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Executive Summary

The UK is committed to the establishment of a network of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) to help conserve marine ecosystems and marine biodiversity. MPAs can be a valuable tool to protect species and habitats and can also be used to aid implementation of the ecosystem approach to management, which aims to maintain the ‘goods and services’ produced by the healthy functioning of the marine ecosystem that are relied on by humans.

A consortium\(^1\) led by ABPmer were commissioned (Contract Reference: MB0102) to develop a series of biophysical data layers to aid the selection of Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs) in England and Wales under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 and the equivalent MPA measures in Scotland. Such data layers may also be of use in taking forward marine planning in UK waters. The overall aim of the project was to ensure that the best available information was used for the selection of MPAs in UK waters, and that the data layers produced were easily accessed and utilized by those with responsibility for selecting sites.

The Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 allows for the designation of MCZs for biological, geological and geomorphological features of interest. To deliver this requirement, the project was divided into a number of discrete tasks, one of which (2D) included the production a series of data layers showing the distribution of key non-native species.

These data layers were produced by the collation of existing data from a wide range of sources and represent the largest UK-wide data collation exercise undertaken in recent years. Once collated, the data was entered into a standard structure and is displayed as ESRI Shapefiles for inclusion in standard GIS and mapping packages including ArcGIS, MapInfo and Google Earth. In addition, the spatial referencing system was standardized and the distributions clipped to the MCZ project boundaries for England and jurisdiction boundaries for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Once in the standard format the underlying data tables were quality assured to check valid information was entered in each of the attributes. Alongside the spatial data, each derived data layer has a metadata record to assist in the discovery and reuse of the outputs.

For each layer a confidence assessment was produced. The confidence assessment was based on the volume of data acquired and the information provided by experts and organizations and took account of datasets that were not available or not in a suitable format.

The species covered by this report were selected as specified in the project specification. The species include, harpoon weed *Asparagopsis armata*, a colonial sea squirt *Botryloides violaceus*, a slipper limpet *Crepidula fornicata*, green sea fingers *Codium fragile* subspecies *tomentosoides*, Japanese skeleton shrimp (*Caprella mutica*), a sea squirt *Corella eumyota*, the Pacific oyster *Crassostrea gigas*, hard_shell clam *Mercenaria mercenaria*, a sea squirt *Perophora japonica*, a razor

\(^1\) ABPmer, MarLIN, Cefas, EMU Limited, Proudman Oceanographic Laboratory (POL) and Bangor University.
shell *Ensis (directus) americanus*, the Chinese mitten crab *Eriocheir sinensis*, common cord-grass *Spartina anglica*, wireweed *Sargassum muticum*, a sea squirt *Styela clava*, and wakame *Undaria pinnatifida*.

Maps for all species were reproduced within this document as image files to allow visualization of the distribution of a representative range of species.

Where possible, it has been the aspiration of the contract to make the derived data layers generated from this project freely available. Due to the range of data sources this has not always been possible. Nevertheless, all derived data will be made available to Government Departments and Public Bodies for non-commercial purposes according to the restriction of use document.

A large data collation and aggregation exercise of this kind encountered several issues. In particular, the need to harmonize disparate data formats and the negotiation with a variety of data providers to allow the widest possible release of the resulting layers. In addition, the work highlighted the importance on cataloguing and storing datasets with an appropriate level of metadata.

The report also identified future considerations to improve access to marine data, which include the need to further promote and adopt the standards and specification developed through the Marine Environmental and Data Information Network (MEDIN) programme and to ensure that organizations comply with EU legislation such as the INSPIRE Directive.
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1. **Introduction**

1.1 **Project Background**

1.1 The UK is committed to the establishment of a network of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) to help conserve marine ecosystems and marine biodiversity. MPAs can be a valuable tool to protect species and habitats and can also be used to aid implementation of the ecosystem approach to management, which aims to maintain the ‘goods and services’ produced by the healthy functioning of the marine ecosystem that are relied on by humans.

