

Volume 2: Appendices

Appendix A2

Integrity Matrices

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Matrix Key	2
3.	Marine and Coastal Habitats	3
4.	Migratory Fish	16
5.	Marine Mammals	20
6.	Ornithology	63

Tables

Table 3.1 Relevant RFI Responses for Marine and Coastal Habitats	3
Table 4.1 Relevant RFI Responses for Migratory Fish	16
Table 5.1 Relevant RFI Responses for Marine Mammals	20
Table 6.1: Relevant RFI Responses for Ornithology	63

1. Introduction

North Irish Sea Array Windfarm Ltd (NISA, hereafter referred to as ‘the Developer’) has been considering the Request for Further Information (RFI) issued by An Bord Pleanála as well as the third-party submissions received following public consultation. At An Bord Pleanála’s behest, the Developer has also continued to consult with stakeholders in respect of the 2024 planning application throughout 2024-2026. The Developer has refined elements of the design to respond to the third party submissions, the continued public and stakeholder consultation and the RFI. Amendments are therefore required to the Supporting Information for Screening for Appropriate Assessment (SISAA) and Nature Impact Statement (NIS), and the Integrity Matrices have subsequently been updated to align with any changes in outcomes. Minor errata have also been amended. Full details of consultation undertaken can be found in Appendix A2 of the SISAA.

For the purposes of clarity, this document shall be read in conjunction with Appendix 2 Integrity Matrices of the 2024 NIS.

Any cross reference to a chapter, section, table, image, figure or appendix within this document is to another location within the Addendum to the NIS unless explicitly stated otherwise. Any cross reference to anything included in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS will be clearly labelled as such.

Text in bold is only used throughout this document to indicate where changes are required, and what is subsequently driving them.

All matrices have been updated from Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS and are included in the Addendum to the Integrity Matrices. These are identified by the “A” prefix in the caption. Any changes within updated tables, in comparison to tables within Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS, are indicated by dark grey shading (as opposed to the light grey shading which shows there is no potential pathway i.e. N/A) in the relevant cell, column or row, as necessary.

Conservation Objectives (COs) have been updated for many designated sites since the submission of the 2024 NIS. In response to RFI 1(b), these new COs have been considered in the Addendum to the NIS.

The relevant sections of the RFI and how they are addressed in the Appendix A2 (Integrity Matrices) are shown in tables A1-1: Relevant RFI for Coastal and Marine Habitats, A1-2: Relevant RFI for Migratory Fish, Table A1-3 Relevant RFI for Marine Mammals and Table A1-4 Relevant RFI for Ornithology.

2. Matrix Key

There is no change to the matrix key within Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS, however for clarity these are repeated below.

Evidence for or against Adverse Effects on Integrity (AEoI) on European site qualifying features and Likely Significant Effect is detailed within the footnotes to the integrity matrix.

✓ = Adverse Effects on Integrity (AEoI) cannot be excluded

X = Adverse Effects on Integrity (AEoI) can be excluded

C = Construction

O = Operation and Maintenance

D = Decommissioning

N/A = Effect not relevant to feature (no potential for pathway) (light grey shading)

3. Marine and Coastal Habitats

Table 3.1 Relevant RFI Responses for Marine and Coastal Habitats

RFI Section	RFI	Relevance to Chapter
1 (b)	The scientific information provided as part of the planning application documentation should be based on up-to-date survey reports and data. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to confirm/provide justification/verification that the information submitted in support of the planning application remains relevant and appropriate at the point of submitting further information or to update same as required.	The Conservation Objectives for a number of protected sites have been updated and therefore they have been considered further within NIS and associated appendices, including relevant Integrity Matrices below.

There have been no changes to the assessment outcomes as a result of the design refinements and updates to the 2024 NIS.

Minor errata have also been corrected. The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb etc) has been updated to improve the clarity and rationale for the decisions made with regards to the conclusions using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 1 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by in its entirety by Matrix A1 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A1 Malahide Estuary SAC (replaces Matrix 1 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Malahide Estuary SAC Site Code: IE000205 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 0.0																		
Impact	Suspended Sediment / Deposition			Accidental Pollution			Marine INNS			Changes to Physical Processes			Dust Deposition			In-combination		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide	X _{af}	X _{af}	X _{af}	X _{bf}	X _{bf}	X _{bf}	X _c	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _d	N/A	X _e	N/A	X _e	X _f	X _f	X _f
<i>Salicornia</i> and other annual colonising mud and sand	X _{af}	X _{af}	X _{af}	X _{bf}	X _{bf}	X _{bf}	X _c	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _d	N/A	X _e	N/A	X _e	X _f	X _f	X _f
Atlantic salt meadows	X _{af}	X _{af}	X _{af}	X _{bf}	X _{bf}	X _{bf}	X _c	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _d	N/A	X _e	N/A	X _e	X _f	X _f	X _f
Mediterranean salt meadows	X _{af}	X _{af}	X _{af}	X _{bf}	X _{bf}	X _{bf}	X _c	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _d	N/A	X _e	N/A	X _e	X _f	X _f	X _f

Evidence supporting conclusions

X_a The sediment plume and deposition modelling does not extend into any SACs beyond trace levels and no sediment plume or deposition extends into this SAC. With embedded mitigation measures in place for suspended sediment entering the SAC through surface water run off (Construction Environmental Monitoring Plan (CEMP)), there is therefore, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, no potential for an AEoI from the onshore or offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_b With embedded mitigation measures in place for accidental spills and surface water run off; Construction Environmental Monitoring Plan (CEMP) and offshore Environmental Management Plan (EMP), and low levels of site-specific sediment bound contaminants at the site, it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore or onshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc Taking into consideration the lack of direct overlap between the SAC and the proposed development, the implementation of embedded mitigation (International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments Convention) and the localised nature of the impact, pathways to the site are considered negligible. Therefore, it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xd Changes in flow dynamics and associated scour effects will remain within the array area with small-scale changes around individual foundations with no far-field effects likely. Consequently, due to the distance from the array, it is unlikely that any impact will occur on the SAC as a result of changes to physical processes and therefore it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xe Impacts are expected to be minimal and temporary during the nearest construction works, with the implementation of relevant mitigation measures inputs of dust into the SAC are considered to be negligible. Therefore, it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the onshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xf When factoring in the lack of potential adverse effects from the proposed development alone, suspended sediment / deposition and accidental pollution from the onshore development area (construction and decommissioning) and offshore development (construction, operation and decommissioning) area are considered for in-combination impacts. It is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt that there is no potential for AEoI from either the onshore or offshore development area on the sites and features for these impacts from any of the projects considered for in-combination for either in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A1.

There have been no changes to the assessment outcomes as a result of the design refinements and updates to the 2024 NIS.

Minor errata have also been corrected. The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb etc) has been updated to improve the clarity and rationale for the decisions made with regards to the conclusions using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 2 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by in its entirety by Matrix A2 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A2 Rogerstown Estuary SAC (replaces Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Impact	Suspended Sediment / Deposition			Accidental Pollution			Marine INNS			Changes to Physical Processes			Dust Deposition			In Combination		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Estuaries	Xaf	Xaf	Xaf	Xbf	Xbf	Xbf	Xc	Xc	Xc	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xe	N/A	Xe	Xf	Xf	Xf
Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide	Xaf	Xaf	Xaf	Xbf	Xbf	Xbf	Xc	Xc	Xc	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xe	N/A	Xe	Xf	Xf	Xf
<i>Salicornia</i> and other annual colonising mud and sand	Xaf	Xaf	Xaf	Xbf	Xbf	Xbf	Xc	Xc	Xc	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xe	N/A	Xe	Xf	Xf	Xf
Atlantic salt meadows	Xaf	Xaf	Xaf	Xbf	Xbf	Xbf	Xc	Xc	Xc	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xe	N/A	Xe	Xf	Xf	Xf
Mediterranean salt meadows	Xaf	Xaf	Xaf	Xbf	Xbf	Xbf	Xc	Xc	Xc	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xe	N/A	Xe	Xf	Xf	Xf

Evidence supporting conclusions

Xa The sediment plume and deposition modelling does not extend into any SACs beyond trace levels and no sediment plume or deposition extends into this SAC. With embedded mitigation measures in place for suspended sediment entering the SAC through surface water run off (Construction Environmental Monitoring Plan (CEMP)), there is therefore, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, no potential for an AEoI from the onshore or offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb With embedded mitigation measures in place for accidental spills and surface water run off; Construction Environmental Monitoring Plan (CEMP) and offshore Environmental Management Plan (EMP), and low levels of site-specific sediment bound contaminants at the site, it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore or onshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc Taking into consideration the lack of direct overlap between the SAC and the proposed development, the implementation of embedded mitigation (International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments Convention), and the localised nature of the impact, pathways to the site are considered negligible. Therefore, it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xd Changes in flow dynamics and associated scour effects will remain within the array area with small-scale changes around individual foundations with no far-field effects likely. Consequently, due to the distance from the array, it is unlikely that any impact will occur on the SAC as a result of changes to physical processes and therefore it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xe The SACs COs are located at a distance where impacts are expected to be imperceptible with the implementation of relevant mitigation measures inputs of dust into the SAC are considered to be negligible. Therefore, it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the onshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xf When factoring in the lack of potential adverse effects from the proposed development alone, suspended sediment / deposition and accidental pollution from the onshore development area (construction and decommissioning) and offshore development area (construction, operation and decommissioning) are considered for in-combination effects. It is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt that there is no potential for AEoI from the offshore or onshore development area on the sites and features for these impacts from any of the projects considered for in-combination in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A2.

There have been no changes to the assessment outcomes as a result of the design refinements and updates to the 2024 NIS.

Minor errata have also been corrected. The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb etc) has been updated to improve the clarity and rationale for the decisions made with regards to the conclusions using information presented in the NIS. The in-combination assessment column and rationale added for consistency.

