



**FISHERIES MANAGEMENT MEASURES WITHIN SCOTTISH OFFSHORE MARINE  
PROTECTED AREAS CONSULTATION**

Report by Chief Officer, Economic & Community Regeneration

**PURPOSE**

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to seek homologation of the Comhairle's response to the Scottish Government consultation on fisheries management measures within the Scottish Offshore Marine Protected Areas, which closed on 14 October 2024.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2.1 On 19 August 2024 Scottish Government opened a consultation seeking views on proposals for management measures to the Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in the Scottish offshore region, in addition to an amendment to the West of Scotland MPA boundary.
- 2.2 The consultation was in two sections - part one concerned proposed fisheries management measures for 20 MPAs within the Scottish offshore region and sought views on documents which provided the rationale, evidence, and assessed potential impacts of the proposals. The second part related to the proposed amendment of the site boundary for the West of Scotland Nature Conservation MPA in order to resolve an issue with the original site boundary designation.
- 2.3 The Comhairle's response to the consultation is appended to this report. It is proposed that the Comhairle's response be homologated, given that the consultation closing date preceded the current committee series.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 **It is recommended that the Comhairle agrees to homologate its response to the Scottish Government Consultation, as appended to the Report.**

Contact Officer: Iain Kennedy, Economic Development Officer - [iain.kennedy@cne-siar.gov.uk](mailto:iain.kennedy@cne-siar.gov.uk)

Appendix: Scottish Government Consultation on Fisheries Management Measures within the Scottish Offshore Marine Protected Areas: Response by Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar.

Background Papers: [Fisheries management measures within Scottish Offshore Marine Protected Areas \(MPAs\) Consultation](#)

## IMPLICATIONS

4.1 The following implications are applicable in terms of the Report.

<b>Resource Implications</b>	<b>Implications/None</b>
Financial	None relating to the Comhairle
Legal	None relating to the Comhairle
Staffing	None
Assets and Property	None
<b>Strategic Implications</b>	<b>Implications/None</b>
Risk	None
Equalities	None
Corporate Strategy	Support community sustainability, particularly in relation to sustainable, traceable fishing; supports growth and resilience within the fisheries sector in targeting continued local food production and contributing towards the objectives of the Islands Growth Deal (IGD) Outer Hebrides Food and Drink Programme.
Environmental Impact	None
Consultation	Appended to the report

## BACKGROUND

- 5.1 The Scottish Government states that Scotland's Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) network helps protect our most important natural and cultural heritage features. Scottish Ministers have national and international commitments to support a network of MPAs which contributes to conservation or improvement of the marine environment. The Scottish MPA network currently consists of 247 sites that are designated for nature conservation, amounting to 37% of all Scottish waters. This exceeds the global biodiversity area target of 30% MPA coverage of global seas by 2030.
- 5.2 This consultation sought views and comments on proposed fisheries management measures for 20 MPAs which occur wholly or partly in the Scottish offshore region. These MPAs have been designated since 2009, following consultation and engagement with stakeholders and this consultation was conducted to determine management measures for these MPAs.
- 5.3 The Comhairle's response to the consultation is appended to this report.

## FISHERIES MANAGEMENT MEASURES

- 6.1 The Scottish MPA network is underpinned by a variety of different legislation, depending on whether a site is in the inshore or offshore region and the features they protect. Scottish Government states that it has a long-term commitment to ensure sustainable management of the marine environment to ensure continuation of the many natural benefits our seas provide.
- 6.2 The Scottish Government has committed to implementing fisheries management measures for existing MPAs, where they are not already in place. The consultation also listed site-specific spatial restrictions proposed to manage the activities which can take place within each protected area. It was hoped that these restrictions would manage sites to achieve conservation objectives and support sustainable use of our marine environment.

