

## CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

### SECTION 1 - THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF AQUACULTURE

#### Board response

**Whilst we do not have either freshwater or marine salmon aquaculture sites within our region, we would fully support the ASFB response to questions 1 to 22**

#### Farm Management Agreements (FMAs)

1. Do you agree that we should, subject to appropriate safeguards, make it a legal requirement for marine finfish operators to participate in an appropriate Farm Management Agreement (FMA), with sanctions for failure to do so, or to adhere to the terms of the agreement? (Page 9)

YES

NO

#### Appropriate Scale Management Areas (MAs)

2. Do you agree that operators should have primary responsibility for determining the boundaries (and other management arrangements) for Management Areas, but with Scottish Ministers having a fallback power to specify alternative areas? (Page 9)

YES

NO

#### Management Measures and Dispute Resolution

3. Do you agree that an independent arbitration process should be put in place (with statutory underpinning) to resolve disputes related to Farm Management Agreements? (Page 10)

YES

NO

4. How do you think such a system might best be developed? (Page 10)

#### Unused Consents

**5. Do you agree we ought to review the question of unused consents?  
(Page 11)**

**YES**

**NO**

6. What do you consider are suitable options to promote use or relinquishment of unused consents? (Page 11)

7. Do you agree that Scottish Ministers should be given powers, ultimately, to revoke, or to require or request others to revoke, consents? (Page 12)

YES

NO

8. Should any such power relate to all or to particular consents (and if the latter, which)? (Page 12)

**Collection and Publication of Sea-lice Data**

9. What in your view is the most appropriate approach to be taken to the collection and publication of sea-lice data? (Page 13)

**Surveillance, Biosecurity, Mortality and Disease Data**

10. Do you agree that aquaculture businesses ought to be required to provide additional information on fish mortality, movements, disease, treatment and production as set out above? (Page 16)

YES

NO

11. What are your views on the timing and frequency of submission of such data? (Page 16)

**Biomass Control**

12. Do you agree that Scottish Ministers should have powers to require SEPA to reduce a biomass consent where it appears to them necessary and appropriate – for example to address concerns about fish health and welfare? (Page 16)

YES

NO

**Wellboats**

13. Do you agree we should make enabling legislation giving Scottish Ministers powers to place additional control requirements on wellboats? (Page 17)

YES

NO

**Processing Facilities**

14. Do you think Scottish Ministers should be given additional powers to place controls on processing plants? (Page 17)

YES

NO

**Seaweed Cultivation**

15. Do you agree that the regulatory framework should be the same for all seaweed farms? (Page 18)

YES

NO

16. Do you agree that the most appropriate approach to regulation of this sector would be through marine licensing? (Page 17)

YES

NO

17. If not, what alternative arrangements would you suggest? (Page 18)

### **Commercially Damaging Species**

**18. Do you agree that we should provide for additional powers for Scottish Ministers in relation to commercially damaging native species? (Page 19)**

**YES**

**NO**

### **SECTION 2 - PROTECTION OF SHELLFISH GROWING WATERS**

**19. Do you agree with the introduction of provisions to protect shellfish growing waters and support the sustainable growth of the shellfish industry? (Page 21)**

**YES**

**NO**

### **SECTION 3 - FISH FARMING AND WILD SALMONID INTERACTIONS**

#### **Sea-lice**

**20. Do you agree that there is a case for giving Scottish Ministers powers to determine a lower threshold above which remedial action needs to be taken, in appropriate circumstances and potentially as part of a wider suite of protection measures? (Page 23)**

**YES**

**NO**

#### **Containment and Escapes**

**21. Do you agree we should provide powers for Scottish Ministers to require all finfish farms operating in Scotland to use equipment that conforms to a Scottish Technical Standard? (The technical content of the standard would be defined separately.) (Page 25)**

**YES**

**NO**

#### **Tracing Escapes**

**22. Do you agree that there should be additional powers for Scottish Ministers to take or require samples of fish from fish farms, for tracing purposes? (Page 26)**

**YES**

**NO**

## SECTION 4 - SALMON AND FRESHWATER FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

Many of the measures proposed in this section would be addressed through the Code of Good Practice produced by the ASFB in 2011.

### Modernising the Operation of District Salmon Fishery Boards

23. Do you agree that we should introduce a specific duty on Boards to act fairly and transparently? (Page 29)

YES

NO

This should be dealt with by adopting the Code of Good Practice.

Clarity should be given (by Scottish Government) as to whom the boards are acting for (The Salmon) and what benchmarks they are to be measured against. (Not forgetting that the Board's activities are entirely funded by the riparian owners).

24. Do you agree that there should be a Code of Good Practice for wild salmon and freshwater fisheries? (Page 29)

YES

NO

See above

25. If yes, should such Code of Good Practice be statutory or non-statutory? (Page 29)

YES

NO

It should be non statutory initially until refined – it may never need to be statutory if all parties accept and adhere to it.

### Statutory Carcass Tagging

26. Do you agree that Scottish Ministers should have powers to introduce a statutory system of carcass tagging for wild Atlantic salmon and sea trout? (Page 31)

YES

NO

Tagging should be introduced for net caught salmon as soon as possible and would close a loophole in the legislation that is being taken advantage of currently. In the interim, boards should be allowed to introduce local schemes for rod caught fish as is being seen in areas of Scotland already, with a view to a longer term statutory solution to both.