For clarity, Matrix 3 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by in its entirety by Matrix A3 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

MatrixA3 Baldoyle Bay SAC (replaces Matrix 3 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Baldoyle Bay SAC Site Code: IE0000199 Distance to closest point of Proposed Development (km): 22.5																		
Impact	Suspended Sediment / Deposition			Accidental Pollution			Marine INNS			Changes to Physical Processes			Dust			In-combination		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	N/A	X _{bc}	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _c	N/A	X _c
<i>Salicornia</i> and other annuals colonising mud and sand	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	N/A	X _{bc}	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _c	N/A	X _c
Atlantic salt meadows	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	N/A	X _{bc}	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _c	N/A	X _c
Mediterranean salt meadows	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	N/A	X _{bc}	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _c	N/A	X _c

Evidence supporting conclusions

Xa Impacts to the QIs will be negligible and the mitigation measures set out in the CEMP for surface water run-off of suspended sediment/deposition, enables the conclusion that there is therefore, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, no potential for an AEoI from the onshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb Although contamination of the SAC from an accidental spill could occur via surface water and hydrologically connected channels, the implementation of the pollution measures mitigation outlined in the CEMP for accidental spills mean it is determined that there is therefore, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, no potential for an AEoI from the onshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc When factoring in the lack of potential adverse effects from the proposed development alone, suspended sediment / deposition and accidental pollution from the onshore development area (construction and decommissioning) are considered for in-combination effects. It is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt that there is no potential for AEoI on the sites and features for these impacts from any of the projects considered for in-combination in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2. (As this SAC is over 20 km from the array area or ECC it was screened out for all effects from the offshore development area).

End of Matrix A3.

There have been no changes to the assessment outcomes as a result of the design refinements and updates to the 2024 NIS.

Minor errata have also been corrected. The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb etc) has been updated to improve the clarity and rationale for the decisions made with regards to the conclusions using information presented in the NIS. The in-combination and dust pathway columns have been added for consistency and assessment outcomes added.

For clarity, Matrix 4 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by in its entirety by Matrix A4 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A4 Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (replaces Matrix 4 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC Site Code: IE0003000 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 2.9																		
Impact	Suspended Sediment / Deposition			Accidental Pollution			Marine INNS			Changes to Physical Processes			Dust			In-combination		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Reefs	X _{ae}	X _{ae}	X _{ae}	X _{be}	X _{be}	X _{be}	X _c	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _d	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _e	X _e	X _e

Evidence supporting conclusions

X_a The sediment plume and deposition modelling indicates that only southerly ebb flows on spring tides have the capacity to carry the sediment plume as far as the northern limit of the Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC with concentrations regarded as equivalent to ambient concentrations. The modelling indicates that all levels of deposition above 1mm remain within the ECC boundary with only trace levels (<1mm) spreading further afield. For high flow conditions, the ebb distribution of the plume has the potential to develop some settlement in the northern part of the Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC, however, the magnitude of deposition is considered to be insignificant in the range 0.01 to 0.1mm, but typically around 0.02mm. The sediment plume and deposition modelling indicates the sediment plumes and associated deposition resulting from works within the Array Area or HDD at landfall will not impinge on the Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC. With embedded mitigation measures in place (Offshore Environmental Monitoring Plan (CEMP)), there is therefore beyond reasonable scientific doubt, no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_b With mitigation measures in place for accidental spills; Offshore Environmental Management Plan (EMP), and low levels of site-specific sediment bound contaminants at the site, it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc Taking into consideration the lack of direct overlap between the SAC and the proposed development, the implementation of embedded mitigation (International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments Convention), and the localised nature of the impact, pathways to the site are considered negligible. Therefore, it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xd Changes in flow dynamics and associated scour effects will remain within the array area with small-scale changes around individual foundations with no far-field effects likely. Consequently, due to the distance from the array, it is unlikely that any impact will occur on the SAC as a result of changes to physical processes and therefore it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xe When factoring in the lack of potential adverse effects from the proposed development alone, and suspended sediment / deposition and accidental pollution from the offshore development area and the identified potential effects from other projects, which are short term, intermittent or small scale, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt that there is no potential for AEoI on the sites and features for these impacts from any of the projects considered for in-combination in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A4.

There have been no changes to the assessment outcomes as a result of the design refinements and updates to the 2024 NIS.

Minor errata have also been corrected. The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb etc) has been updated to improve the clarity and rationale for the decisions made with regards to the conclusions using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 5 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by in its entirety by Matrix A5 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A5 Boyne Coast and Estuary SAC (replaces Matrix 5 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Boyne Coast and Estuary SAC Site Code: IE001957 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 7.9																		
Impact	Suspended Sediment / Deposition			Accidental Pollution			Marine INNS			Changes to Physical Processes			Dust			In-combination		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Estuaries	X _{ae}	X _{ae}	X _{ae}	X _{be}	X _{be}	X _{be}	X _c	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _d	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _e	X _e	X _e
Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide	X _{ae}	X _{ae}	X _{ae}	X _{be}	X _{be}	X _{be}	X _c	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _d	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _e	X _e	X _e
<i>Salicornia</i> and other annuals colonising mud and sand	X _{ae}	X _{ae}	X _{ae}	X _{be}	X _{be}	X _{be}	X _c	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _d	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _e	X _e	X _e
Atlantic salt meadows	X _{ae}	X _{ae}	X _{ae}	X _{be}	X _{be}	X _{be}	X _c	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _d	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _e	X _e	X _e

Evidence supporting conclusions

X_a The sediment plume and deposition modelling does not extend into any SACs beyond trace levels and no sediment plume or deposition extends into this SAC there is therefore, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb With embedded mitigation measures in place for accidental spills, offshore Environmental Management Plan (EMP), and low levels of site-specific sediment bound contaminants at the site, it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc Taking into consideration the lack of direct overlap between the SAC and the proposed development, the implementation of embedded mitigation (International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments Convention), and the localised nature of the impact, pathways to the site are considered negligible. Therefore, it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xd Changes in flow dynamics and associated scour effects will remain within the array area with small-scale changes around individual foundations with no far-field effects likely. Consequently, due to the distance from the array, it is unlikely that any impact will occur on the SAC as a result of changes to physical processes and therefore it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xe When factoring in the lack of potential adverse effects from the proposed development alone, and suspended sediment / deposition, and accidental pollution considered for in-combination impacts for the offshore development area and the identified potential effects from other projects, which are short term, intermittent or small scale, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt that there is no potential for AEoI on the sites and features for these impacts from any of the projects considered for in-combination in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A5.

There have been no changes to the assessment outcomes as a result of the design refinements and updates to the 2024 NIS.

Minor errata have also been corrected. The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb etc) has been updated to improve the clarity and rationale for the decisions made with regards to the conclusions using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 6 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by in its entirety by Matrix A6 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A6 Lambay Island SAC (replaces Matrix 6 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Lambay Island SAC Site Code: IE000204 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 14.8																		
Impact	Suspended Sediment / Deposition			Accidental Pollution			Marine INNS			Changes to Physical Processes			Dust			In-combination		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Reefs	X _{ae}	X _{ae}	X _{ae}	X _{be}	X _{be}	X _{be}	X _c	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _d	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _e	X _e	X _e

Evidence supporting conclusions

X_a The sediment plume and deposition modelling does not extend into any SACs beyond trace levels and no sediment plume or deposition extends into this SAC and the communities present have low sensitivity to low levels of deposition. There is therefore, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_b With embedded mitigation measures in place for accidental spills; offshore Environmental Management Plan (EMP), and low levels of site-specific sediment bound contaminants at the site, it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_c Taking into consideration the lack of direct overlap between the SAC and the proposed development, the implementation of embedded mitigation (International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments Convention), and the localised nature of the impact, pathways to the site are considered negligible. Therefore, it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xd Changes in flow dynamics and associated scour effects will remain within the array area with small-scale changes around individual foundations with no far-field effects likely. Consequently, due to the distance from the array, it is unlikely that any impact will occur on the SAC as a result of changes to physical processes and therefore it is concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xe When factoring in the lack of potential adverse effects from the proposed development alone, and suspended sediment / deposition and accidental pollution from the offshore development area and the identified potential effects from other projects, which are short term, intermittent or small scale, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt that there is no potential for AEoI on the sites and features for these impacts from any of the projects considered for in-combination in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A6.

4. Migratory Fish

Table 4.1 Relevant RFI Responses for Migratory Fish

RFI Section	RFI	Relevance to Chapter
1 (b)	The scientific information provided as part of the planning application documentation should be based on up-to-date survey reports and data. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to confirm/provide justification/verification that the information submitted in support of the planning application remains relevant and appropriate at the point of submitting further information or to update same as required.	The Conservation Objectives for a number of protected sites have been updated and therefore they have been considered further within NIS and associated appendices, including relevant Integrity Matrices below.
11 (g)	The applicant is requested to consider disturbance to fish, basking shark and sea turtles from underwater noise generated by wind turbines during the operational phase of the proposed development'	In response to RFI 11 (g), operational noise from WTGs has been screened in to the NIS for relevant receptors, including migratory fish, within the NIS. As this introduces an additional potential impact pathway to the assessment, the Integrity Matrices have been revised accordingly. Therefore, Matrix 7 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been replaced with Matrix A.12 in Section 4 of this document.

In response to RFI 11 (g), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in migratory fish features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 7 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

Minor errata have also been corrected. The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to replace the term “piling” with “drilling”, reflecting that impact pile driving is no longer part of the project description and has been updated to improve the clarity and rationale for the decisions made with regards to the conclusions using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 7 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A7 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A7 River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (replaces Matrix 7 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC Site Code: IE0002299 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 13.0															
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG noise			Suspended Sediment Plumes and Deposition			Accidental Pollution			EMF		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
River lamprey	Xag	N/A	Xag	N/A	Xc	N/A	Xdh	Xdh	Xdh	Xei	Xei	Xei	N/A	Xfj	N/A
Atlantic salmon	Xbg	N/A	Xbg	N/A	Xc	N/A	Xdh	Xdh	Xdh	Xei	Xei	Xei	N/A	Xfj	N/A

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa There are multiple sources of underwater noise including drilling, UXO clearance and continuous noise. With mitigation measures in place for UXO clearance, the low susceptibility of river lamprey to pressure-related injuries, and the preference of the species for estuarine habitats, the risk of lethal or sub-lethal injuries was assessed to be negligible. Any potential TTS and behavioural changes will likely be temporary and reversible in nature. There is therefore, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb There are multiple sources of underwater noise including drilling, UXO clearance and continuous noise. With mitigation measures in place for UXO clearance, the impact is not predicted to alter individual fitness or reproductive rates to the extent that could alter the trajectory of the population at the site. There is therefore, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc Underwater noise from operational turbines is predicted to be long-term (over the lifetime of the proposed development) and continuous, but any effects on qualifying features would be indirect and limited to very close proximity to individual turbines within the array area. Given their mobility, and transient nature across the array area, Atlantic salmon and River Lamprey are unlikely to remain within any near-field noise zone for durations sufficient to result in auditory effects or sustained behavioural disruption. There is therefore, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xd Sediment plumes are expected to dissipate after cessation of construction activity, with SSCs reducing within a couple tidal cycles. Factoring in the mobile nature of the QIs and the temporary, intermittent and localised nature of the impact, no barrier effects to any upstream or outgoing migration preventing the QIs from accessing or leaving their freshwater habitat within the site are predicted. There is therefore, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xe With embedded mitigation measures in place for accidental spills (Construction Environmental Monitoring Plan (CEMP) and Environmental Management Plan (EMP)), and low levels of site-specific sediment bound contaminants at the site, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xf EMFs generated by the power cables are likely to be detectable above background levels only in close proximity to the cables (i.e., within metres). Taking into consideration the distance of the cables from the River Boyne estuary combined with the localised nature of potential behavioural responses, effects from EMF are not predicted to result in a barrier effect that would prevent the QIs from accessing or leaving the SAC. There is therefore, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xg When factoring in the lack of potential adverse effects from the proposed development alone, and the potential extent and duration of underwater noise effects for projects considered in-combination, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xh When factoring in the lack of potential adverse effects from the proposed development alone, and the temporary, localised and intermittent nature of the impact (SSC) for projects considered in-combination, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xi When factoring in the lack of potential adverse effects from the proposed development alone, and the temporary, localised and intermittent nature of the impact (accidental pollution) for projects considered in-combination, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xj When factoring in the lack of potential adverse effects from the proposed development alone, and the highly localised nature of the (EMF) impact for projects considered in-combination, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A7.

