the Llŷr Project, the Erebus is a 100MW Floating Wind T&D project comprising up to ten Wind Turbine Generators (WTGs) with each WTG is housed on a semi-submersible floating platform attached to the seabed by weighted mooring lines, up to 870 m in length, and an anchor. Seabed depth, conditions and environment are all very similar due to proximity.
3	**Benthic ecology (offshore) comments**		
3.1	**P11-LYR-3.4.3-PAP-Rev 01 – Marine Licence Application Clarifications A2**		
3.1.1	Comments 100, 111	JNCC are still of the opinion that decommissioning activities have not been fully considered. We believe that the Applicant has not taken a quantitative approach to the worst-case scenario for decommissioning and although the Applicant has stated that during the decommissioning stage the area of seabed impacted would be similar to the area assessed as impacted during construction, JNCC are of the opinion that without a quantitative approach to the assessment of decommissioning activities we are unable to assess the impact from the project as a whole. Given the potential recovery of the site over the course of the project lifespan, the impacts from decommissioning may therefore be 'new' impacts and should be accounted for. The Applicant has stated that upon commencement of decommissioning, assessments may indicate that the best environmental approach is to leave infrastructure in place, if this is the case, JNCC would expect to see robust evidence supporting this approach.	Noted, this will be addressed prior to decommissioning once a Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) assessment has been undertaken considering the latest technologies at the time and the baseline environment. The BPEO will accompany the relevant Marine licence application requirement (or equivalent at that stage) submitted for approval prior to the activities being undertaken.
3.1.2	Comment 101	JNCC believe that although the benthic assessment was based on a worst-case scenario with regards to the burial and protection of the Inter Array Cables (IACs), the issue of contradicting statements has not been addressed as outline in our response of 22 January 2025 (JNCC Reference, OIA-10573). We would expect consistency across documentation to ensure no confusion now, or in situations where future windfarms may reflect on the Llyr project for reference.	Noted, any required updates/corrections will be addressed in an Errata document submitted post consent.
3.1.3	Comment 108	JNCC note the Applicant's comments with regards to dividing the temporary and permanent impacts into offshore and inshore areas and reiterates that this would be useful in any further applications. JNCC welcome the clarification of a worst-case scenarios for cable repairs and reburial however, it is still unclear if additional protection has also been included in the worst-case scenario. JNCC reiterate our original comment made regarding placement of permanent and temporary impacts in different stages of the project and recommend that this is addressed in further applications, as this is a test and demonstration project, the ES submitted will likely set a precedent for future applications.	Noted
3.1.4	Comment 114	JNCC acknowledges that the details needed to undertake the assessment of benthic impacts are included in the relevant chapter, however JNCC expects consistency across all documentation as previously stated to ensure no confusion. The applicant has stated that "*The footprints detailed within the Benthic ecology chapter are specific to the impact pathways affecting benthic habitats specifically and may be different to those included in the assumptions log* .", we would ask that it is made clear in all documents what impacts are included in each figure to avoid confusion.	Noted

Gap Analysis - CAS-01352-L3N2P8 - Llŷr 1 Floating Offshore Wind Demonstration Project
Version: A3 **JNCC 2**

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
1	Marine Ornithology Comments	**Presentation of Population Viability Analyses (PVA) outputs**	
		We thank the Applicant for providing full PVA outputs relevant to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).	Noted
		In-combination assessment of lesser black-backed gull and Atlantic puffin features of Skomer, Skokholm and the Seas off Pembrokeshire/Sgomer, Sgogwm a Moroedd Penfro (SSSP) Special Protection Area (SPA) We maintain the need for in-combination assessments for lesser black-backed gull and Atlantic puffin features of SSSP SPA. Whilst the Llŷr alone contribution to mortality, as well as those from other projects, may individually be below a 1% of baseline mortality threshold set to determine whether a Population Viability Analysis (PVA) is required, this does not automatically exclude the need for an in-combination assessment. In-combination assessments are important for considering whether individual small impacts (e.g. those below 1% baseline mortality) may add up to be significant in-combination with other plans and projects. It could be that once in-combination mortality totals are calculated, this total passes the 1% baseline mortality threshold, and further consideration is required, for example through PVA.	This is addressed in the updated Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3 – dated 07 November 2025
		NRW (A) have concluded no Adverse Effect on Integrity (AEoI) in-combination for lesser black-backed gull and Atlantic puffin at SSSP SPA based on their own in-combination mortality calculations. We advise that the Applicant either provide their own calculation of in-combination mortality totals for these two species, or consider whether they agree with NRW (A)'s in-combination mortality calculations and if so present these in their own submission.	To confirm we agree with NRW (A)'s in-combination mortality calculations and the NRW (A) 's in combination mortality calculations are presented in the updated Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3 – dated 07 November 2026, as appendix 1
		We note that NRW-A's advice of the 29th July 2025 on Atlantic puffin appears to be misinterpreted. The Applicant states on page 9 "In providing their final response on Llŷr, dated 29 July 2025, NRW-A have agreed that the 111.63 puffin mortalities we have modelled in the Llŷr cumulative PVA against the SSSP SPA does represent a realistic 'worst-case' for the total impacts of all offshore wind projects within the wider Biologically Defined Minimum Population Scales (BDMPS), including those in Liverpool Bay.". However, in NRW-A's advice of the 29th July 2025 it states "…the in-combination PVA previously conducted by the Applicant - assuming 111 mortalities in-combination - may not necessarily present the worst-case scenario, particularly given that all relevant plans and projects have not been included in the in-combination assessment.". NRW-A do state that their full in-combination total calculations including all relevant plans and projects "…is a small increase compared to the 111 mortalities previously assessed via Llŷr's PVA…" and "…this would result in a negligible difference in the results of the PVA…". However, this is not the same as stating NRW-A's agreement with the 111 mortalities representing a realistic worst-case. We suggest the Applicant removes this sentence as it misrepresents NRW-A's advice.	This sentence has been removed from the the updated Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3 – dated 07 November 2025
		Statement on Collision Risk Modelling (CRM) and tip height We note our previous comments of 29th July 2025 regarding revised turbine parameters and whether this would make a significant difference to the outcome of CRM. We advise that clarity should be provided as to whether the worst-case scenario has still been modelled within the CRM, or whether the proposed revised turbine parameters would result in significantly different CRM results.	We confirm that the indicative worst-case for SLVIA (max turbine height to upper blade tip), does not affect the ornithological CRM as it does not alter any of the worst-case parameters that are material in this modelling, i.e., air gap, rotor radius/rotor diameter, or number of turbines. The Llŷr project is not proposing to reduce the modelled air gap (22m), nor to increase the blade length (rotor radius), nor increase the number of turbines beyond the worst-case parameters already modelled under CRM. As requested by JNCC and NRW (A), we will undertake a further round of post-consent CRM, at the appropriate time, once we've confirmed the final turbine selection (which will fall within the worst-case, as assessed, for all receptors)
	Marine Mammals	**Marine Mammals Mitigation Plan (MMMP)** We thank the Applicant for updating the Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (MMMP) to reflect discussions during JNCC's meeting with the project team on the 17th September 2025. As discussed in the meeting, additional text has been added to Section 2 Mitigation Method (p.3) that outlines a commitment to align with the JNCC, NE, and Cefas joint position on the use of noise abatement during piling. We note, however, previous text within the preceding paragraph on p.3 has not been removed which contradicts the new text. We advise this section is reviewed and updated.	The necessary text has been updated in the Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3 – dated 07 November 2026, line with the JNCC observations
		We also take this opportunity to highlight outstanding comments we have provided on this mitigation plan. While not specifically discussed in the meeting due to time constraints, we still expect these to be addressed. These are provided below.	Our responses to the outstanding comments are addressed below
		Piling The injury range proposed to be mitigated for piling is the instantaneous (SPLpeak) range. As advised previously (OIA-10438, 27th September 2024, OIA-10573, dated 22 January 2025; OIA-10904, dated 29 July 2025, and OIA-11008, 15th August 2025) we strongly disagree with the use of this metric. It is Statutory Nature Conservation Body (SNCB) advice to present dual metrics for impulsive noise assessments (unweighted SPLpeak and frequency-weighted Sound Exposure Level (SEL)) and that the metric predicting the most precautionary injury range (PTS) should be mitigated. This is our standard regulatory advice for all Welsh and English waters for previous projects. We recommend a commitment to do this is included in the draft MMMP, therefore presenting the worst-case injury range for the SELcum metric that mitigation shall be based upon. It can be caveated with a statement to consider best practice at the time of finalising the mitigation plan, however at this time both the SPLpeak and cumulative SEL metrics need to be mitigated. We agree that the final plan can be agreed with regulators and SNCBs post-consent provided this agreement is again secured at consent.	The draft MMMP has been updated to include a commitment to use the dual metrics for impusive noise assessments in line with the JNCC recommendations.
		Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) clearance For UXO clearance, as discussed in previous response letters (OIA-10573, dated 22 January 2025; OIA-10904, dated 29 July 2025), we advise that the draft MMMP should clearly state a commitment to align with the DEFRA joint guidance, published in January 2025. This guidance has been adopted by Welsh Government, NRW (advisory and licencing) and JNCC.	The draft MMMP has been updated to include a commitment to align with the DEFRA joint guidance in line with the JNCC recommendations.
		Entanglement The draft MMMP still does not include any mitigation/monitoring methodology in relation to entanglement. We strongly advise the Applicant to re-visit JNCC and NRW-A's previous advice (OIA-10573, dated 22 January 2025; OIA-10904, dated 29 July 2025) in relation to mitigation proposals for entanglement risk to marine mammals as these contain recommendations, (including examples) on different potential entanglement mitigation methodologies.	The draft MMMP has been updated to include a commitment to address entanglement risk and will monitor for, and remove, marine debris caught on cables as part of the regular surveys of subsea infrastructurein line with the JNCC recommendations.
		JNCC agree that detailed requirements for entanglement monitoring could be discussed post-consent prior to the commencement of works (post-consent), through written consultation and written agreement with both JNCC and NRW-A. However, a commitment or outline of how the project will address this impact pathway should be included within this draft MMMP.	The draft MMMP has been updated to include a commitment to Design and frequency of this monitoring will be agreed with the Regulator and SNCBs post-consent once final design parameters – particularly number of turbines and number of mooring lines – are confirmed.
		Additional comments Our comments above seek to directly address the latest draft MMMP provided by the Applicant. We would also like to take this opportunity to highlight the following points regarding information provided to support the HRA process (see letter OIA-10573, dated 22 January 2025, for detailed responses). Our position on these items remains unchanged and our advice to NRW-L will reflect that if no further information is provided.	Noted
		Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA)	

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
		Currently the worse-case scenario for disturbance from piling has not been assessed for the Bristol Channel Approaches Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or West Wales Marine SAC. Without this, JNCC will be advising the licensing authority that the Applicant has not provide sufficient information for them to undertake an appropriate assessment.	
			To confirm the worst case scenario is 20 full days of piling over a 45 day period (the additional 25 days provides contingency in the construction scheduling to allow for periods of down-time due to poor weather potential, moving of piling equipment from one turbine location to another, etc). iPCoD is unable to accommodate piling durations of less than a day, so that the modelled 'worst case' for Llŷr (as submitted) assumed 10 days of continuous piling, i.e., 24 hours per turbine for the maximum ten turbine scenario. The iPCoD 10 day piling activity model output identifies the number of Harbour porpoise impacted population as being less than 3 animals (99.99 % of un-impacted population after 12 years) and 0 animals (100% of un-impacted population after 12 years) for Grey Seal - source Llŷr 1 Floating Offshore Wind Farm, Environmental Statement, Volume 3 : Chapter 21 – Marine Mammals - "Table 21-36 Harbour porpoise iPCOD modelling results" and "Table 21-38 Grey seal iPCOD modelling results 20 days of full piling would represent a doubling of the impact assessed which would result in no more than 6 Harbour porpoise being impacted and even from an ultra-precautionary stance of quadrupling the impact (i.e. 4 x 10 days impact), this would result in no more than 12 Harbour porpoise and even fewer Grey seals being impacted, which is less than 1% of the total population of both species, which is of negligible significance. As a consequence, the worst-case scenario for disturbance from piling has been assessed for the Bristol Channel Approaches Special Area of Conservation (SAC) ant the West Wales Marine SAC and has resulted in a negligible significance outcome.
		To provide context, in our response OIA-10904, dated 29 July 2025, we acknowledged that the Llŷr project confirmed that the project envelope identified the minimum number of days of piling to be 20 but the marine mammal disturbance assessment for impact piling in both the Environmental Statement and the RIAA has used a maximum scenario of 10 days. The justification provided was that the underwater modelling was carried out early in the assessment process, with the project envelope updated after the modelling had been completed. In the P11-LYR-3.4.3-PAP-Rev 01 – Marine Licence Application Clarifications A2 document it was stated that the piling duration was '20-45' days, meaning the 20-day scenario is not the worst-case.	As above
		Effective Deterrent Ranges (EDRs) JNCC advice will be that Effective deterrent Ranges (EDRs) should be used for HRA purposes when managing noise disturbance in the two harbour porpoise SACs. This is for both project alone and in-combination assessment. JNCC previously advised (email to NRW-L dated 4th August 2023, OIA-10438, 27th September 2024; and OIA-10573, dated 22 January 2025) that EDRs be used when assessing noise disturbance within harbour porpoise sites. This approach has been adopted by JNCC and Natural England, who along with NRW-A, manage the Bristol Channel Approaches SAC. The West Wales SAC is jointly managed by JNCC and NRW-A. Currently, the project has only applied EDRs when assessing impacts from geophysical surveys. This approach has not been applied for any other noise source for which EDRs are available. We also highlight that updated EDRs have now been published (JNCC, 2025). In addition to updating the existing EDRs, it includes new EDRs for additional noise sources including the use of ADDs. This will also have to be considered in the RIAA.	The mitigation zone will be determined through consultation with SNCBs and informed by relevant JNCC guidelines for mitigation of impact to marine mammals from piling, geophysical surveys and explosions, as well as relevant EDRs. For the purpose of the draft MMMP, standard JNCC mitigation zones have been used. As above As above

Gap Analysis - CAS-01352-L3N2P8 - Llŷr 1 Floating Offshore Wind Demonstration Project
Version: A3 NRW(A)