### **Fish Sampling**

27. Do you agree that Scottish Ministers should have powers to take or require fish and/or samples for genetic or other analysis? (Page 32)

**YES**

**NO**

**Not only should there be powers to take samples, it would also be beneficial to boards to be empowered to be able to enter land to collect fish or habitat data for management purposes in the same way as boards are able to exercise powers for the enforcement of fishery legislation.**

### **Management and Salmon Conservation Measures**

28. Do you agree that Scottish Ministers should have powers to initiate changes to Salmon District Annual Close Time Orders? (Page 32)

**YES**

**NO**

**We support the ASFB response.**

29. Do you agree that Scottish Ministers should be able to promote combined salmon conservation measures at their own hand? (Page 32)

**YES**

**NO**

**But only where evidence is clear that existing measures are inadequate.**

**30. Do you agree that Scottish Ministers should be able to attach conditions, such as monitoring and reporting requirements, to statutory conservation measures? (Page 32)**

**YES**

**NO**

**We support the need for evidence based fishery management, but would not wish a disproportionate workload to be imposed on the small team of board employees.**

**Further, there should be minimal/no financial implications for already pressed budgets; the board's activities being funded by the riparian owners themselves.**

### **Dispute Resolution**

**31. Do you agree that we should introduce statutory provisions related to mediation and dispute resolution, to help resolve disputes around salmon conservation, management and any related compensation measures? (Page 33)**

**YES**

**NO**

**Dispute resolution is a complex area and can affect the parties in differing ways. Any provisions should be flexible and should be based on the Code of Practice.**

### **Improved Information on Fish and Fisheries**

**32. Do you agree that there should be a legal requirement to provide comprehensive effort data for rod fisheries? (Page 34)**

**YES**

**NO**

**Assuming there is not a disproportionate burden on boards in collecting data. In some instances Boards struggle to gain even basic catch data – trying to gain further information will inevitably be difficult.**

**33. What additional information on the fish or fisheries should proprietors and/or Boards be required to collect and provide; and should this be provided routinely and/or in specific circumstances? (Page 34)**



**34. Should Scottish Ministers have powers to require Boards and/or proprietors or their tenants to investigate and report on salmon and sea trout and the fisheries in their district? (Page 34)**

**YES**

**NO**

**See answer to Q.32.**

**Licensing of Fish Introductions to Freshwater**

**35. Do you agree that Scottish Ministers should have powers to recall, restrict or exclude the jurisdiction of Boards in relation to fish introductions, in certain circumstances? (Page 35)**

**YES**

**NO**

**ASFB response refers to both 35 & 36.**

**36. If so, why and in what circumstances? (Page 35)**

**SECTION 5 - MODERNISING ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS**

**We support the ASFB response to questions 37 – 48.**

**Strict Liability for Certain Aquaculture Offences**

**37. Do you agree that strict liability criteria should apply – where they capable of being applied – for offences related to Marine Licensing requirements insofar as they apply to aquaculture operations and, potentially, in other situations? (Page 37)**

**YES**

**NO**

**Widening the Scope of Fixed Penalty Notices**

**38. Do you agree that we should extend the use of fixed financial penalties as alternatives to prosecution in relation to marine, aquaculture and other regulatory issues for which Marine Scotland has responsibility? (Page 38)**

**YES**

**NO**

**39. Do you agree that we should increase the maximum sum that can be levied through a fixed penalty notice to £10,000? (Page 39)**

**YES**

**NO**

**40. Are there particular regulatory areas that merit a higher or lower maximum sum? (Page 39)**

**YES**

**NO**

**Enforcement of EU Obligations Beyond British Fisheries Limits**

**41. Do you agree that we should amend section 30(1) of the Fisheries Act 1981 as proposed? (Page 40)**

**YES**

**NO**

**Powers to Detain Vessels in Port**

**42. Do you agree that sea fisheries enforcement officers should be given specific power to allow vessels to be detained in port for the purposes of court proceedings? (Page 41)**

**YES**

**NO**

**Disposal of Property/Forfeiture of Prohibited Items**

**43. Do you agree that sea fisheries enforcement officers should be able to dispose of property seized as evidence when it is no longer required, or forfeit items which would be illegal to use? (Page 41)**

**YES**

**NO**

**Power to Inspect Objects**

**44. Do you agree that sea fisheries enforcement officers should have the power to inspect objects in the sea and elsewhere that are not obviously associated with a vessel, vehicle or relevant premises? (Page 42)**

**YES**

**NO**

**Sea Fisheries (Shellfish) Act 1967**

**45. Do you have any views on the proposals to amend the Sea Fisheries (Shellfish) Act 1967 to help make its application clearer? (Page 42)**

**YES**

**NO**

**SECTION 6 - PAYING FOR PROGRESS**

**46. Do you agree that there should be enabling provisions for Scottish Ministers to provide, through secondary legislation, for both direct and more generic charges for services/benefits arising from public sector services and activities? (Page 43)**

**YES**

**NO**

**47. If you do not agree that there should be charging provisions, how do you envisage ongoing and new work to assist in management and development of the aquaculture and fisheries sectors should be resourced? (Page 43)**

**48. If no new way of resourcing such activity can be found, what activities do you suggest might be stopped to free up necessary funds? (Page 43)**