5. Marine Mammals

Table 5.1 Relevant RFI Responses for Marine Mammals

RFI Section	RFI	Relevance to Chapter
1 (b)	The scientific information provided as part of the planning application documentation should be based on up-to-date survey reports and data. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to confirm/provide justification/verification that the information submitted in support of the planning application remains relevant and appropriate at the point of submitting further information or to update same as required.	The Conservation Objectives for a number of protected sites have been updated and therefore they have been considered further within NIS and associated appendices, including relevant Integrity Matrices below.
10 (h)	The applicant is requested to fully assess disturbance from operational turbines in the context of the size and the number of turbines proposed and ensure that the assessment of the combined noise effects of all turbines be examined and relevant disturbance ranges identified.	In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from Wind Turbine Generators (WTGs) has been screened into the assessment for marine mammals within the NIS. As this introduces an additional potential impact pathway to the NIS, the Integrity Matrices have been revised accordingly. Therefore, Matrices 8 to 44 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have replaced with Matrices A8 to A44 in Section 5 of this document.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 8 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 8 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A8 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A8 Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (replaces Matrix 8 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC Site Code: IE003000 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 2.4																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource.

Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A8.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 9 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 9 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A.9 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A9 Lambay Island SAC (replaces Matrix 9 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Lambay Island SAC Site Code: IE0000204 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 14.8																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}
Grey seal	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}
Harbour seal	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X_a The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_b The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A9.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 10 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 10 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A10 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A10: Codling Fault SAC (replaces Matrix 10 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Codling Fault SAC Site Code: IE003015 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 28																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X_a The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_b The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_c The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource.

Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A10.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 11 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 11 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A11 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A11 North Anglesey Marine/ Gogledd Môn Forol SAC (replaces Matrix 11 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: North Anglesey Marine/ Gogledd Môn Forol SAC Site Code: UK0030398 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 34.7																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource.

Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A11.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 12 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

Minor errata have also been corrected. The qualifying interest (QI) has been amended from “harbour porpoise” to “harbour seal” to correct an error in the original submission.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 12 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A12 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A12: Murlough SAC (replaces Matrix 12 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Murlough SAC Site Code: UK0016612 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 41.3																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour seal	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X_a The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_b The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A12.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 13 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 13 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A13 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A13 North Channel SAC (replaces Matrix 13 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: North Channel SAC Site Code: UK0030399 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 48.4																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A13.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 14 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 14 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A14 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A14 Glannau Ynys Gybi / Holy Island Coast SAC (replaces Matrix 14 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Glannau Ynys Gybi / Holy Island Coast SAC Site Code: UK0013046 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 82.3																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Grey seal	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X_a The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_b The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_c The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A14.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 15 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 15 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A15 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A15 West Wales Marine/ Gorllewin Cymru Foro SAC (replaces Matrix 15 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: West Wales Marine/ Gorllewin Cymru Forol SAC Site Code: UK0030397 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 100.7																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A15.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 16 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 16 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A16 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A16 Pen Llŷn a'r Sarnau/ Lleyn Peninsula and the Sarnau SAC (replaces Matrix 16 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Pen Llŷn a'r Sarnau/ Lleyn Peninsula and the Sarnau SAC																		
Site Code: UK0013117																		
Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 106.7																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Bottlenose dolphin	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A16.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 17 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 17 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A17 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A17 Blackwater Bank SAC (replaces Matrix 17 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Blackwater Bank SAC Site Code: IE002953 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 121																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A17.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 18 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 18 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A18 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A18 Carnsore Point SAC (replaces Matrix 18 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Carnsore Point SAC Site Code: IE002269 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 154																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A18.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 19 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 19 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A19 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A19 Cardigan Bay/ Bae Ceredigion SAC (replaces Matrix 19 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Cardigan Bay/ Bae Ceredigion SAC Site Code: UK0012712 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 161.9																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Bottlenose dolphin	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A19.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 20 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 20 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A20 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A20 Hook Head SAC (replaces Matrix 20 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Hook Head SAC Site Code: IE000764 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 199																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}
Bottlenose dolphin	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A20.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 21 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 21 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A21 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A21 Bristol Channel Approaches/ Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren SAC (replaces Matrix 21 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Bristol Channel Approaches/ Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren SAC																		
Site Code: UK0030396																		
Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 223.0																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A21.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 22 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 22 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A22 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A22 Roaringwater Bay and Island SAC (replaces Matrix 22 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Roaringwater Bay and Island SAC Site Code: IE0000101 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 320.0																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A22.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 23 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 23 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A23 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A23 Blasket Island SAC (replaces Matrix 23 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Blasket Island SAC Site Code: IE0002172 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 346.6																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A23.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 24 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 24 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A24 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A24 Kenmare River SAC (replaces Matrix 24 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Kenmare River SAC Site Code: IE002158 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 453																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A24.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 25 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 25 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A25 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A25 Bunduff Lough and Machair/ Trawlua/ Mullaghmore SAC (replaces Matrix 25 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Bunduff Lough and Machair/ Trawlua/ Mullaghmore SAC																		
Site Code: IE00625																		
Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 436																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A25.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 26 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 26 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A26 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A26 Nord Bretagne DH SAC (replaces Matrix 26 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Nord Bretagne DH SAC Site Code: FR2502022 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 470.8																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A26.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 27 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 27 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A27 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A27 West Connacht Coast SAC (replaces Matrix 27 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: West Connacht Coast SAC Site Code: IE002998 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 477																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A27.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 28 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 28 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A28 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A28 Mers Celtiques – Talus du golfe de Gascogne SAC (replaces Matrix 28 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Mers Celtiques – Talus du golfe de Gascogne SAC Site Code: FR5302015 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 499.9																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A28.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 29 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 29 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A29 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A29 Récifs et landes de la Hague SAC (replaces Matrix 29 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Récifs et landes de la Hague SAC Site Code: FR2500084 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 503.8																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A29.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 30 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 30 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A30 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A30 Anse de Vauville SAC (replaces Matrix 30 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Anse de Vauville SAC Site Code: FR2502019 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 511.8																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A30.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 31 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 31 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A31 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A31 Banc et récifs de Surtainville SAC (replaces Matrix 31 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Banc et récifs de Surtainville SAC Site Code: FR2502018 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 529.6																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A31.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 32 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 32 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A32 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A32 Tregor Goëlo SAC (replaces Matrix 32 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Tregor Goëlo SAC Site Code: FR5300010 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 535.1																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A32.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 33 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 33 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A33 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A33 Belgica Mound SAC (replaces Matrix 33 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Belgica Mound SAC Site Code: IE002327 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 545																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A33.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 34 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 34 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A34 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A34 Baie de Morlaix SAC (replaces Matrix 34 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Baie de Morlaix SAC Site Code: FR5300015 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 551.2																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A34.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 35 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 35 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A35 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A35 Abers – Côtes des Légendes SAC (replaces Matrix 35 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Abers – Côtes des Légendes SAC Site Code: FR5300017 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 554.0																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A35.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 36 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 36 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A36 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A36 Ouessant-Molène SAC (replaces Matrix 36 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Ouessant-Molène SAC Site Code: FR5300018 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 572.2																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A36.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 37 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 37 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A37 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A37 Chausey SAC (replaces Matrix 37 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Chausey SAC Site Code: FR2510037 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 578.2																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X_a The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_b The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_c The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A37.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 38 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 38 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A38 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A38 Baie de Saint-Brieuc – Est SAC (replaces Matrix 38 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS).

Name of designated site: Baie de Saint-Brieuc – Est SAC Site Code: FR5300066 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 592.8																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A38.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 39 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 39 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A39 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A39 Côtes de Crozon SAC (replaces Matrix 39 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Côtes de Crozon SAC Site Code: FR5302006 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 598.1																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A39.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 40 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 40 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A40 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A40 Baie de Lancieux, Baie de l'Arguenon, Archipel de Saint Malo et Dinard SAC (replaces Matrix 40 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Baie de Lancieux, Baie de l'Arguenon, Archipel de Saint Malo et Dinard SAC																		
Site Code: FR5300012																		
Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 605.0																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A40.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 41 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 41 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A41 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A41 Baie du Mont Saint-Michel SAC (replaces Matrix 41 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Baie du Mont Saint-Michel SAC Site Code: FR2500077 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 607.1																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A41.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 42 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 42 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A42 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A42 Kilkerian Bay and Islands SAC (replaces Matrix 42 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Kilkerian Bay and Islands SAC Site Code: IE002111 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 636																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A42.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 43 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 43 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A43 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A43 Chaussée de Sein SAC (replaces Matrix 43 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Chaussée de Sein SAC Site Code:FR5302007 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 617.0																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	Xac	N/A	Xac	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xac	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc	Xbc

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site’s COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A43.

In response to RFI 10 (h), operational noise from WTGs has been considered as an impact pathway for all SACs with screened-in marine mammal features within the Addendum to the NIS. Matrix 44 of Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS has been updated accordingly.

The text under evidence supporting conclusions (items Xa and Xb) has been updated to improve the clarity of the conclusion using information presented in the NIS.

For clarity, Matrix 44 and accompanying evidence supporting conclusions in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS have been deleted and replaced by Matrix A44 alongside updated evidence supporting conclusions.

