

Scottish Highly Protected Marine Areas: Consultation analysis

Annex 1: Full tables

Dawn Griesbach, Alison Platts and Jennifer Waterton
Griesbach & Associates

26 July 2023

Tables

Table A1.1: Q1 – What is your view of the aims and purpose of Highly Protected Marine Areas as set out in sections 2 and 3 of the draft Policy Framework?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	1	2%	40	95%	42	100%
• Community organisations and groups	1	2%	3	7%	2	5%	14	33%	22	52%	42	100%
• Environmental organisations	14	47%	12	40%	3	10%	1	3%	0	0%	30	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	7	28%	6	24%	1	4%	1	4%	10	40%	25	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	1	4%	1	4%	2	8%	3	12%	19	73%	26	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	3	20%	3	20%	1	7%	1	7%	7	47%	15	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	33%	10	67%	15	100%
• Energy providers	2	22%	4	44%	3	33%	0	0%	0	0%	9	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	6	75%	8	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	3	43%	1	14%	0	0%	3	43%	7	100%
• Political parties	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	4	67%	6	100%
• Other organisations	0	0%	5	71%	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%	7	100%
Total organisations	29	13%	38	16%	15	6%	27	12%	123	53%	232	100%
Total individuals	222	12%	136	7%	66	4%	165	9%	1,278	68%	1,867	100%
Total, all respondents	251	12%	174	8%	81	4%	192	9%	1,401	67%	2,099	100%

Table A1.2: Question 1 – Offline responses only

This table presents quantitative results on the attitudes towards HPMA's expressed by respondents who submitted email or postal responses. A separate field in the database was created to record the overall attitudes of these respondents towards HPMA's – based on the comments in their messages. A 4-point scale was used: (i) Support, (ii) Neutral, (iii) Oppose, and (iv) Unclear or mixed views.

Response	Support		Neutral		Oppose		Unclear or mixed views		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	11	100%	0	0%	11	100%
• Community organisations and groups	0	0%	0	0%	7	78%	2	22%	9	100%
• Environmental organisations	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	2	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	3	60%	5	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	3	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	0	0%	1	25%	3	75%	0	0%	4	100%
• Energy providers	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
• Other organisations	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Total organisations	1	2%	4	9%	31	72%	7	16%	43	100%
Total individuals	2	1%	0	0%	238	91%	21	8%	261	100%
Total, all respondents	3	1%	4	1%	269	88%	28	9%	304	100%

Table A1.3: Overall balance of opinion on HPMA's (see Overview Chapter)

The figures in this table have been derived from information presented in Tables A1.1 and A1.2 above, and information about the campaign responses presented in Chapter 2 of the main report (see paragraphs 2.22 and 2.24).

Views about HPMA's	Support		Neutral		Oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Citizen Space responses	425	20%	81	4%	1,593	76%	2,099	100%
• Email / postal responses	3	1%	4	1%	269	97%	276	100%
• Campaign responses	2,018	99%	0	0%	26	1%	2,044	100%
Total responses	2,446	55%	85	2%	1,888	43%	4,419	100%

Table A1.4: Q2.1 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage COMMERCIAL FISHING, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMAAs?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	26	100%	26	100%
• Community organisations and groups	1	3%	2	6%	0	0%	13	37%	19	54%	35	100%
• Environmental organisations	14	58%	7	29%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	24	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	3	15%	0	0%	7	35%	4	20%	6	30%	20	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	1	6%	3	18%	1	6%	3	18%	9	53%	17	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	15%	1	8%	2	15%	3	23%	5	38%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	3	20%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	11	73%	15	100%
• Energy providers	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	5	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	5	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	5	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	4	80%	5	100%
• Other organisations	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	5	100%
Total organisations	28	16%	14	8%	17	10%	25	14%	91	52%	175	100%
Total individuals	219	17%	106	8%	75	6%	178	13%	747	56%	1,325	100%
Total, all respondents	247	16%	120	8%	92	6%	203	14%	838	56%	1,500	100%