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
1	**Offshore**		
1.1	**General Offshore Comments**	1. NRW (A) welcomes the additional information and clarifications provided by the Applicant in their recent submissions. NRW (A) has reviewed this information and, notwithstanding the advice raised herein, consider the majority of the clarifications to be satisfactory.	Noted
		2. NRW (A) notes the Applicant's reliance on post-consent mitigation (via post-consent conditions) across a number of offshore receptors in order to allow a conclusion of no significant effect under Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and no adverse effect on site integrity (AEoSI) under Habitats Regulations Assessments (HRA). Whilst this approach may be acceptable, the risks associated with the extensive post-consent obligations required to discharge conditions - including any further assessment(s) under HRA and/or EIA that may be required - should be clearly acknowledged. On the basis of the information presented, NRW (A) agrees in principle that the proposed mitigation measures presented by the Applicant and relied on in HRA and/or EIA assessments are capable of avoiding adverse effects on site integrity and/or likely significant effects in line with the conclusions. The advice of NRW (A) is that the Competent Authority (CA) will need to be assured that conditioning of mitigation measures, relied on in support of conclusions of HRA and/or EIA, will provide a secure mechanism that ensures that those mitigation measures will be guaranteed and effective. NRW (A) advises and requests that the CA makes any relevant environmental condition requiring mitigation measures, to be subject to a requirement for the Applicant to consult and obtain the agreement in writing from NRW (A) before it may be discharged.	Noted
		3. There are a number of instances where we advise NRW MLT that consideration should be given to the provision of an errata document to ensure the information and data associated with the project are clear. In line with our advice in January, some of the points raised are important from the perspective of this being a test and demonstration project, and so that for the avoidance of doubt NRW (A)'s position on these matters is clear and demonstrated in the public record for the benefit of this project and to inform future projects.	Noted
		4. For the avoidance of doubt, our advice on the CA's draft HRA is based on the updated Conservation Advice Packages published 25th June 2025: Natural Resources Wales / Conservation advice for European marine sites (Reg 37).	Noted
1.2	**Physical Processes**		
1.2.1	Overall Comments	5. NRW (A) welcomes the clarifications, additional information and further assessment provided by the Applicant in response to our comments made on 29 January 2025 relating to; methodologies associated with Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) and numerical modelling of Suspended Sediment Concentration (SSC) plumes, cumulative impact assessments, assessing impacts of decommissioning, seabed recovery and the potential for cable protection measures to reduce water depth. Following a review of the additional information provided, NRW (A) has no major concerns to raise with respect to physical processes - please see individual comments for further details.	Noted
1.2.2	Detailed Comments		
1.2.2.1	Clarifications Spreadsheet	6. NRW (A) welcomes the additional information, provided at Number / reference 12, 13, 18, 19, 21 & 25 of the Clarifications Spreadsheet, relating to the construction phase for the HDD exit pits, including confirmation that excavated material will be used for the backfilling of the HDD exit pits. NRW (A) has no further concerns to raise with respect to assessing changes in seabed roughness. NRW (A) also note that maintenance dredging is not required and therefore not assessed. We are content with the rationale provided and this is now resolved.	Noted
		7. Following confirmation of a four-week period of exit pit exposure, NRW (A) are content that no further assessment of the construction phase of the HDD exit pits, including potential modifications to the wave and current climate, is required.	Noted
		8. NRW (A) acknowledges and welcomes the additional clarification regarding the consideration of baseline data describing seasonal variability in the beach profile at the proposed HDD exit pit locations, and the additional justification for the 3m burial depth. There are no further concerns to raise regarding the burial depth of proposed HDD exit pits.	Noted
		9. NRW (A) acknowledges and welcomes the additional information, provided at Number / reference 14 & 20 of the Clarification Spreadsheet, regarding the project-specific inputs to the numerical spreadsheet models used to assess potential impacts of SSC plumes during the construction phase of the proposed project. In particular, we welcome the presentation and justification of representative current speed and sediment type used. NRW (A) has no further concerns to raise with respect to the methodology of the numerical spreadsheet modelling.	Noted
		10. NRW (A) acknowledges the clarifications provided at Number / reference 15, 23, 24 & 30 of the Clarification Spreadsheet, relating to inconsistencies in the reporting of project design details between Volume 1: Chapter 4 and Volume 3: Chapter 17. We have no further concerns to raise.	Noted
		11. NRW (A) acknowledges and welcomes the additional assessment (as noted at Number / reference 16, 28 & 29 of the Clarification Spreadsheet) of the potential cumulative impacts of SSC plumes, in particular the additional assessment with respect to finer sediments that remain in suspension for longer periods. NRW (A) agrees with the conclusion of the additional assessment and has no further concerns to raise with respect to the potential cumulative impacts of SSC plumes.	Noted
		12. NRW (A) also welcomes the further assessment and justification given to the potential cumulative impacts of sand-wave levelling and cable protection along the Offshore Export Cable Corridor (OfECC) where the Llŷr offshore project boundary and the Erebus export cable corridor overlap. NRW (A) are content with the conclusion that, given the localised nature of the potential impacts of sand-wave levelling along the 10km of cable corridor where the impacts of the two projects overlap, the potential for cumulative impacts between projects is unlikely.	Noted
		13. NRW (A) acknowledges the commitment to a post-consent licence condition related to the Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) and Cable Specification and Installation Plan (CSIP) (see Number / reference 17 of the Clarification Spreadsheet). Provided that NRW (A) is consulted in writing on the suitability of the CBRA, CSIP, and pre-construction surveys via appropriate conditions before works commence, we have no further concerns.	Noted
		14. NRW (A) acknowledges the commitment (Number / reference 22 of the Clarification Spreadsheet) to monitoring seabed recovery rates (e.g. targeted bathymetric surveys along parts of the cable route) as a routine part of construction and operation, and to discussing the sharing of monitoring data to inform future projects and substantiate the conclusions of the Environmental Statement (ES). We suggest that clarification is sought from the Applicant on the process by which seabed recovery monitoring plans can be assessed by NRW (A). For example, the commitment to monitoring seabed recovery rates and sharing data could be included in the CSIP. NRW (A) has no further concerns to raise on this matter.	The CSIP will be finalised with consultation with NRW(A) prior to works being undertaken. This will include the agreement on the appropriate seabed recovery monitoring process and how information is to be promulgated.
		15. NRW (A) acknowledges the commitment (Number / reference 26 of the Clarification Spreadsheet) to assess potential impacts on hydrodynamics and associated sediment transport processes as part of the CBRA, if any section of cable protection along the export cable corridor exceeds 5% of the navigable water depth referenced to chart datum. We welcome this commitment.	Noted
		16. NRW(A) acknowledges and welcomes the additional assessment and consideration of seabed recovery rates during decommissioning, as noted at Number / reference 27 of the Clarification Spreadsheet. We have no further concerns to raise with respect to decommissioning at this time.	Noted

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
1.2.2.2	ORML2465: Record of a Habitats Regulations Assessment of a project: Form 1	17. NRW (A) agrees with the overall conclusions of the HRA of no AEoSI for impact pathways related to physical processes.	Noted
		18. We note that potential 'blockage' impacts to bedload sediment transport processes via cable crossings requiring cable protection measures outlined in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Description of the Proposed Project (Section 4.5.3, para 104) are not identified as a potential impact pathway. We advise this potential impact pathway should be included in the screening assessment (Section 3.2.2) due to the potential for interruptions to sediment transport processes which support designated benthic habitat features within the Pembrokeshire Marine Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Due to the proximity of proposed cable crossings to the shore and designated features of the SAC, NRW (A) recognises that in this case, at the Appropriate Assessment (AA) stage of the HRA process, AEoSI could be ruled out and therefore, including this impact pathway would not make a material difference to the conclusion of the HRA.	Noted
1.2.2.3	ORML2465: Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment	19. NRW (A) agrees with the overall conclusion of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) Compliance Assessment, that the proposed project has no potential to cause deterioration of the Pembrokeshire South Coastal (GB611008590003) or Milford Haven Outer Coastal (GB641008220000) waterbody with respect to hydromorphology.	Noted
1.3	**Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology**		
1.3.1	Overall Comments	20. We have reviewed the responses in the Clarifications Spreadsheet and on the whole agree with all of the outcomes. We consider that one minor clarification should be sought in relation to the use of concrete versus natural rock cable protection.	Noted and agree to consult in writing with the SNCB's on the use of natural rock protection over concrete matressing within the CSIP and CBRA ahead of commencement of works
1.3.2	Detailed Comments		
1.3.2.1	Clarifications Spreadsheet	21. NRW (A) acknowledges the Applicant's commitment to undertake additional post-consent surveys (see Number / reference 32, 39-41, 43-45 in the Clarifications Spreadsheet) and ensure that any potential impacts to Annex 1 reef as a result of intersection with the Offshore Export Cable Corridor (OfECC) will be mitigated through demonstrating that there is no cable movement - either as a result of the weight of the cable itself, or through additional pinning where necessary. We agree that the scope and interpretation of the surveys need to be agreed in writing, prior to commencement of works, with NRW (A) as part of the post-consent licence condition (please also see paragraph 22 and 24 below). NRW (A) have no further concerns on this matter.	Noted
		22. NRW (A) acknowledges the Applicant's commitment (Number / reference 33, 42 of the Clarifications Spreadsheet) to ensuring that the post-consent CSIP and CBRA will develop a clear criterion informed by current guidance, to identify and differentiate between mixed gravel and low resemblance story reef to ensure that impacts on reef habitat are avoided in relation to boulder clearance activities. Provided that NRW (A) is consulted in writing on the suitability of the CSIP and CBRA via appropriate conditions before works commence, then we have no further concerns on this matter.	Noted
		23. NRW (A) acknowledges the Applicant's commitment (Number / reference 34 of the Clarifications Spreadsheet) to ensuring that all project vessels shall adhere to the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments (IMO, 2017). NRW (A) have no further concerns on this matter.	Noted
		24. NRW (A) acknowledges the Applicant's commitment (Number / reference 36 & 38 of the Clarifications Spreadsheet) to consult NRW (A) in writing in relation to the scope and interpretation of the post-consent geophysical and geotechnical surveys, via the CBRA. NRW (A) have no further concerns on this matter.	Noted
		25. Regarding the assessment to ensure all potential interactions with Pembrokeshire Marine SAC Annex 1 Reef feature are avoided (See Number / Reference 37 of the Clarifications Spreadsheet) - due to the Applicant's commitment to ensure the cable will be secured in place (either through the weight of the cable or through pinning), NRW (A) have no further concerns in relation to the assessment provided.	Noted
		26. NRW (A) acknowledges that the Applicant will consider the use of natural rock protection over concrete mattressing to reduce the potential impact of Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) and encourage general biodiversity (see Number / reference 43 in the Clarifications Spreadsheet). NRW (A) recommend this element being included in the post-consent review of the CSIP and CBRA to provide further clarification as to how this element will be considered.	Noted and agree to consult in writing with the SNCB's on the use of natural rock protection over concrete matressing within the CSIP and CBRA ahead of commencement of works
		27. NRW (A) acknowledges the Applicant's commitment to ensuring a risk based approach to monitoring the cable protection infrastructure and potential presence of INNS, to confirm assumptions made in the ES is incorporated (see Number / reference 44 of the Clarifications Spreadsheet). NRW (A) have no further concerns on this matter.	Noted
		28. With regard to NRW (A)'s advice that the potential impacts on the Pembrokeshire Marine SAC Annex 1 reef in relation to the OfECC should be included in the assessment of impacts, we note the Applicant's response (Number / reference 45 & 47 of the Clarifications Spreadsheet) that no further assessment is necessary due to the mitigation measures presented in the form of weighted (articulated cable) and/or pinning where necessary. However, due to the nature of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), we reiterate the requirement to identify all potential impact pathways. As it stands in the Environmental Statement (ES) presented, this has not been undertaken. Nevertheless, NRW (A) note that the accompanying HRA undertaken by the NRW MLT has acknowledged and incorporated this potential impact pathway. Therefore, NRW (A) have no further concerns on this matter.	Noted
		29. With respect to the Applicants response at Number / reference 46 of the Clarifications Spreadsheet - NRW (A) acknowledges and welcomes the Applicants commitment to further discussion with NRW (A) relating to general biodiversity gain and colonisation of native flora and fauna on cable protection, as part of the CSIP, CBRA and Project Environmental Management Plan (PEMP). NRW (A) have no further concerns on this matter.	Noted
		30. NRW (A) acknowledges the Applicants commitment to ensuring that a full biosecurity risk assessment will be undertaken for all development phases (see Number / reference 49 & 50 of the Clarifications Spreadsheet). We advise particular diligence in relation to the presence of Didemnum vexillum in the Milford Haven waterway with all biosecurity management measures. The Biosecurity Risk Assessment and Management Plan should be agreed in writing with NRW (A) via appropriate condition. NRW (A) have no further concerns on this matter.	Noted
1.3.2.2	ORML2465: Record of a Habitats Regulations Assessment of a project: Form 1	31. NRW (A) agrees with the overall conclusions of the HRA of no AEoSI for impacts on benthic ecology receptors. This includes those measures indicated in the HRA that can be secured though a licence condition.	Noted
1.3.2.3	ORML2465: Water Framework Directive: Compliance Assessment	32. NRW (A) agrees with the conclusions of the WFD assessment in relation to impacts on benthic ecology receptors.	Noted
1.4	**Marine Water and Sediment Quality (MW&SQ)**		
1.4.1	Overall Comments	33. NRW (A) considers the standard of the Applicant's assessment of the impacts to marine water and sediment quality (MW&SQ) to be generally good. We remain satisfied that appropriate impact pathways have been accounted for and that the relevant aspects of the marine environment have been assessed for impact. We welcome the clarifications provided by the Applicant in the Clarifications Spreadsheet.	Noted
1.4.2	Detailed comments		
1.4.2.1	Clarifications Spreadsheet	34. The Project proposal states that any adverse effects may be mitigated through adherence to best practise and through methodology design considerations (e.g. ES Volume 3, Chapter 18: Marine Water and Sediment Quality 52.Section 18.7 Embedded Mitigation, Management Plans and Good Practice, Table 18-14: Mitigation measures, management plans and best practice adopted as part of the proposed Project).	Noted