Matrix A44 Inishmore Island SAC (replaces Matrix 44 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Inishmore Island SAC Site Code: IE000213 Distance to closest point of Proposed development (km): 636																		
Impact	Underwater Noise			Operational WTG Noise			Vessel Disturbance			Vessel Collision			Changes in Prey			Accidental Pollution		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Harbour porpoise	X _{ac}	N/A	X _{ac}	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{ac}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}	X _{bc}

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X_a The impacts are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_b The small-scale, localised changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_c The impacts from in-combination effects are not predicted to result in any significant change to individual fitness or reproductive success and ultimately no effect on the community at the site. Mitigation is required for underwater noise and vessel collision. Any small scale, localised, changes to the fish communities that the qualifying feature depend on are not expected to result in the deterioration of the prey resource. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the offshore development area in view of the site's COs with respect to all QIs, for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A44.

6. Ornithology

Table 6.1: Relevant RFI Responses for Ornithology

RFI Section	RFI	Relevance to Screening Matrice
1 (b)	The scientific information provided as part of the planning application documentation should be based on up-to-date survey reports and data. Accordingly, the applicant is requested to confirm/provide justification/verification that the information submitted in support of the planning application remains relevant and appropriate at the point of submitting further information or to update same as required.	The timeframes associated with the RFI have necessitated a review of the datasets previously used in the 2024 NIS to ensure any necessary updates to the baseline environment are captured. Where the CO have been updated since the 2024 NIS, this is reflected in the Screening Matrice as appropriate.
8 (a) (ii)	Red-throated Diver: The desktop review summarised in Table 15.3 of Chapter 15 of the EIAR does not appear to include the results generated from a series of Digital Aerial Surveys (DAS) undertaken over marine waters off Gormanstown (HiDef, 2019) that was commissioned by the Marine Institute and referenced in the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) Conservation Objective document for the NWIS cSPA. This survey data indicates a high density of Red-throated Diver <i>Gavia stellata</i> in the area of the coast west of the array and overlapping with the proposed cable route. Densities were notably larger than those densities that informed the applicant's assessment of mortality caused by displacement-disturbance effects for this proposed development (i.e. 3.26 individuals km-2 on 29/12/2018; 1.35 individuals km-2 on 16/01/19; 3.45 individuals km-2 on 04/02/19; 2.99 individuals km-2 on 23/03/19). As well as being important for assessment of Red-throated Diver, the HiDef/Gormanstown 2019 surveys are also likely to be relevant for the assessment of other species that the applicant is requested to reconsider (e.g. Great Northern Diver <i>Gavia immer</i>, Common Scoter). As such, the applicant is requested to include the HiDef/Gormanstown 2019 survey data in the assessment of impacts on the marine birds of the NWIS cSPA in relation to this proposed development, including in the assessment associated with the cable route. The applicant is requested to review the EIAR and NIS accordingly.	The Developer notes the request to include the HiDef (2019) DAS data, which covers waters off Gormanstown, within the assessment. These data have been considered alongside more recent survey datasets to assess their suitability (this is presented in Section 2.11 of the Offshore Intertidal Ornithology Baseline, A14 of the NIS). Since submission of the application, however, the Developer has undertaken an additional 12-month programme of DAS across the NWIS cSPA between September 2024 and August 2025. Following consultation with NPWS during 2025 and 2026, the Developer adopted the NWIS DAS dataset as the primary baseline for assessment on the basis that it represents the most spatially comprehensive and high-resolution dataset currently available for the NWIS cSPA and is directly focused on the area most relevant to the proposed development. The programme achieved >16% spatial coverage of the SPA and >18% coverage within both the red-throated Diver (RTD) Projected Footprint of Infrastructure¹ (PFI) +10 km displacement assessment buffer and the ECC +2 km buffer. The same is true for the common scoter and great northern diver Zone of Influence (ZoI) of the PFI +4 km displacement assessment buffer and the ECC +2 km buffer. While the HiDef (2019) dataset provides contextual information, it offers limited spatial coverage of the key ZoIs used within the assessment (e.g. PFI +10km buffer and the full ECC +2km buffer) and is based on data that are now superseded by the targeted, site-specific NWIS DAS programme. The NWIS DAS recorded consistently low diver and seaduck usage within and around the proposed array area and ECC during 2024 and 2025. In light of the NWIS DAS, the assessments have been reviewed and updated for all species (including red-throated diver, common scoter and great northern diver) to ensure that the baseline characterisation and subsequent impact assessments reflect this evidence. Cross-references to these updates are provided within Section 5.4 and 6.4 of the NIS, where the NWIS DAS has informed both the quantitative analysis and the overall conclusions.

RFI Section	RFI	Relevance to Screening Matrice
		¹ The PFI represents a defined ornithology study sub-area within the overall array area, where all permanent offshore array infrastructure will be located. The PFI has been developed following design refinements to minimise spatial overlap with sensitive receptors and occupies just 57.7 km², representing 2.5% of the NWIS cSPA. These updates are reflected in the Addendum to the SISAA (Section 1.9) and NIS ornithology assessment (see Section 5.1.2, including red-throated diver assessment at Section 5.1.2.19) and are supported by detailed survey information in the Technical Baseline (Appendix A14 of the NIS). The Screening Matrices (Appendix 1 of the SISAA) and Integrity Matrices (Appendix 2 of the NIS) are updated accordingly.
8 (a) (iii)	Red-throated Diver is a species known to be highly sensitive to offshore wind farm developments due to displacement effects. A 4km displacement buffer is applied in the application documentation. The Board note that for Red—throated Diver best available evidence as presented in the UK Joint SNCB ‘Interim Advice On The Treatment Of Displacement For Red-Throated Diver’ (SNCB, 2022) states that: “For non-breeding red-throated diver, a pragmatic displacement buffer of at least 10km is recommended for use in site characterization, impact assessments and post-consent monitoring where a plan or project is within 10km of a Special Protection Area (SPA) designated for non-breeding redthroated diver. Where a plan or project is further than 10km from a SPA designated for non-breeding red-throated diver, a standard displacement buffer of 4km should continue to be used”. The DAU in their observation identifies the following papers which further indicate displacement impacts of greater than 4 km for Red-throated Diver: Heinänen et al. (2016); Žydelis et al. (2016); Webb et al. (2017); Mendel et al. (2019); Heinänen et al. (2020); Vilela et al. (2020); and APEM (2021). The Board notes that the proposed development is located entirely within the NWIS cSPA, for which Red-throated Diver is a SCI, and given the evidence sources available, the Board requests that the applicant reconsiders screening out displacement effects on Red-throated Diver associated with the array area. The information available from HiDef (2019) surveys indicates the known extent of Red-throated Diver and their densities and shows the species concentrating in shallower coastal areas. This therefore provides an evidence base for waters of 5-20m; however, the species can also use water depths up to 30m (Natural England, 2012). There appears to be a data gap between the HiDef survey boundary and the array area boundary. The applicant is requested to overlay the application survey maps with the HiDef survey maps and, where there is a data gap, the applicant is requested to undertake additional survey work to address the data gap. The survey should provide sufficient coverage to reliably characterise the distribution and abundance of Red-throated Diver from the proposed array area western boundary to a distance of 10 km towards the coast (west).	The Developer notes An Bord Pleanála’s comments regarding potential displacement of RTD beyond a 4 km buffer. Since submission of the application, the Developer has completed an additional 12-month programme of DAS across the NWIS cSPA between September 2024 and August 2025, which has now been adopted as the primary baseline dataset for assessment as it fully addresses the data gaps identified within the ECC to the west of the array area. Given the extent, recency and relevance of the NWIS DAS coverage, the Developer considers this dataset sufficient to robustly characterise baseline distribution and abundance of RTD, common scoter and great- northern diver. The NWIS DAS effectively constitutes ‘further targeted winter surveys’ over a far larger spatial area (albeit one survey per month, instead of two, was carried out during Jan – Mar) addressing the concerns over the gaps in spatial survey coverage. Although one survey per month was undertaken in January, February and March, the Developer is confident that the surveys provide the relevant information in defining the baseline of red-throated diver in the NWIS cSPA and provide data that is representative of how the site is used over the winter period. Moreover, for the area of highest potential displacement (the array area plus 4km buffer), previous annual surveys were undertaken that area and used to define the baseline. Overall, the surveys allow for the estimation of abundance and densities estimates, as well as highlighting distribution, which have been used in the assessment of potential disturbance/displacement. In this context, the additional data provide a comprehensive and proportionate evidence base, and no further targeted surveys are considered necessary. Full details of the survey design, coverage and results are provided in Appendix A14: Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology Technical Baseline (of the NIS). The NWIS DAS recorded consistently low usage of RTD within and around the proposed array area across the full survey period. Given the extent, recency and applicability of this coverage, the Developer considers the dataset sufficient to robustly characterise baseline RTD distribution across the PFI + 10 km buffer, without the need for additional targeted winter surveys. On this basis and informed by a review of the best available displacement evidence, the assessment of potential displacement effects on RTD has been updated to consider effects extending up to 10 km from the PFI, with findings reported in the NIS. Full details of the

RFI Section	RFI	Relevance to Screening Matrice
	The applicant is requested to assess displacement of Red-throated Diver to a distance of at least 10 km from the proposed array area due to project infrastructure, having regard to recent best available evidence as presented in the UK Joint SNCB Interim Displacement Advice Note (SNCB, 2022), and update the EIAR and NIS accordingly. Note: Due to the water depth within the array area and low numbers of Red-throated Diver observed in the existing DAS (May 2020 to October 2022), two full winter seasons may not be required to be surveyed to address any data gap, where it is detected. It is requested that the applicant considers undertaking targeted surveys covering one winter period, with two surveys per month undertaken in critical months for wintering Red-throated Diver. This would comprise one survey per month to be undertaken in November and December; two surveys per month in each of January, February, and March, and one survey to be undertaken in April.	survey design, coverage and results are provided in the Appendix A14: Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology Technical Baseline (of the NIS). Displacement Assumptions The Developer has reviewed the available evidence on RTD disturbance, including that cited in the NPWS recommendation, and has adopted the following operational-phase displacement rates: • PFI+ 4 km buffer: 100% displacement • 4 km to 10 km buffer: 52% displacement (Garthe et al., 2023) These rates are considered precautionary and represent the upper end of displacement responses reported in the literature. A number of empirical studies report lower displacement within both distance bands (e.g. Percival, 2010; Heinänen et al., 2016; Zydels et al., 2016; Webb et al., 2017; Mendel et al., 2019; Heinänen et al., 2020; Vilela et al., 2020; APEM, 2021; Garthe et al., 2023); however, the adopted values provide a conservative estimate of potential effects. The approach of using empirical studies to inform displacement rates is in line with the UK Joint SNCB Interim Displacement Advice Note, which states “<i>The SNCBs have previously accepted an estimate of red-throated diver displacement at 100% up to 4km, an approach that recognises that displacement may occur up to and beyond 10km but is not 100%. Where a plan or project is within 10km of a SPA designated for non-breeding red-throated diver however, it is necessary to make a more detailed assessment, considering the details of displacement up to, and potentially beyond, 10km with an appropriate gradient agreed with the relevant SNCB which must take account of any local evidence supporting a known displacement rate</i>” and “<i>Displacement will not be 100% throughout the distance over which the effect occurs but there will likely be a gradation, with decreasing effects at increased distance from an OWF. That is to say that red-throated diver densities might be expected to increase at increasing distances from an OWF. While displacement within the OWF footprint may be close to 100%, the rate of change in displacement up to and beyond 4km appears to vary, perhaps between regions and survey platforms</i>” These updates are reflected in updates to the SISAA (Section 1.9 and Sections 3.4 and 3.5) and throughout the ornithology assessment of the NIS (see Section 5.1.2, including red-throated diver assessment at Section 5.1.2.19) and are supported by detailed survey information in the Technical Baseline (Appendix A14 of the NIS). The Screening Matrices (Appendix 1 of the SISAA) and Integrity Matrices (Appendix 2 of the NIS) are updated accordingly.
8 (c)(ii)	The applicant is requested to use the displacement matrix approach, as for other species. Here, a 30% displacement rate should be applied, and mortality rates should be based on best available evidence, but with a range of rates presented, from 1% to 3%, as advised by NatureScot (2023).	Without prejudice to its position that the best available evidence indicates that black-legged kittiwake are not prone to displacement from operational offshore wind farms, the Developer has included an assessment of kittiwake displacement within Section 5.4 of the NIS.