1.2 As a signatory of OSPAR, the UK is committed to establishing an ecologically coherent network of well managed MPAs. The UK is already in the process of completing a network consisting of Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Areas of Protection (SPAs), collectively known as Natura 2000 sites to fulfil its obligations under the EC Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC). Through provisions in the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009, a network of Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs) can be designated in England and Welsh territorial waters and UK offshore waters. The Scottish Government is also considering equivalent Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in Scotland. These sites are intended to help to protect areas where habitats and species are threatened, and to also protect areas of representative habitats. For further information on the purpose of MCZs and the design principles to be employed see [http://www.defra.gov.uk/marine/biodiversity/marine-bill/guidance.htm](http://www.defra.gov.uk/marine/biodiversity/marine-bill/guidance.htm) Defra, 2009.

1.3 MCZ selection will be undertaken via a participatory stakeholder engagement approach. Four Regional MCZ Projects have been established to lead this process, and have been identified as the principle ‘customer’ of any WebGIS system established. The Regional MCZ Projects were established during the latter half of 2009, and were expected to be fully functional by early 2010. The full stakeholder engagement process was anticipated to begin in February 2010, continuing until the end of 2011. A formal public consultation is expected in 2012.

1.4 Under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009, the UK government is committed to conserve, and promote the recovery of a wide range of habitats and species through the establishment of an ecologically coherent network of well managed MPAs. Five of the seven network design principles listed in the Ministerial Statement (2010)\(^2\) cannot be fulfilled without the following knowledge:

1) Representativeness – the range of marine habitats and species are represented through protecting all major habitat types and associated biological communities present in our marine area.

2) Replication – replication of major habitats through the network;

3) Viability – self-sustaining, geographically dispersed component sites of sufficient size to ensure species and habitats persistence through natural cycles of variation;

4) Adequacy – the network is of adequate size to deliver its ecological objectives and ensure the ecological viability and integrity of populations, species and communities; and
5) Connectivity – to maximize and enhance the linkages among individual MPAs.

1.5 The selection of MPAs should be based on the best available data. This data will be a range of data types including biological, physical and oceanographic characteristics and socio-economic data (such as the location of current activities). To ensure such data are easily available to those who would have responsibility for selecting sites, Defra and its partners\(^3\) commissioned a consortium\(^1\) lead by ABPmer and partners to take forward a package of work. The consortium were tasked with the development of the following new Geographical Information System (GIS) data layers:
- geological and geomorphological features;
- listed habitats and species;
- selected non-native species;
- fetch and wave exposure;
- marine diversity layer;
- benthic productivity; and
- residual current flow.

1.6 In addition to the development of data layers, there is a need to ensure such information can be easily accessed given the participatory nature of the MCZ process that is currently being planned. Hence, all derived data products would be made available for use by the MCZ Regional Projects and to the Devolved Administrations for their equivalent processes.

1.7 This report provides a detailed description of the development of the priority species with limited mobility data layer, the steps taken to collate the data, standardise, undertake quality assurance and output the resulting layers in an accessible format.

1.8 Relevant datasets are held by a wide variety of organizations and individuals with a regional or species-specific bias to the data. Through large collation exercises, these datasets can be standardised and made widely available for future projects, greatly reducing the time taken to collate data and improving the long-term availability and visibility of important datasets.

1.2 **Aims and Objectives**

1.9 The aims of this element of the project were to produce spatially referenced tables and associated GIS layers showing the distribution of non-native species.

1.10 The species covered by this report are harpoon weed (*Asparagopsis armata*), A colonial sea squirt (*Botrylloides violaceus*), a slipper limpet (*Crepidula fornicata*), green sea fingers (*Codium fragile* subspecies *tomentosoides*), Japanese skeleton shrimp (*Caprella mutica*), a sea squirt (*Corella eumyota*), Pacific oyster (*Crassostrea gigas*), hard-shell clam (*Mercenaria mercenaria*), a

\(^3\) Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC), Countryside Council for Wales (CCW), Natural England (NE), Scottish Government (SG), Department of Environment Northern Ireland (DOENI) and Isle of Man Government.
sea squirt (*Perophora japonica*), a razor shell (*Ensis (directus) americanus*), Chinese mitten crab (*Eriocheir sinensis*), common cordgrass (*Spartina anglica*), wireweed (*Sargassum muticum*), a sea squirt (*Styela clava*) and wakame (*Undaria pinnatifida*).

1.11 The full species list and corresponding legislation that they fall under is listed in Appendix B.

1.3 **Format of the Report**

1.12 The report comprises three main sections:

- Section 1 details the approach and methodology used to derive the layers;
- Section 2 shows the results and outlines guidance for use and interpretation, and
- Section 3 outlines issues encountered during data collation and layer generation production and sets out future considerations.