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
		35. Whilst we are satisfied that the Applicant's assessment is adequate, we consider that the project is dependent on using the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), the Water Quality and Pollution Management Plan (WQPMP) and Drilling Plan to avoid conclusions of significant impact for the project alone, cumulatively and in-combination.	Noted
		36. Nonetheless, we maintain our position that it is possible to adequately mitigate any negative effects and undesirable impacts to the quality of marine water and sediment.	Noted
		37. If the CEMP and WQPMP cannot be provided before a licence is granted, then, in order to ensure that the plans adequately mitigate the potential negative effects, NRW (A) advise that we are consulted in writing and agree the suitability of the CEMP and WQPMP ahead of commencement of works (see Number / reference 52 of the Clarifications Spreadsheet).	Noted and agree to consult in writing the suitability of the CEMP and WQPMP ahead of commencement of works
		38. In consideration of the reliance on these measures to conclude no significant effect, the Applicant should make explicit the links from the identified effect-pathways to the proposed mitigation in their CEMP. The mitigation should contain a clear description of how the proposed measures will be carried out to avoid or reduce the identified effects and/or ameliorate the impact of the effects. This description can be high-level, however, as a minimum it should include the full pathway through source, pressure and mitigation applied to reduce the impact.	Noted and agree to consult in writing the suitability of the CEMP and WQPMP ahead of commencement of works
		39. We continue to welcome the proposals to monitor the water quality during the works to verify the efficacy of the mitigation measures proposed. We continue to recommend that this commitment is captured as a condition of consent, and the detail of which should be agreed with NRW (A) in writing. We note that the monitoring must be adequate to detect change in the marine environment and must result in positive action to mitigate the effects of the change.	Noted and agree to consult in writing the suitability of the CEMP and WQPMP ahead of commencement of works
1.4.2.2	ORML2465: Record of a Habitats Regulations Assessment of a project: Form 1	40. Whilst NRW (A) agrees with a conclusion of no AEoSI when "… *taking into account any conditions or restrictions as applicable*… ", we disagree with aspects of the CA's assessment process to reach these conclusions. Further detail is provided below, alongside recommendations to the CA to improve the assessment. We welcome discussion with the CA on these aspects.	Noted
		Section 3.2, Likelihood of significant effects (LSE) test 41. NRW (A) agrees that the appropriate protected areas have been included for assessment by the CA and that the appropriate pressures and source-pathways have been included for the test of likely significant effects.	Noted
		Section 4.2, Assessment of the project taking into account additional mitigating measures, conditions or restrictions 42. NRW (A) can agree with the conclusion of the assessment of no AEoSI, subject to the inclusion of a post-consent condition to provide the requested mitigation as noted above, the detail and suitability of which is to be agreed in writing with NRW (A) – this should include detail of the mechanisms for reducing the identified effects, or reducing the impacts of those effects.	Noted and agree to consult in writing the suitability of the CEMP and WQPMP (including detail of the mitigation mechanisms for reducing the identified effects) ahead of commencement of works
1.4.2.2.1	Advice on the assessment	43. Although it is not necessary to provide all the details of the proposed mitigation at this stage of the HRA process, a high-level summary containing information about the effects to be mitigated, with information of how the mitigation will be put in to place, would increase the quality of the assessment presented by the CA.	Noted - an updated mitigation schedule/regster will be issued post consent. This will include the effects to be mitigated.
		44. To support a conclusion of no adverse effect, the links between the proposed mitigating activities and the mechanism for reducing adverse effects should be made explicit at AA, and it should be made clear that any conclusion of no AEoSI is dependent on the full development, implementation and adherence to any proposed mitigation. Further, any schemes (e.g. on-site monitoring) for determining the efficacy of the proposed mitigation must include details of how they will lead to controls on an activity that is found to be having an adverse or deleterious effect that may affect protected sites or designated features.	Noted - the project is commmiteent to implementation and adherance to the proposed mitigation.
1.4.2.3	ORML2465: Water Framework Directive: Compliance Assessment	45. NRW (A) agrees with a conclusion that the project has no potential to cause deterioration of any water body or WFD Protected Area from meeting its objectives when "… taking into account any conditions or restrictions as applicable…". However, we disagree with aspects of the CA's assessment process to reach these conclusions. Further detail is provided below, alongside recommendations to the CA to improve the assessment. We welcome discussion with the CA on these aspects.	Noted
	Stage 2 Scoping Assessment	46. The WFD compliance assessment notes that the mitigation proposals to be included in the CEMP (and associated documentation) will ameliorate any negative effects that would otherwise cause deterioration to a WFD waterbody, or an area protected under the WFD regulations.	Noted
		47. Ideally, and in order to increase the quality of the CA's compliance assessment, further detail of the proposed post-consent licence condition mitigation should be provided. These details would help determine the suitability of the proposed mitigation in the context of the identified effects and their impacts, and demonstrate that the proposals for embedded mitigation are sufficient to support the conclusions of no deterioration (allowing determination of their suitability in the context of the effects identified and the impacts of those effects). If the detail of the proposed mitigation cannot be provided at this stage, then we continue to advise that mitigation is secured via a post-consent condition, and that NRW (A) must be consulted in writing and agree the suitability of the plans ahead of commencement of works.	Noted and agree to consult in writing the suitability of the CEMP and WQPMP (including detail of the mitigation mechanisms for reducing the identified effects) ahead of commencement of works
1.4.2.3.1	Advice on the assessment	48. Ideally, detailed information outlining the proposed mitigating activities (to be included as post-consent licence conditions through a CEMP) should be included in the detailed assessment. Links between the mitigation activities and how they will ameliorate the impacts of the Project activities should be made clear.	Noted - an updated mitigation schedule/regster will be issued post consent. This will include the effects to be mitigated.
	Protected Areas and Critical sensitive habitats/species Stage 2, step 2: Page 32	49. The WFD compliance assessment includes consideration of five Bathing Waters sites, but does not assess the Broadhaven South and Barafundle Bathing Waters sites. No information is provided to show that these two sites are beyond the Zone of Influence (ZoI) delineated by the spring tidal excursion, and the additional 2km buffer to be applied beyond the ZoI.	The bathing waters specified have not been included since they are outside the 2km required screening distance and are also beyond the zone of influence of all project impact pathways. The scope of the assessement and identification of the Spring Tidal Excursion Buffer (The study area and ZoI for Marine Water and Sediment Quality) is presented in figure 18.1 (as stated in paragraph 10 of Volume 6: Appendix 10D – Offshore Water Framework Directive Assessment). This ZoI area extends as far as St Govans Head in the South West, but does not extend to the Broadhaven South and Barafundle Bathing Waters sites, so they are not considered.
1.4.2.3.2	Advice on the assessment	50. Protected areas such as bathing waters sites (as specified in the WFD regulations) up to 2km outside of the ZoI should also be considered for impact assessment.	The bathing waters specified have not been included since they are outside the 2km required screening distance and are also beyond the zone of influence of all project impact pathways. The scope of the assessement and identification of the Spring Tidal Excursion Buffer (The study area and ZoI for Marine Water and Sediment Quality) is presented in figure 18.1 (as stated in paragraph 10 of Volume 6: Appendix 10D – Offshore Water Framework Directive Assessment)
		51. A map/chart showing the extent of the ZoI of the project with an overlay of the bathing waters sites in the vicinity would illustrate which sites lie within the affected area, and those that lie beyond the ZoI extent, and those that should be considered for assessment that are outside the ZoI extent, but that fall within the additional 2km buffer stipulated by the WFD guidance.	The scope of the assessement and identification of the Spring Tidal Excursion Buffer (The study area and ZoI for Marine Water and Sediment Quality) is presented in figure 18.1 (as stated in paragraph 10 of Volume 6: Appendix 10D – Offshore Water Framework Directive Assessment)
		52. We refer to the Applicants Clarification Spreadsheet (Number / reference 69) and continue to advise that the numerically modelled ZoI should dictate the spatial bounds around which an assessment of adverse or deleterious effects should be assessed. 53. We refer to GN 078 Complying with the WFD Regulations 2017: screening (Step 2) for further information on identifying the relevant waterbodies (and protected areas) to include for assessment.	As stated in the clarification statement 69 The bathing waters specified have not been included since they are outside the 2km required screening distance and are also beyond the zone of influence of all project impact pathways. As above
	Stage 2, step 1, Page 11	54. We recommend that an assessment of bentonite pollution is assessed for the Pembrokeshire South waterbody (as well as Milford Haven Outer). If referred to, the assessment must be explicit that the "no significant effects" conclusion stated in the EIA ES is only valid when appropriate mitigation is taken into account. This mitigation should form a post-consent condition of the licence, the details of which should be referred to in this assessment.	Noted and agree to consult in writing the suitability of the CEMP and WQPMP (including detail of the mitigation mechanisms for reducing the identified effects) ahead of commencement of works

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
	Protected Areas and Critical sensitive habitats/species Stage 2, step 2, Page 32	55. Shellfish waters: We agree that there are no shellfish waters that are within the vicinity of the proposed activity (within the ZoI or within 2km of the ZoI) and no further assessment is required.	Noted
		56. SACs/SPAs/RAMSAR: The appropriate European Protected Sites have been identified.	Noted
	Stage 3: Detailed Assessment	57. NRW (A) agrees with the conclusions of the WFD compliance assessment that the risk of the activity preventing the Milford Haven Outer waterbody from meeting its objectives and the risk of deterioration of the Milford Haven Outer waterbody can be ruled out.	Noted
		58. If the effects of pollution from a bentonite spill on the Pembrokeshire South waterbody are assessed / included in the compliance assessment, then NRW (A) can agree with the conclusion that the risk of the activity preventing the Pembrokeshire South waterbody from meeting its objectives and the risk of deterioration can be ruled out.	Noted and agree to consult in writing the suitability of the CEMP and WQPMP (including detail of the mitigation mechanisms for reducing the identified effects) ahead of commencement of works
1.5	**Fish and Shellfish Ecology**		
1.5.1	Overall Comments	59. NRW (A) acknowledges and welcomes the clarifications that the Applicant has provided in response to our advice on fish receptors. We have reviewed the responses in the Clarifications spreadsheet and although we do not entirely agree with the Applicant's responses on all matters, we consider our previous issues resolved.	Noted
1.5.2	Detailed Comments		
1.5.2.1	Clarification Spreadsheet	60. With respect to the area of suitable sandeel habitat affected within the development area (quantitative compared to qualitative assessment) (Number / Reference 91), we disagree with the Applicant that it is not considered appropriate to calculate the potential areas of effect as a percentage of the total area of available habitat. Nor do we agree with the reasons cited. This was communicated to the Applicant on 16 May 2025. We have clearly stated previously that this information is required to inform the magnitude of effect and to contextualise any impacts, especially relating to any potential cumulative effects. Nonetheless, using professional judgement, and considering the spatial scale of the development (with respect to impacts on fish) and the limited nature of piling, on this occasion we are satisfied that the Applicant need not undertake further quantitative work on this aspect. For future reference, we advise that a reference is provided for the information that has been cited with respect to CEFAS advice to support any further information being provided to decision-making authorities.	Noted
1.5.2.2	ORML2465: Record of a Habitats Regulations Assessment of a project: Form 1	61. We agree overall with the conclusions of no AEoSI for migratory fish features of Welsh sites.	Noted
		62. However, we note the following: • Tables 9 and 10, page 30-34 Severn Estuary Ramsar and Severn Estuary SAC The migratory fish assemblage feature of the Ramsar includes sea trout and European eel, and these should be included in the table. In addition, for the Severn Estuary SAC, the notable species sub-feature of the estuary feature includes: salmon, eel, sea trout and Allis shad, and the Assemblage of fish species (>100 species). These features should also have been taken forward for Appropriate Assessment in Section 4. • We note that soft-start procedures have been included as mitigation for impacts to migratory fish features from underwater noise from piling activities. We advise that there is no evidence to support the use of soft-start as mitigation for fish, however given the short duration of the activities and the limited spatial extent of the noise impact, we agree that adverse effects on site integrity can be ruled out.	Noted
1.5.2.3	ORML2465: Water Framework Directive: Compliance Assessment	63. We agree with the conclusions of the draft WFD compliance assessment.	Noted
1.6	**Marine Ornithology**		
1.6.1	Clarification Documents	64. We welcome the clarification documents submitted by the Applicant (Marine Ornithology Clarification Notes 1-4 and in the Clarifications spreadsheet) and post-submission discussions with the Applicant to try to resolve some of our previous concerns. Whilst these have addressed some of the previous issues raised by NRW (A) on the original submission consultation (please see NRW (A)'s response dated 29 January 2025), it is our view that there remain some outstanding areas where the Applicant still has not supplied sufficient information for NRW (A) to provide appropriate advice to NRW MLT to make an informed consent decision. These issues are detailed below in Section 1.6.1.1 – Section 1.6.1.4 below and a summary table is provided at Section 1.6.1.5. It remains our view that the Applicant should have supplied this information. However, given the stage of the consenting process the project is at, in order to be enabling and to expedite a consenting decision, NRW (A) has undertaken its own work to provide MLT with the information required to make an informed decision. The details of this work, together with our advice on the conclusions on significance of impact at EIA, and on impacts to site integrity for HRA, are detailed in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 respectively. In addition, Appendix 3 details our comments on the Applicant's interim marine ornithology clarification notes, dated 28 March 2025.	The Llyr project team notes the NRW(A) response and appreciates the proactive actions undertaken to ensure that the application proceeds.
		65. We continue to agree with the conclusions of no significant effect at EIA and no AEoSI at HRA for the project alone. We also now agree with the conclusions of no significant impact at EIA scale, and no AEoSI at HRA scale, for the project cumulatively and in-combination with other plans and project. This conclusion has only been reached as a result of the additional cumulative / in-combination work undertaken by NRW (A). We strongly advise that the approach adopted by Llŷr for cumulative effects assessment / in-combination assessment should not be followed by other Applicants, and that future Applicants undertake thorough and comprehensive assessments.	Noted
1.6.1.1	Commitment to limit turbine tip height to 300 meters above Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT) within the Project Design Envelope	66. The Applicant notes, at Number / Reference 15, of the 'NRW(A) SLVIA' tab in the Clarifications spreadsheet, that: '….in recognition of the concerns raised by NRW and the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority (PCNPA), the project team has reevaluated the Project Design Envelope and will commit to limit the turbine tip height to 300 meters above Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT) within the Project Design Envelope.'	Noted

