

How to Respond

Responding to this consultation

You are invited to respond to this consultation by 13 November 2013 using the form in Appendices D & E.

Please send your response with the completed Respondent Information Form (see 'Handling your Response' below) to:

Responses can be sent by email, by post or by online electronic response form:

Email: [Marine Environment Mailbox@scotland.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Marine_Environment_Mailbox@scotland.gsi.gov.uk)

Post: MPA Network Consultation
Scottish Government
Marine Planning and Policy Division
Area 1-A South
Victoria Quay
Edinburgh
EH66QQ

On line: www.scotland.gov.uk/consultations

If you have any enquiries please send them to [Marine Environment Mailbox@scotland.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Marine_Environment_Mailbox@scotland.gsi.gov.uk) or call Sebastian Howell on 0131 244 5301, Michael McLeod on 0131 244 5562 or Paul Cook on 0131 244 0381.

We would be grateful if you would use the consultation questionnaire provided in your response as this will aid our analysis of the responses received. This consultation, and all other Scottish Government consultation exercises, can be viewed online on the consultation web pages of the Scottish Government website at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/consultations>.

The Scottish Government has an email alert system for consultations, <http://register.scotland.gov.uk>. This system allows stakeholder individuals and organisations to register and receive a weekly email containing details of all new consultations (including web links). It complements, but in no way replaces SG distribution lists, and is designed to allow stakeholders to keep up to date with all SG consultation activity, and therefore be alerted at the earliest opportunity to those of most interest. We would encourage you to register.

Handling your response

We need to know how you wish your response to be handled and, in particular, whether you are happy for your response to be made public. Please complete and return the **Respondent Information Form** which forms part of the consultation questionnaire as this will ensure that we treat your response appropriately. If you ask

for your response not to be published we will regard it as confidential, and we will treat it accordingly.

All respondents should be aware that the Scottish Government are subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 and would therefore have to consider any request made to it under the Act for information relating to responses made to this consultation exercise.

Next steps in the process

Where respondents have given permission for their response to be made public and after we have checked that they contain no potentially defamatory material, responses will be made available to the public in the Scottish Government Library and on the SEConsult web pages. You can make arrangements to view responses by contacting the SG Library on 0131 244 4552. Responses can be copied and sent to you, but a charge may be made for this service.

What happens next?

Following the closing date, all responses will be analysed and considered to help us make a decision on the shape of the MPA network. We aim to issue a report on this consultation process in early 2014.

Comments and complaints

If you have any comments about how this consultation exercise has been conducted, please send them to Sebastian Howell. (0131 244 5301 or Sebastian.howell@scotland.gsi.gov.uk).

The Scottish Government Consultation Process

Consultation is an essential and important aspect of Scottish Government working methods. Given the wide-ranging areas of work of the Scottish Government, there are many varied types of consultation. However, in general, Scottish Government consultation exercises aim to provide opportunities for all those who wish to express their opinions on a proposed area of work to do so in ways which will inform and enhance that work.

The Scottish Government encourages consultation that is thorough, effective and appropriate to the issue under consideration and the nature of the target audience. Consultation exercises take account of a wide range of factors, and no two exercises are likely to be the same.


Typically Scottish Government consultations involve a written paper inviting answers to specific questions or more general views about the material presented. Written papers are distributed to organisations and individuals with an interest in the issue, and they are also placed on the Scottish Government web site enabling a wider audience to access the paper and submit their responses.

Consultation exercises may also involve seeking views in a number of different ways, such as through public meetings, focus groups or questionnaire exercises.

Copies of all the written responses received to a consultation exercise (except those where the individual or organisation requested confidentiality) are placed in the Scottish Government library at Saughton House, Edinburgh (K Spur, Saughton House, Broomhouse Drive, Edinburgh, EH113XD, telephone 0131 244 4565).

All Scottish Government consultation papers and related publications (e.g. analysis of response reports) can be accessed at: Scottish Government consultations (<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/consultations>) The views and suggestions detailed in consultation responses are analysed and used as part of the decision making process, along with a range of other available information and evidence. Depending on the nature of the consultation exercise the responses received may: indicate the need for policy development or review; inform the development of a particular policy; help decisions to be made between alternative policy proposals; be used to finalise legislation before it is implemented. Final decisions on the issues under consideration will also take account of a range of other factors, including other available information and research evidence.

While details of particular circumstances described in a response to a consultation exercise may usefully inform the policy process, consultation exercises cannot address individual concerns and comments, which should be directed to the relevant public body.



CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. Do you support the development of an MPA network in Scotland's Seas?

Yes No

However we have two qualifications:

1/ the absence of specific proposals as to how the MPAs will be managed;
2/ not all species listed in the Priority Marine Features are presently included.

Individual possible Nature Conservation MPAs

2. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Clyde Sea Sill* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation:

Yes No

Comments

Management Options:

Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes No

Comments

All of the above:

Yes No

Comments

3. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *East Caithness Cliffs* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

4. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *East of Gannet and Montrose Fields* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

5. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Faroe-Shetland sponge belt* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

6. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Fetlar to Haroldswick* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

7. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Hatton-Rockall Basin* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

8. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Loch Creran* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

9. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Loch Sunart* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

10. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Loch Sunart to the Sound of Jura* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

11. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Loch Sween* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

12. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Lochs Duich, Long and Aish* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

13. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Monach Isles* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

14. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Mousa to Boddam* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

15. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *North-east Faroe Shetland Channel* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

16. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *North-west Orkney* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

17. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *North-west sea lochs and Summer Isles* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

18. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Noss Head* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

19. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Papa Westray* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

20. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Rosemary Bank Seamount* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

21. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Small Isles* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

22. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *South Arran* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

23. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for *The Barra Fan and Hebrides Terrace Seamount* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

24. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Turbot Bank* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

25. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Upper Loch Fyne and Loch Goil* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

26. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *West Shetland Shelf (formerly Windsock)* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation: Yes No

Comments

Management Options: Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes No

Comments

All of the above: Yes No

Comments

27. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Wyre and Rousay Sounds* possible Nature Conservation MPA?