Table A1.5: Q2.2 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage RECREATIONAL FISHING, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMAs?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	2	10%	1	5%	18	86%	21	100%
• Community organisations and groups	1	3%	2	6%	2	6%	12	34%	18	51%	35	100%
• Environmental organisations	10	43%	6	26%	6	26%	0	0%	1	4%	23	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	1	5%	0	0%	5	24%	6	29%	9	43%	21	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	0	0%	4	25%	3	19%	2	13%	7	44%	16	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	15%	1	8%	3	23%	3	23%	4	31%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	3	20%	0	0%	2	13%	1	7%	9	60%	15	100%
• Energy providers	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	5	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	5	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%	3	60%	5	100%
• Other organisations	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	5	100%
Total organisations	20	12%	15	9%	28	17%	28	17%	77	46%	168	100%
Total individuals	204	15%	89	7%	129	10%	142	11%	759	57%	1,323	100%
Total, all respondents	224	15%	104	7%	157	11%	170	11%	836	56%	1,491	100%

Table A1.6: Q2.3 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage ALL OTHER RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMA's?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	7	33%	0	0%	14	67%	21	100%
• Community organisations and groups	2	6%	1	3%	11	31%	10	29%	11	31%	35	100%
• Environmental organisations	9	38%	11	46%	3	13%	0	0%	1	4%	24	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	1	5%	3	14%	6	29%	7	33%	4	19%	21	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	0	0%	4	25%	6	38%	2	13%	4	25%	16	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	1	8%	2	17%	4	33%	2	17%	3	25%	12	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	3	20%	0	0%	3	20%	2	13%	7	47%	15	100%
• Energy providers	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	4	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	4	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	2	33%	0	0%	1	17%	3	50%	6	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	4	100%
• Other organisations	2	50%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	4	100%
Total organisations	18	11%	24	14%	46	28%	26	16%	52	31%	166	100%
Total individuals	179	14%	131	10%	251	19%	132	10%	617	47%	1,310	100%
Total, all respondents	197	13%	155	11%	297	20%	158	11%	669	45%	1,476	100%

Table A1.7: Q2.4 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage FINFISH AQUACULTURE, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMAs?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	1	5%	1	5%	3	14%	0	0%	17	77%	22	100%
• Community organisations and groups	2	6%	3	9%	6	17%	8	23%	16	46%	35	100%
• Environmental organisations	19	79%	4	17%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	24	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	3	15%	1	5%	9	45%	4	20%	3	15%	20	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	0	0%	3	15%	0	0%	6	30%	11	55%	20	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	15%	1	8%	3	23%	2	15%	5	38%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	3	21%	0	0%	2	14%	1	7%	8	57%	14	100%
• Energy providers	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	5	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	5	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	4	80%	5	100%
• Other organisations	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	4	100%
Total organisations	33	19%	14	8%	27	16%	23	13%	74	43%	171	100%
Total individuals	231	18%	136	10%	193	15%	147	11%	600	46%	1,307	100%
Total, all respondents	264	18%	150	10%	220	15%	170	12%	674	46%	1,478	100%

Table A1.8: Q2.5 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage SHELLFISH AQUACULTURE, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMAs?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	1	5%	0	0%	3	14%	0	0%	18	82%	22	100%
• Community organisations and groups	2	6%	2	6%	0	0%	12	34%	19	54%	35	100%
• Environmental organisations	15	63%	5	21%	3	13%	0	0%	1	4%	24	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	3	15%	1	5%	8	40%	4	20%	4	20%	20	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	1	5%	2	11%	1	5%	1	5%	14	74%	19	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	1	8%	0	0%	4	33%	2	17%	5	42%	12	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	3	20%	0	0%	2	13%	0	0%	10	67%	15	100%
• Energy providers	2	40%	0	0%	3	60%	0	0%		0%	5	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	5	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%	3	60%	5	100%
• Other organisations	2	50%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	4	100%
Total organisations	30	18%	12	7%	26	15%	20	12%	82	48%	170	100%
Total individuals	204	16%	131	10%	131	10%	171	13%	671	51%	1,308	100%
Total, all respondents	234	16%	143	10%	157	11%	191	13%	753	51%	1,478	100%