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
		67. We note this commitment. However, it is unclear from the statement provided what this means in terms of the turbine parameters that feed into the ornithological collision risk model (CRM), and, what this subsequently means for ornithological collision predictions from the project. For example: • It is unclear whether this commitment would mean that the hub height and lower blade tip (i.e. air gap above sea level) is also proportionately reduced, or not. We assume, however, that the lower tip height would not drop below the current modelled 22m clearance of the sea surface as we understand this is the minimum requirement for navigation purposes. Therefore, we also assume that this reduction in upper blade tip height will result in a reduction to the overall rotor swept area of the project and hence some reduction to the collision risk predictions. • It is also unclear whether this commitment would result in a reduction in rotor blade radius and hence a potential increase in rotor speed. However, in order to understand this further, together with JNCC, we have run different CRM scenarios for kittiwake with decreased tip height and increased rotor speed. Our analysis shows that given the relatively small number of predicted collisions from the Llŷr project alone, this would not materially alter the predicted alone impacts and conclusions for the project alone and hence cumulatively/in-combination. However, we advise that for a larger site with a greater number of predicted collisions this may not be the case, therefore in such cases, we would require further information on whether and how much the rotor radius and rotor speed could change. This should be noted for future project applications.	Noted - To clarify the commitment to limit the maximum turbine height to 300m, does not affect the ornithological CRM as it does not alter any of the worst-case parameter's material for the modelling,i.e., air gap, rotor radius/rotor diameter, or number of turbines. The Llŷr project is not proposing to reduce the modelled air gap (22m), nor to increase the blade length (rotor radius), nor increase the number of turbines beyond the worst-case parameters already modelled under CRM.
		68. Given that the Llŷr project alone collision predictions may now be overly precautionary, we recommend that NRW MLT request that the Applicant provides a clarification note (as an errata) that contains revised project alone collision predictions at EIA and HRA scale for the revised worst case scenario (WCS) turbine parameters. This information should include the project alone CRM predictions for the actual WCS for each species (by month/season) for EIA scale, and relevant HRA scale. We recommend that the information is provided either pre-consent as an errata document, or potentially as a condition of any license post-consent. This is in order to ensure the most appropriate project figures are made available for use by future projects that include the Llŷr project in their cumulative/in-combination assessments and to reduce precaution in any such future cumulative/in-combination assessments.	We are willing to commit (as requested by JNCC and NRW (A)) to undertake a further round of post-consent CRM at an appropriate time once the final turbine selection has been confirmed (which will fall within the worst-case, as assessed, for all receptors) to ensure that the appropriate Llŷr parameters are fed into future CRM modelling undertaken for other future projects.
1.6.1.2	Cumulative & In-Combination Issues		
1.6.1.2.1	Previous NRW (A) advice on original consultation	69. Following the original Llŷr application submission, NRW (A) were able to advise MLT, in January 2025, that the proposed development alone would not cause significant adverse effects at EIA scale, or AEoSI at HRA scale, for any seabird populations or Special Protection Area (SPAs) / Ramsars with seabird qualifying features with potential connectivity with the proposal. This advice remains the case.	Noted
		70. However, we were unable to assess and hence provide advice to NRW MLT regarding the potential levels of significance of cumulative and in-combination impacts due to a lack of information provided by the Applicant. We considered that additional work was needed on the cumulative and in-combination assessments to fully understand the impact that the proposed development will have on marine ornithology receptors. We also noted that, where applicable, the Llŷr project could utilise data from the Mona assessments to present and assess the required cumulative and in-combination impacts (please refer to our full initial response which can be accessed from the Public Register - paragraphs 178 – 180).	Noted
1.6.1.2.2	Applicant's Initial Response: 25 03 28 – Llŷr – marine ornithology – clarification note 1 – cumulative & in-combination	71. In response to the issues noted in Section Error! Reference source not found. above, the Applicant produced 'Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 1', which provided a comparison of the Applicant's calculated Llŷr project alone EIA scale predicted impacts with those included for the Llŷr project by the Mona project in its cumulative assessments. No cumulative or in-combination totals were presented by the Applicant for Llŷr, nor were any cumulative or in-combination assessments presented. Hence NRW (A) advised the Applicant, during a call on 02 May 2025, that we considered that the information presented was not sufficient to address the concerns previously raised regarding the lack of provision of appropriate cumulative and in-combination assessments, and that further work was required. This advice was also provided in writing to the Applicant via email on 02 May 25, and a copy of the advice can be found in Appendix 3.	Noted
		72. During the call, we advised that the Applicant should be able to resolve the outstanding concerns regarding the current lack of appropriate cumulative and in-combination assessments relatively straightforwardly by, as a minimum: • For each EIA species and SPA site/feature combination - present the cumulative or in-combination collision or displacement predicted total calculated by Mona, with reference to the specific Mona document and table number this has been taken from. • For each EIA species and SPA site/feature combination - present an assessment of the % baseline mortality the predicted cumulative/in-combination total equates to of the relevant population. Where this equates to less than 1% of baseline mortality of the respective population, the cumulative/in-combination total can be considered undetectable against background mortality and hence a conclusion of no significant impact can be made for EIA scale, or that an AEoSI could be ruled out for HRA scale. • Where the predicted cumulative/in-combination totals exceed 1% of baseline mortality of the respective populations, then this will require further consideration through Population Viability Analysis (PVA). Again, in instances where this occurs and Mona have also undertaken a PVA, the Mona PVAs can be considered to represent best available evidence at this time, and hence as a minimum the Llŷr Applicant could consider referring to these PVAs and presenting information including the output metrics (counterfactuals of population size and growth rate, growth rates, final population size etc.) from these and reach conclusions based on these in any updated assessment. • As noted in our previous comments, there may be site/species combinations relevant for the Llŷr assessment where the Mona Applicant has not presented an in-combination assessment (e.g. Skomer, Skokholm and seas of Pembrokeshire (SSSP) SPA puffin and lesser black-backed gull (LBBG)). In such instances, the cumulative figures will be available from the Mona documents and hence the Llŷr Applicant should be able to undertake an apportionment exercise on the cumulative figures. In order to produce an indicative in-combination impact for such site features, we suggest that a similar approach to that used by Mona for other sites/species is used – so for breeding season apportionment, where there is no information available for relevant projects within foraging range from a colony, use the breeding season apportionment rate for the nearest project with information. For the non-breeding seasons take the approach used by Llŷr themselves in the apportioning for the project alone, e.g. for SSSP SPA puffin for the non-breeding season use an apportioning weighting of 0.029 for all projects and for SSSP SPA LBBG for autumn and spring use 0.083 and for winter use 0.094 for all projects.	Noted
1.6.1.2.3	Applicant's Subsequent Response: 25 05 21 – Llŷr – marine ornithology – clarification note 3: further info on cumulative & in-combination – final	73. In response to the discussion and advice provided by NRW (A) on 'Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 1', the Applicant produced 'Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3'. In this document the Applicant addressed some further issues, namely: • In tables 1, 2 and 4 of 'Clarification Note 3' the Applicant has presented the cumulative or in-combination collision, or displacement predicted total, calculated by Mona for each species and site/feature - with reference to the specific Mona document and table number this has been taken from. However, we note that for guillemot, razorbill, puffin and gannet cumulative displacement assessments, the Applicant has not included the additional mortalities from underwater collisions from tidal energy sites that the Mona project did include. We have added these into our cumulative assessments in Appendix 1 below. • In tables 1, 2 and 4 of 'Clarification Note 3' the Applicant has, for each EIA species and SPA site/feature combination, presented the % of baseline mortality the predicted cumulative/in-combination total equates to of the relevant population. However, we note that the Applicant has not stated what the reference populations and mortality rates used are, meaning that the % baseline mortality the predicted impact equates to cannot be replicated – we believe these figures are a copy of those from the Mona documents and hence assume that the same populations and mortality rates as Mona used have been used by Llŷr (which we note are different to those used by the Llŷr Applicant in their original submission, especially for EIA). Therefore, in our detailed advice in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, we have included information on the populations and mortality rates used by Mona, which we assume Llŷr have also used.	Noted

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
		74. However, the remaining issues that NRW (A) advised were provided have still not been presented by the Applicant. In summary, in 'Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 3' the Applicant still has not provided the following: • Where indicative cumulative/in-combination impacts equate to greater than 1% of baseline mortality of the respective population, no PVA metrics from the Mona PVAs have been presented by the Applicant in Clarification Note 3 – all the Applicant has done is list the species (EIA) and site/feature combinations (HRA) where Mona ran PVAs and direct the reader to the relevant table numbers to find this information in the Mona documents. This information should have been provided in order to evidence/justify the statements in 'Clarification Note 3' that: 'PVA outputs showed no significant population-level consequences…..' and to provide context to the Llŷr assessments. • No suitable assessments / conclusions for cumulative or in-combination impacts have been presented, or made, by the Applicant themselves in 'Clarification Note 3'. All the Applicant has done is simply repeat NRW (A)'s advice provided during the Mona project examination. The Applicant should have presented their own assessment of what the predicted impacts, and any PVA outputs, mean in terms of impacts to relevant populations - including to Conservation Objectives for HRA. • The Applicant has not undertaken any updated in-combination assessments for SSSP SPA, LBBG, or puffin, and has made no attempt to apportion the EIA scale figures to the colony.	Noted
		75. Despite the information and assessments provided, we still consider the information provided to be insufficient for NRW MLT to undertake an appropriately informed HRA for the in-combination assessment. We do not consider it appropriate for the Applicant to direct the CA / decision maker(s) to extract information themselves from the Mona documents in order to make an assessment to inform the HRA. We consider it correct that the Applicant should provide this information (in the context of the proposed project) for the CA to review and evaluate in their decision-making. It is our view that the approach adopted by the Applicant therefore potentially results in a lack of confidence that the CA can place on the information provided by the Applicant to support the AA and its conclusions - and hence, critically, poses a consenting risk for the project.	Noted
		76. Given the stage the project is at and in order to be enabling and to expedite a consenting decision, NRW (A) has therefore conducted its own work to provide the required information, assessment and advice to assist NRW MLT in reaching an appropriately informed decision on the Llŷr project proposals. This has included: • Extracting and providing the relevant Mona PVA outputs; • Undertaking our own apportionment of impacts for in-combination SSSP SPA puffin and LBBG gull impacts; and, • Provision of assessments of both cumulative and in-combination impacts.	Noted
		77. For clarity and completeness, the detail of this work and assessments is set out in Appendix 1 for cumulative impacts and assessment and in Appendix 2 for in-combination impacts and assessment.	Noted
		78. A summary of our advice following this work is set out in Table 1 in Section 1.6.1.5 below.	Noted
		79. It is our firm view that this information should have been presented upfront by the Applicant in order to help the decision maker / CA reach consent conclusions expediently. It is not the role of the SNCBs (or any other interested party) to undertake this work on behalf of an Applicant, and we have only done so extraordinarily in order to expedite and enable this consenting decision. This is something that future Applicants should not come to rely on being undertaken by the SNCBs.	Noted
1.6.1.3	Auk non-ID Apportioning		
1.6.1.3.1	Previous NRW (A) advice on original consultation	80. Following the original Llŷr application submission, NRW (A) requested clarity from the Applicant on how unidentified species that crossed multiple species/groups, or are more ambiguous, were apportioned. For example, regarding which unidentified species groupings were included; e.g. for razorbills and guillemots the groupings 'auk/shearwater species', 'auk/small gull species', 'auk species', and presumably 'large auk species' could all potentially include guillemots and razorbill. In addition, we advised that clarity be provided on how species were apportioned should species level data not be available for a survey. It will be important to fully understand the methods employed in apportioning records of such birds to species level, as the approaches taken could have implications for the appropriateness of overall abundance estimates of each species and hence on assessments and levels of predicted impacts.	Noted
1.6.1.3.2	Applicant's Initial Response: 25 03 28 – Llŷr – marine ornithology – clarification note 2 –auk non-ID apportioning 2	81. In response to the issues noted in Section Error! Reference source not found. above, the Applicant produced 'Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 2'. However, following review of this note, NRW (A) advised the Applicant that we would welcome further discussion/information regarding the calculations presented in Table 2 of 'Clarification Note 2', as we considered the table confusing and could not follow or replicate the calculations and requested that further explanation be provided as to how the calculations were made. Following this advice a separate call was held with NRW (A) and the Applicant to discuss this issue on 06 May 2025.	Noted
		82. During this call it became apparent that the apportioning of birds not identified to species level actually used the ratios of birds recorded to each relevant species within the wider Llŷr survey area rather than just the Llŷr proposed array and 2km buffer footprint. It also appeared that the contractor employs a hierarchical approach to the apportionment of such birds. This was not made clear in 'Clarification Note 2' and NRW (A) requested that this information along with full worked examples be presented in order to make the approach undertaken clear and its appropriateness be considered.	Noted
1.6.1.3.3	Applicant's Subsequent Response: 25 05 21 – Llŷr – marine ornithology – clarification note 4 – auk non-ID apportioning – further info – vs3	83. Following the discussion on the call of 06 May 2025, the Applicant produced 'Llŷr Marine Ornithological Clarification Note 4', which provided further detail on the methods and calculations employed to apportion birds identified to group level to species level. It also provided more detail on the calculations involved in the worked examples (see Table 2 of 'Clarification Note 4'). We consider that the additional information provided in this clarification note is clearer and we have been able to follow the numbers through and replicate the calculations and are content that this issue is now resolved.	Noted
1.6.1.4	Gannet macro avoidance	84. The Applicant's response to Number / Reference 153 of the 'NRW(A)-Offshore' tab of the Clarification Spreadsheet, highlights a note to MLT with respect to Gannet macro avoidance. That note states: *'To highlight to NRW-MLT - In their objection, the RSPB dispute the use of the 70% reduction for macro-avoidance, so this needs to be resolved by NRW. '*	Noted
		85. We note that during the Llŷr project pre-application engagement with NRW (A), advice was provided to the Applicant that there is a clear evidence base that gannets display macro-avoidance. Therefore, the collision assessment methodology requires the reduction of density of birds in flight by an agreed macro-avoidance rate as an input to the CRM, followed by using an 'all gulls' avoidance rate (AR) within the CRM. An evidence report has been commissioned by Natural England to inform this rate, until this is available, we suggest reducing density of gannet in flight going into the CRM by 70% to account for macro-avoidance. For clarity, this is NRW (A)'s current position on macro avoidance and has been clearly advised to the Applicant previously. This is also consistent with our advice given at Erebus and at Round 4 Irish Sea projects (this is also consistent with advice given by Natural England at the Round 4 projects).	Noted
		86. Whilst we acknowledge RSPB's comments at number / reference 153, we note that the Applicant has presented the Llŷr project alone and indicative in-combination impacts for (i) no application of macro avoidance, and (ii) with application of macro avoidance (see Table 4 of 'Clarification Note 3'). , Our advice below has been based on previous advice to the Applicant regarding approaches to accounting for gannet macro avoidance (see Table 1 below and detailed in Error! Reference source not found.). It is our view that no consideration of macro avoidance, is overly precautionary.	Noted
1.6.1.5	Summary of NRW (A) Advice	Table 1 Summary of conclusions for assessments of the Llŷr project alone and cumulatively at EIA scale and in-combination for HRA scale with other plans and projects for relevant species (see table 1 in original NRW reponse)	Noted
1.6.1.6	ORML2465: Record of a Habitats Regulations Assessment of a project: Form 1		