1.13 In addition, the Appendices provide further contextual information.
2. **Adopted Approach and Methodology**

2.1 **Collation of Data and Information**

2.1 Data was requested from all the major holders of marine biodiversity data for the target species identified in Appendix B. Additional records for the species were sought through direct contact with authors, specialists, recording schemes, societies and organisations known to have carried out work on target species, or who were likely to hold records and information on their distribution. Their details are included in Appendix B.

2.2 The data collated from the statutory agencies and major databases (such as the UKOOA holdings) and the National Biodiversity Network (NBN) were augmented by a literature search for each species on the list, utilising the resources of the National Marine Biological Library (NMBL) and other online literature search tools.

2.3 The data collation was undertaken simultaneously for Limited Mobility Benthic Species (2B), Habitats (2C), Non-native species (2D) and the Biodiversity Layer (2F). In total, over 120 individuals from 68 organizations were initially contacted of which 107 provided data to the project. The resulting number of species records was over 2 million.

2.4 Publications containing relevant information were collected and records extracted. These records (and their originating publication) were then entered into Marine Recorder where permissions allowed. Where permission was not granted for Marine Recorder upload, or there was risk of duplication, some records were imported directly into the species layers. The risk of duplication was caused by access to the latest records from organizations such as Seasearch which had not yet been entered into Marine Recorder. Entry by MarLIN would therefore result in multiple entries for the same record when MarLIN holdings were uploaded to the NBN.

2.5 In addition to requests for data for the MB0102 project, the data providers were asked to give permission for wider dissemination and archiving in DASSH, the MEDIN Data Archive Centre (DAC) for biodiversity data. Where it was agreed, the requests enabled the derived data layers to be more widely available and ensured that data became available from a central point for future projects.

2.2 **Quality Assurance**

2.6 Progress of datasets through Marine Recorder into the archive used for the contract was monitored using an Access database to ensure that QA standards were adhered to during data input. A record of publication and data sources used was stored in an Endnote database. The bibliography is included in this report. Details of the points of contact and specialists consulted during the data acquisition phase of the project were also logged in the same Access database. The details of individuals and organizations contacted are all available in Appendix D of this report.

2.7 After initial data entry all data and metadata were validated and verified to ensure the data met appropriate standards. The standards used included those established by the Join Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) and
DASSH (the Archive for Marine Species and Habitat Data) in its role as a Marine Environmental Data and Information Network (MEDIN) Data Archive Centre (DAC). Data validation was carried out independently of the member of staff responsible for data entry.

2.3 Taxonomic Standards

2.8 All species records were matched to the World Register of Marine Species\(^4\), (WoRMS) using the online “Match taxa” tool. The matching gave a consistent species list to work from and ensured that the layers included the most up-to-date taxonomic information. The matched taxonomic lists were then joined back to the original dataset. In all cases, the taxonomy originally assigned by the data provider was retained to ensure all changes were clear in the final layer.

2.4 Analysis and Data Layer Development

2.9 The species data was then imported into an ESRI Geodatabase structure and the GIS information was standardised and referenced to geographic coordinate system WGS84. The standardization involved the re-projection of any data held in different datums using the toolboxes available through the ESRI ArcGIS software. As Marine Recorder exports data in OSGB36 the Petroleum geographic transformation was applied to re-project the data from OSGB36 into WGS84.