RFI Section	RFI	Relevance to Screening Matrice
	The applicant, based on the revised findings, is requested to re-analyse the displacement impacts on the regional population of Black-legged Kittiwake in the EIAR and against the Conservation Objectives of the relevant SPAs and cSPA in the NIS to ensure comprehensiveness of appropriate assessment conclusions.	The assessment follows the UK Joint SNCB Interim Displacement Advice Note prepared by MIG Birds (SNCBs, 2022), within which kittiwake are not identified as a priority species for displacement assessment. Consistent with this guidance, the NIS Section 5.4 classifies kittiwake as having low vulnerability to displacement. The NIS assessed all qualifying interests of the NWIS cSPA, including kittiwake, with consideration of spatial distribution and disturbance in line with the site conservation objectives. As set out in Section 5.4 of the NIS, no adverse effect on integrity is predicted for kittiwake, reflecting the species' extensive foraging range (mean maximum + 1 SD: 300.6 km; Woodward et al., 2019) and low sensitivity to disturbance and displacement. Updated conservation objectives published in November 2024 for Ireland's Eye SPA, Howth Head SPA and Lambay Island SPA have been reviewed, and incorporated in the NIS. Both displacement and collision impacts have been assessed in the NIS for all relevant SPAs. Overall, displacement effects were lower than collision risks. Neither impact pathway gave rise to AEoI in view of the sites' conservation objectives, either alone or in combination (as concluded in the Section 5.4 and 6.4 of the NIS). These conclusions are considered robust, as they are based on precautionary assumptions, up-to-date survey data, and established assessment methodologies applied consistently across all relevant SPAs. Whilst the assessment of kittiwake displacement has been included in response to this RFI, the developer position is that the use of the NatureScot (2023) approach is likely to overestimate effect. NatureScot (2023) advises the application of a precautionary displacement rate of 30% with 1–3% mortality for kittiwake; however, these rates are not derived from robust published empirical studies but instead reflect a highly precautionary interpretation informed by a small number of studies. The wider peer-reviewed evidence base, together with the Joint SNCB advice, is less consistent and does not demonstrate clear or systematic evidence of displacement effects for kittiwake at operational offshore wind farms; studies instead report variable responses, including negligible effects or a balance of attraction and avoidance behaviours across sites (e.g. Dierschke et al., 2016; Leopold et al., 2013; Vanermen et al., 2014; Petersen et al., 2006; Mendel et al., 2014; APEM, 2017; Percival & Ford, 2017; Trinder et al., 2024; Pollock et al., 2023; Johnston et al., 2024; Lamb et al., 2024). The joint SNCB guidance bases screening on disturbance susceptibility and habitat specialisation scores (Furness et al., 2013; Bradbury et al., 2014), with species typically taken forward where either score exceeds 2 (out of 5). Kittiwake score 2 for both metrics. The guidance further notes that gull species generally do not require routine displacement assessment, reflecting evidence of neutral responses or attraction to offshore wind farms. Post-construction monitoring provides further support for this approach. For example, studies at Westernmost Rough (APEM, 2017) and Beatrice (Trinder et al., 2024) found no evidence of kittiwake displacement or turbine avoidance. Likewise, tagging data indicate continued use of operational wind farm footprints during the breeding season, including within the Buchan Ness to Collieston Coast SPA (O'Hanlon et al., 2024).

RFI Section	RFI	Relevance to Screening Matrice
		One study reporting reduced kittiwake density (Peschko et al., 2020) identified a 45% reduction within an array and a 3 km buffer in the German North Sea; however, transferability of these findings to the proposed development is uncertain. Effects were limited to a narrow breeding-season window (mid-May to mid-July), confidence intervals were wide, and survey effort was uneven between impact and control areas, meaning alternative explanatory factors cannot be ruled out. Most recently, tracking data from Whinnyfold, Scotland (Pollock et al., 2024) showed macro-scale attraction of kittiwake to within 1 km of an offshore wind farm, alongside meso-scale avoidance of individual turbines. While the study notes that aggregation could theoretically reflect redistribution within the array, one offshore wind farm was visited by 95% of tagged individuals, indicating that significant displacement is unlikely. In this context, there is limited empirical support for applying standardised displacement rates, and the precautionary approach adopted by NatureScot is likely to overestimate effects. The Screening Matrices (Appendix 1 of the SISAA) and Integrity Matrices (Appendix 2 of the NIS) are updated accordingly.
8 (c)(iii)	Red-throated Diver Displacement: The Board requests that the applicant reconsiders screening out displacement effects on Red-throated Diver associated with the array area. As noted in point a(iii) above, Red-throated Diver is highly sensitive to displacement effects associated with OWFs and vessel traffic (e.g. Furness et al., 2013; Bradbury et al., 2014a-b, Fliessbach et al., 2019). As described in point a(iii) and the references therein, Red-throated Diver can be displaced by OWFs up to 10 km. The species is a SCI of the NWIS cSPA and the region supports an important wintering population (HiDef, 2019). The applicant is requested to use appropriate data (as discussed in points a(ii) and (iii) above) to assess potential displacement impacts to the regional and the cSPA Red-throated Diver populations in the EIAR and the NIS. The applicant should consider displacement effects up to 10 km from the proposed array area during operation.	See Developer response to RFI 8(a) (iii) above.
8 (e)(i)	Foraging Range Screening: Within the document ‘Supporting Information for Screening for Appropriate Assessment’, Section 3.4.3.1, it is stated that in Table 3.13 “For SPAs beyond 300km, only features which have breeding season connectivity were included (based on foraging ranges in Table 1.8), for example gannet and kittiwake due to their larger foraging ranges”. The last table in that section is numbered 3.12 and, notwithstanding the labelling, does not include any SPAs beyond 300 km. The applicant is requested to clarify this discrepancy and present screening determinations for all SPAs within the species-specific foraging ranges, including those beyond 300 km from the proposed array area.	The intention of the assessment was to include SPAs beyond 300 km where species have demonstrated breeding-season connectivity based on species-specific foraging ranges (e.g. gannet and kittiwake). We confirm that screening determinations for all SPAs within the relevant species-specific foraging ranges, including those beyond 300 km from the proposed array area, have now been included in the Supporting Information for Screening for Appropriate Assessment (SISAA). Where connectivity cannot be ruled out, sites have been screened in on a precautionary basis and assessed in the NIS. The updated screening does not alter the conclusions of the NIS and no AEoI is identified on any European protected site. The Screening Matrices (Appendix A1 of the SISAA) has been updated accordingly. Where relevant the Integrity Matrices have been updated.

RFI Section	RFI	Relevance to Screening Matrice
8 (e) (ii)	Gull Screening for Likely Significant Effect: The applicant is requested to provide further justification to screen out Black-legged Kittiwake and Lesser Black-backed Gull <i>Larus fuscus</i> for the Seas off Wexford cSPA, given that this cSPA is within the species-specific foraging ranges of the proposed development or alternatively provide further consideration of these species in the NIS.	Foraging ranges are relevant for deriving connectivity between breeding colonies (where birds act as central place foragers) and developments, with developments falling within a given foraging range from an SPA potentially impacting that SPA. The Seas of Wexford SPA, as a marine SPA, does not have any breeding seabirds (it protects seabirds breeding at other SPA colonies), and as such birds are not acting as central place foragers from this SPA. Therefore, species specific foraging ranges from this SPA are only relevant in determining which colonies may contribute to the numbers of birds within the Seas off Wexford SPA during the breeding season. However, this is not relevant as the Seas off Wexford SPA is specifically designated to protect qualifying interests breeding at three colony SPAs that abut the Seas off Wexford SPA. The qualifying interests of the Seas off Wexford SPA are contributed by four breeding colony SPAs, namely Lady's Island Lake SPA, Wexford Harbour and Slobbs SPA, the Saltee Islands SPA and the Keeragh Islands SPA. All of these breeding colony SPAs about the Seas off Wexford SPA. The proposed development is located over 118 km away from the Seas of Wexford SPA and therefore would not result in any direct effect on the designated site itself through displacement or collision. For there to be an impact pathway for proposed development for the Seas off Wexford SPA, the proposed development would need to be located within the pattern of foraging movement between Seas of Wexford SPA and the abutting SPAs. However, given that the proposed development is over 118 km from the Seas off Wexford SPA and all of its abutting contributory SPA colonies, this is considered extremely unlikely. As such, it is considered that there is no impact pathway for any birds designated at the Seas off Wexford SPA. In other words, when identifying potential impact pathways from collision or displacement, the key consideration is effects on breeding populations associated with an SPA. Seas of Wexford does not have a breeding population for any QIs. Instead, impacts on breeding populations of birds using the Seas of Wexford SPA colony are considered through the assessment for the SPAs from which those birds originate (their breeding colony), i.e. Lady's Island Lake SPA, the Saltee Islands SPA, Wexford Harbour and Slobbs SPA and the Keeragh Islands SPA. These sites have been included in the screening, and, where appropriate, screened in with impacts assessed and apportioned to these colonies. For context, current advice by NatureScot for Marine SPAs is that “<i>For breeding seabirds within marine SPAs, the population level consequences will be addressed through consideration of connectivity from functionally linked seabird colony SPAs</i>”, and that “<i>For all non-breeding seabird qualifying features of marine SPAs to determine LSE, impact pathways need to be considered within 15km of the marine SPA</i>”. The proposed development is thus well beyond the Zone of Influence typically considered.