Table A1.9: Q2.6 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage SEAWEED HARVESTING, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMAs?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	6	29%	1	5%	14	67%	21	100%
• Community organisations and groups	2	6%	3	9%	0	0%	11	31%	19	54%	35	100%
• Environmental organisations	14	58%	5	21%	4	17%	1	4%	0	0%	24	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	3	17%	1	6%	7	39%	4	22%	3	17%	18	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	2	12%	2	12%	2	12%	2	12%	9	53%	17	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	15%	0	0%	5	38%	2	15%	4	31%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	4	27%	0	0%	1	7%	2	13%	8	53%	15	100%
• Energy providers	1	20%	0	0%	4	80%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	4	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	5	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%	3	60%	5	100%
• Other organisations	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	4	100%
Total organisations	32	19%	12	7%	31	19%	24	14%	67	40%	166	100%
Total individuals	208	16%	140	11%	179	14%	161	12%	617	47%	1,305	100%
Total, all respondents	240	16%	152	10%	210	14%	185	13%	684	46%	1,471	100%

Table A1.10: Q2.7 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage THE OIL AND GAS SECTOR, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMAAs?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	0	0%	2	10%	9	43%	0	0%	10	48%	21	100%
• Community organisations and groups	4	13%	3	9%	15	47%	3	9%	7	22%	32	100%
• Environmental organisations	15	63%	4	17%	1	4%	2	8%	2	8%	24	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	3	16%	3	16%	9	47%	1	5%	3	16%	19	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	1	6%	0	0%	6	38%	3	19%	6	38%	16	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	15%	2	15%	5	38%	2	15%	2	15%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	4	29%	1	7%	4	29%	1	7%	4	29%	14	100%
• Energy providers	2	33%	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	1	17%	6	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	4	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	5	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	4	100%
• Other organisations	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	4	100%
Total organisations	33	20%	17	10%	57	35%	13	8%	42	26%	162	100%
Total individuals	226	17%	140	11%	372	29%	125	10%	434	33%	1,297	100%
Total, all respondents	259	18%	157	11%	429	29%	138	9%	476	33%	1,459	100%

Table A1.11: Q2.8 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage RENEWABLE ENERGY, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMAAs?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	2	10%	0	0%	6	30%	0	0%	12	60%	20	100%
• Community organisations and groups	2	6%	3	9%	3	9%	12	36%	13	39%	33	100%
• Environmental organisations	10	42%	6	25%	3	13%	4	17%	1	4%	24	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	2	11%	2	11%	9	47%	3	16%	3	16%	19	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	1	6%	2	13%	4	25%	2	13%	7	44%	16	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	15%	1	8%	6	46%	1	8%	3	23%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	2	14%	1	7%	6	43%	1	7%	4	29%	14	100%
• Energy providers	3	38%	2	25%	2	25%	0	0%	1	13%	8	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	4	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	2	33%	3	50%	6	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	4	100%
• Other organisations	1	20%	1	20%	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	5	100%
Total organisations	25	15%	18	11%	44	27%	27	16%	52	31%	166	100%
Total individuals	219	17%	194	15%	249	19%	141	11%	493	38%	1,296	100%
Total, all respondents	244	17%	212	15%	293	20%	168	11%	545	37%	1,462	100%

Table A1.12: Q2.9 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage CARBON CAPTURE, UTILISATION AND STORAGE, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMAs?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	3	14%	0	0%	7	33%	0	0%	11	52%	21	100%
• Community organisations and groups	2	6%	3	10%	16	52%	4	13%	6	19%	31	100%
• Environmental organisations	12	52%	8	35%	2	9%	1	4%	0	0%	23	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	2	11%	3	16%	9	47%	2	11%	3	16%	19	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	1	6%	2	13%	5	31%	2	13%	6	38%	16	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	15%	1	8%	5	38%	3	23%	2	15%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	1	7%	1	7%	6	43%	2	14%	4	29%	14	100%
• Energy providers	2	33%	0	0%	3	50%	0	0%	1	17%	6	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	4	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	5	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	4	100%
• Other organisations	1	17%	2	33%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	6	100%
Total organisations	26	16%	21	13%	58	36%	16	10%	41	25%	162	100%
Total individuals	196	15%	171	13%	414	32%	97	8%	406	32%	1,284	100%
Total, all respondents	222	15%	192	13%	472	33%	113	8%	447	31%	1,446	100%