2.10 The collated data was stored in an ESRI Geodatabase with standardised fields. The fields used were agreed with the Project Steering Group and are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Field names for species layers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OrigName</td>
<td>Name in original dataset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciName</td>
<td>Name matched in WoRMS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SurveyID</td>
<td>Unique Survey ID from Marine Recorder. Where data was not entered into Marine Recorder a unique project ID was assigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date of Record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LocName</td>
<td>Name of location where record is taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SampleID</td>
<td>Unique ID from Marine Recorder (where relevant).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Name of Survey Event from Marine Recorder (where relevant).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat</td>
<td>Latitude of record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Longitude of record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>The group or individual(s) responsible for the taxonomic determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Status of the record (Present, Absent, Uncertain).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>Precision of spatial information, based on how the spatial information was derived.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, a survey table was produced in Microsoft Access, to record details of each survey and allow the further interrogation of the layers. The survey table was provided separately to the species layer as it would result in a large amount of duplicated information and greatly increase the size of the delivered layers. The layers can be linked through the SurveyID field which is common to both tables. The fields in the survey table are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Field names for survey table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SurveyID</td>
<td>Unique Survey ID from Marine Recorder. Where data was not entered into Marine Recorder a unique project ID was assigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpeciesListUsed</td>
<td>The name of the species list. In all cases this was “WoRMS – World Register of Marine Species”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SurveyName</td>
<td>Name of the Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SurveyTechnique</td>
<td>Where known the method of survey that the records result from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StartDate</td>
<td>The date the survey started. In cases where only the month or year are known the first day of the month or year are recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EndDate</td>
<td>The date the survey ended. In cases where only the month or year are known the last day of the month or year are recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SurveyTechniqueDetails</td>
<td>Where known further details of survey technique are recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UseContraints</td>
<td>The limitations on the use of the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeterminedBy</td>
<td>The group or individual(s) responsible for the taxonomic determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyors</td>
<td>The group or individual(s) responsible for the survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 Confidence Assessment

In many cases, we were aware of data that was not available within the scope of the project, or that were not in an accessible format currently. Therefore, there was a need to attach a measure of confidence to the resultant species layers. Table 3 shows the ascribed confidence based on current data availability.
Table 3. Confidence assessment, based on data availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species name</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asparagopsis armata</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Not all data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botrylloides violaceus</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>All accessible data included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crepidula fornicata</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Widespread sublittoral species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codium fragile subspecies tormentosoides</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Not all data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprella mutica</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>All accessible data included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corella eumyota</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>All accessible data included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crassostrea gigas</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>All accessible data included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercenaria mercenaria</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>All accessible data included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perophora japonica</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>All accessible data included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eris (directus) americanus</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>All accessible data included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriocheir sinensis</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>All accessible data included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartina anglica</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Not all data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargassum muticum</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>All accessible data included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styela clava</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>All accessible data included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undaria pinnatifida</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Not all data available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.13 Once sufficient preliminary records were collected a series of draft maps were produced, displaying the currently recognized distribution for each species. These maps were then made available, with restrictions through the MarLIN website. All previous consultants, along with any known specialists not yet contacted were invited to review the distributions and provide feedback. The feedback was then collated and additions and edits made to the underlying data. Details of the additional data are shown in Appendix C.

2.14 GIS data was manually screened for duplicate entries, missing information and points plotting on land. There remains an issue with creating point layers where some historic data is stored at resolutions of 1 or 10kms. Coordinate precision was therefore included as a data attribute, to allow records at these resolutions to be filtered out as required without having to remove them from the final layers.

2.15 Where many replicates were taken at one station, or duplicates formed by more than one surveyors records being entered the points were removed. Where sampling occurred at different years (for example as part of long-term monitoring programmes) the data from the latest year was retained.
3. Derived Data Layers for Selected Non-native Species

3.1 Using the Data Layers

3.1 The interpretation and usage of the derived data layers should be carried out with reference to the information outlined in the sections below. Each layer had valid MEDIN discovery metadata associated with it, allowing further interpretation and additional information relating to the layer.

3.2 Coordinate Precision

3.2 All records are provided as points. However, this data must be interpreted using the coordinate precision field. The precision may affect how a record displays, particularly for those at 10 km resolution as they may appear offshore for an intertidal species or intertidal for a sublittoral species.

3.3 Figure 1 illustrates the precision of a typical selection of records.

![Figure 1. Example of varying coordinate precision for records within a dataset.]

3.3 Permissions and Reuse

3.4 The non-native (2D) species layers are provided only for the uses set out by Defra in the Restrictions of Use document, included here as Appendix D. The original data providers should be contacted for any uses outside the “Accessing and developing the required biophysical datasets and data layers for Marine Protected Areas network planning and wider marine spatial
planning purposes’ contract remit. Where possible, permission has additionally been cleared for data to be disseminated publicly via the NBN.

3.5 The derived data layers resulting from the MB0102 project will be made available through the MEDIN DAC network, with metadata available through the MEDIN portal available from the MEDIN website⁵.