- 6.3 Following conclusion of the process, Scottish Ministers will decide upon fisheries management measures to take forward and the legislative mechanisms adopted to implement these. Once in place, infringement of the management measures would be a criminal offence.
- 6.4 A scientific exception would be included in the orders to allow relevant and appropriate scientific survey work to be carried out within sites, as required. It was also intended that measures would include a minimum transit speed of six knots by vessels operating restricted gear - and a requirement that restricted fishing gear be lashed and stowed within areas subject to relevant fishing restrictions.

## **SITES AND DEFINITIONS**

- 7.1 There are 27 protected areas within the Scottish offshore region. 23 sites have been identified as requiring fisheries management measures for nature conservation purposes. 20 of these sites were within the scope of this consultation. The two areas most relevant to the Outer Hebrides were the Stanton Banks Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Barra Fan and Hebrides Terrace Seamount Nature Conservation Marine Protected Areas (NCMPAs). These are the only designations that see any activity from local fishing vessels operating from the Outer Hebrides.
- 7.2 Three Special Protection Areas (SPAs) recognised as requiring measures were not addressed in the consultation: Seas off Foula; Seas off St Kilda; and the Outer Firth of Forth Banks Complex. These sites are designated across the boundary between the inshore region (0-12 nautical miles) and offshore region (12-200 nautical miles). Measures for these sites will be addressed as part of the programme of works identifying measures for inshore MPAs so they were not included in the consultation.
- 7.3 Proposed measures were also developed for other MPAs in which it was proposed that targeted sandeel fishing would be prohibited - however these were not taken forward as they are no longer required. In 2023 the Scottish Government consulted on the closure of fishing for sandeel in all Scottish waters. As a result, The Sandeel (Prohibition of Fishing) (Scotland) Order 2024 came into force on 26 March, ahead of the 2024 fishery season - it applies to all vessels (UK & EU) fishing within Scottish waters.
- 7.4 Fisheries management measures proposed are based on the type of gear used. Demersal mobile gear is defined as towed or trawled gear that makes or has potential to make any form of contact with the seabed. The gear types classified under this definition are trawl; demersal towed gear; bottom trawl; bottom pair trawl; beam trawl; Scottish or Danish seine; pair seine; boat dredge; mechanised dredge; and hydraulic dredge. Demersal static gear is defined as gear that makes or has potential to make any form of contact with the seabed, including gear anchors and weights. Gear types classified under this definition are pots, traps and creels; floated demersal longlines; and set/ static nets (including trammel, gill and entangler nets). There are no proposed fisheries measures for pelagic fishing gear, as the consultation stated the protected features of these MPAs mostly reside on the seabed.
- 7.5 Each MPA has specific conservation objectives for the features the site is designated to protect. For Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), conservation objectives are either to 'conserve' or 'recover' a feature to the desired state or quality. For NCMPAs, conservation objectives will be to 'restore' or 'maintain' to the desired state or quality. Therefore, if the feature is currently considered to be in unfavourable condition within the site, the objective is to 'recover' or 'restore.' If the feature is shown to be in favourable condition, the objective is to 'conserve' or 'maintain.'