RFI Section	RFI	Relevance to Screening Matrice
		Table A3.9 of the SISAA has been updated. The Screening Matrices have been updated and additional Matrices for Lady Island's Lake SPA, Wexford Harbour Slobs SPA and Saltee Islands SPA have been provided. Where appropriate the Integrity Matrices have been updated.
8 (e) (iv)	North-west Irish Sea cSPA Conservation Objectives: The NWIS cSPA is designated for 21 bird species. It is a Conservation Objective of the NWIS cSPA to restore the favourable conservation condition of Black-legged Kittiwake, European Herring Gull <i>Larus argentatus</i>, Atlantic Puffin <i>Fratercula arctica</i>, Northern Fulmar <i>Fulmarus glacialis</i>, Great Cormorant, and European Shag. This 'restore' objective also applies to the same SCIs within the ecologically connected SPAs in this area. It is noted that having regard to survey data related to Atlantic Puffin and the NWIS cSPA population and applying the industry standard recommended rates (60% displacement, 1-5% mortality; NatureScot, 2023) results in >1% increase in baseline mortality, thus would constitute 'Likely Significant Effect' and require Appropriate Assessment in the NIS. This species should therefore be assessed in the NIS for the NWIS cSPA, following the industry standard displacement matrix approach using the recommended displacement and mortality rates (NatureScot, 2023). The applicant is requested to review the SCIs of the aforementioned species to ensure and to clarify that they are appropriately assessed in the NIS, with regard to the objective to restore these species.	This comment is noted by the Developer. In response to the RFI, it is clarified that the majority of the species referenced were not screened out but were screened in and assessed within the NIS. A robust assessment of all relevant qualifying interests of the NWIS cSPA, including roseate tern, puffin and Manx shearwater, is provided in Section 5.4.2 of the NIS in view of the relevant conservation objectives. This assessment concluded that the proposed development, alone and in-combination, will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of the NWIS cSPA. The only species screened out from further assessment of offshore impact pathways was shag and cormorant. As explained in response to RFI 8(b)(ii), shag and cormorant were screened out on the basis that they are not considered vulnerable to collision risk (based on robust flight height data) and show limited evidence of displacement, with studies indicating potential attraction to offshore wind farms and use of structures for roosting (Bradbury et al., 2014; Dierschke et al., 2016).
8 (e) (v)	North-west Irish Sea cSPA Red-throated Diver: As discussed in points a(ii), a(iii), and c(iii) above (regarding Red-throated Diver and Displacement), Red-throated Diver is a SCI for the NWIS cSPA and is highly sensitive to disturbance and displacement effects. The Board queries the applicant's approach where the species is screened out of displacement effects associated with the proposed array area. The applicant is requested to use appropriate data and to screen Red-throated Diver in for displacement effects associated with the proposed array area and vessel traffic. The NIS should be updated accordingly.	The Developer acknowledges the sensitivity of red-throated diver to noise and visual presence, and therefore the risk of disturbance. Considering this, the Developer has assessed red-throated diver for disturbance within the offshore ECC + 2km buffer and within the PFI + 10km buffer for the NWIS cSPA, following the best available evidence (Chapter 15 & the NIS). The Developer has used the recent NWIS DAS data which is the most recent and comprehensive dataset to characterise the baseline environment. The Developer has assessed displacement effects on red-throated diver within the PFI plus a 10km buffer for the NWIS cSPA (addressed in Section 5.4.1.2.19 of the NIS). In response to RFI 8 (e) (v) Red-throated diver are now screened in for construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning disturbance and displacement effects for NWIS cSPA. Table 3.12 (Table of sites and features identified for offshore and intertidal ornithology receptors) has been updated (now Table A.3). Table 4.4 Screening summary has also been updated (now Table A 4.1). The Screening Matrix for NWIS cSPA has been updated accordingly. The Integrity Matrix has been updated where appropriate.

There are changes to this section following requests within the RFI as described in Table 6.1 above. The updates made to the Integrity Matrices include the following:

- **Minor revisions to improve auditability of the matrices;**
- **Matrices have been re-ordered in distance from Array Area order;**
- **Provision of additional justification for Assessment outcomes decisions (where appropriate);**
- **Conservation Objectives have updated for many designated sites since submission of the 2024 NIS. In response to RFI 1(b), these new COs (attributes and targets) have been considered in the Addendum to the NIS, and subsequent assessment conclusions are reflected throughout the integrity matrices.**
- **Puffin has been assessed for disturbance and displacement effects and screened in for the North-West Irish Sea cSPA (see Matrix A45) in response to RFI Section 8(e)(iv). Puffin has also been screened in for Lambay Island SPA (see Matrix A48);**
- **In response to RFI 8 (e) (v), red-throated diver are now screened in for construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning disturbance and displacement effects for NWIS cSPA (see Matrix A45);**
- **In response to RFI 8 (c) (ii), kittiwake have been screened in for offshore disturbance and displacement effects within the Addendum to the SISAA, and Matrix 36 of Appendix 1 (Screening Matrices) of the 2024 SISAA has been updated accordingly.**
- **In response to RFI 8 (e) (iii), purple sandpiper has been assessed for disturbance and displacement during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the proposed development due to being within the buffer range for disturbance to this species. Therefore, the assessment conclusions have been updated in Matrix A47 for this QI.**

To note, updates to the assessment alongside reasoning for conclusions presented in the alone or in-combination assessment have been reflected throughout the relevant matrices. For clarity, Integrity Matrices 45 to 73 of the 2024 NIS has been replaced in their entirety by Integrity Matrices A45 to A73 below.

Matrix A45 North-West Irish Sea SPA (replaces Matrix 45 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: North-West Irish Sea SPA Site Code: IE0004236 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 0.0																											
Impact	Collision Risk			Barrier Effects			Offshore Disturbance and Displacement			Indirect Effects Via Impacts on Prey			Spatial Distribution			Dust Deposition			Suspended Sediment			Accidental Pollution			Onshore Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Common scoter	N/A	X _h	N/A	N/A	X _e	N/A	X _f	N/A	X _f	X _c	X _c	X _c	X _b	X _b	X _b	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d
Red-throated diver	N/A	X _h g	N/A	N/A	X _e	N/A	X _f	X _f	X _f	X _c	X _c	X _c	X _b	X _b	X _b	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d
Great northern-diver	N/A	X _h	N/A	N/A	X _e	N/A	X _f	N/A	X _f	X _c	X _c	X _c	X _b	X _b	X _b	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d
Great black-backed gull	N/A	X _f	N/A	N/A	X _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _c	X _c	X _c	X _e	X _e	X _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fulmar	N/A	X _f	N/A	N/A	X _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _c	X _c	X _c	X _e	X _e	X _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Manx shearwater	N/A	X _f	N/A	N/A	X _e	N/A	X _f	X _f	X _f	X _c	X _c	X _c	X _b	X _b	X _b	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Little gull	N/A	X _f	N/A	N/A	X _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _c	X _c	X _c	X _e	X _e	X _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kittiwake	N/A	X _f	N/A	N/A	X _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _c	X _c	X _c	X _e	X _e	X _e	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d
Black-headed gull	N/A	X _f	N/A	N/A	X _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _c	X _c	X _c	X _e	X _e	X _e	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d
Common gull	N/A	X _f	N/A	N/A	X _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _c	X _c	X _c	X _e	X _e	X _e	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d
Lesser black-backed gull	N/A	X _f	N/A	N/A	X _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _c	X _c	X _c	X _e	X _e	X _e	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d
Herring gull	N/A	X _f	N/A	N/A	X _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _c	X _c	X _c	X _e	X _e	X _e	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d	X _d	N/A	X _d
Little tern	N/A	X _a	N/A	N/A	X _a	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _a	X _a	X _a	X _e	X _e	X _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Roseate tern	N/A	X _f	N/A	N/A	X _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _c	X _c	X _c	X _e	X _e	X _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Name of designated site: North-West Irish Sea SPA Site Code: IE0004236 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 0.0																											
Impact	Collision Risk			Barrier Effects			Offshore Disturbance and Displacement			Indirect Effects Via Impacts on Prey			Spatial Distribution			Dust Deposition			Suspended Sediment			Accidental Pollution			Onshore Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Common tern	N/A	Xf	N/A	N/A	Xe	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xc	Xc	Xc	Xe	Xe	Xe	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arctic tern	N/A	Xf	N/A	N/A	Xe	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xc	Xc	Xc	Xe	Xe	Xe	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Razorbill	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xe	N/A	Xf	Xf	Xf	Xc	Xc	Xc	Xb	Xb	Xb	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xd	N/A	Xd
Guillemot	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xe	N/A	Xf	Xf	Xf	Xc	Xc	Xc	Xb	Xb	Xb	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xd	N/A	Xd
Cormorant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xd	N/A	Xd
Shag	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xd	N/A	Xd
Puffin	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xa	Xa	Xa	Xa	Xa	Xa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa During aerial surveys this species was found to be absent or only present in trivial numbers. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xb Considering the minimal area potentially affected by disturbance and displacement, the potential for any adverse impact is unlikely. The effects are also likely temporary and reversible in nature. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xc Impacts on prey species were found to be non-significant, therefore any potential indirect effects on ornithological receptors are extremely low. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xd Impacts will be localised in nature and unlikely to cause AEoI. However, with appropriate mitigation, any impact is minimised. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xe Based on available tracking data and/or vulnerability to potential barrier effects. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xf The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population, and a non-material contribution to the baseline mortality of this qualifying interest feature. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xg The predicted mortality from the proposed development in-combination across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population, and a non-material contribution to the baseline mortality of this qualifying interest feature. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xh The number of annual collision mortalities estimated for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of migratory collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A45.

