

Natural England

# **Ornithological and Marine Mammal Baseline Characterisation Surveys for the POSEIDON project**

**October-December (Seasonal) Report – Central North  
Sea**

**Steven Young, Victoria Davitt**



COMMERCIAL IN CONFIDENCE

**Client:** Natural England

**Address:** 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Foss House  
Kings Pool  
1-2 Peasholme Green  
York  
YO1 7PX

**Project reference:** P000011683

**Date of issue:** March 2024

---

**Project Director:** Dr Stephanie McGovern

**Project Manager:** Dr Steven Young

**Report Contributors:** Dr Steven Young, Victoria Davitt

---

APEM Ltd  
Riverview  
A17 Embankment Business Park  
Heaton Mersey  
Stockport  
SK4 3GN

Tel: 0161 442 8938

Fax: 0161 432 6083

Registered in England No. 02530851

Report should be cited as:

“APEM (2024). Ornithological and Marine Mammal Baseline Characterisation Surveys for the POSEIDON project. APEM October-December (Seasonal) Report, Central North Sea, P000011683. Natural England, 03/05/24, v1.4, 34 pp.”

## Revision and Amendment Register

Version Number	Date	Section(s)	Page(s)	Summary of Changes	Approved by
1.0	13/02/2024	All	All	Creation	VD
1.1	22/02/2024	All	All	Internal Review	SY
1.2	08/03/2024	All	All	Client Comments	SY
1.3	13/03/2024	4.1	14	Client Comments	SY
1.4	03/05/2024	3.1	8	Add UTC to table 3	SY

## Contents

1.	Executive Summary.....	1
2.	Introduction .....	2
2.1	Background .....	2
2.2	Aim of Report.....	2
3.	Survey and Analysis Methodologies .....	4
3.1	Digital Aerial Survey Methods.....	4
3.2	Species Identification .....	10
3.3	Summary of Quality Assurance.....	11
3.4	Species Distribution Maps .....	11
3.5	Species Flight Heights .....	11
4.	Abundance and distribution .....	13
4.1	Abundance .....	13
4.2	Spatial Distribution .....	15
5.	Abiotic Structures and Observations .....	31
	Appendix I Scientific Names and Taxonomy .....	32
	Appendix II Example images (snags) of birds and marine mammals. ....	33

## List of Figures

Figure 1	Location of Central North Sea survey area.....	3
Figure 2	Individual image capture points during the October to December 2023 survey.....	6
Figure 3	Distribution of all birds recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.....	16
Figure 4	Distribution of all marine megafauna recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey. ....	17
Figure 5	Kittiwake distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.....	18
Figure 6	Great black-backed gull distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey. ....	19
Figure 7	Guillemot distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey. ....	20

Figure 8 Razorbill distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey. ....	21
Figure 9 Guillemot / Razorbill distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey. ....	22
Figure 10 Puffin distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey. ....	23
Figure 11 Auk species distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey. ....	24
Figure 12 Fulmar distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey. ....	25
Figure 13 Distribution of less abundant bird species recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey. ....	26
Figure 14 White-beaked dolphin distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey. ....	27
Figure 15 Harbour porpoise distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey. ....	28
Figure 16 Distribution of less abundant marine megafauna recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey. ....	29
Figure 17 Distribution of abiotic structures recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey. ....	30
Figure 19 White-beaked dolphin. ....	33
Figure 20 Harbour porpoise. ....	33
Figure 21 Great Northern diver in flight. ....	33
Figure 22 Small raft of guillemots sitting on the water. ....	33
Figure 23 Great black-backed gull in flight. ....	34
Figure 24 Kittiwake in flight over foamy sea. ....	34

## List of Tables

Table 1 Lateral and vertical camera tolerances (m). A ‘cutout’ is the process of automatically aborting data capture. Should this occur, the plane is required to revisit and resurvey the affected section of the survey line. ....	7
Table 2 Image capture and other observations during the October to December 2023 seasonal survey. ....	7
Table 3 Survey conditions during the October to December 2023 seasonal survey. ....	8
Table 4 Explanation of weather conditions. ....	9