## PROPOSED MANAGEMENT MEASURES

- 8.1 Fisheries management measures have been developed for each individual site. Measures proposed are based on scientific evidence regarding the risk to designated features from different fishing gear. For 15 of the sites, two options for fisheries management were presented within the consultation. A zonal restriction on the use of specified gear identified as requiring management (Option 1), or alternatively, restrictions on the use of specified gear from the full designated site (Option 2). For five sites only one management proposal was presented, i.e. a full site exclusion for fishing with specified gear – where it was decided that a full site level of protection from specified gear would be the only suitable option in order to achieve the conservation objectives of that site.
- 8.2 The Stanton Banks SAC is located in the Scottish Continental Shelf south of the Outer Hebrides and approximately 124km west of the UK mainland, 43km west-south-west of Tiree and 83km north-north-east of Malin Head, Ireland. Surveys of the Stanton Banks reef have shown it to be a rocky landscape with deep gullies. Although the rocky outcrops have been rounded by glacial action, they are an extremely rugged series of granite ridges up to 160m tall that protrude from the seabed at 190m deep. The bedrock outcrops are heavily encrusted with coralline algae, keel worms and brittlestars, with clusters of sponges. On the slopes there is a transition from smooth bedrock to fissured rock outcrops, boulder and cobble with feather stars, dead man's fingers and robust hydroids. The lower zone of the Stanton Banks is characterised by smooth, silty bedrock dominated by extensive encrusting coralline red algae, numerous barnacles, brittlestars, small sponge crusts, cup-shaped sponges and massive sponges.
- 8.3 Situated to the west of Scotland, adjacent to the boundary with Irish waters, the Barra Fan and Hebrides Terrace Seamount MPA follows the seabed from the top of the Hebridean continental slope as it descends into the deep Rockall Trough and beyond. The 'Fan' is a geological protected feature of the site that was created when a large build-up of sediments underwent a series of submarine landslides. These landslides have subsequently been modified by water currents and were long ago gouged by icebergs grounding on the seabed during past ice ages. The Barra Fan is regarded as scientifically important because the morphology and sedimentary sequences have helped in furthering understanding of changes as well as fluctuations in the extent of the last British Ice Sheet.
- 8.4 On the continental slope part of the MPA, mud, sand and gravel habitats are home to worms and other creatures which live buried in and on the seabed. The base of the continental slope provides conditions for the establishment of burrowed mud habitat - specifically seapen and burrowing megafauna communities - which are considered Threatened and / or Declining across the North-east Atlantic.
- 8.5 To the west of the site, the Hebrides Terrace Seamount rises to a height of almost 1km above the surrounding seabed and is thought to represent a remnant of an ancient volcano. The seamount supports a diverse range of marine life, including cold-water corals and deep-sea sponges. These seamount communities are also considered Threatened and / or Declining, as are orange roughy - a long-lived deep-water fish found associated with The Hebrides Terrace Seamount. The seamount is thought to be significant to the health of Scotland's seas due to the effect it has on the movement of underwater currents, which bring a good supply of food to the area. The resulting rich diversity supports many fish species, which in turn attract larger marine animals, such as sharks and whales.

## **WEST OF SCOTLAND MPA BOUNDARY**

- 9.1 The consultation also sought views on the amendment of the site boundary for the West of Scotland NCMPA. This was proposed to resolve an issue with the existing site boundary. The West of Scotland NCMPA is designated up to the UK Economic Exclusion Zone boundary, so a small part of the site overlaps this Special Area and the Faroese continental shelf. As Scottish Government does not have jurisdiction in respect of the seabed and subsoil within the Faroese continental shelf, an amendment to the existing NCMPA boundary was proposed – i.e. to remove the area of the NCMPA which overlaps the Special Area and the Faroese continental shelf. This would be of little consequence to the Outer Hebrides, given its distant location and minor impact the change would have – therefore no objection to this proposal was raised in the Comhairle’s response.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

- 10.1 Of the twenty offshore MPA’s discussed in the consultation only two are of any significance to the Outer Hebrides given the limited range of the local fleet - the Stanton Banks SAC and the Barra Fan and Hebrides Terrace Seamount NCMPA. Both are a significant distance from the islands and significant investment would be required for local vessels to fish in these areas. Therefore, the proposed management measures would have little effect on the existing fishing industry.
- 10.2 One issue that could arise from the measures proposed would be if the decision were taken to close the vast majority of sites altogether, rather than adopting a zonal approach. This could result in the forced displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore grounds - and once there causing permanent damage to inshore waters, as witnessed in the Minch in the past. Therefore, a zonal approach would be preferable where available within the proposed management measures.
- 10.3 Regular surveys should also be conducted to ascertain the success of such measures and closures, as these have been known to have the opposite effect previously. That is, allowing certain species to thrive and destroying others - leaving areas stale, with a smaller variety of species co-existing than before the closure. The closure of Broadbay on the east side of Lewis is a good example of this - whereby healthy catches of scallops could be caught before the closure, though scallop numbers are now extremely low and starfish numbers disproportionately high.
- 10.4 The Comhairle’s response to the consultation is appended to this report. It is recommended that the Comhairle’s response be homologated, given that the closing date of 14 October 2024 preceded the current committee series.

**SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON FISHERIES MANAGEMENT MEASURES WITHIN THE SCOTTISH OFFSHORE MARINE PROTECTED AREAS: RESPONSE BY COMHAIRLE NAN EILEAN SIAR****CONSULTATION QUESTIONS****PART 1 - PROPOSED FISHERIES MANAGEMENT MEASURES**

This part of the consultation seeks your views on the following questions regarding the proposed fisheries management measures within MPAs in the Scottish offshore region:

1. Do you support or oppose the proposed zonal fisheries management measures for offshore MPAs?

**Support.**

2. Do you have any comments on the proposed zonal fisheries management measures?

***As long as there is a balanced approach to protect features and habitats as well as allowing reasonable economic activities to take place. The measures outlined in option one would meet the principles of sustainable use and would be the preferred option.***

3. Do you support or oppose the proposed full site fisheries management measures for offshore MPAs?

**Oppose.**

4. Do you have any comments on the proposed full site fisheries management measures?

***Full site closures seem like a step too far given the economic impact it would have against the predicted environmental benefits for such measures. The Socio-economic Impact Assessment clearly highlights that losses from option 2 will be significantly higher than Option 1 without significant environmental gains. Full site closures then seem like an unnecessary measure and one which could see offshore vessels displaced into inshore waters which would have a devastating effect on the smaller inshore fleet that have no option but to fish in inshore waters.***

5. Do you have any comments on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA)?

**No Comment.**

6. Do you have any comments on the draft Fisheries Assessments, including the methodology, which have been undertaken for each site?

**No Comment.**

7. Do you have any comments on the Strategic Environmental Report (SEA)?

**No Comment.**

8. Do you have any comments on the Socio-Economic Impact Assessment (SEIA)?

**No Comment.**

9. Do you have any comments on the partial Business Regulatory Impact Assessments (BRIAs) for the fisheries management measures?

**No Comment.**

10. Do you have any comments on the partial Island Communities Impact Assessment (ICIA)?

**No Comment.**

11. Do you wish to comment on the measures proposed for any specific sites?

**Yes.** (progresses to Q12)

No (skips Q12-31)

12. A) Do you support the full site fisheries management measures proposed for Anton Dohrn Seamount SAC? To note only one option for potential measures is proposed for this site.

**Support.**

B) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed for Anton Dohrn Seamount SAC? To note only one option for potential measures is proposed for this site.

***The full site fisheries management measures proposed for this site were developed and supported by industry and stakeholders and the outcome of these consultations should be respected and implemented.***

13. A) Do you support the full site fisheries management measures proposed for Braemar Pockmarks SAC? To note only one option for potential measures is proposed for this site.

**Support.**

B) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed for Braemar Pockmarks SAC? To note only one option for potential measures is proposed for this site.

***The full site fisheries management measures proposed for this site were developed and supported by industry and stakeholders and the outcome of these consultations should be respected and implemented.***

14. A) Do you support the fisheries management measures proposed for Central Fladen NCMPA under Option 1 (zonal) or Option 2 (full site)?

**Option 1 (zonal).**

B) Do you have any comments on the zonal fisheries management measures proposed under Option 1 for Central Fladen NCMPA?

***The Zonal fisheries management measures proposed for this MPA were developed with the support of the Stakeholders who took part in the relevant workshops and should be respected. The zonal approach also lessens the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

C) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed under Option 2 for Central Fladen NCMPA?