3.4 Example Maps

3.6 From the resulting data layers, a series of images have been produced within this report showing the distribution of those non-native species as specified in the project specification. These demonstrate the outputs from the project GIS but do not include the GIS functionality to allow the user to zoom, pan and query the data points.

⁵ http://www.oceannet.org/
Figure 2. Final derived data layer for wakame *Undaria pinnatifida*.
Figure 3. Final derived data layer for harpoon weed *Asparagopsis armata*. 
Figure 4. Final derived data layer for the colonial sea squirt *Botrylloides violaceous.*
Figure 5. Final derived data layer for the Japanese skeleton shrimp *Caprella mutica*.
Figure 6. Final derived data layer for green sea fingers *Codium fragile fragile*. 
Figure 7. Final derived data layer for the sea squirt *Corella eumyota*. 
Figure 8. Final derived data layer for the Pacific oyster *Crassostrea gigas*. 
Figure 9. Final derived data layer for the slipper limpet *Crepidula fornicata*.
Figure 10. Final derived data layer for the American jackknife clam *Ensis directus*. 
Figure 11. Final derived data layer for the Chinese mitten crab *Eriochier sinensis*.
Figure 12. Final derived data layer for the hard-shell clam *Mercenaria mercenaria*. 
Figure 13. Final derived data layer for the sea squirt *Perophora japonica*. 
Figure 14. Final derived data layer for wireweed *Sargassum muticum*. 
Figure 15. Final derived data layer for common cord-grass *Spartina anglica*. 
Figure 16. Final derived data layer for the leathery sea squirt *Styela clava*.
4. Issues and Further Considerations

4.1 The project represented one of the largest data collation exercises ever undertaken for marine species and identified a number of issues related to access, collation and onward dissemination of data gathered from a wide variety of sources. The data providers recognised the importance of the project and were keen to be involved.

4.2 The collation of large volumes of data from disparate providers highlighted a number of issues which are discussed below.

4.1 Ease of Access and Supply of Data

4.3 A number of organisations holding key datasets were very slow to respond to data requests in spite of repeated attempts. We conclude that these organisations should review their data dissemination policies in order to ensure compliance with the 20 day limit specified in Environmental Information Regulation (EIR) and the EU’s Information for Spatial Information in Europe (INSPIRE) legislation.

4.4 Although many data providers believed they had given most of their data, even providers with good, central, point data storage still have issues with the archiving of GIS polygon layers. It also appears that large volumes of data are held at regional level, often with incomplete cataloguing. It is hoped that organisations will soon develop complete INSPIRE compliant metadata catalogues as this contract has shown that regional and local data is vital for use at a national level. In some cases reports had been separated from the raw or derived data meaning that data had to be digitised to allow inclusion at a less accurate level than would have been possible with the original data.

4.5 Much of the polygon data available was too generic to be of use for plotting species data (e.g. based on life forms) even though some biotopes are relevant to species data.

4.6 During the data collation we encountered two organisations who felt that their data had previously been misused, either by being given to contractors without permission or by being published prior to publication by the original authors. These instances have made the suppliers unwilling to share their data again. We suggest that guidance should be developed on the collation, storage and reuse of third party data (i.e. that not collected under contract) to ensure the optimum flow of data between organisations and the protection of the IPR of data providers. The guidance could be developed based on the existing work of organisations such as the National Biodiversity Network (NBN) or the Marine Environmental Data and Information Network (MEDIN).

4.2 Data Formatting Issues and Standards

4.7 The provision of data without relevant report references or metadata of any kind resulted in difficulties in collating information to populate the survey table. Where GIS layers were provided there was often insufficient information relating to the projection of the original data. Both OSGB36 and WGS84 are widely used and can lead to inaccuracies in the spatial rendering of the data.
points. In addition the lack of metadata greatly increases the level of QA that is required.

4.8 Much of the data arrived in a variety of formats. While transformation between electronic formats is (in most cases) simple, when data were late arriving it made incorporation into the project outputs difficult.

4.9 When comparing the species in the supplied datasets against the World Register of Marine Species, there was typically a 70-80% correlation. Many mismatches were due to changes in taxonomy since the creation of the original dataset, however typographical errors and inconsistent naming conventions (such as the use of ‘indet’, ‘crusts’ etc) also meant matches had to be manually entered. Again this is a time consuming process and one that can be avoided if data providers are able to adopt existing standards for the supply of data.