Table 5 Avian species included higher-level taxonomic groups for the October to December 2023 seasonal survey period. ....	10
Table 6 Marine mammal species included within higher-level taxonomic groups for the October to December 2023 seasonal survey period. ....	10
Table 7 Total number of individuals of birds by species or species group recorded during the October to December 2023 seasonal survey period. ....	13
Table 8 Total number of individuals of marine megafauna by species or species group recorded during the October to December 2023 seasonal survey period. ....	14

## 1. Executive Summary

This report constitutes the first year two seasonal (October to December 2023) report outlining results from digital aerial surveys conducted in December 2023 within the Central North Sea under the POSEIDON project and commissioned by Natural England. Surveys were undertaken using APEM's high-resolution camera system to capture digital still imagery of birds and marine megafauna within the Survey Area.

The survey was successfully carried out across two days in December 2023 with no safety issues. A total of 2,813 observations were recorded during the survey in December 2023, of which 2,715 were observations of birds and 98 were observations of marine megafauna. APEM will continue to monitor the site for these species and others during the remaining seasonal surveys.

## 2. Introduction

### 2.1 Background

APEM has been contracted by Natural England for the supply of four, year two seasonal digital aerial surveys within the Central North Sea, commencing from December 2023. The programme of work repeats the four seasonal surveys of the Survey Area completed by APEM from 2022-2023. The surveys form part of the POSEIDON project which is led by Natural England and funded through The Crown Estates Offshore Wind Evidence and Change (OWEC) programme. Analysis of existing seabird and marine mammal data for English and Welsh waters identified gaps in the evidence base for the Survey Area. The main purpose of the survey programme is to address these evidence gaps through providing baseline information on the abundance, distribution and behaviour of birds and marine mammals within the Survey Area.

The Survey Area is located within the North Sea to the east of Fraserburgh in the North and Bridlington in the South, bounded to the south-east by the Dogger Bank, (**Figure 1**) and covers an area of 42,050 square kilometres (km<sup>2</sup>). The survey method has been designed to optimise the data collection for all bird, marine mammal, and other marine megafauna species using a transect-based survey design at 1.5 centimetre (cm) resolution to achieve a minimum of 3% captured and 3% analysed coverage using a twin-engine aircraft. These surveys have been carried out to meet the aims and objectives of the work by Natural England and the POSEIDON project.

This report describes the seasonal (October to December 2023) survey, undertaken in December 2023, as part of the survey programme.

### 2.2 Aim of Report

The report presents information on marine birds, mammals, and other megafauna, which includes the following:

- Description of, and rationale for, survey methods and design.
- Map of survey route and coverage.
- Survey details as actually flown (including dates/times, weather, and other relevant conditions).
- Raw count observations for behaviours of all avian and marine mammal species, as well as any other marine megafauna recorded per month within the Survey Area.
- Bird flight heights and direction.
- Spatial distribution maps of avian, marine mammal, and other marine megafauna species.




Figure 1 Location of Central North Sea survey area

### 3. Survey and Analysis Methodologies

#### 3.1 Digital Aerial Survey Methods

The survey was conducted using APEM's bespoke camera system, termed "Shearwater V", customised by in-house specialists for surveying the offshore environment. The camera system is integrated with custom flight planning software that allows each survey flight line to be accurately mapped before the aircraft leaves the ground. Each image capture node is precisely defined, allowing the system to fire the camera exposures at exactly the right location. This ensures that each survey is flown with the same orientation and the camera is triggered at the same position within set tolerances (**Table 1**). APEM's flight planning software enables tolerances along survey lines to be set, meaning the camera system would automatically abort data capture should the aircraft drift away from the planned flight line. The process of automatically aborting data capture is called a 'cutout'. Should this occur, the plane is required to revisit and resurvey the affected section of the survey line.

APEM's on-board camera technician continually monitored the imagery as it was collected to ensure data collected was fit for purpose. The camera technician would make the decision to cease data collection should conditions become unsuitable for surveying or data collection. Subsequently, the survey would then be resumed at the next earliest opportunity. All completed surveys therefore maintained conditions conducive to successful surveying.