***This option is not seen as a better alternative to a zonal approach as the environmental benefits assessed are not significantly greater to justify such a high socio-economic cost and could increase the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

15. A) Do you support the full site fisheries management measures proposed for Darwin Mounds SAC? To note only one option for potential measures is proposed for this site.

**Support.**

B) Do you have any comments on the full site measures proposed in Darwin Mounds SAC? To note only one option for potential measures is proposed for this site.

***The full site fisheries management measures proposed for this site were developed and supported by stakeholders and the outcome of these consultations should be respected and implemented.***

16. A) Do you support the fisheries management measures proposed for East of Gannet and Montrose Fields NCMPA under Option 1 (zonal) or Option 2 (full site)?

**Option 1 (zonal).**

B) Do you have any comments on the zonal fisheries management measures proposed under Option 1 for East of Gannet and Montrose Fields NCMPA?

***The Zonal fisheries management measures proposed for this MPA were developed with the support of the Stakeholders who took part in the relevant workshops and should be respected. The zonal approach also lessens the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

C) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed under Option 2 for East of Gannet and Montrose Fields NCMPA?

***This option is not seen as a better alternative to a zonal approach as the environmental benefits assessed are not significantly greater to justify such a high socio-economic cost and could increase the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***



17. A) Do you support the fisheries management measures proposed for East Rockall Bank SAC under Option 1 (zonal) or Option 2 (full site)?

**Option 1** (zonal).

B) Do you have any comments on the zonal fisheries management measures proposed under Option 1 for East Rockall Bank SAC?

***The Zonal fisheries management measures proposed for this MPA were developed with the support of the Stakeholders who took part in the relevant workshops and should be respected. The zonal approach also lessens the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

C. Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed under Option 2 for East Rockall Bank SAC?

***This option is not seen as a better alternative to a zonal approach as the environmental benefits assessed are not significantly greater to justify such a high socio-economic cost and could increase the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

18. A) Do you support the fisheries management measures proposed for Faroe-Shetland Sponge Belt NCMPSA under Option 1 (zonal) or Option 2 (full site)?

**Option 1** (zonal).

B) Do you have any comments on the zonal fisheries management measures proposed under Option 1 for Faroe-Shetland Sponge Belt NCMPSA?

***The Zonal fisheries management measures proposed for this MPA were developed with the support of the Stakeholders who took part in the relevant workshops and should be respected. The zonal approach also lessens the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

C) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed under Option 2 for Faroe-Shetland Sponge Belt NCMPSA?

***This option is not seen as a better alternative to a zonal approach as the environmental benefits assessed are not significantly greater to justify such a high socio-economic cost and could increase the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

19. A) Do you support the fisheries management measures proposed for Firth of Forth Banks Complex NCMPSA under Option 1 (zonal) or Option 2 (full site)?

**Option 1** (zonal).

B) Do you have any comments on the zonal fisheries management measures proposed under Option 1 for Firth of Forth Banks Complex NCMPSA?

***The Zonal fisheries management measures proposed for this MPA were developed with the support of the Stakeholders who took part in the relevant workshops and should be respected. The zonal approach also lessens the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

C) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed under Option 2 for Firth of Forth Banks Complex NCMPA?

***This option is not seen as a better alternative to a zonal approach as the environmental benefits assessed are not significantly greater to justify such a high socio-economic cost and could increase the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

20. A) Do you support the fisheries management measures proposed for Geikie Slide and Hebridean Slope NCMPA under Option 1 (zonal) or Option 2 (full site)?

**Option 1** (zonal).

B) Do you have any comments on zonal fisheries management measures proposed under Option 1 for Geikie Slide and Hebridean Slope NCMPA?

***The Zonal fisheries management measures proposed for this MPA were developed with the support of the Stakeholders who took part in the relevant workshops and should be respected. The zonal approach also lessens the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

C) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed under Option 2 for Geikie Slide and Hebridean Slope NCMPA?