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
1.6.1.6.1	Main/Headline Comments	87. Please note that we have only provided comments/advice on SPAs that are located within Wales and are therefore within NRW's remit, namely: Skomer, Skokholm and Seas off Pembrokeshire (SSSP) SPA, Grassholm SPA and Aberdaron Coast and Bardsey Island SPA.	Noted
		88. Whilst we agree with the conclusions of no AEoSI for SSSP SPA and Grassholm SPA from the project alone and in-combination, we note that this is only because NRW (A) has had to undertake its own work on in-combination assessments (including extracting PVA metrics from the Mona project documents, apportioning of in-combination impacts to SSSP SPA Lesser Black-Backed Gull (LBBG) and puffin, and ultimately undertaking our own assessments based on these), as the assessments provided by the Applicant were insufficient. Please see Section 1.6.1.2 above and Appendices 1 and 2 below. We note that the draft HRA has not considered NRW (A)'s advice previously provided to MLT on 29 January 2025. Therefore, we suggest that the HRA is updated according to our advice of 29 January 2025 and as provided on the re-consultation (dated 29 July 2025).	Noted
		89. We note that in the draft HRA, the CA has not ruled out AEoSI pre-mitigation for entanglement with mooring lines and cables for the Manx shearwater and puffin features, and the guillemot and razorbill named components of the assemblage feature, of the SSSP SPA or the gannet feature of Grassholm SPA. However, with mitigation through 'regular inspection of the mooring lines', which would be implemented via the Project Environmental Management Plan, a conclusion of no AEoSI has been reached. For this to be considered mitigation, we suggest that this be updated to regular inspection of the mooring lines and removal of entangled debris and be secured through a licence condition and agreed in writing with NRW (A) and JNCC. Additionally, as part of the licence condition, we advise a requirement be included that the Applicant provide annual reports of the debris found entangled in the mooring lines, with the reports including frequency of entanglement, type of debris entangled and details of its removal. Given that the Llŷr project is a FLOW demonstrator project, providing this information will add to the evidence base for the frequency of entanglement of debris and of marine fauna with mooring lines and cables, which will aid with future FLOW impact assessments.	The draft MMMP has been updated to include a commitment by the Llŷr project to perform cable monitoring and report instances of marine debris caught on cables under a frequency and arrangement agreed with the Regulator and SNCBs.
1.6.1.6.2	Additional specific comments	90. Project details Table 1a of the draft HRA (page 2 of HRA): The information on the proposed activity states that: '*Up to 10 Wind Turbine Generators (WTGs), each with a maximum rotor diameter of 285m* ' Whilst we note that the maximum rotor diameter figure stated is correct based on the collision risk modelling information provided with the application, we note that the Applicant has since reevaluated the *Project Design Envelope and will commit to limit the turbine tip height to 300 meters above Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT) within the Project Design Envelope* – as stated in the 'NRW(A) SLVIA' tab of the '*Marine Licence Application Clarifications A2* ' spreadsheet. As noted in NRW (A)'s response to the clarification information provided by the Applicant, it is unclear what this commitment means in terms of the turbine parameters (rotor radius, rotor speed etc). We assume that it would result in a reduction to the maximum rotor radius. We advise that MLT seek clarification on this point from the Applicant if the HRA is to list the maximum rotor radius.	To clarify the commitment to limit the maximum turbine height to 300m, does not affect the ornithological CRM as it does not alter any of the worst-case parameter's material for the modelling,i.e., air gap, rotor radius/rotor diameter, or number of turbines. The Llŷr project is not proposing to reduce the modelled air gap (22m), nor to increase the blade length (rotor radius), nor increase the number of turbines beyond the worst-case parameters already modelled under CRM.
		91. Skomer, Skokholm and seas off Pembrokeshire (SSSP) SPA (throughout HRA): Please note that the Qualifying Features (QF) of the SSSP SPA are: • Lesser black-backed gull • Manx shearwater • Atlantic puffin • European storm petrel • Seabird Assemblage	Noted
		92. Guillemot, razorbill and kittiwake are not qualifying features of the site in their own right – they are named components of the seabird assemblage Qualifying Features. We advise that the draft HRA is updated to reflect this throughout.	Noted
		93. **SSSP SPA assessment (page 168 of HRA):** The assessment in view of conservation objectives makes reference to the Applicant's SeabORD outputs. In our advice to MLT dated 29 January 2025, NRW (A) raised concerns regarding the confidence that we can place in the outputs of the SeabORD approach undertaken by the Applicant, and hence we have based our advice on consideration of the displacement matrix assessment and predicted impacts and not SeabORD. (see paras 160-165 of our original consultation response to MLT). Therefore, we advise that the SeabORD modelling is not relied upon in the HRA and that the assessment is updated based on the displacement matrix approach results instead.	Noted
		94. We also note that the text in the draft HRA regarding SeabORD is not fully correct, as SeabORD modelling was not undertaken for lesser black-backed gull or Manx shearwater and the model can only be run for auks (guillemot, razorbill, puffin) and kittiwake - see Appendix 22D-Annex C SeabORD modelling report of submission.	Noted
1.7	**Marine Mammals**		
1.7.1	Overall Comments	95. NRW (A) acknowledges and welcomes the clarifications provided by the Applicant in the Clarifications Spreadsheet. In view of these additional clarifications, we consider that a number of issues with respect to Marine Mammals are now resolved, but advise that an errata document is provided (or application documents are updated) with the relevant agreed amendments such that they form a clear public record, particularly in view of informing future projects.	Noted - The project will commit to providing a complete errata document to cover all aspects raised by NRW(A), that can be conditioned for and produced post-consent.
		96. Whilst a number of issues have been resolved, NRW (A) consider that there remain some pending material issues that have not been fully addressed by the clarifications, which we have outlined below. Nonetheless, we consider that with additional commitment from the Applicant with respect to key mitigation measures (as advised below), we would be able to agree with the conclusions of no significant adverse effects at EIA scale / no AEoSI at HRA scale.	Noted
1.7.2	Detailed Comments		
1.7.2.1	Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) and In-Combination Assessment	97. In our original response, NRW (A) recommended that further justification was provided for the four-tier allocation process used for screening projects. The Applicant has now confirmed that the data from Tier 4 projects were included in the cumulative assessment and Interim Population Consequences of Disturbance (iPCoD) modelling (See Number / reference 189 of the Clarifications Spreadsheet), therefore we consider the issue concerning our request to update the cumulative assessment is now resolved. However, please see Paragraph 148 regarding the CA's HRA.	Noted
		98. Our concerns with the decision to scope out a number of impact pathways in the CEA and in-combination assessment remain. To justify scoping out an impact pathway on the basis that it will be mitigated, NRW (A) would expect the Applicant to provide sufficient detail on the proposed mitigation to allow us to arrive at the same conclusion. In Number / Reference 196 of the NRW (A) Offshore Tab of the Clarifications Spreadsheet, the Applicant has stated that these impact pathways have been scoped out because the impacts would be addressed by mitigation (and please see our comments below) or 'are qualitative impacts anyway'. As per our response to the original consultation we do not consider it is sufficient to state that 'the impact will be mitigated', or to dismiss the requirement for cumulative assessment on the basis of it being qualitative in nature.	Noted
1.7.2.1.1	Mitigation	99. NRW (A)'s concerns outlined in our initial response regarding mitigation measures remain. For a number of pathways (namely Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) clearance, entanglement and cumulative Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS) from piling) the specific mitigation measures that are being relied upon to conclude no AEoSI (at HRA scale) and no significant effect (at EIA scale) have not been indicated with sufficient detail. As such, we are unable to currently agree with the Applicant's conclusions. However, we consider that it is possible to mitigate any negative effects and undesirable impacts to marine mammals. With additional commitment from the Applicant, which must be secured via appropriate post-consent condition(s), and the detail and suitability of the proposals agreed in writing with NRW (A), we would be able to agree no significant effect / no AEoSI. Further details are provided below. This is in line with our previous advice for the Erebus application.	Noted

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
		100. With respect to entanglement our primary concern is secondary entanglement, for example, as a result of derelict fishing gears. We note the proposed mitigation E232 outlined in Volume 6: Appendix 32A – Mitigation Register, concerning removal of debris from floating lines and cables. Ideally, we would also expect to see further information regarding the frequency of checks (including criteria for increasing or decreasing frequency), how they will be conducted, as well as a plan of action in the event a mortality was detected. However, given that there are currently no fixed recommendations for entanglement monitoring specific to floating offshore wind farms, NRW (A) recognises the uncertainty and complexity surrounding these discussions. As such, we strongly advise further discussion on any requirements for entanglement monitoring post-consent prior to the commencement of works, through written consultation and written agreement with NRW (A), and that this should be a condition of the Marine Licence as part of the Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (MMMP). In development of any entanglement monitoring, it may be useful for the Applicant to refer to relevant mitigation proposed for other similar projects. For example, proposed mitigation for the Erebus project includes using load cells attached to mooring lines or ROV surveys ORML2170 Project Erebus Draft Outline Environmental Monitoring Plan (1).pdf; whilst other projects (e.g. Car-y-Mor) have proposed surface and subsurface inspections using cameras and acoustic monitoring devices DEML2151 Marine mammal entanglement protocol.pdf. We also note that the final updated monitoring plans for Whitecross contains more detailed plans.	As stated in the updated Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) the project is committed to addressing entanglement risk and will monitor for, and remove, marine debris caught on cables as part of the regular surveys of subsea infrastructure. The design and frequency of this monitoring will be agreed with the Regulator and SNCBs post-consent once final design parameters – particularly number of turbines and number of mooring lines – are confirmed. Use of strain gauges will be considered as a possible monitoring option.
		101. For UXO, we advise that, in the MMMP, the Applicant notes their intention and commitment to align themselves with the relevant DEFRA guidance (adopted by both Welsh Government and NRW) published in January 2025.	This is now addressed in Section 2.1 of the updated Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003)
		102. For piling, we refer to NRW (A)'s original consultation response dated 29 January 2025. The Llŷr project has indicated that mitigation measures have only been considered for auditory injury from instantaneous PTS from piling. As outlined in NRW's position on Assessing the effects of Hearing Injury from Underwater Noise on Marine Mammals (NRW, 2023) and in line with Southall et al. (2019) we advise the use of dual metrics for impulsive noise: unweighted SPLpeak and frequency-weighted Sound Exposure Level (SEL). These metrics are needed to account for the different aspects of sound exposure and duration. SPLpeak is a measure of absolute maximum exposure at any one time, whereas SEL is a measure of the sound energy of exposure accumulated over time. These two metrics are applied under the condition that exceeding either threshold by the specified level is sufficient to result in Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS) or PTS onset. The metric predicting the largest range of impact should be used for the impact assessment (because it is the worst-case scenario), and any required mitigation of this pathway will be determined by the assessment. This has always been the default regulatory approach and advice given in Welsh and English waters for previous projects.	The Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) has been updated to include a commitment to use the dual metrics for impusive noise assessments in line with the NRW recommendations.
		103. As it currently stands, with respect to piling impacts, we cannot agree with the assessment conclusions for the project alone (EIA and HRA), the CEA (EIA) or the in-combination assessment (HRA). Therefore, and as noted above, we strongly advise that the Llŷr project should base their mitigation plans on both instantaneous and cumulative PTS and that the detail of this mitigation is incorporated into the MMMP post-consent, following further discussion and agreement in writing with NRW (A). With a firm commitment from the Applicant to mitigate Cumulative SEL in this manner, and which is secured via a condition, NRW (A) would be able to agree no significant effects at EIA scale, no AEoSI, and no harm or disturbance to European Protected Species.	The Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) has been updated to address both instantaneous and cumulative PTS and that the detail of this mitigation will be incorporated into the MMMP post-consent. This will done following further discussion and agreement in writing with the Regulator and Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCB) as part of the post-consent dialogue and discharge of conditions.
		104. We further advise that the Applicant notes in their mitigation documents their intention and commitment to align themselves with the relevant JNCC, NE, and CEFAS joint position on the use of noise abatement systems, as well as the decision report from Welsh Government published on 5 March 2025 indicating the intent to develop a policy position on managing Marine Noise in-line with the similar policy position in England. This will include a requirement for Applicants to demonstrate that they have employed 'best endeavours' to deliver noise reductions through the use of primary and/or secondary noise reduction methods. Given the timing of publication of these policies, NRW (A) would be happy to advise the Applicant where appropriate and in due course, based on the Consenting Authority's response.	Noted
		105. For reference, we direct the Applicant to the Underwater Sound Noise Management Strategies (UWSMS) and Marine Mammal Management Plans (MMMPs) submitted by Mona, Morgan and Morecambe offshore wind farms as examples.	Noted
		106. With regard to reducing the impacts of Vessel Noise, we note the Applicant's commitment to use the WiSe Scheme. Given that this is currently the only viable way to mitigate vessel noise, NRW (A) are content that this should mitigate a sufficient proportion of the risks.	Noted
1.7.2.2	Additional comments that do not impact our ability to agree with the assessment:	107. The worst-case scenario for impact piling duration had originally been specified as 20 days in the project description (Volume 1: Chapter 4 – Description of the Proposed Project), however, this is not consistent with the impact assessment, where the worst-case scenario for piling duration is stated as 10 days. We note and acknowledge the response provided by the Applicant at Number / reference 218 in the Clarifications Spreadsheet, however advise that the assessment is updated to include this information; application documents should be as updated as possible at the determination stage e.g. via an errata document, particularly to inform future projects using this ES to inform their own.	To confirm the worst case scenario is 20 full days of piling over a 45 day period (the additional 25 days provides contingency in the construction scheduling to allow for periods of down-time due to poor weather potential, moving of piling equipment from one turbine location to another, etc). 20 days of full piling would represent a doubling of the impact assessed which would result in no more than 6 Harbour porpoise being impacted and even from an ultra-precautionary stance of quadrupling the impact (i.e. 4 x 10 days impact), this would result in no more than 12 Harbour porpoise and even fewer Grey seals being impacted, which is less than 1% of the total population of both species, which is of negligible significance. As a consequence, the worst-case scenario for disturbance from piling has been assessed for the Bristol Channel Approaches Special Area of Conservation (SAC) ant the West Wales Marine SAC and has resulted in a negligible significance outcome. The project will commit to providing a complete errata document to cover all aspects raised by NRW(A), that can be conditioned for and produced post-consent.
		108. Bottlenose dolphin densities: NRW (A) previously raised the issue that the number of animals disturbed from piling should be based on the full dose response curve, rather than clipping the dose response curve to 25 m. Given that it is the offshore population / offshore Management Unit (MU) being assessed (as opposed to the inshore Cardigan Bay SAC population), our view is that there is no justification that the animals are limited to coastal areas.	Noted
		109. While the inshore ecotype / Cardigan Bay population does tend to be found closer to the shore, population modelling work carried out by NRW (A) has shown no evidence of the Irish sea population being linked to a specific depth contour / distance from the shore (in contrast with the Moray Firth population). As the methodology used is not supported by evidence for Welsh waters, we advise against future projects using this approach.	Noted