Favourable conditions for surveying were defined as: a cloud base (lowest altitude of the visible portion of the cloud) of at least 1,300 ft, according to a geoidal model, to ensure there is no cloud below the planned altitude of the aircraft, visibility of greater than 5 km, wind speed of less than 30 knots, and sea state of 4 (moderate) or less. Naturally, the cloud base may vary in altitude, but aircraft will always fly lower than the lowest cloud level; if the cloud base is lower than the planned aircraft altitude the survey would not take place. Whilst the image footprint and GSD both increase with altitude, the flight plan tolerances and focus of the camera lenses ensures no discernible differences occur within the range of altitudes potentially flown. Wind speed was recorded at the same altitude as the aircraft, whereas sea state was determined from the appearance of the sea surface recorded by the onboard aerial survey technician. The two measures therefore do not necessarily correlate. For safety reasons, no surveying can take place in icing conditions.

Data capture comprised digital still images of an average 1.5 cm GSD. Images at each camera are processed at each node, resulting in slight variation in GSD across the swath width. GSD is smaller than 1.5 cm GSD at the nadir and increases with distance from the nadir, resulting in an average GSD of 1.5 cm. Image resolution is therefore clearest at the nadir, although the variation is small. Images were collected in a continuous transect-based design along a single line covered by three overlapping cameras, using a Global Positioning System (GPS) linked, bespoke flight management system to ensure the tracks were flown with a high degree of accuracy. The aircraft's internal GPS and Inertial Motion Unit (IMU) systems record to an accuracy of +/- 3 to 5 m as standard.

Flights occurred on the 15<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> of December. Take off on the 16<sup>th</sup> December was delayed due to dangerous activities being planned by the MOD in the survey area (Druridge Bay) between 09:15 and 10:30. On 15<sup>th</sup> December, three aircraft were used to survey lines 1 to 2 (take off at 10:25, landing at 15:30), 5 to 6 (take off at 10:37, landing at 15:13), and 9 to 12 (take off at 08:43, landing at 12:32), respectively.

Before all lines were completed on 15<sup>th</sup> December, the angle of the sun prevented photos of sufficient quality for analysis being taken. Therefore, on 19<sup>th</sup> December, two aircraft surveyed lines 3 to 4 (take off at 09:35, landing at 13:50), and 7 to 8 (take off at 09:59, landing at 15:06).

The camera system captured abutting imagery along 12 survey flight lines spaced approximately 18 km apart within the Survey Area (**Figure 1**). The total Survey Area was 42,050 km<sup>2</sup>. The aircraft collected the data at an altitude of approximately 1,450 ft (440 m) according to the ellipsoid model as

recorded by GPS, equivalent to 1,300 ft (395 m) above geoidal mean sea level, and at a speed of approximately 120 knots. Images were collected continuously along the survey flight lines with slight overlap between image nodes. To avoid double-counting due to image overlap, all image footprints are merged into a single file, for which total area is calculated. A total of 15,903 nodes were initially captured. Of these, 15,809 were used for analysis. The difference reflects nodes removed during clipping to the boundary area. Total coverage was calculated to be 3.55% generated from 15,903 image nodes. A total of 11 nodes were not captured, one node on line 3 and 10 nodes on line 4 due to minor camera issues (**Table 2**). Impact on coverage was negligible, with the target coverage of 3% achieved including a redundancy of an additional 0.55%, which is over 10% contingency with respect to the target coverage.

Effort data is calculated as the area (km<sup>2</sup>) per image footprint using trigonometric methods and the pinhole camera model (the mathematical relationship between the coordinates of a point in three-dimensional space, and its projection onto the image plane of an ideal pinhole camera). Effort is dependent on altitude, camera angle and aircraft position (pitch, roll and yaw), accounting for variation both between image nodes and individual cameras at each node. It is therefore possible that some images have an effort value of zero. The effort values provided in the GPS log reflect the total footprint of each image and do not account for overlap. Therefore, summing these values for a survey would result in an overestimate of effort. The true effort for a given survey is calculated geospatially by creating polygons for each image footprint and removing the overlapping areas. Summing the analysed footprints and comparing against entire survey area gives the percentage analysed.