Designation:

Yes No

Comments

Management Options:

Yes No

Comments

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes No

Comments

All of the above:

Yes No

Comments

Choices to represent features in the MPA Network

28. Recognising the scientific advice from JNCC included alternatives for representing offshore subtidal sands and gravels, ocean quahog and shelf banks and mounds in the Southern North Sea, do you have a preference or comments on the following combinations to represent these features, bearing in mind Turbot Bank will need to be designated to represent sandeel in this region:

- Firth of Forth Banks Complex
- Turbot bank and Norwegian Boundary Sedimentary Plain
- Or Firth of Forth Banks Complex, Turbot bank and Norwegian Boundary Sedimentary Plain

Comments

29. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessments for the preference you have indicated in the question above, regarding alternatives for representing offshore subtidal sands and gravels, ocean quahog and shelf banks and mounds in the Southern North Sea?

Yes No

Comments

30. Recognising the scientific advice from JNCC included alternatives for representing the burrowed mud feature in the Fladens, do you have a preference or comments on the following combinations to represent these features, bearing in mind the part of Central Fladen (known as Central Fladen (Core)) containing tall seapen (*Funiculina quadrangularis*) will need to be designated to represent tall seapen in this region:

- Central Fladen pMPA only
- The tall sea-pen component of Central Fladen, plus Western Fladen
- Or the tall sea-pen component of Central Fladen, plus South-East Fladen.

Comments

31. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessments for the preference you have indicated in the question above, regarding alternatives for representing the burrowed mud feature in the Fladens?

Yes No

Comments

32. Recognising the scientific advice from JNCC included alternatives for representing offshore subtidal sands and gravels, offshore deep sea mud, and burrowed mud in OSPAR Regions III and V, do you have a preference or comments on the following combinations to represent these features:

South-West Sula Sgeir and Hebridean slope
Or Geikie slide and Hebridean slope

Comments

33. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessments for the preference you have indicated in the question above, regarding alternatives for representing offshore subtidal sands and gravels, offshore deep sea mud, and burrowed mud in OSPAR Regions III and V?

Yes No

Comments

Sustainability Appraisal

34. Do you have any comments on the Sustainability Appraisal of the MPA network as a whole?

Yes No

Comments

Final Thoughts

35. On the basis of your preferences on which pMPAs should be designated, do you view this to form a complete or ecologically coherent network, subject to the completion and recommendations of SNH's further work on the 4 remaining search locations?

Yes No

Until a list of the means of protection, even if only as intended measures, for all the Priority Marine Features is put together, it is difficult to see how the present list of MPAs can be coherent.

For example, there are no pMPAs for the protection of whales and dolphins and porpoises. We urge an early conclusion concerning the 4 remaining search locations.

As regards the area local to us, Southern Trench, we believe that this area, if not wider, should be designated a MPA for the protection of whales, dolphins and porpoises for a number of reasons:

a/ that these animals are widely regarded as intelligent creatures, to which humans owe a duty of care. Many of them live year round in the Moray Firth, with proven movements up and down the east coast of Scotland;

b/ these animals are almost universally loved, and animals that people want their children and grand-children to be able to enjoy in the wild;

c/ these animals have had a resident population in the area for at least several decades and potentially several centuries. Hence they are part of the local eco-system, and as stated in the consultation document one of the aims of MPAs is to protect bio-diversity;

d/ these animals also currently provide an important source of economic benefit to the area, by bringing in a substantial number of tourists.

This is far reaching to many aspects of the local economy, both indirectly as well as directly to local accommodation and the responsible wildlife tourist boats from several of the harbours in the area. Additionally we are in a “Priority Regeneration Area” and as a sustainable economy is given as one of the five guiding principles, protecting the rich wildlife of the area is one way to assist this aim.

e/ Scientific data has been presented by organisations such as WDC to support the creation of a Marine Protected Area around the southern Moray Firth coasts, and this was supported by 38,000 people; the signatures of many of whom were from our immediate area.

36. Do you have any other comments on the case for designation, management options, environmental or socioeconomic assessments of the pMPAs, or the network as a whole?

Yes No

One of the other documents referenced in the Consultation document is a Draft Management Handbook. This makes extensive reference to the involvement of “Stakeholders”, a term that is often ill-defined and in the case of this consultation we have not been able to find any sort of definition. We are concerned that the creation of any list of local “stakeholders” for any consultation may be solely at the knowledge of those that may be on the management team for each MPA, and hence reference to bodies such as a Community Council may be random. We urge that there are sufficient guidelines developed that envisage the wide range of stakeholders.

The following is an example to try to illustrate our concern on this matter:

As a volunteer organisation with the interests of our towns at heart, we are involved in a number of activities to assist the economic regeneration of our towns. One of these is attracting large ships to anchor off our port and receive various services by launch. The impact on local wildlife was a consideration that we took into account, and some quantified observations have been undertaken to demonstrate that there is no impact to whales, dolphins and porpoises. However during the planning of this project we consulted with 18 local and national bodies to set this project up, yet not one enquired about the impact of these ships on the local wildlife; assuming at least some of these 18 bodies would be represented in managing an MPA we find it difficult to believe that any of these 18 bodies would consider a Community Council as having access to data in relation to establishing the impact of that particular type of project.