Table A1.13: Q2.10 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage SUBSEA CABLES, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMA's?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	1	5%	0	0%	6	29%	1	5%	13	62%	21	100%
• Community organisations and groups	1	3%	3	9%	12	38%	4	13%	12	38%	32	100%
• Environmental organisations	10	43%	7	30%	2	9%	3	13%	1	4%	23	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	2	11%	3	16%	10	53%	1	5%	3	16%	19	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	1	6%	2	13%	6	38%	0	0%	7	44%	16	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	15%	2	15%	4	31%	2	15%	3	23%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	2	14%	0	0%	6	43%	1	7%	5	36%	14	100%
• Energy providers	1	14%	2	29%	1	14%	1	14%	2	29%	7	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	4	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%	3	60%	5	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	4	100%
• Other organisations	0	0%	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	4	100%
Total organisations	20	12%	21	13%	52	32%	14	9%	55	34%	162	100%
Total individuals	157	12%	176	14%	357	28%	119	9%	474	37%	1,283	100%
Total, all respondents	177	12%	197	14%	409	28%	133	9%	529	37%	1,445	100%

Table A1.14: Q2.11 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage AGGREGATE EXTRACTION, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMAAs?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	4	20%	1	5%	8	40%	0	0%	7	35%	20	100%
• Community organisations and groups	4	12%	3	9%	13	39%	2	6%	11	33%	33	100%
• Environmental organisations	18	75%	6	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	24	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	4	21%	3	16%	9	47%	0	0%	3	16%	19	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	2	13%	1	6%	5	31%	1	6%	7	44%	16	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	1	8%	5	38%	3	23%	1	8%	3	23%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	3	21%	1	7%	6	43%	1	7%	3	21%	14	100%
• Energy providers	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	4	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	4	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	3	50%	6	100%
• Political parties	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	2	50%	4	100%
• Other organisations	2	40%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%	5	100%
Total organisations	40	25%	20	12%	50	31%	9	6%	43	27%	162	100%
Total individuals	226	18%	125	10%	342	27%	130	10%	461	36%	1,284	100%
Total, all respondents	266	18%	145	10%	392	27%	139	10%	504	35%	1,446	100%

Table A1.15: Q2.12 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage PORTS AND HARBOURS, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMA's?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	1	5%	0	0%	6	29%	0	0%	14	67%	21	100%
• Community organisations and groups	2	6%	1	3%	6	18%	10	30%	14	42%	33	100%
• Environmental organisations	12	55%	5	23%	5	23%	0	0%	0	0%	22	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	3	16%	3	16%	6	32%	4	21%	3	16%	19	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	1	6%	4	24%	4	24%	2	12%	6	35%	17	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	15%	1	8%	5	38%	1	8%	4	31%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	3	20%	1	7%	3	20%	1	7%	7	47%	15	100%
• Energy providers	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	5	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	4	67%	6	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	5	100%
• Other organisations	2	40%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%	5	100%
Total organisations	27	16%	18	11%	40	24%	20	12%	60	36%	165	100%
Total individuals	209	16%	177	14%	264	21%	129	10%	508	39%	1,287	100%
Total, all respondents	236	16%	195	13%	304	21%	149	10%	568	39%	1,452	100%

Table A1.16: Q2.13 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage SHIPPING AND FERRIES, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMA's?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	1	5%	1	5%	6	30%	0	0%	12	60%	20	100%
• Community organisations and groups	2	6%	5	15%	15	44%	3	9%	9	26%	34	100%
• Environmental organisations	11	50%	5	23%	5	23%	1	5%	0	0%	22	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	2	11%	3	16%	9	47%	2	11%	3	16%	19	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	0	0%	5	29%	7	41%	1	6%	4	24%	17	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	15%	2	15%	5	38%	1	8%	3	23%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	3	20%	0	0%	5	33%	0	0%	7	47%	15	100%
• Energy providers	1	20%	1	20%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	4	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	2	29%	2	29%	0	0%	3	43%	7	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	5	100%
• Other organisations	2	40%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%	5	100%
Total organisations	24	14%	25	15%	60	36%	10	6%	47	28%	166	100%
Total individuals	228	18%	192	15%	278	22%	103	8%	486	38%	1,287	100%
Total, all respondents	252	17%	217	15%	338	23%	113	8%	533	37%	1,453	100%