Imagery was captured in raw format and post-processed to ensure optimal quality for the subsequent stage of image analysis, to extract information on marine fauna or other notable occurrences. When a survey was completed, data were checked to ensure the number of lines and the number of images collected was correct, and that the quality of the imagery was acceptable. Once image analysis was completed, further quality assurance (QA) processes took place (see **Section 3.3**).

Survey conditions are summarised in **Table 3**. Weather conditions are defined in **Table 4**. Weather conditions during the survey were conducive to collecting and analysing imagery for the purposes of providing data on the identification, distribution, and abundance of bird species and marine fauna within the Survey Area. Whilst high tail and head winds were experienced during the survey, no impact on image capture or quality, or health and safety, were reported.

Measures were taken to minimise glint and glare, such as avoiding surveying when the sun angle had the greatest potential to impact image quality. Furthermore, data collected provided coverage of 3.55%, thus exceeding the 3% coverage required, enabling sufficient coverage to be collected should images be affected by glint or glare.




Figure 2 Individual image capture points during the October to December 2023 survey.

**Table 1 Lateral and vertical camera tolerances (m). A ‘cutout’ is the process of automatically aborting data capture. Should this occur, the plane is required to revisit and resurvey the affected section of the survey line.**

<u>Survey Tolerances</u>	Warning	Cutout	
Lateral Tolerance	30	60	m
Vertical tolerance	15	30 (No auto cutout)	m

**Table 2 Image capture and other observations during the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.**

Survey line	Transect length (km)	N cameras capturing image	N image nodes (captured)	N image nodes (analysed)	Camera issues*	Shipping observations	Anecdotal observations	Health and Safety
1	246.88	3	1,736	1,728	-	-	-	-
2	248.25	3	1,744	1,737	-	-	-	-
3	249.18	3	1,749	1,742	1 missing node	-	-	-
4	250.23	3	1,747	1,739	10 missing nodes	-	-	-
5**	251.22	3	1,755	1,748	-	-	Low bird abundance	-
6**	252.18	3	1,768	1,758	-	-	-	-
7	189.86	3	1,338	1,329	-	-	-	-
8***	190.91	3	1,343	1,336	-	-	-	-
9	191.44	3	1,348	1,340	-	-	-	-
10	64.10	3	457	449	-	-	-	-
11	64.33	3	459	451	-	Cable-laying vessel	-	-
12	64.51	3	459	452	-	-	-	-

\*Due to the vast number of capture points collected during the survey it is not uncommon for camera systems to sometimes miss capture points. Typically, the number of missed capture points is low and random across the site. APEM collected additional data to ensure the required coverage was captured. Additionally, APEM’s onboard camera technician monitored data as it was being captured. Surveys are aborted or lines re-surveyed if camera issues impact data collection.

\*\*During lines 5 and 6, a software error occurred causing the software to crash. The issue was resolved, and the missing sections re-flown to ensure no images were missing. During post-processing, duplicate images were removed, and the best quality images retained for analysis.

\*\*\* A capture error, in which the camera triggering system crashed, occurred during the initial line 8 survey attempt. This resulted in approximately two-thirds of the nodes being missing. The issue was resolved, and the line resurveyed to ensure coverage. All details for line 8 within this report refer to the successful resurvey.

**Table 3 Survey conditions during the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.**

Survey line	Date	Time (UTC) on line (Start / End)	Ground speed (knots)	Cloud cover (%)	Visibility (km)	Outside temperature (°C)	Wind speed (knots)	Wind direction	Sea state (Douglas)	Turbidity
1	15/12/2023	11:18 / 12:20	130	20	10	6	29	260°	2	1
2	15/12/2023	12:26 / 13:46	109	50	10	6	30	270°	2	1
3	19/12/2023	10:12 / 11:18	123	40	>10	4	34	265°	2	1
4	19/12/2023	11:26 / 12:41	110	30	>10	4	37	270°	2	1
5	15/12/2023	11:09 / 12:17	120-130	15-35	>10	6-7	28-31	250-280°	2-3	2
6	15/12/2023	12:24 / 14:00	107	10-100	>10	6-7	26-31	250-270°	2	2
7	19/12/2023	11:35 / 12:25	125	10-25	>10	6	32	270°	3	1-2
8	19/12/2023	12:58 / 13:36	110	10-50	>10	6	32	270°	2-3	1-2
9	15/12/2023	09:11 / 09:58	132	0	>10	7	23-27	270°	1	1
10	15/12/2023	10:42 / 11:04	105	0	>10	6	29-32	270°	1	1
11	15/12/2023	11:13 / 11:28	125	0	>10	6	21	270°	1	1
12	15/12/2023	11:37 / 11:57	107	0	>10	7	21	270°	1	1