Matrix A46 Rockabill SPA (replaces Matrix 47 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS

Name of Designated Site: Rockabill SPA Site Code: IE0004014 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 0.2															
Impact	Collision Risk			Barrier Effects			Offshore Disturbance and Displacement			Indirect Effects Via Impacts on Prey			Onshore Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Common tern	N/A	Χ _a	N/A	N/A	Χ _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Χ _g	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Roseate tern	N/A	Χ _a	N/A	N/A	Χ _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Χ _g	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arctic tern	N/A	Χ _a	N/A	N/A	Χ _e	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Χ _g	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Purple sandpiper	N/A	Χ _f	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Χ _h	Χ _h	Χ _h	N/A	N/A	N/A	Χ _d	N/A	Χ _d

Evidence supporting conclusions

Χ_a The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population, and a non-material contribution to the baseline mortality of this qualifying interest feature. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Χ_b This species is considered to have low vulnerability to disturbance and displacement and therefore the presence of wind turbines is unlikely to deter them from entering the Proposed Array Area. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Χ_c During aerial surveys this species was found to be absent or only present in trivial numbers. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Χ_d With mitigation in place, local and temporary disturbance and displacement at the landfall site will occur for the period of works, however this effect is not expected to have AEoI of the site due to the small numbers of SCI located at the landfall. Therefore, it is considered, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Χ_e This species is considered to have low vulnerability to the barrier effects. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xf The number of annual collision mortalities estimated for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of migratory collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xg Impacts on prey species were found to be non-significant, therefore any potential indirect effects on ornithological receptors are extremely low. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xh Due to this species being a tidal zone feeder, and the distance between the proposed development and the tidal zone, there is no pathway for effect for this species. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

End of Matrix A46.

Matrix A47 Skerries Islands SPA (replaces Matrix 53 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Skerries Islands SPA Site Code: IE0004122 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 5.1									
Impact	Collision Risk			Onshore Disturbance and Displacement			Indirect effects via impacts on prey		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Cormorant	N/A	N/A	N/A	χ _b	N/A	χ _b	N/A	N/A	N/A
Shag	N/A	N/A	N/A	χ _b	N/A	χ _b	N/A	N/A	N/A
Herring gull	N/A	χ _{ac}	N/A	χ _b	N/A	χ _b	χ _c	χ _c	χ _c
Light-bellied brent goose	N/A	χ _d	N/A	χ _b	N/A	χ _b	N/A	χ _c	N/A
Purple sandpiper	N/A	χ _d	N/A	χ _b	N/A	χ _b	N/A	χ _c	N/A
Turnstone	N/A	χ _d	N/A	χ _b	N/A	χ _b	N/A	χ _c	N/A

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

χ_a The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

χ_b With mitigation in place, local and temporary disturbance and displacement at the landfall site will occur for the period of works, however this effect is not expected to have AEoI of the site due to the small numbers of SCI located at the landfall. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

χ_c Based on PVA, there is no potential for an AEoI for the proposed development in-combination. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

χ_d The number of annual collision mortalities estimated for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of migratory collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations.

Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xc Impacts on prey species were found to be non-significant, therefore any potential indirect effects on ornithological receptors are extremely low. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

End of Matrix A47.

Matrix A48 Lambay Island SPA (replaces Matrix 57 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Lambay Island SPA Site Code: IE0004069 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 14.4												
Impact	Collision Risk			Offshore Disturbance and Displacement			Onshore Disturbance and Displacement			Indirect effects via impacts on prey		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Cormorant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xb	N/A	Xb	N/A	N/A	N/A
Shag	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xb	N/A	Xb	N/A	N/A	N/A
Guillemot	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xa	Xaf	Xa	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xh	Xh	Xh
Razorbill	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xa	Xac	Xa	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xh	Xh	Xh
Herring gull	N/A	Xag	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xh	Xh	Xh
Kittiwake	N/A	Xag	N/A	Xa	Xa	Xa	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xh	Xh	Xh
Lesser black backed gull	N/A	Xag	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xh	Xh	Xh
Fulmar	N/A	Xa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xh	N/A
Greylag goose	N/A	Xe	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xh	N/A
Puffin	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xd	Xd	Xd	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xh	Xh	Xh

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

Xa The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xb With mitigation in place, local and temporary disturbance and displacement at the landfall site will occur for the period of works, however this effect is not expected to have AEoI of the site due to the small numbers of SCI located at the landfall. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xc The predicted mortality from the proposed development in-combination across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xd During aerial surveys this species was found to be absent or only present in trivial numbers. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xe The number of annual collision mortalities estimated for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of migratory collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xf Based on PVA, there is no potential for an AEoI for the proposed development in-combination. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xg The number of annual collision mortalities estimated in-combination for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xh Impacts on prey species were found to be non-significant, therefore any potential indirect effects on ornithological receptors are extremely low. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A48

Matrix A49 Rogerstown Estuary SPA (replaces Matrix 57 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Rogerstown Estuary SPA Site Code: IE0004015 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 0.79															
Impact	Collision Risk			Dust Deposition			Suspended Sediment			Accidental Pollution			Onshore Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Black-tailed godwit	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _d	N/A	X _d
Dunlin	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _d	N/A	X _d
Grey plover	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _d	N/A	X _d
Greylag goose	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _d	N/A	X _d
Knot	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _d	N/A	X _d
Light-bellied brent goose	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _d	N/A	X _d
Oystercatcher	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _d	N/A	X _d
Redshank	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _d	N/A	X _d
Ringed plover	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _d	N/A	X _d
Shelduck	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _d	N/A	X _d
Shoveler	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _d	N/A	X _d
Wetlands and waterbirds	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _c	N/A	X _c	X _d	N/A	X _d

Evidence supporting conclusions

X_a The number of annual collision mortalities estimated for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of migratory collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xb The distance of the SPA to the proposed development means any impacts will be imperceptible. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xc The impact will not adversely affect the integrity of the QIs habitats and with the implementation of the mitigation in the CEMP. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xd The SPA is beyond the range of impact from the proposed development and for those SCIs which are associated with other SPAs. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

End of Matrix A49.

Matrix A50 Boyne Estuary SPA (replaces Matrix 58 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Boyne Estuary SPA Site Code: IE0004080 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 10.6															
Impact	Collision Risk			Barrier Effects			Offshore Disturbance and Displacement			Indirect Effects Via Impacts on Prey			Onshore Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Black-tailed godwit	N/A	Χa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Χb	N/A	Χb
Golden plover	N/A	Χa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Χb	N/A	Χb
Grey plover	N/A	Χa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Χb	N/A	Χb
Knot	N/A	Χa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Χb	N/A	Χb
Lapwing	N/A	Χa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Χb	N/A	Χb
Oystercatcher	N/A	Χa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Χb	N/A	Χb
Redshank	N/A	Χa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Χb	N/A	Χb
Sanderling	N/A	Χa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Χb	N/A	Χb
Shelduck	N/A	Χa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Χb	N/A	Χb
Turnstone	N/A	Χa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Χb	N/A	Χb

Evidence supporting conclusions

Χa The number of annual collision mortalities estimated for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of migratory collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Χb With mitigation in place, local and temporary disturbance and displacement at the landfall site will occur for the period of works, however this effect is not expected to have AEoI of the site due to the small numbers of SCI located at the landfall. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xc This species is considered to have low vulnerability to the impact. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

End of Matrix A50.

Matrix A51 River Nanny Estuary & Shore SPA (replaces Matrix 51 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: River Nanny Estuary & Shore SPA Site Code: IE0004158 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 3.03						
Impact	Collision Risk			Onshore Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D
Golden plover	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b
Knot	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b
Oystercatcher	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b
Ringed plover	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b
Sanderling	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b

Evidence supporting conclusions

X_a The number of annual collision mortalities estimated for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of migratory collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_b With mitigation in place, local and temporary disturbance and displacement at the landfall site will occur for the period of works, however this effect is not expected to have AEoI of the site due to the small numbers of SCI located at the landfall. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

End of Matrix A51.

MatrixA52 Malahide Estuary SPA (replaces Matrix 56 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of designated site: Malahide Estuary SPA Site Code: IE0004025 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 0.0005															
Impact	Collision Risk			Dust Deposition			Suspended Sediment			Accidental Pollution			Onshore Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Bar-tailed godwit	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xc	N/A	Xc
Black-tailed godwit	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xc	N/A	Xc
Dunlin	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xc	N/A	Xc
Golden plover	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xc	N/A	Xc
Goldeneye	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xc	N/A	Xc
Great crested grebe	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xc	N/A	Xc
Grey plover	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xc	N/A	Xc
Knot	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xc	N/A	Xc
Light bellied brent goose	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xc	N/A	Xc
Oystercatcher	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xc	N/A	Xc
Pintail	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xc	N/A	Xc
Red-breasted merganser	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xc	N/A	Xc
Redshank	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xc	N/A	Xc
Shelduck	N/A	Xa	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xc	N/A	Xc
Wetlands and waterbirds	N/A	N/A	N/A	Xd	N/A	Xd	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xb	N/A	Xb	Xc	N/A	Xc

Xa The number of annual collision mortalities estimated for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of migratory collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xb The impact will not adversely affect the integrity of the intertidal habitats for which SCIs rely on and with the implementation of the mitigation in the CEMP. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xc The implementation of noise barriers and visual mitigation in the CEMP for disturbance and displacement along the Estuary Road enables the conclusion of no AEoI. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

Xd Impacts will be localised in nature and unlikely to cause AEoI. However, with appropriate mitigation, any impact is minimised and there is no potential for AEoI. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

End of Matrix A52.

Matrix A53 Ireland's Eye SPA (replaces Matrix 54 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Ireland's Eye SPA Site Code: IE0004117 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km):5.61						
Impact	Collision Risk			Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D
Guillemot	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _a	X _{ab}	X _a
Razorbill	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _a	X _{ab}	X _a
Herring gull	N/A	X _{ab}	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kittiwake	N/A	X _{ab}	N/A	X _a	X _{ab}	X _a

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X_a The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

X_b Based on PVA, there is no potential for an AEoI for the proposed development in-combination. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

End of Matrix A53.

Matrix A54 Baldoyle Bay SPA (replaces Matrix 49 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Baldoyle Bay SPA Site Code: IE0004016 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 0.92												
Impact	Collision risk			Suspended sediment			Accidental pollution			Onshore disturbance and displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D	C	O	D
Bar-tailed godwit	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c
Golden plover	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c
Grey plover	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c
Light-bellied brent goose	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c
Ringed plover	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c
Shelduck	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c
Wetlands and waterbirds	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _b	N/A	X _b	X _c	N/A	X _c

Evidence supporting conclusions

X_a The number of annual collision mortalities estimated for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of migratory collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

X_b The impact will not adversely affect the integrity of the QIs habitats and with the implementation of the mitigation in the CEMP, it can be concluded that there is no potential for AEoI. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

X_c The SPA is beyond the range of impact from the proposed development and for those SCIs which are associated with other SPAs, the conclusion remains no potential for AEoI. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A54.

