

RESPONSE FORM

DRAFT SEAWEED POLICY STATEMENT 2013

State any you agree or disagree with, and your reasons. IT WOULD APPEAR THAT YET AGAIN THE CART HAS BEEN PLACED BEFORE THE HORSE. IT IS TO THE BEST OF OUR KNOWLEDGE THAT NO INSHORE FISHERMAN WHETHER THEY BE STATIC OR MOBILE OPERATORS, HAVE BEEN GIVEN ANY INFORMATION ON CONSIDERATION REGARDING THESE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS. TO THIS END WE WOULD SUGGEST A MEETING WITH MARINE SCOTLAND AT THE EARLIEST POSSIBLE OPPORTUNITY, TO DISCUSS THIS CONSULTATION WITH A VIEW TO ASSURING FISHERMEN THAT THESE DEVELOPMENTS WILL NOT AFFECT THEIR OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE A LIVING FROM THE SEA. HAPPY TO DISCUSS AND SUGGEST THAT MS OFFICIALS GET OUT AMONG THE FISHERMEN AGAIN TO DISCUSS THIS TOPIC.

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

State your reasons: PLEASE REFER TO INITIAL COMMENT

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

State your reasons: PLEASE REFER TO INITIAL COMMENT

4. Do you agree with policies 8 and 9?

State any you agree or disagree with, and your reasons: REFER TO INITIAL COMMENT

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

Give your reasons REFER TO INTITAL COMMENT

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

Give your reasons REFER TO INITIAL COMMENT

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

REFER TO INITIAL COMMENT

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

State what named species should be included, and provide your reasons.

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

REFER TO INITIAL COMMENT