**Table 4 Explanation of weather conditions.**

Wind (Beaufort Scale)			Douglas Sea State			Cloud cover (%)		Turbidity	
Scale	Description	Mean wind speed (knots)	Scale	Description	Wave height	% Cover	Description	Scale	Description
0	Calm	0	0	Calm (glass)	No wave	0	Clear	0	Clear
1	Light air	2	1	Calm (rippled)	0 – 0.10 m	1-10	Few	1	Slightly Turbid
2	Light breeze	5	2	Smooth	0.10 – 0.50 m	11-50	Scattered	2	Moderately Turbid
3	Gentle breeze	9	3	Slightly Moderate	0.50 – 1.25 m	51-95	Broken	3	Highly Turbid
4	Moderate breeze	13	<i>Surveys not typically flown at sea states &gt; 3.</i>			96-100	Overcast		
5	Fresh breeze	19	4	Moderate	1.25 – 2.50 m				
6	Strong breeze	24							
7	Near gale	30							
8	Gale	37							

### 3.2 Species Identification

The images were analysed to enumerate birds and marine mammals to species level where possible. Targets identified from the images were 'snagged' (i.e., located within the images) and categorised.

There were occasions when it was not possible to identify an individual in the digital aerial survey imagery to the species level and the individual was therefore identified as belonging to a higher-level taxonomic group (e.g., 'small gull species' or 'dolphin / porpoise species'). The possible groups and the individual species attributed to them are listed in **Table 5** for birds and **Table 6** for marine mammals.

**Table 5 Avian species included higher-level taxonomic groups for the October to December 2023 seasonal survey period.**

Species	Group Level 1	Group Level 2	Group Level 3	Group Level 4
Kittiwake	Small Gull species		Gull species	Unidentified Bird species
Great Black-backed Gull	Black-backed Gull	Large Gull species		
Herring Gull				
Guillemot	Guillemot and / or Razorbill	Auk species		
Razorbill				
Little Auk				
Puffin				
Great Northern Diver	Great Northern / White-billed Diver	Diver species		
White-billed Diver				
Fulmar	Fulmar / Gull species			
Gannet				

**Table 6 Marine mammal species included within higher-level taxonomic groups for the October to December 2023 seasonal survey period.**

Species	Group Level 1	Group Level 2	Group Level 3	Group Level 4
Grey Seal	Seal species			Unidentified Marine Mammal species
White-beaked Dolphin	Dolphin species		Dolphin / Porpoise species	
Harbour Porpoise				

### 3.3 Summary of Quality Assurance

Internal QA was carried out on the data collected during the survey. This consists of two steps:

The first step in the QA process, referred to as Blank QA, reviewed percentage agreement between images identified as positive (containing at least one target of interest) and those identified as blank (not containing any targets of interest). A random sample of 20% of survey imagery were subjected to a QA audit review, in which agreement in positive images should reach 90% agreement versus the main analysis of the whole survey. Where 90% agreement was not reached, a complete re-analysis of the survey data was undertaken. This consisted of analysing each image from the survey again, and extra positives from the re-analysis and QA audit are included in the data. For the current survey, the initial agreement was 91%. No re-analysis was necessary on this occasion.