Table A1.17: Q2.14 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage MILITARY AND DEFENCE, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMAs?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	1	5%	0	0%	10	48%	0	0%	10	48%	21	100%
• Community organisations and groups	2	6%	3	9%	17	52%	3	9%	8	24%	33	100%
• Environmental organisations	13	59%	5	23%	3	14%	0	0%	1	5%	22	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	3	17%	0	0%	11	61%	1	6%	3	17%	18	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	2	13%	1	6%	8	50%	1	6%	4	25%	16	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	15%	1	8%	6	46%	2	15%	2	15%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	4	29%	0	0%	5	36%	2	14%	3	21%	14	100%
• Energy providers	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	4	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	4	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	5	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	4	100%
• Other organisations	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	4	100%
Total organisations	28	18%	12	8%	68	43%	11	7%	39	25%	158	100%
Total individuals	185	14%	134	10%	432	34%	118	9%	414	32%	1,283	100%
Total, all respondents	213	15%	146	10%	500	35%	129	9%	453	31%	1,441	100%

Table A1.18: Q2.15 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage HYDROGEN PRODUCTION, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMAAs?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	2	10%	0	0%	8	40%	0	0%	10	50%	20	100%
• Community organisations and groups	1	3%	1	3%	6	18%	14	41%	12	35%	34	100%
• Environmental organisations	13	62%	6	29%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	21	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	2	11%	1	6%	9	50%	3	17%	3	17%	18	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	1	6%	3	19%	5	31%	2	13%	5	31%	16	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	1	8%	2	15%	6	46%	1	8%	3	23%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	2	14%	1	7%	6	43%	2	14%	3	21%	14	100%
• Energy providers	1	17%	1	17%	4	67%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	4	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	5	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	4	100%
• Other organisations	1	20%	2	40%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	5	100%
Total organisations	24	15%	18	11%	51	32%	24	15%	43	27%	160	100%
Total individuals	174	14%	160	13%	399	31%	113	9%	423	33%	1,269	100%
Total, all respondents	198	14%	178	12%	450	31%	137	10%	466	33%	1,429	100%

Table A1.19: Q2.16 – What is your view of the effectiveness of the proposed approaches to manage SPACE PORTS, as set out in section 6 of the draft Policy Framework, in order to achieve the aims and purpose of HPMAAs?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	3	14%	0	0%	11	52%	0	0%	7	33%	21	100%
• Community organisations and groups	2	6%	1	3%	7	21%	12	36%	11	33%	33	100%
• Environmental organisations	15	65%	6	26%	0	0%	1	4%	1	4%	23	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	4	22%	1	6%	8	44%	2	11%	3	17%	18	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	2	13%	0	0%	8	50%	0	0%	6	38%	16	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	15%	1	8%	3	23%	4	31%	3	23%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	1	7%	1	7%	8	57%	1	7%	3	21%	14	100%
• Energy providers	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	5	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	4	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	5	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	2	50%	4	100%
• Other organisations	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	4	100%
Total organisations	31	19%	12	8%	54	34%	22	14%	41	26%	160	100%
Total individuals	182	14%	109	9%	418	33%	115	9%	443	35%	1,267	100%
Total, all respondents	213	15%	121	8%	472	33%	137	10%	484	34%	1,427	100%