***This option is not seen as a better alternative to a zonal approach as the environmental benefits assessed are not significantly greater to justify such a high socio-economic cost and could increase the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

21. A) Do you support the fisheries management measures proposed for North-East Faroe-Shetland Channel NCMPA under Option 1 (zonal) or Option 2 (full site)?

**Option 1** (zonal).

B) Do you have any comments on the zonal fisheries management measures proposed under Option 1 for North-East Faroe-Shetland Channel NCMPA?

***The Zonal fisheries management measures proposed for this MPA were developed with the support of the Stakeholders who took part in the relevant workshops and should be respected. The zonal approach also lessens the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

C) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed under Option 2 for North-East Faroe-Shetland Channel NCMPA?

***This option is not seen as a better alternative to a zonal approach as the environmental benefits assessed are not significantly greater to justify such a high socio-economic cost and could increase the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

22. A) Do you support the fisheries management measures proposed for North West Rockall Bank SAC under Option 1 (zonal) or Option 2 (full site)?

**Option 1** (zonal).

B) Do you have any comments on the zonal fisheries management measures proposed under Option 1 in North West Rockall Bank SAC?

***The Zonal fisheries management measures proposed for this MPA were developed with the support of the Stakeholders who took part in the relevant workshops and should be respected. The zonal approach also lessens the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

C) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed under Option 2 in North West Rockall Bank SAC?

***This option is not seen as a better alternative to a zonal approach as the environmental benefits assessed are not significantly greater to justify such a high socio-economic cost and could increase the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

23. A) Do you support the fisheries management measures proposed for Norwegian Boundary Sediment Plain NCMPSA under Option 1 (zonal) or Option 2 (full site)?

**Option 1** (zonal).

B) Do you have any comments on the zonal fisheries management measures proposed under Option 1 in Norwegian Boundary Sediment Plain NCMPSA?

***The Zonal fisheries management measures proposed for this MPA were developed with the support of the Stakeholders who took part in the relevant workshops and should be respected. The zonal approach also lessens the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

C) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed under Option 2 in Norwegian Boundary Sediment Plain NCMPSA?

***This option is not seen as a better alternative to a zonal approach as the environmental benefits assessed are not significantly greater to justify such a high socio-economic cost and could increase the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

24. A) Do you support the fisheries management measures proposed for Pobie Bank Reef SAC under Option 1 (zonal) or Option 2 (full site)?

**Option 1** (zonal).

B) Do you have any comments on the zonal fisheries management measures proposed under Option 1 for Pobie Bank Reef SAC?

***The Zonal fisheries management measures proposed for this MPA were developed with the support of the Stakeholders who took part in the relevant workshops and should be respected. The zonal approach also lessens the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

C) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed under Option 2 for Pobie Bank Reef SAC?

***This option is not seen as a better alternative to a zonal approach as the environmental benefits assessed are not significantly greater to justify such a high socio-economic cost and could increase the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

25. A) Do you support the full site fisheries management measures proposed for Scanner Pockmark SAC? To note only one option for potential measures is proposed for this site.

**Support.**

B) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed for Scanner Pockmark SAC? To note only one option for potential measures is proposed for this site.

***The full site fisheries management measures proposed for this site were developed and supported by stakeholders and the outcome of these consultations should be respected and implemented.***

26. A) Do you support the fisheries management measures proposed for Solan Bank Reef SAC under Option 1 (zonal) or Option 2 (full site)?

**Option 1** (zonal).

B) Do you have any comments on the zonal fisheries management measures proposed under Option 1 for Solan Bank Reef SAC?

***The Zonal fisheries management measures proposed for this MPA were developed with the support of the Stakeholders who took part in the relevant workshops and should be respected. The zonal approach also lessens the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

C) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed under Option 2 for Solan Bank Reef SAC?

***This option is not seen as a better alternative to a zonal approach as the environmental benefits assessed are not significantly greater to justify such a high socio-economic cost and could increase the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

27. A) Do you support the fisheries management measures proposed for Stanton Banks SAC under Option 1 (zonal) or Option 2 (full site)?