The second step of the QA process, referred to as Species ID QA, reviewed species identifications. Target (snag) identifications made by image analysts were reviewed by our dedicated QA team and an agreement rate determined. If the original identification made by the image analyst matched that made by the QA analyst, this was considered agreement. Agreement was also made if the original and the QA identifications were both within the same taxonomic grouping, for example an initial identification of guillemot / razorbill, and a QA identification as guillemot. This method was adopted by BTO's method of species identification QA. A minimum of 10% of snags are checked with the proportion increasing depending on survey difficulty and accuracy of identifications. For this survey 100% of identifications were checked due to the relatively small number of targets overall. For the current survey, the identification agreement rate was 91%.

### 3.4 Species Distribution Maps

Each animal recorded during the surveys was geo-referenced, enabling locations to be related to the boundary of the Survey Area. Corresponding coordinates for each observation were accurate to  $\pm$  3 to 5 m. Spatial distribution maps for birds and other marine megafauna within the Survey Area have been produced using QGIS by separating individual species records during the surveys and representing these as symbols on a map. Symbols are determined by the species group, with a relevant icon and a unique colour assigned on a per species basis, the latter of which allows for a differentiation across the board between species that use the same icon. Icons in the distribution map will appear to overlap when individuals recorded during the surveys are in close proximity to each other.

### 3.5 Species Flight Heights

Bird flight heights were estimated from the digital still images. using a size-based methodology developed by APEM from techniques described by Johnston and Cook (2016)<sup>1</sup>. They were determined using bespoke APEM software that applies a set of rules developed in-house and trigonometry to provide an estimate of flight height above mean sea level (MSL). The accuracy of the application of the trigonometric rules varies depending on the size and position of the bird. The trigonometric calculation is based on species-specific bird measurements (based on reference lengths taken from the literature), image GSD (the distance between pixel centres), the known height of the aircraft as the image was taken, and the pitch, roll, and yaw of the aircraft. These parameters are entered into APEM's flight height calculator to estimate the height of each individual bird captured in survey

---

<sup>1</sup> Johnston, A. and Cook, A.S.C.P., 2016. *How High Do Birds Fly?: Development of Methods and Analysis of Digital Aerial Data of Seabird Flight Heights*. British Trust for Ornithology.

images. Flight height estimates are less reliable for birds that are diving or turning sharply (this affects the measurement of body length and wingspan from the image) or other aspects that may affect the body length measurement. Such birds are removed from the sample used to calculate flight heights. Flight height data is included within the separate raw data files.

## 4. Abundance and distribution

### 4.1 Abundance

A total of 2,715 birds were recorded in the Survey Area during the October – December 2023 seasonal survey. Of those, 1,842 were sitting on the water, 868 were in flight and five were deceased (**Table 7**).

A total of 98 marine megafauna were recorded in the Survey Area (**Table 8**). Scientific names and taxonomy of species recorded are provided in **Appendix I Scientific Names and Taxonomy**.

**Table 7 Total number of individuals of birds by species or species group recorded during the October to December 2023 seasonal survey period.**

Species Group	Species	Flying	Sitting	Perched	Diving	Taking off	Deceased	Total
Gulls	Kittiwake	186	52	-	-	-	-	238
	Great Black-backed Gull	17	20	-	-	-	-	37
	Herring Gull	7	3	-	-	-	-	10
	Large Gull species	2	3	-	-	-	-	5
Auk	Little Auk	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	Guillemot	30	1,007	-	-	-	-	1,037
	Guillemot / Razorbill	27	357	-	-	-	-	384
	Razorbill	21	75	-	-	-	-	96
	Puffin	-	140	-	-	-	-	140
	Auk species	2	58	-	-	-	-	60
Diver	Great Northern Diver	1	2	-	-	-	-	3
	Great Northern Diver / White-billed Diver	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Fulmar	Fulmar	562	112	-	-	-	-	674
Fulmar / Gull	Fulmar / Gull species	1	10	-	-	-	4	15
Gannet	Gannet	7	-	-	-	-	-	7
Unidentified Bird species	Unidentified Bird species	5	1	-	-	-	1	7
<b>Total</b>		<b>868</b>	<b>1,842</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>2,715</b>

**Table 8 Total number of individuals of marine megafauna by species or species group recorded during the October to December 2023 seasonal survey period.**