Matrix A55 Howth Head Coast SPA (replaces Matrix 56 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Howth Head Coast SPA Site Code: IE0004113 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 27.1						
Impact	Collision Risk			Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D
Kittiwake	N/A	X _{ab}	N/A	X _a	X _{ab}	X _a

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X_a The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site’s COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

X_b Based on PVA, there is no potential for an AEoI for the proposed development in-combination. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site’s COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

End of Matrix A55

Matrix A56 North Bull Island SPA (replaces Matrix 50 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: North Bull Island SPA Site Code: IE0004006 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 2.0			
Impact	Onshore Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D
Bar tailed godwit	X a	N/A	X a
Black tailed godwit	X a	N/A	X a
Curlew	X a	N/A	X a
Dunlin	X a	N/A	X a
Golden plover	X a	N/A	X a
Grey plover	X a	N/A	X a
Knot	X a	N/A	X a
Light bellied brent goose	X a	N/A	X a
Oystercatcher	X a	N/A	X a
Pintail	X a	N/A	X a
Redshank	X a	N/A	X a
Sanderling	X a	N/A	X a
Shelduck	X a	N/A	X a
Shoveler	X a	N/A	X a
Teal	X a	N/A	X a
Turnstone	X a	N/A	X a
Black headed gull	X a	N/A	X a
Wetlands and waterbirds	X a	N/A	X a

Evidence supporting conclusions

Xa The SPA is beyond the range of impact from the proposed development and for those SCIs which are associated with other SPAs. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

End of Matrix A56.

Matrix A57 South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (replaces Matrix 52 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA Site Code: IE0004024 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 4.4			
Impact	Onshore Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D
Black headed gull	X _a	N/A	X _a
Bar tailed godwit	X _a	N/A	X _a
Dunlin	X _a	N/A	X _a
Grey plover	X _a	N/A	X _a
Knot	X _a	N/A	X _a
Light bellied brent goose	X _a	N/A	X _a
Oystercatcher	X _a	N/A	X _a
Redshank	X _a	N/A	X _a
Ringed plover	X _a	N/A	X _a
Sanderling	X _a	N/A	X _a

Evidence supporting conclusions

X_a The SPA is beyond the range of impact from the proposed development and for those SCIs which are associated with other SPAs. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2

End of Matrix A57

Matrix A58 Poulaphouca Reservoir SPA (replaces Matrix 59 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Poulaphouca Reservoir SPA			
Site Code: IE0004063			
Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 61.5			
Impact	Collision Risk		
Stage of Development	C	O	D
Greylag goose	N/A	Xa	N/A

Evidence supporting conclusions

Xa The number of annual collision mortalities estimated for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of migratory collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site’s COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A58.

Matrix A59 Wicklow Head SPA (replaces Matrix 60 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Wicklow Head SPA						
Site Code: IE0004127						
Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 70.4						
Impact	Collision Risk			Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D
Kittiwake	N/A	χ _a	N/A	χ _a	χ _a	χ _a

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

χ_a The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site’s COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A59.

Matrix A60 Morecambe Bay & Duddon Estuary SPA (replaces Matrix 61 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Morecambe Bay & Duddon Estuary SPA Site Code: UK9020326 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 164.6			
Impact	Collision Risk		
Stage of development	C	O	D
Lesser black-backed gull	N/A	X a	N/A

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X a The number of annual collision mortalities estimated for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of migratory collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site’s COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A60.

Matrix A61 Rathlin Island SPA (replaces Matrix 62 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Rathlin Island SPA Site Code: UK9020011 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 168.5						
Impact	Collision Risk			Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D
Kittiwake	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _a	X _a	X _a
Lesser black-backed gull	N/A	X _a	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Puffin	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _b	X _b	X _b

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X_a The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_b During aerial surveys this species was found to be absent or only present in trivial numbers. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A61.

Matrix A62 Saltee Islands SPA (replaces Matrix 55 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Saltee Islands SPA Site Code: IE0004002 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 169.3						
Impact	Collision Risk			Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D
Guillemot	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _a	X _{ab}	X _a
Gannet	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _a	X _a	X _a
Kittiwake	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _a	X _a	X _a
Lesser black backed gull	N/A	X _a	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Razorbill	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _a	X _{ab}	X _a
Puffin	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _c	X _c	X _c

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X_a The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_b The predicted mortality from the proposed development in-combination across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_c During aerial surveys this species was found to be absent or only present in trivial numbers. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

Xd This species is considered to have low vulnerability to the impact, and therefore there is no potential for an AEoI. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A62.

Matrix A63 Ailsa Craig SPA (replaces Matrix 63 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Ailsa Craig SPA Site Code: UK9003091 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 171.0						
Impact	Collision Risk			Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D
Gannet	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _a	X _a	X _a
Lesser black backed gull	N/A	X _a	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kittiwake	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _a	X _a	X _a

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X_a The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A63.

MatrixA64 Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA (replaces Matrix 65 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA Site Code: UK9005103 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 177.8			
Impact	Collision Risk		
Stage of development	C	O	D
Lesser black-backed gull	N/A	X _a	N/A

Evidence supporting conclusions

X_a The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site’s COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A64.

Matrix A65 Horn Head to Fanad Head SPA (replaces Matrix 69 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Horn Head to Fanard Head SPA						
Site Code: IE0004194						
Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 190.7						
Impact	Collision Risk			Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D
Kittiwake	X _a	X _a	X _a	X _a	X _a	X _a

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X_a The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site’s COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A65.

Matrix A66 Blackwater Callows SPA (replaces Matrix 68 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Blackwater Callows SPA Site Code: IE0004094 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 190.4			
Impact	Collision Risk		
Stage of Development	C	O	D
Whooper swan	N/A	X _a	N/A
Bewick's swan	N/A	X _a	N/A
Wigeon	N/A	X _a	N/A
Teal	N/A	X _a	N/A
Mallard	N/A	X _a	N/A
Shoveler	N/A	X _a	N/A
Black-tailed godwit	N/A	X _a	N/A
Lapwing	N/A	X _a	N/A
Curlew	N/A	X _a	N/A

Evidence supporting conclusions

X_a The number of annual collision mortalities estimated for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of migratory collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A66.

Matrix A67 Helvick Head to Ballyquin SPA (replaces Matrix 64 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Helvick Head to Ballyquin SPA						
Site Code: IE0004192						
Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 174.78						
Impact	Collision Risk			Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D
Kittiwake	X _a	X _a	X _a	X _a	X _a	X _a

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X_a The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site’s COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A67.

Matrix A68 Skomer, Skokholm & the Seas off Pembrokeshire/ Sgomer, Sgogwm a Moroedd Penfro SPA (replaces Matrix 66 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Skomer, Skokholm & the Seas off Pembrokeshire/ Sgomer, Sgogwm a Moroedd Penfro SPA Site Code: UK9014051 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 188.16						
Impact	Collision Risk			Disturbance and displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D
Lesser black backed gull	N/A	X _a	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kittiwake	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _a	X _a	X _a
Puffin	N/A	N/A	N/A	X _b	X _b	X _b

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X_a The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

X_b During aerial surveys this species was found to be absent or only present in trivial numbers. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A68.

Matrix 69 Grassholm SPA (replaces Matrix 67 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Grassholm SPA Site Code: UK9014041 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 207.2						
Impact	Collision Risk			Disturbance and Displacement		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D
Gannet	N/A	Χa	N/A	Χa	Χa	Χa

Evidence supporting conclusions

Χa The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site’s COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A69.

Matrix A70 Cork Harbour SPA (replaces Matrix 70 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Cork Harbour SPA Site Code: IE0004030 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 213.29			
Impact	Collision Risk		
Stage of Development	C	O	D
Shelduck	N/A	X _a	N/A
Wigeon	N/A	X _a	N/A
Teal	N/A	X _a	N/A
Mallard	N/A	X _a	N/A
Pintail	N/A	X _a	N/A
Shoveler	N/A	X _a	N/A
Red-breasted merganser	N/A	X _a	N/A
Little grebe	N/A	X _a	N/A
Great crested grebe	N/A	X _a	N/A
Grey heron	N/A	X _a	N/A
Oystercatcher	N/A	X _a	N/A
Black-tailed godwit	N/A	X _a	N/A
Bar-tailed godwit	N/A	X _a	N/A
Redshank	N/A	X _a	N/A
Golden plover	N/A	X _a	N/A
Grey plover	N/A	X _a	N/A
Lapwing	N/A	X _a	N/A
Dunlin	N/A	X _a	N/A
Curlew	N/A	X _a	N/A

Evidence supporting conclusions

Xa The number of annual collision mortalities estimated for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of migratory collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A70.

Matrix A71 North Colonsay & Western Cliffs SPA (replaces Matrix 72 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Colonsay & Western Cliffs SPA Site Code: UK9003171 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 259.5						
Impact	Collision Risk			Disturbance and displacement.		
Stage of development	C	O	D	C	O	D
Kittiwake	N/A	X _a	N/A	X _a	X _a	X _a

Evidence Supporting Conclusions:

X_a The predicted mortality from the proposed development alone across the relevant bio-seasons represents an increase in baseline mortality which would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the population. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site’s COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A71.

Matrix A72 Courtmacsherry SPA (replaces Matrix 71 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Courtmacsherry SPA Site Code: IE0004219 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 256.14			
Impact	Collision Risk		
Stage of Development	C	O	D
Shelduck	N/A	X a	N/A
Wigeon	N/A	X a	N/A
Red-breasted merganser	N/A	X a	N/A
Black-tailed godwit	N/A	X a	N/A
Bar-tailed godwit	N/A	X a	N/A
Golden plover	N/A	X a	N/A
Lapwing	N/A	X a	N/A
Dunlin	N/A	X a	N/A
Curlew	N/A	X a	N/A
Great northern diver	N/A	X a	N/A

Evidence supporting conclusions

X a The number of annual collision mortalities estimated for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of migratory collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A72.

Matrix A73 Clonakilty SPA (replaces Matrix 73 in Appendix 2 (Integrity Matrices) of the 2024 NIS)

Name of Designated Site: Clonakilty SPA Site Code: IE0004081 Distance to closest point of proposed development (km): 268.43			
Impact	Collision Risk		
Stage of Development	C	O	D
Shelduck	N/A	X ^a	N/A
Black-tailed godwit	N/A	X ^a	N/A
Curlew	N/A	X ^a	N/A
Dunlin	N/A	X ^a	N/A

Evidence supporting conclusions

X^a The number of annual collision mortalities estimated for the qualifying features are very low as such the increases in baseline mortality for the qualifying feature as a result of migratory collisions would be indistinguishable from natural fluctuations in the populations. Therefore, it is considered beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no potential for an AEoI from the proposed development alone and in-combination with other plans or projects in view of the site's COs with respect to the QI(s), for either Project Option 1 or Project Option 2.

End of Matrix A73.