

RESPONSE FORM

DRAFT SEAWEED POLICY STATEMENT 2013

1. Do you agree with policies 1-6?

Yes but within Policy 2 the geographical extent of "the area" requires further consideration

2. Should policy 2 require local provenance, i.e., stock must originate from the water body the seaweed is to be grown in? YES/ NO

No. At this stage in emergence of a seaweed cultivation industry in Scotland we believe this would be unnecessarily restrictive

3. Do you agree with policy 7? YES/NO

Yes. The approach summarised appears to be logical.

4. Do you agree with policies 8 and 9?

Yes. We believe it is important to explore the opportunities offered by IMTA but with an open mind. While it may provide some

5. Do you think that the size scales (shellfish (small), medium, and extensive), are appropriate?

No comment

6. Which consenting option would be most appropriate for seaweed cultivation?

We are firmly of the view that marine aquaculture should ultimately be regulated by the marine licensing process. As an interim measure we would support option 4.

7. Should guidance be developed for the harvesting of wild seaweed? If not, what (if any) alternative arrangements would you suggest?

Yes

8. Should the 1997 Act should be amended to provide the flexibility to farm other species or specifically named species? YES/NO

As noted above we favour marine licensing as the means of regulating marine aquaculture developments. However as an interim measure it would appear sensible to amend the 1997 Act to

9. Do you have any comments to make on the BRIA content?

No