4.3 Future Considerations

4.10 It is hoped that the issues raised in this data collation and mapping exercise will assist organisations in developing their data management systems for easier data flow.

4.11 Many of the issues are being addressed though the work of MEDIN, which is developing data specifications, standards and metadata standards to simplify and harmonise the exchange of marine data and metadata.

4.12 The work detailed in this report is an important first step at broadening the availability of data for key species. Carefully defined pathways for marine data flow and the adoption of MEDIN standards and specifications will facilitate the update of these derived data products and provide a solid foundation for future marine data management.

4.13 These data layers constitute the best available knowledge at the current date, but provide an incomplete picture, and this must be taken into consideration in their application. Further reduction in data quality would only act to reduce the applicability of these layers, both for MCZ Regional Projects and their potential subsequent wider use in spatial planning.
5. References and Data Sources


Appendix A. Validation Checklist

1. Check fields complete
   - OrigName
   - SciName
   - SurvID
   - Date
   - Location
   - Sample
   - Event
   - Lat
   - long
   - Determiner
   - Status
   - CoordinatePrecision (m)

2. Check points
   - Within UK territorial limits?
   - Any on land?
   - Remove duplicate records
### Appendix B. Original Species list and WoRMS match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ScientificName</th>
<th>Phylum</th>
<th>AphialID</th>
<th>AphialID (accepted)</th>
<th>WoRMS ScientificName</th>
<th>TSN</th>
<th>ScientificName Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asparagopsis armata</td>
<td>Rhodophyta</td>
<td>144438</td>
<td>144438</td>
<td>Asparagopsis armata</td>
<td>11776</td>
<td>Harvey, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botryllloides violaceus</td>
<td>Chordata</td>
<td>148715</td>
<td>148715</td>
<td>Botryllloides violaceus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oka, 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crepidula fornicata</td>
<td>Mollusca</td>
<td>138963</td>
<td>138963</td>
<td>Crepidula fornicata</td>
<td>72623</td>
<td>(Linnaeus, 1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codium fragile fragile</td>
<td>Chlorophyta</td>
<td>370562</td>
<td>370562</td>
<td>Codium fragile fragile</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Suringar) Hariot, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprella mutica</td>
<td>Arthropoda</td>
<td>146768</td>
<td>146768</td>
<td>Caprella mutica</td>
<td>656389</td>
<td>Schurin, 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corella eumyota</td>
<td>Chordata</td>
<td>173223</td>
<td>173223</td>
<td>Corella eumyota</td>
<td>159160</td>
<td>Traustedt, 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crassostrea gigas</td>
<td>Mollusca</td>
<td>140656</td>
<td>140656</td>
<td>Crassostrea gigas</td>
<td>79868</td>
<td>(Thunberg, 1793)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercenaria mercenaria</td>
<td>Mollusca</td>
<td>141919</td>
<td>141919</td>
<td>Mercenaria mercenaria</td>
<td>81496</td>
<td>(Linnaeus, 1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perophora japonica</td>
<td>Chordata</td>
<td>103758</td>
<td>103758</td>
<td>Perophora japonica</td>
<td>206908</td>
<td>Oka, 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensis (directus) americanus</td>
<td>Mollusca</td>
<td>152356</td>
<td>140732</td>
<td>Ensis directus</td>
<td>205635</td>
<td>(Conrad, 1843)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriocheir sinensis</td>
<td>Arthropoda</td>
<td>107451</td>
<td>107451</td>
<td>Eriocheir sinensis</td>
<td>99058</td>
<td>H. Milne-Edwards, 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartina anglica</td>
<td>Angiospermophyta</td>
<td>234043</td>
<td>234041</td>
<td>Spartina townsendii var. anglica</td>
<td>505302</td>
<td>C.E. Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargassum muticum</td>
<td>Ochrophyta</td>
<td>145559</td>
<td>145559</td>
<td>Sargassum (Bactrophyces) muticum</td>
<td>11390</td>
<td>(Yendo) Fensholt, 1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styela clava</td>
<td>Chordata</td>
<td>103929</td>
<td>103929</td>
<td>Styela clava</td>
<td>159337</td>
<td>(Herdman, 1881)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undaria pinnatifida</td>
<td>Ochrophyta</td>
<td>145721</td>
<td>145721</td>
<td>Undaria pinnatifida</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Harvey) Suringar, 1872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C. Data Contacts