**Option 1** (zonal).

B) Do you have any comments on the zonal fisheries management measures proposed under Option 1 for Stanton Banks SAC?

***The Zonal fisheries management measures proposed for this MPA were developed with the support of the Stakeholders who took part in the relevant workshops and should be respected. The zonal approach also lessens the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

C) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed under Option 2 for Stanton Banks SAC?

***This option is not seen as a better alternative to a zonal approach as the environmental benefits assessed are not significantly greater to justify such a high socio-economic cost and could increase the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

28. A) Do you support the fisheries management measures proposed for The Barra Fan and Hebrides Terrace Seamount NCMPA under Option 1 (zonal) or Option 2 (full site)?

**Option 1** (zonal).

B) Do you have any comments on the zonal fisheries management measures options proposed under Option 1 for The Barra Fan and Hebrides Terrace Seamount NCMPA?

***The Zonal fisheries management measures proposed for this MPA were developed with the support of the Stakeholders who took part in the relevant workshops and should be respected. The zonal approach also lessens the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters. This is the only Offshore MPA where vessels from the Western Isles undertake fishing activities,***

C) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures options proposed for under Option 2 for The Barra Fan and Hebrides Terrace Seamount NCMPA?

***This option is not seen as a better alternative to a zonal approach as the environmental benefits assessed are not significantly greater to justify such a high socio-economic cost and could increase the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

29. A) Do you support the full site fisheries management measures proposed for West of Scotland NCMPA? To note only one option for potential measures is proposed for this site.

**Support.**

B) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed in West of Scotland NCMPA? To note only one option for potential measures is proposed for this site.

***The full site fisheries management measures proposed for this site were developed and supported by stakeholders and the outcome of these consultations should be respected and implemented.***

30. A) Do you support the fisheries management measures proposed for West Shetland Shelf NCMPA under Option 1 (zonal) or Option 2 (full site)?

**Option 1** (zonal).

B) Do you have any comments on the zonal fisheries management measures proposed under Option 1 for West Shetland Shelf NCMPA?

***The Zonal fisheries management measures proposed for this MPA were developed with the support of the Stakeholders who took part in the relevant workshops and should be respected. The zonal approach also lessens the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

C) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed under Option 2 for West Shetland Shelf NCMPA?

***This option is not seen as a better alternative to a zonal approach as the environmental benefits assessed are not significantly greater to justify such a high socio-economic cost and could increase the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

31. A) Do you support the fisheries management measures proposed for Wyville-Thomson Ridge SAC under Option 1 (zonal) or Option 2 (full site)?

**Option 1** (zonal).

B) Do you have any comments on the zonal fisheries management measures proposed under Option 1 in Wyville-Thomson Ridge SAC?

***The Zonal fisheries management measures proposed for this MPA were developed with the support of the Stakeholders who took part in the relevant workshops and should be respected. The zonal approach also lessens the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

C) Do you have any comments on the full site fisheries management measures proposed under Option 2 in Wyville-Thomson Ridge SAC?

***This option is not seen as a better alternative to a zonal approach as the environmental benefits assessed are not significantly greater to justify such a high socio-economic cost and could increase the risk of displacement of the larger offshore fleet into inshore waters.***

## **PART 2 AMENDMENT OF THE WEST OF SCOTLAND MPA BOUNDARY**

This part of the consultation seeks your views on the proposed amendment of the West of Scotland NCMPA boundary.

32. What are your views on the proposed amended boundary for West of Scotland NCMPA?

**Support.**

Please explain your answer in the text box

***Comhairle nan Eilean Siar do not have any objections with this amendment to the changing of the boundary line.***

33. Do you have any comments on the revised Business Regulatory Impact Assessment for the boundary amendment for West of Scotland NCMPA?

**No Comment.**