

Figure 3. Is the potential Sabellaria sp reef formed mostly by tubes constructed by *S. alveolata* or *S. spinulosa*?

S. alveolata

Is *S. alveolata* reef a designated feature or sub feature of a protected site located within the project Zol?

If yes:

- Does the relevant site conservation documentation define the qualifying criteria for *S. alveolata* reef for the site? If yes, does the *S. alveolata* colony fit the definition as reef? If no, consider role of colony in maintaining favourable conservation status of any designated *S. alveolata* reefs within the site during the EclA and HRA. If the *S. alveolata* colony fit the definition as reef, then include reef as a receptor during the EclA (and HRA/WFD assessment as required).

If the relevant site conservation documentation does not define the qualifying criteria for *S. alveolata* reef for the site, then you need to determine site specific definition of reef in discussion with NRW (and NE/EA for cross boundary sites). Does *S. alveolata* colony fit the definition as reef? If No then you need to consider role of the colony in maintaining favourable conservation status of any designated *S. alveolata* reefs within the site during the EclA and HRA. If yes, then include reef as a receptor during EclA (and HRA/WFD assessment as required).

If *S. alveolata* reef **is not** a designated feature or sub feature of a protected site located within the project Zol:

- Does the *S. alveolata* colony meet the qualifying criteria for definition as reef under Section 7 (to be determined in discussion with NRW and NE/EA for cross boundary sites)? If yes, it will require a WFD assessment and the reef will need to be included as a receptor during the EclA (and HRA/WFD assessment as required).
- If the colony does not meet the qualifying criteria for definition as reef under Section 7, could the colony have a role in maintaining favourable conservation status of designated *S. alveolata* reefs located within the zone of influence? If no, no further action is required. If yes, then the reef will need to be included as a receptor during EclA (and HRA/WFD assessment as required).

S. spinulosa

Is *S. spinulosa* reef a designated feature or sub feature of a protected site located within the project Zol?

If yes:

Does the relevant site conservation documentation define the qualifying criteria for *S. spinulosa* reef for the site? If yes Does the *S. spinulosa* colony fit the definition as reef? If it does, then the reef needs to be included as a receptor during the EclA (and HRA/WFD assessment as required). If it doesn't, then you need to consider the role of the colony in maintaining favourable conservation status of any designated *S. spinulosa* reefs within the site during the EclA and HRA.

If *S. spinulosa* **is not** a designated feature or sub feature of a protected site located within the project Zol, then you need to determine the site specific definition of reefs in discussion with NRW (and NE/EA for cross boundary sites). Does *S. spinulosa* colony fit the definition of reef? If yes, the reef needs to be included as a receptor during the EclA (and HRA/WFD assessment as required). If it doesn't, then you need to consider the role of the colony in maintaining favourable conservation status of any designated *S. spinulosa* reefs within the site during the EclA and HRA.

If *S. spinulosa* reef **is not** a designated feature or sub feature of a protected site located within the project Zol then:

Would the *S. spinulosa* colony be considered 'reef' according to Gubbay 2007/Jenkins et al. 2015 and/or the OSPAR description? If yes, then a WFD assessment is required and the reef needs to be included as a receptor during the EclA (and HRA/WFD assessment as required).

If *S. spinulosa* colony cannot be considered 'reef' according to Gubbay 2007/Jenkins et al., 2015 and/or the OSPAR description, then could the colony have a role in maintaining favourable conservation status of designated *S. spinulosa* reefs located within the project Zol? If it doesn't, no further action is required. If it does have a role, the reef needs to be included as a receptor during the EclA (and HRA/WFD assessment as required).