The names of individuals have been removed to comply with the Data Protection Act, but have been retained for future reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Data required</th>
<th>Data offered?</th>
<th>Data received?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adur District Council</td>
<td><em>Edwardsia ivelli</em></td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFBI</td>
<td>All species and biotopes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFBI</td>
<td>Passed us on to Matt Service</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artoo Marine Consultants</td>
<td>Saline lagoons</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Society of the British Isles</td>
<td><em>Spartina anglica</em> distribution</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Society of the British Isles</td>
<td><em>Spartina anglica</em> distribution, tetrad shapefile</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPS</td>
<td>Seaweed data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Record Centre</td>
<td>Seaweed data bpc</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Record Centre</td>
<td><em>Tenellia</em> and <em>Spartina</em> records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Phycological Society</td>
<td>Seaweed data</td>
<td>Yes - atlas and herbarium data - also possible seaweed survey data</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefas</td>
<td>Benthic invertebrate data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefas</td>
<td>Other relevant Cefas data</td>
<td>Yes seahorse data being sent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefas</td>
<td>Species distribution</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Harbour Conservancy</td>
<td><em>Heleobia stagnorum</em> distribution</td>
<td>Referred to other</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMACS</td>
<td>Isle of Man intertidal reports</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conchological</td>
<td><em>Heleobia stagnorum</em> distribution</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, and compiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Data required</td>
<td>Data offered?</td>
<td>Data received?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conchological Society</td>
<td>Mollusc data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Wildlife Trust</td>
<td><em>Amphianthus dorhni</em> distribution records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside Council for Wales</td>
<td>Expert for map checking</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside Council for Wales</td>
<td>Saltmarsh distribution in Wales</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon Sea Fisheries Committee</td>
<td><em>Crepidula fornicata</em> distribution records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOENI</td>
<td>Species and biotope data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>Species and biotope mapping</td>
<td>Biotope data not available</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWT</td>
<td>Species and biotope mapping</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Biotope data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU</td>
<td>MB0102 Interpreted biotopes (1A) layers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td><em>Eriocheir sinensis</em> data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Species and biotope data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Species and biotope data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Species and biotope data</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Species and biotope data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Species and biotope data</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Data required</td>
<td>Data offered?</td>
<td>Data received?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERCCIS</td>
<td>Maël &amp; stalkked jellyfish distribution in Cornwall</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geodata</td>
<td>Offshore data ALSF/REA etc</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire Wildlife Trust</td>
<td><em>G. insensibilis</em>. All species &amp; habitats. Hotspots</td>
<td><em>G. insensibilis so far</em></td>
<td><em>G. insensibilis so far</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Fal &amp; Helford records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Cornwall records, <em>Vicorella pavida</em> data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Expert for map checking</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Expert for map checking</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Expert for map checking</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Expert for Scotland for map checking</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td><em>Leptopsamnia &amp; Amphianthus</em> records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Welsh non native records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Man government</td>
<td>Species records in the Isle of Man</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isles of Scilly Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>Maël records for Cornwall</td>
<td>Suggested good contacts</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td><em>Alkmaria</em> records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNCC</td>
<td>JNCC data holdings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent &amp; Essex Sea Fisheries Committee</td>
<td><em>Ensis americanus</em> distribution records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>Species and biotope data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancing Parish Council</td>
<td><em>Edwardsia ivelli</em></td>
<td>Passed on to ranger</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Biological Association</td>
<td>Deep sea data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Biological Association</td>
<td><em>Marclim</em> data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Biological Association</td>
<td>Non native species records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Data required</td>
<td>Data offered?</td>
<td>Data received?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Biological Association</td>
<td>Non-native species record check</td>
<td>Yes papers and non published records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Fish Information Services</td>
<td><em>Hippocampus</em> species, <em>Gobius cobitis</em> records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Scotland</td>
<td><em>Pachycerianthus multiplicatus</em> and <em>Funiculina</em> data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Scotland</td>
<td>Species and biotope data</td>
<td>Passed on to other agencies</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MarLIN</td>