Species Group	Species	Deeply submerged*	Submerged**	Surfacing	Bottling***	Hauled Out	Deceased	Total
Seal	Grey Seal	-	3	-	-	-	-	3
	Seal species	-	13	2	1	-	-	16
Dolphin	White-beaked Dolphin	7	27	4	-	-	-	38
Porpoise	Harbour Porpoise	5	9	20	-	-	-	34
Dolphin / Porpoise	Dolphin / Porpoise species	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Marine Mammal species	Marine Mammal species	2	3	1	-	-	-	6
<b>Total</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>1</b>	-	-	<b>98</b>

\*The target is far beneath the surface so that many features are difficult to distinguish. Deeply submerged targets may be difficult to identify to species level.

\*\*The target is wholly underwater, within the first few metres of the surface. Features used to aid identification are usually visible.

\*\*\* Applies to seals, where the head is positioned above the surface and the rest of the body is submerged vertically.

## 4.2 Spatial Distribution

**Figure 3** and **Figure 4** show the location of birds and marine megafauna, respectively, recorded in the Survey Area. Birds were recorded across the Survey Area, with numbers evenly distributed throughout the Survey Area. Marine megafauna species were loosely distributed throughout the Survey Area, but with lower numbers in the north and north-east. **Figure 5** to **Figure 12** show distributions of more abundant birds by species, whilst **Figure 14** shows the distribution of less frequently recorded bird species. **Figure 14** shows the distribution of white-beaked dolphins within the Survey Area, **Figure 15** shows the distribution of harbour porpoises within the Survey Area and **Figure 16** shows the distributions of less frequently recorded marine megafauna by species. **Figure 17** shows the distribution of abiotic structures in the Survey Area.




Figure 3 Distribution of all birds recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.




Figure 4 Distribution of all marine megafauna recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.




Figure 5 Kittiwake distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.




Figure 6 Great black-backed gull distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.




Figure 7 Guillemot distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.




Figure 8 Razorbill distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.




Figure 9 Guillemot / Razorbill distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.




Figure 10 Puffin distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.




Figure 11 Auk species distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.




Figure 12 Fulmar distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.




Figure 13 Distribution of less abundant bird species recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.




Figure 14 White-beaked dolphin distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.




Figure 15 Harbour porpoise distribution recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.




Figure 16 Distribution of less abundant marine megafauna recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.




Figure 17 Distribution of abiotic structures recorded in the October to December 2023 seasonal survey.

## 5. Abiotic Structures and Observations

The following abiotic structures were observed during the survey period:

A single, stationary, cable-laying vessel was observed from the aircraft. The vessel was recorded between survey lines number 10 and 11 on 15<sup>th</sup> of December. No vessels were observed in the imagery; however, a single buoy was recorded on line 9 on the 15<sup>th</sup> of December.

## Appendix I Scientific Names and Taxonomy

Scientific names and taxonomy for all species can be found in the accompanying appendix document.


Species	Scientific.Name
Kittiwake	<i>Rissa tridactyla</i>
Great Black-backed Gull	<i>Larus marinus</i>
Herring Gull	<i>Larus argentatus</i>
Little Auk	<i>Alle alle</i>
Guillemot	<i>Uria aalge</i>
Razorbill	<i>Alca torda</i>
Puffin	<i>Fratercula arctica</i>
Great Northern Diver	<i>Gavia immer</i>
White-billed Diver	<i>Gavia adamsii</i>
Fulmar	<i>Fulmarus glacialis</i>
Gannet	<i>Morus bassanus</i>
Grey Seal	<i>Halichoerus grypus</i>
White-beaked Dolphin	<i>Lagenorhynchus albirostris</i>
Harbour Porpoise	<i>Phocoena phocoena</i>

**Appendix II Example images (snags) of birds and marine mammals.**

Images are jpeg files of a lower resolution than those used by image analysts when performing identifications.



**Figure 18 White-beaked dolphin.**



**Figure 19 Harbour porpoise.**




**Figure 20 Great Northern diver in flight.**



**Figure 21 Small raft of guillemots sitting on the water.**



**Figure 22 Great black-backed gull in flight**



**Figure 23 Kittiwake in flight over foamy sea**