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
		110. We further advise that ensuring clarity, when presenting numbers disturbed, will be important for future floating offshore windfarm projects using the information presented by Llŷr for their respective cumulative assessments. Following the initial response provided by the Applicant with respect to this issue, and our meeting in March 2025 where the Applicant clarified that the numbers from the full dose response curve were used to inform conclusions, NRW (A) anticipate being able to agree with the conclusions of the assessment for bottlenose dolphins, provided the assessment is updated or an errata document provided to remove references to the clipped dose response curve and the numbers presented (for information) which were derived from the clipped dose response curve.	The project will commit to providing a complete errata document to cover all aspects raised by NRW(A), that can be conditioned for and produced post-consent.
		111. Ideally, re-assessment of the impacts of piling on bottlenose dolphin using iPCoD should be undertaken. However, given the stage the project is at, NRW (A) are content, in this instance, to base the assessment on expert judgement (and that the Applicant state this in errata). This can be done by comparing the % of the population affected versus the Management Unit (MU) population while specifying whether the assessment was carried out over a single disturbance event or all events. If a conclusion is based on numbers disturbed by a single disturbance event, sufficient justification needs to be provided to back the conclusion that subsequent disturbance events would not lead to additional effects. NRW (A) does not consider only referring to the 'temporary nature' of the impact or 'recoverability' to be adequate justification as we posit that in the process of repeated recovery from repeated disturbance events, the animals sustain some cost (e.g. energetic).	The Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) has been updated to address both instantaneous and cumulative PTS and that the detail of this mitigation will be incorporated into the MMMP post-consent. This will done following further discussion and agreement in writing with the Regulator and Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCB) as part of the post-consent dialogue and discharge of conditions. The project will commit to providing a complete errata document to cover all aspects raised by NRW(A), that can be conditioned for and produced post-consent.
		112. In response to the Applicant's comments in Number / reference 239 of the Clarifications Spreadsheet, NRW (A) note, for clarification purposes, that whereas the Applicant's response has focused on bottlenose dolphin modelling, the main aspect of the issue raised focuses on the use of the 1% threshold of the reference population as a trigger for requiring iPCoD modelling in any population. We reiterate that the 1% threshold used for this purpose was not recommended in any NRW (A) advice given to the Applicant, nor can it be found in any of our published advice. While NRW (A) have previously advised a 1% threshold, this is strictly to review the modelling outputs from iPCoD to determine the level of change equivalent to an adverse or significant effect within the context of other methods, which also informs the decision. In this case, the impacted population (piling) is compared against the unimpacted population (no piling) and a decline in the impacted population of 1% or more per year (over a 5 or 6 year period) is considered significant / adverse. We therefore request that reference to NRW (A) in this matter should be corrected to ensure our advice has been recorded correctly.	The Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) has been updated to address both instantaneous and cumulative PTS and that the detail of this mitigation will be incorporated into the MMMP post-consent. This will done following further discussion and agreement in writing with the Regulator and Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCB) as part of the post-consent dialogue and discharge of conditions. The project will commit to providing a complete errata document to cover all aspects raised by NRW(A), that can be conditioned for and produced post-consent.
		113. *Use of 143 dB SELss fixed noise threshold to crop the dose response curve:* As per our meeting on 25 March 2025 and further to our email sent on 15 May 2025, NRW (A) confirm that this is no longer a material issue. We would like to clarify that for the reasons explained in prior discussions, we do not advise use of this method for any purposes (including to inform the assessment). However, given that the overall conclusions were based on the full dose response curve, we consider that no further action is required by the Applicant.	Noted
		114. For completeness and future reference, we have provided our original explanation discussed during the meeting of 25 March 2025 below: *In our original consultation response (Paragraphs 216 – 224) NRW (A) explained why we had significant concerns about the method proposed and that as currently proposed, the method has applied a fixed noise threshold onto a dose response curve, which we do not consider to be a standard accepted use of either method.* *Fixed noise thresholds are a type of behavioural noise criterion that function as a step-function (i.e. all or none) and assume that no animals exposed below that threshold are disturbed and that 100% of animals exposed at or above this threshold are disturbed. While, given our knowledge of observed animal responses in the wild this is not a realistic assumption to make, we assume that there is a balance between the animals that do not react within the calculated impact area and those that are affected outside the range. This set of assumptions allows us to use a single number to estimate the impact in a simple manner. A fixed noise threshold functions within this all or none assumption, and we would caution against interpreting it to be absolutely outside of it.* *Dose response curves for harbour porpoise are based on empirical studies of animal responses through acoustic detections, where it is suggested that displacement is the main driver of such observed decreases in echolocation detections. While a decrease in acoustic detections may be due to ceasing vocalisation (while remaining in the area), it is considered unlikely that they would cease vocalising for several hours. At any rate, such prolonged cessation of vocalisation (at the expense of feeding) would be as much a response as displacement and would be considered to be of similar severity to displacement from the area. Although the probability of these responses at lower sound levels / greater distances decreases, these are still of the same severity, and there are many more animals at these larger distances since the area covered becomes increasingly larger.* *We would thus caution against interpreting a fixed noise threshold (of 140 dB or 143 dB) as a generalised threshold for "significant disturbance" and applying this as a cut-off for a dose response curve. By doing so, this would mean that: (1) the assumption of 100% disturbance of animals exposed above the threshold has been dropped, and (2) animals disturbed below this threshold (detected through empirical studies) are no longer considered.* *The risks of such an approach (clipping a dose response curve) have already been highlighted in the literature by Tyack and Thomas (2019), with further discussion in Southall et al (2021). Tyack and Thomas (2019) demonstrated that the approach of selecting the threshold at which half of the animals respond (RLp50) underestimates the number of animals affected. While the example used to illustrate their point focuses on the RLp50, the effect would be similar were a dose response curve to be clipped at 140 dB or 143 dB.* We have included this comment for the purpose of logging our advice publicly for the sake of creating precedent for future applications. Our concern is that future projects drawing information from the present project may repeat the approach, contributing to delays in consenting.	Noted
		115. *Use of logarithmic model for piling:* Based on the information provided verbally during our meeting on 25 March 2025 (where reference was made to a data validation exercise which would provide quantified validation that the results obtained compared well with other modelling methods) and the response provided in the Clarifications Spreadsheet (Number / reference 190 and 274), NRW (A) anticipate being able to agree to the use of this method, provided the assessment is updated or an errata document provided.	The Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) has been updated to address both instantaneous and cumulative PTS and that the detail of this mitigation will be incorporated into the MMMP post-consent. This will done following further discussion and agreement in writing with the Regulator and Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCB) as part of the post-consent dialogue and discharge of conditions.
		116. *Vessel noise:* In response to the Applicant's comments in Number / reference 298 – 303, we agree that a common approach when assessing impact pathways such as vessel noise is to base the estimate of the number of animals disturbed on a fixed radius (snapshot) for a single point in time, which is then used to inform a conclusion. However, we note that this is not a formally agreed 'standard', rather a commonly used approach.	Noted
		117. As noted in our original response, the scientific community already recognises that for noise events where the effect may be individually small (e.g. passage of one vessel), it is plausible that the cumulative impact of repeated but individually small disturbances may be greater than the impact from a single disturbance event, hence the work being done to develop methods to quantify these impacts.	Noted
		118. We fully agree with the Applicant that these methods are still largely conceptual in nature, and while these are being developed it is not possible to quantify the effects of repeated disturbance events on a population from non-piling sources. However we advise it is also important to recognise that the total number of animals disturbed by the impact pathway would be larger than the estimate based on a snapshot. Therefore NRW have tended to advise the importance of stating that the number of animals disturbed was obtained at a single point in time and to consider any potential impacts from repeated disturbance events, otherwise it would not be accurate to only state e.g. 0.02% of the harbour porpoise MU will be disturbed.	Noted

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
		119. This was the approach we advised for a number of recent application consultations. The recommended qualitative assessment could consist of a simple brief, explanatory statement acknowledging repeated disturbance events, but arriving at a conclusion based on expert judgement.	Noted
		120. That said, we acknowledge the Applicant has stated that this aspect of the assessment has been considered and given the low number of vessel trips over the lifetime of the project, we consider this issue to be resolved.	Noted
1.7.2.3	ORML2465: Record of a Habitats Regulations Assessment of a project: Form 1	121. NRW (A) does not currently agree with the conclusions of the HRA. Nonetheless, we would be able to agree with the conclusions of no AEoSI, if 1) the Applicant commits to key mitigation measures as advised in section 1.7.2 above and below - the suitability of which is to be agreed in writing with NRW (A) and secured through a post-consent condition; 2) clarification is provided regarding the duration of piling and 3) the CA considers the remaining assessment discrepancies outlined below.	The Llyr project team have (a) committed to the nessary mitigation in the updated Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) as advised in section 1.7.2 and below, along with agreeing the final measures with NRW(A) in writing post consent. (b) The project has confirmed above that the worst case scenario is 20 full days of piling over a 45 day period.
		122. We welcome the approach taken to group the AA for harbour porpoise and grey seal SACs into a single section, which facilitated easier review. For larger HRA documents (e.g. Band 3) it could be beneficial to include a contents page.	Noted
		123. We note that NRW's position statement (PS) on the use of Management Units in HRA (NRW, 2022) has since been updated and any references to this PS should be changed to (NRW, 2025) although no further changes are necessary to the HRA since the advice on the use of iterative assessment has not changed.	Noted
		124. In view of the newly published Revised Reg 37 Conservation Advice Packages, we recommend that any reference to the superseded condition assessments made below are updated and information used to inform conclusions revised to ensure these are up to date.	Noted
	Likelihood of significant effects (LSE) test, 3.2.1 – Which Natura 2000 sites might be affected by the proposal – page 10	125. We agree with the list of SACs that have been screened in, and also agree with the decision to screen out harbour seal (page 12).	Noted
	Screening Assessment	126. For grey seal and harbour porpoise, the collision with project vessels impact pathway currently only covers the construction and decommissioning phases in the table. The operational phase should be included, following which the assessments may need revision.	The relevant information required to inform the determination and including an updated MMMP. The assessment will be updated to include operational activities (which are less than construction noise) in a complete errata document, that can be conditioned for, and produced post-consent.
		127. For grey seal, the impact pathway "Potential effects to supporting habitats and species" was included for Pembrokeshire Marine but not other grey seal SACs. Clarification would be welcomed.	The marine mammal impact pathway is listed in the screening report for "*Potential for indirect effects through impacts to prey species* " is listed, where indirect effects are changes in habitat. This pathway is considered against all grey seal SACs.
		128. We confirm agreement over the decision to screen out the inshore population of bottlenose dolphin, as per our original advice to the Applicant.	Noted
	Appropriate Assessment of the Project when Considered Alone, 4. Harbour porpoise SACs, page 148 – page 155.	*<u>Effects of underwater noise (construction, operation and decommissioning):</u>* *"For harbour porpoise and grey seals, noise impacts during the operational and decommissioning phases are of lower magnitude than the potential impacts during construction."*	Noted
		129. We agree that noise impacts during the operational phase would be expected to be of lower magnitude than the construction phase, and that it is likely that noise impacts during the decommissioning phase will be of lower magnitude than the construction phase. While no action is required, we note that when considering impacts for each phase alone, this statement is sufficient to help inform a conclusion. However, for an in-combination assessment, the total effects across all phases need to be considered over the lifetime of the project.	
		"Noise effects from the decommissioning phase will be much less than for construction, particularly as this is a floating offshore wind project."	This statement is based on the expert judgment of the technical author from HiDef
		130. This statement could be made more robust if evidence, or a rationale supporting it, were provided. Alternatively it can be sufficient to say that it was based on "expert judgement / knowledge".	
		<u>Effects of underwater noise (construction, operation and decommissioning):</u>	
		131. For Conservation Objective 1, the assessment of disturbance appears to have only considered piling noise. We advise that the assessment should be updated to include all other activities that may cause disturbance.	The relevant information required to inform the determination and including an updated MMMP. The assessment will be updated to include all activities in a complete errata document, that can be conditioned for, and produced post-consent.
		132. For Conservation Objective 2, the maximum daily spatial overlap of 16.83% given is for a UXO clearance event (which is not considered in this HRA). We recommend that for completeness, it would be beneficial to also include a statement on the worst spatial overlap that could occur as a result of an impact pathway that is considered in this HRA (e.g. piling).	The relevant information required to inform the determination and including an updated MMMP. The assessment will be updated to include all activities in a complete errata document, that can be conditioned for, and produced post-consent.
		133. For Conservation Objective 2, we recommend that the seasonal percentage overlap section should specify the impact pathway and the percentage overlap.	The relevant information required to inform the determination and including an updated MMMP. The assessment will be updated to include all activities in a complete errata document, that can be conditioned for, and produced post-consent.
		<u>Collision with Project vessels (construction, operation and decommissioning):</u>	Noted
		134. While we agree with the conclusions of the assessment on collision with vessels, the assessment could be made more robust by referring to any published avoidance / collision rates with construction / maintenance vessels.	
		<u>Entanglement with mooring lines and cables:</u>	
		135. In NRW (A)'s view, the statement "the cables and mooring lines are often taut and of a diameter large enough to preclude entanglement" (note: bold and underlining of text is our own) is not sufficiently robust to allow a conclusion of the risk being small, particularly considered within the context of NRW's mortality limits (NRW, 2022b).	Noted
		136. We posit that in the absence of data on avoidance and entanglement rates with mooring lines and fishing gear, conclusions on the risk of entanglement remain a judgement call, which should be stated in the assessment. This leads to the focus needing to be on mitigation to lower the risk.	Noted
		137. While we agree with the overall conclusions that "In the absence of any mitigation measures, however, there is a potential to compromise the site's conservation objectives.", as highlighted in our comments for the previous consultation and our comments above , we do not agree with the statement that "The applicant's assessment of effects takes account of best practice mitigation measures that will be adopted as part of the project."	Noted
		138. However, with a firm commitment from the Applicant to provide the requested mitigation, the suitability of which is to be agreed in discussion and written agreement with NRW (A) prior to any works commencing, and secured via post-consent condition (see Paragraphs 100), then we would be able to agree no AEoSI.	As stated in the updated Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) the project is committed to addressing entanglement risk and will monitor for, and remove, marine debris caught on cables as part of the regular surveys of subsea infrastructure. The design and frequency of this monitoring will be agreed with the Regulator and SNCBs post-consent once final design parameters – particularly number of turbines and number of mooring lines – are confirmed.