<td>MarLIN records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Biological Association</td>
<td>Species and biotope data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merman / BODC</td>
<td>CSEMP data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merseyside Biobank</td>
<td><em>Spartina anglica</em> records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>Species and biotope data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England contractor</td>
<td><em>Crassostrea gigas</em> in Kent area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural History Museum</td>
<td><em>Eriocheir sinensis</em> distribution</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural History Museum</td>
<td>Expert for map checking</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMGW</td>
<td><em>Arctica islandica</em> and <em>Thyasira gouldii</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Sea Fisheries Committee</td>
<td><em>Palinurus</em> distribution records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland Environment Agency</td>
<td>Species and biotope data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Data required</td>
<td>Data offered?</td>
<td>Data received?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Marine Laboratory</td>
<td>Scillies All-Taxa Biodiversity Index</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens University, Belfast</td>
<td>Non native seaweeds</td>
<td>Yes database</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranger</td>
<td>Edwardsia ivelli</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research thesis</td>
<td>Crassostrea.gigas in Devon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial data received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research thesis</td>
<td>Crassostrea.gigas in Strangford Lough</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salacia Marine</td>
<td>Palinurus elephas distribution</td>
<td>Suggested good contacts</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Association for Marine Science</td>
<td>Caprella mutica distribution records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Association for Marine Science</td>
<td>Species and biotope data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Species and biotope data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, but related to fishfarms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Species and biotope data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td>Expert for map checking</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td>Saline lagoons, Spatina and saltmarsh</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td>Species and biotope data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafish</td>
<td>Crassostrea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Report contained no new data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seahorse Trust</td>
<td>UK seahorse records</td>
<td>Yes but not at full resolution</td>
<td>Only partial data supplied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Data required</td>
<td>Data offered?</td>
<td>Data received?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasearch</td>
<td>Expert for map checking</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasearch</td>
<td><em>Leptopsamnia &amp; Amphianthus</em> records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasearch</td>
<td>Seasearch records and expert for map checking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shellfish Association GB</td>
<td>UK shellfish distribution records</td>
<td>Report sent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Sea Fisheries Committee</td>
<td><em>Palinurus elephas</em> distribution</td>
<td>No relevant data</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td><em>Caprella mutica</em> distribution records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Biological Records Centre</td>
<td>Suffolk records of <em>Spartina anglica</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex Wildlife Trust</td>
<td><em>Spartina mutica</em> distribution in Sussex</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullie House Museum and Art Gallery</td>
<td><em>Eriocheir sinensis</em> in Duddon Estuary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster Museum</td>
<td><em>P.multiplicatus</em> in N.I.</td>
<td>Confirmation of absence in N.I.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Bangor</td>
<td>English Channel dredge results</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Bangor</td>
<td>Expert for map checking</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Bangor</td>
<td><em>Modiolus</em> and North Wales data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Bournemouth</td>
<td>IOW records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Brighton</td>
<td>Saline lagoon species</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Expert for map checking</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Data required</td>
<td>Data offered?</td>
<td>Data received?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol (retired)</td>
<td>Maërl data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Plymouth</td>
<td>Seaweed expert non natives for map checking</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ulster</td>
<td><em>Tenellia</em> record</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Bristol</td>
<td><em>Arrhis phyllonyx</em> data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex county council</td>
<td>Saline lagoon species</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D. Restriction of Use Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB0102 Task Reference</th>
<th>Derived Data Layer Title</th>
<th>Specific layers included in derived data layer</th>
<th>Restriction &amp; Access</th>
<th>Copyright/Reference/Acknowledgement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>DAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Non Native Species</td>
<td>Asparagopsis armata; Botrylloides violaceus; Crepidula fornicata; Codium fragile; Caprella mutica; Corella eumyota; Crassostrea gigas; Mercenaria mercenaria; Perophora japonica; Ensis (americanus) directus; Eriocheir sinensis; Spartina anglica; Sargassum muticum; Styela clava; and Undaria pinnatifida.</td>
<td>Public version freely available is gridded. Non public point or polygon data to 10km grid squares resolution</td>
<td>Crown Copyright – Defra – MB0102</td>
<td>All layers supplied for the specific uses outlined. They may not be disaggregated or used for any other purpose other than that specified in the license without the prior consent of the original data provider. Where agreed all data will be made available via the NBN.</td>
<td>DASSH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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