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
	Appropriate Assessment of the Project when Considered Alone, 5. Grey seal SACs, page 156 – page 165.	*Effects of underwater noise (construction, operation and decommissioning):* 139. Similarly to above, we agree that noise impacts during the operational phase would be expected to be of lower magnitude than the construction phase, and that it is likely that noise impacts during the decommissioning phase will be of lower magnitude than the construction phase. While no action is required, we note that when considering impacts for each phase alone, this statement is sufficient to help inform a conclusion. However, for an in-combination assessment, the total effects across all phases need to be considered over the lifetime of the project. *Effects of underwater noise (construction, operation and decommissioning):* "*Noise effects from the decommissioning phase will be much less than for construction, particularly as this is a floating offshore wind project* ."	Noted This statement is based on the expert judgment of the technical author from HiDef
		140. This statement could be made more robust if evidence or a rationale supporting it were provided. Alternatively it can be sufficient to say that it was based on "expert judgement / knowledge". 141. For conservation objective 1, the assessment of disturbance appears to have only considered piling noise. We advise that the Assessment should be updated to include all other activities that may cause disturbance. 142. For conservation objective 2, we note that the numbers disturbed as a proportion of the MU population are based on a single disturbance event at a single point in time (e.g. 91 individuals for the cable laying activity) and are not equivalent to the number of animals disturbed by that activity over the entire phase of the project / lifetime of the project through repeated disturbance events (and / or a moving noise source). If a conclusion is based on numbers disturbed by a single disturbance event, sufficient justification needs to be provided to back the conclusion that subsequent disturbance events would not lead to additional effects. It may be sufficient to use expert judgement to arrive at this conclusion. *"Furthermore, any disturbance that occurs as a result of construction (or decommissioning) activity will be short term and reversible."* 143. We do not consider referring to the 'short term' nature of the impact or 'recoverability' to be adequate justification to inform a conclusion as we posit that in the process of repeated recovery from repeated disturbance events, the animals sustain some cost (e.g. energetic). If a conclusion is based on numbers disturbed by a single disturbance event, sufficient justification needs to be provided to back the conclusion that subsequent disturbance events would not lead to additional effects. Furthermore, a definition of "short term" (and other temporal terminology) would need to be provided. *Entanglement with mooring lines and cables:* 144. The same comments made for harbour porpoise in paragraphs 135-138 above also apply to grey seal.	The relevant information required to inform the determination and including an updated MMMP. The assessment will be updated to include the other activities (which are less than piling noise) in a complete errata document, that can be conditioned for, and produced post-consent. The relevant information required to inform the determination and to confirm that the. This includies confirmation that this determination was based on the expert judgement of the technical author from HdDef, and an updated MMMP has been provided. The relevant information required to inform the determination and including an updated MMMP. The assessment will be updated to include the other activities (which are less than piling noise) in a complete errata document, that can be conditioned for, and produced post-consent. As stated in the updated Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) the project is committed to addressing entanglement risk and will monitor for, and remove, marine debris caught on cables as part of the regular surveys of subsea infrastructure. The design and frequency of this monitoring will be agreed with the Regulator and SNCBs post-consent once final design parameters – particularly number of turbines and number of mooring lines – are confirmed.
		145. With reference to Section 4.2 Assessment of the project taking into account additional mitigating measures, conditions or restrictions, page 173 – 181 of the HRA Form 1, • For grey seal SACs and harbour porpoise SACs - Entanglement with mooring lines and cables • For grey seal SACs and harbour porpoise SACs - Effects of underwater noise (specifically from piling) 146. Alongside reference to our comments in our initial response and Paragraphs 102 of the current response, we cannot currently agree that impacts from PTS will be mitigated as the Applicant has indicated that mitigation measures have only been considered for auditory injury from instantaneous PTS from piling (and not cumulative auditory injury). 147. That said, with additional commitment from the Applicant to mitigate cumulative SEL as outlined in Paragraph 103 above, NRW (A) would be able to agree no AEoSI.	noted noted The Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) has been updated to address both instantaneous and cumulative PTS and that the detail of this mitigation will be incorporated into the MMMP post-consent. This will done following further discussion and agreement in writing with the Regulator and Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCB) as part of the post-consent dialogue and discharge of conditions.
	In-combination assessment, 2. Annex II Marine Mammals, page 189 – 197	148. With reference to Annex II Marine Mammals, page 189: We advise that a number of additional projects may have a cumulative effect on the MU populations (including Mona, Morgan, and Morecambe) and that these should be included in the assessment, and the HRA revised. *Effects of underwater noise (construction, operation and decommissioning), Harbour porpoise SACs:* 149. We note that the assessment for disturbance for Conservation Objective 1, appears to have only considered piling noise. The combined total impact of all underwater noise pathways across the lifetime of the project should be assessed. 150. We understand that Conservation Objective 2 was assessed by only considering plans and projects that could have a noise overlap with the project. However it is possible that other projects may overlap with SACs within the same MU, without overlapping with the Llŷr project. We recommend that the assessment should be updated to consider this. *Collision with Project vessels (construction, operation and decommissioning), Harbour porpoise SACs:* 151. We understand that although the Applicant presented a table with total numbers of animals disturbed in combination with other projects, the population model run for the assessment (iPCoD) only modelled the combined population effects from pile driving – iPCoD can currently only assess impacts of piling on a population. Therefore, as the model predictions did not include the additional risk of collision, further information should be included to justify a conclusion of no in-combination effect, and ideally the current reasoning should be revised. *Entanglement with mooring lines and cables, Harbour porpoise and Grey Seal SACs:* 152. We agree that the scale of this development, in combination with other floating wind farm projects will not cover a significant area in comparison to the Celtic and Irish Seas MU. However, we advise that when considering the risk of entanglement for harbour porpoise, the possibility of an entanglement occurring needs to take into consideration our mortality limits (NRW, 2022b), as well as density distribution of the population. 153. Furthermore, the conclusion of no in-combination effect has been based on it being "…likely that all floating offshore wind developments will deploy monitoring of the cables and moorings and will commit to removal of any ghost gear present". We do not consider that this is sufficiently robust to justify a conclusion of no in-combination effect particularly in the context of a lack of evidence of the risk of secondary entanglement and rate of subsequent mortality as a result. However, please also see paragraph 99 above with respect to mitigation for entanglement. *Effects of underwater noise (construction, operation and decommissioning), Grey seal SACs*	The Llyr project team have (a) committed to the nessary mitigation in the updated Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) as advised in section 1.7.2 and below, along with agreeing the final measures with NRW(A) in writing post consent. (b) The project has confirmed above that the worst case scenario is 20 full days of piling over a 45 day period. The Llyr project team have (a) committed to the nessary mitigation in the updated Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) as advised in section 1.7.2 and below, along with agreeing the final measures with NRW(A) in writing post consent. (b) The project has confirmed above that the worst case scenario is 20 full days of piling over a 45 day period. The Llyr project team have (a) committed to the nessary mitigation in the updated Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) as advised in section 1.7.2 and below, along with agreeing the final measures with NRW(A) in writing post consent. (b) The project has confirmed above that the worst case scenario is 20 full days of piling over a 45 day period. The Llyr project team have (a) committed to the nessary mitigation in the updated Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) as advised in section 1.7.2 and below, along with agreeing the final measures with NRW(A) in writing post consent. (b) The project has confirmed above that the worst case scenario is 20 full days of piling over a 45 day period. The Llyr project team have (a) committed to the nessary mitigation in the updated Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) as advised in section 1.7.2 and below, along with agreeing the final measures with NRW(A) in writing post consent. (b) The project has confirmed above that the worst case scenario is 20 full days of piling over a 45 day period.

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
		154. While we acknowledge that the ES Chapter 21: Marine Mammals presented the cumulative total number of animals at risk of disturbance for each activity, the total was calculated by summing the number of animals at risk of disturbance from one disturbance event for each activity – it does not consider repeated disturbance events (across the lifetime of the project).	The Llyr project team have (a) committed to the nessary mitigation in the updated Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) as advised in section 1.7.2 and below, along with agreeing the final measures with NRW(A) in writing post consent. (b) The project has confirmed above that the worst case scenario is 20 full days of piling over a 45 day period.
		155. If a conclusion is based on numbers disturbed by single disturbance events, sufficient justification needs to be provided to back the conclusion that subsequent disturbance events would not lead to additional effects. We do not consider the points currently presented referring to the 'short term' nature of the impact or 'recoverability' to be adequate justification to inform a conclusion as we posit that in the process of repeated recovery from repeated disturbance events, the animals sustain some cost (e.g. energetic). However, in the absence of supporting empirical evidence, we consider it sufficient to use expert judgement to reach this conclusion, should these points be taken into account and included in the consideration of the impacts in a revised HRA.	The Llyr project team have (a) committed to the nessary mitigation in the updated Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Plan (P10-LLY-4.2.3-PLA-0003) as advised in section 1.7.2 and below, along with agreeing the final measures with NRW(A) in writing post consent. (b) The project has confirmed above that the worst case scenario is 20 full days of piling over a 45 day period.
		Collision with Project vessels (construction, operation and decommissioning), Grey seal SACs: 156. The HRA would benefit from evidence that "*grey seals are accustomed to vessel movement.* "	
		157. Similar to Paragraph 107 above, the worst-case scenario for impact piling duration had originally been specified as 20 days in the project description (Volume 1: Chapter 4 – Description of the Proposed Project), however, this is not consistent with the impact assessment, where the worst-case scenario for piling duration is stated as 10 days. We note and acknowledge the response provided by the Applicant at *Number / reference 218* in the Clarifications Spreadsheet, however we advise the assessment is updated to include this information; application documents should be as updated as possible at the determination stage e.g. via an errata document, particularly to inform future projects using this ES to inform their own.	To confirm the worst case scenario is 20 full days of piling over a 45 day period (the additional 25 days provides contingency in the construction scheduling to allow for periods of down-time due to poor weather potential, moving of piling equipment from one turbine location to another, etc). 20 days of full piling would represent a doubling of the impact assessed which would result in no more than 6 Harbour porpoise being impacted and even from an ultra-precautionary stance of quadrupling the impact (i.e. 4 x 10 days impact), this would result in no more than 12 Harbour porpoise and even fewer Grey seals being impacted, which is less than 1% of the total population of both species, which is of negligible significance. As a consequence, the worst-case scenario for disturbance from piling has been assessed for the Bristol Channel Approaches Special Area of Conservation (SAC) ant the West Wales Marine SAC and has resulted in a negligible significance outcome. The project will commit to providing a complete errata document to cover all aspects raised by NRW(A), that can be conditioned for and produced post-consent.
2	**ONSHORE**		
2.1	**General Onshore Comments**	158. We continue to have concerns with the application as submitted because inadequate information has been provided in support of the proposal. To overcome these concerns, we advise that further information should be sought from the Applicant regarding European Protected Species (EPS), Protected Sites, Landscape and Seascape.	Following discussions with NRW(A): - a bat mitigation scheme has been drafted and submitted. - an otter survey has been undertaken and the report submitted to NRW; and - an SLVIA technical note on the effect on the SLVIA by reducing the tip height from 325.5m to 300m and providing additional Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) figures and wireline visualisations comparing 270m and 300m turbines for Llŷr Floating Wind Farm.
		159. We also advise that based on the information submitted to date, conditions regarding: A Construction and Operational Lighting Plan to include aviation lighting, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and a Bathing Water Quality Mitigation Plan, should be attached to any permission granted.	Noted and agreed
2.2	**European Protected Species and Protected Sites**	160. We cannot agree with a conclusion of no Likely Significant Effect for otters as a feature of the Pembrokeshire Marine SAC and Pembrokeshire Bat Sites and Bosherston Lakes SAC. We are unable to assess the proposals in the context of the Favourable Conservation Status test.	Following discussions with NRW(A) an otter survey has been undertaken and the report submitted to NRW
		161. This consultation is in relation to the marine licence only, the jurisdiction for which we understand runs to the mean high water level. Therefore, our comments are in regards to those terrestrial protected species which may also utilise the coastal habitats; greater and lesser horseshoe bats and otters principally.	Noted
		162. Otters are a feature of Pembrokeshire Marine SAC and Pembrokeshire Bat Sites and Bosherston Lakes SAC, and the application site is well within the range of otters from both SACs. The HRA form indicates that noise and visual disturbance could arise from the works with disturbance anticipated up to approximately 600m from source. This could encompass some of the terrestrial coastal habitat suitable for the species.	Following discussions with NRW(A) an otter survey has been undertaken and the report submitted to NRW
		163. The Applicant's response confirms that no specific otter surveys have been carried out and, as such, it is not possible to ascertain whether an otter natal holt is present in close proximity to the shore where the cabling works will make landfall. In the absence of such survey information, significant effects cannot be ruled out. If further surveys can rule out the likely presence of a natal holt within 200m of the works, we would be content to agree with a conclusion of no likely significant effect on this feature of both SACs.	Following discussions with NRW(A) an otter survey has been undertaken and the report submitted to NRW on 12 December 2025
		164. Horseshoe bats are a feature of both the Pembrokeshire Bat Sites SAC and Limestone Cliffs of SW Wales SAC, and the greater horseshoe bats in particular are known to use the sea caves along the Castlemartin Coast. We refer to our previous advice in which we confirmed that the works are unlikely to affect any of the sea caves used by the bats and encompassed by SAC designation. We are content to agree a conclusion of no likely significant effect for the horseshoe bat features of these two SAC sites.	Noted
		165. Regarding the proposals to leave further protected species surveys to the post-consent pre-construction phase, we refer you to our previous advice dated 28 March 2025 and continue to advise that this approach does not accord with planning policy or case law.	Noted
		166. For awareness, NRW (A) received correspondence from the Applicant on 18 July 2025 with respect to the potential proposals for inclusion of new buffer (exclusion) zones within the application documents, for the purposes of bat ecology. We have advised the Applicant that the proposals would need to be formally submitted to the decision-maker(s) for a decision to be made as to whether to accept the proposed changes as part of the application. We have also advised, for the Applicants awareness, that they would need to demonstrate that the proposed buffer zones would be sufficient to address any potential impacts on bats, including from noise, vibration and construction lighting.	Following discussions with NRW(A) a bat mitigation scheme has been drafted and submitted. This document includes the buffer zone proposal and the mitigation measures undertaken to avoid impacts from construction and operational actvities (with the inclusion of bat habitat enhancement measures).
2.3	**Designated Landscapes**	167. We have reviewed 'AppP11-LYR-3.4.3-PAP-Rev01-Marine Licence Application Clarifications A2' which is the spreadsheet containing the Applicant's response to our comments on the Application.	Noted
		168. Our comments below address new information / changes to the proposal. The majority of the Applicant's comments do not relate to new information and do not change our previous advice. Where we have provided a response, we have used the reference number from the SLVIA tab of the spreadsheet.	Noted
		169. See Clarification Spreadsheet Number / reference 15. We welcome the proposal to reduce the turbine blade tip height from 325.5m to 300m (above Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT)). This change is proposed in response to the SLVIA concerns raised by NRW and PCNPA.	Noted
		170. It is not clear whether this change would require a corresponding reduction in the rotor diameter (currently 285m). Please can the applicant clarify this.	From a visual impact perspective it is confirmed that the rotor diameter is likely to reduce slightly, with the final dimension subject to a procurement exercise post consent

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
		171. We advise that turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 300m would still be inside - rather than 'beyond' - the low magnitude of effect buffer identified for turbines of this height1 in the Offshore Wind Sensitivity Guidance, 20192. Consequently, turbines with a tip height of 300m in this location would still be contrary to siting principles outlined in the Offshore Wind Sensitivity Guidance3. For example: • The Array would not be located 'beyond the limit of negligible visual effects, particularly for the highest sensitivity area National Parks overlaid with Heritage Coasts'. (Principle 3) • The Array would not be located 'beyond the Stage I report low magnitude buffer distances for the highest potential turbine proposed from National Parks' which is requested when Principle 3 is not achievable (beyond 41.6km for turbines between 226-300m). At the closest point the Array is 35km from the PCNP. (Principle 4) • The Array would not be located 'as far away from Heritage Coasts ... as possible' using the low magnitude of effect buffer distances for the highest potential turbine proposed (Principle 5). • The Array would not be located in 'areas identified as lower sensitivity in the Stage 3 report' (it is located in one of the higher sensitivity areas, Zone 13 which has high/medium sensitivity4) (Principle 6). • The Array would not be located in 'areas offshore from local seascape character areas identified as having lower inherent sensitivity' (Principle 7). • The Array would not be located 'off already industrialised or developed coastlines' (Principle 8). • The Array would not be located to 'avoid locations offshore from remote headlands/peninsulas' (Principle 17). • The Array would not be located to 'avoid potential cumulative impacts by extending the width of arrays visible through extensions or additional wind farms' when considered in the context of the consented Erebus development. (Principle 19).	The technical SLVI author confirms the project view, the reduction of turbine height from 325.5m to 300m does not change any of the SLVIA outcomes relating to Project Llŷr. The primary reason for the conclusion is that the SLVIA assessed a "worst case" and although the reduction in height results in a theoretical reduction in visibility and magnitude of effect, at the distances concerned (typically over 35 km) there is no justifiable reduction in magnitude to a lower category, noting that effects at all viewpoints are small or negligible magnitude. We consider that this is evident from the ZTV (Figure 1) and wirelines comparing the 325,5 and 300m tip heights (Figures 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1 and 7.1) in Appendix A, showing the difference in height, which is barely perceptible at 35 km. The use of the Offshore Wind Sensitivity Guidance, 2019 is as acknowledged in the Stage 1 report, an approximation of potential effects rather than an assessment of a specific project as submitted in a detailed SLVIA within the ES. The concerns raised by NRW apply to an equal or greater extent in relation to the consented Erebus wind farm which is closer to the PCNP albeit with turbine heights which are 270m as opposed to 300m for Project Llŷr. Our analysis, using wirelines and a calculation of the angle subtended in a view using the two turbine heights and distances based on VP2, is that the taller height of the Project Llŷr turbines does not translate into perceived increased height due to a reduction in size over distance. In simple terms, from the closest point in the PCNP (VP2) the closest Erebus turbines will appear larger than Project Llŷr turbines. In relation to the points raised by NRW we assess that a comparison with Erebus is relevant given that it is a consented scheme, closer to the coast, not raising unacceptable effects on SLVIA receptors. Our conclusion is that at the distances concerned, typically over 35 km the significance of effects of turbines at 300m height remains well below any significant threshold and the difference with the 270m suggested by NRW and the proposed 300m is imperceptible in real terms. We consider that this is illustrated by Figure 2 showing the comparative ZTV and the range of wirelines for five of the assessment viewpoints provided in Appendix A of the technical note. Further detailed assessment to support the statements above are contained in Project Llŷr Landscape & Visual Technical Note that supports this submission.
		172. For further information on the Offshore Wind Sensitivity Guidance 2019, see paragraph 290 onwards in our previous comments on the marine licence application.	As above and detailed in the supplementary SLVIA technical note that accompanies this submission
		173. Based on the specific details of the scheme, the 'ready reckoner' provided in the Stage 1 Report of the Offshore Wind Sensitivity Guidance, and the guidance within the Stage 2 and 3 Reports (including that on the specific sensitivities of the PCNP), we advise that a reduction in blade tip height to 270m (the same height as the consented Erebus turbines) would be expected to reduce impacts within the PCNP; and likely to an acceptable level. Notwithstanding this, the impact of any revised scheme should be illustrated and confirmed through updated visualisations.	As above and detailed in the supplementary SLVIA technical note that accompanies this submission
		174. See Clarification Spreadsheet *Number / reference 54. We note the Applicant states 'Subject to the MCA, CAA/NATS and DOD approval the project will integrate a detection system to detect when visibility is greater than 5 km. When this is the case, the aviation lights will be dimmed to 10% of the 2,000 candela (cd) maximum so that the intensity of the light emitted would be 200 cd'.* We welcome this mitigation measure and advise that approval should be sought so the mitigation can be secured via a condition.	Noted, the project is content to have this requirement to be secured via a condition
		175. In addition to the above, the LEMP should include the following: • The existing surrounding landscape context / vegetation so we can see how the proposals would relate to existing landscape. • Existing contours and an indication of the proposed contours (not only bunds). • Indication of the height of the bunds. • Indication of plant species • More detailed reasoning for planting / measures linked to the findings of the LVIA.	Figure 7.8 of the ES provides an indicative landscape mitigation plan, including woodland and scrub planting and grassland seeding within the Onshore Substation Site. These types of planting are typical of this area with examples of both in close proximity, indicating that they can be successfully established in this are despite the relative exposure. The final details on layout and how the planting would be established and maintained will be developed further at the detailed design stage and subject to consultation and agreement with the Regulator and SNCBs post-consent once final design parameters are confirmed. The project is in agreement that the aspects highlighted will be contained withi the LEMP and can be secured via a condition.
2.4	Groundwater and Contaminated Land	176. We have reviewed the submitted information and note that the Applicant intends to avoid the Private Water Supply (PWS) by including a 50 m buffer around it and if the source is lost, to supply the owner with a new source of supply and test for the water quality. We support this approach. We advise that the Applicant contacts the owner of the PWS to inform them of the potential risk and to discuss the mitigation measures if there PWS is lost or polluted.	Noted
2.5	Pollution Prevention	177. We refer you to our previous advice and request that an updated Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Bathing Water Quality Mitigation Plan are conditioned as part of any permission granted.	Noted
2.6	Water Framework Directive: Onshore	178. We have no comments to make with regard to onshore WFD.	Noted

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
4	APPENDIX 1: NRW (A) detailed comments/conclusions on the Llŷr project EIA scale cumulative assessments following the Applicant's further information in 'Offshore Ornithology Clarification Notes 1 and 3', and; NRW (A)'s further work to extract the relevant information from the Mona project submission documents in order to produce advice for NRW MLT	Please refer to orignal NRW(A) Response	Noted
5	APPENDIX 2: NRW (A) detailed comments/conclusions on the Llŷr project HRA scale in-combination assessments following the Applicant's further information in 'Offshore Ornithology Clarification Notes 1 and 3', and; NRW (A)'s further work to extract the relevant information from the Mona project submission documents in order to produce advice for NRW MLT	Please refer to orignal NRW(A) Response	Noted
6	APPENDIX 3: NRW (A) comments on the Llŷr Applicant's interim marine ornithology - clarification notes (dated 28 March 2025)	Note 1 - cumulative and in-combination	The project agrees with the cumulative / in combination assessment that NRW (A) undertook for the birds, based on the submitted Mona information already used in the determination process. We also agree with Appendix 2 (EIA) and Appendix 3 (HRA) from the NRW (A) response. Updated mortality estimates for Llŷr will be provided, based on new collision risk modelling for the final turbine selection, in an errata document that will be submitted post-consent.
		Whilst we welcome the Applicant's provision of the cumulative and in-combination clarification note, on review of this we consider that the information presented is not sufficient to address the concerns raised regarding the lack of provision of appropriate cumulative and in-combination assessments. The '2025 03 28 - Llŷr - marine ornithology - clarification note 1 - cumulative and in-combination' document' does not contain any presentation of the cumulative and in-combination totals calculated by the Mona applicant for any species at EIA scale or site/feature for HRA. It purely contains a comparison of the Llŷr project EIA scale alone abundance estimates/collision predictions with those included by the Mona applicant for Llŷr. The Applicant needs to provide their own cumulative and in-combination assessments that consider the impacts across all the relevant plans and projects. This should include the predicted cumulative and in-combination totals for all the relevant EIA scale species and SPA site/feature combinations. As we have noted in our previous advice, the Mona applicant has already filled the gaps for the historic projects that should be included in the cumulative/in-combination assessments, and has included appropriate figures for the Llŷr project in these totals (as shown by the Llŷr applicant's clarification note). The approach taken by Mona meant that NRW were content that conclusions could be reached. Therefore, the Mona calculated totals can be seen as best available evidence for the Llŷr Applicant to quote and make reference to in their assessment. The same is true for the PVAs. The Llŷr Applicant should present the cumulative and in-combination totals reached by Mona for each relevant species and site/feature combination and then make their own assessment of what these totals mean in terms of baseline mortality and consider any need for further consideration through PVA, and reach any conclusions as to the level of significance or on impacts to site integrity. It will not be acceptable to simply suggest that NRW (or the decision maker) refer to the Mona assessment documents.	The project have had ongoing discussions with NRW(A) on the calculations and approach undertaken in the assessment and are content to continue dialogue to clarify any aspect should it be required.

Number / reference	Aspect	Response (Key concern, etc)	Response from Llŷr Floating Wind
		NRW consider that the Applicant should be able to resolve the outstanding concerns regarding the current lack of appropriate cumulative and in-combination assessments relatively straightforwardly by, as a minimum: • For each EIA species and SPA site/feature combination present the cumulative or in-combination collision or displacement predicted total calculated by Mona, with reference to the specific Mona document and table number this has been taken from. • For each EIA species and SPA site/feature combination present an assessment of the % baseline mortality the predicted cumulative/in-combination total equates to of the relevant population. Where this equates to less than 1% of baseline mortality of the respective population, the cumulative/in-combination total can be considered undetectable against background mortality and hence a conclusion of no significant impact can be made for EIA scale, or an AEoSI could be ruled out for HRA scale. • Where the predicted cumulative/in-combination totals exceed 1% of baseline mortality of the respective populations, then this will require further consideration through PVA. Again, in instances where this occurs and Mona have also undertaken a PVA, the Mona PVAs can be considered to represent best available evidence at this time, and hence as a minimum the Llŷr Applicant could consider referring to these PVAs and presenting information including the output metrics (counterfactuals of population size and growth rate, growth rates, final population size etc.) and reach conclusions based on these in any updated assessment. • As noted in our previous comments, there may be site/species combinations relevant for the Llŷr assessment where the Mona Applicant has not presented an in-combination assessment (e.g. Skomer, Skokholm and seas of Pembrokeshire, SSSP SPA puffin and lesser black-backed gull). In such instances, the cumulative figures will be available from the Mona documents and hence the Llŷr Applicant should be able to undertake an apportionment exercise on the cumulative figures. NRW (A) suggest that a similar approach to that used by Mona for other species is used – so for breeding season apportionment, where there is no information available for relevant projects within foraging range from a colony, use the breeding season apportionment rate for the nearest project with information. For the non-breeding seasons take the approach used by Llŷr themselves in the apportioning for the project alone, e.g. for SSSP SPA puffin for the non-breeding season use an apportioning weighting of 0.029 for all projects and for SSSP SPA LBBG for autumn and spring use 0.083 and for winter use 0.094 for all projects.	
	Note 2 – auk non-ID apportioning	We welcome the information provided in the clarification note. However, we would welcome further discussion/information from the Applicant regarding the calculations presented in Table 2 of the document, as we consider the table confusing and cannot follow the calculations. Further explanation as to how the calculations have been made is required.	