Table A1.20: Q3 – What is your view of the proposed additional powers set out in section 8.3.2 of the draft Policy Framework: ‘Allow for activities to be prohibited from the point of designation to afford high levels of protection’?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	27	96%	28	100%
• Community organisations and groups	2	6%	3	8%	1	3%	5	14%	25	69%	36	100%
• Environmental organisations	15	52%	12	41%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	29	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	1	5%	5	23%	2	9%	2	9%	12	55%	22	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3	14%	18	82%	22	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%	5	38%	5	38%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%	14	93%	15	100%
• Energy providers	1	11%	1	11%	3	33%	1	11%	3	33%	9	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%	6	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	2	29%	1	14%	1	14%	3	43%	7	100%
• Political parties	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	5	100%
• Other organisations	1	17%	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	2	33%	6	100%
Total organisations	23	12%	24	12%	12	6%	21	11%	118	60%	198	100%
Total individuals	178	13%	72	5%	41	3%	131	9%	976	70%	1,398	100%
Total, all respondents	201	13%	96	6%	53	3%	152	10%	1094	69%	1,596	100%

Table A1.21: Q4 – What is your view of the proposed additional powers set out in section 8.3.3 of the draft Policy Framework: ‘Establish processes to permit certain limited activities within a HPMA on a case-by-case basis for specified reasons’?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	2	8%	2	8%	3	12%	0	0%	18	72%	25	100%
• Community organisations and groups	3	9%	9	26%	6	17%	11	31%	6	17%	35	100%
• Environmental organisations	4	13%	17	57%	8	27%	1	3%	0	0%	30	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	5	23%	5	23%	3	14%	4	18%	5	23%	22	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	2	9%	3	14%	6	27%	1	5%	10	45%	22	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	3	23%	6	46%	1	8%	1	8%	2	15%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	0	0%	1	7%	1	7%	3	20%	10	67%	15	100%
• Energy providers	3	33%	4	44%	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	9	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	1	17%	0	0%	3	50%	1	17%	1	17%	6	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	3	38%	2	25%	2	25%	1	13%	8	100%
• Political parties	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	5	100%
• Other organisations	2	33%	2	33%	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	6	100%
Total organisations	26	13%	54	28%	35	18%	25	13%	56	29%	196	100%
Total individuals	186	14%	221	16%	169	12%	154	11%	637	47%	1,367	100%
Total, all respondents	212	14%	275	18%	204	13%	179	11%	693	44%	1,563	100%

Table A1.22: Q5 – What is your view of the proposed additional powers set out in section 8.3.4 of the draft Policy Framework: ‘Activities which are not permitted in a HPMA but are justified in specified cases of emergency or force majeure’?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	3	12%	3	12%	11	42%	0	0%	9	35%	26	100%
• Community organisations and groups	3	9%	12	38%	14	44%	1	3%	2	6%	32	100%
• Environmental organisations	11	39%	14	50%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	28	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	7	33%	5	24%	5	24%	1	5%	3	14%	21	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	5	25%	4	20%	9	45%	1	5%	1	5%	20	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	4	31%	7	54%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	2	13%	1	7%	5	33%	1	7%	6	40%	15	100%
• Energy providers	4	44%	3	33%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	9	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	2	33%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	2	33%	6	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	2	25%	3	38%	1	13%	2	25%	0	0%	8	100%
• Political parties	1	20%	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	5	100%
• Other organisations	2	33%	3	50%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%
Total organisations	46	24%	59	31%	53	28%	7	4%	24	13%	189	100%
Total individuals	250	19%	244	18%	303	23%	70	5%	453	34%	1,320	100%
Total, all respondents	296	20%	303	20%	356	24%	77	5%	477	32%	1,509	100%

Table A1.23: Q6 – What is your view of the proposed additional powers set out in section 8.3.4 of the draft Policy Framework: ‘Measures for activities allowed and carefully managed in HPMA’s’?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	0	0%	1	4%	8	32%	1	4%	15	60%	25	100%
• Community organisations and groups	1	3%	6	18%	14	41%	8	24%	5	15%	34	100%
• Environmental organisations	5	17%	19	63%	5	17%	0	0%	1	3%	30	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	4	19%	4	19%	7	33%	1	5%	5	24%	21	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	0	0%	5	24%	1	5%	3	14%	12	57%	21	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	3	23%	5	38%	1	8%	1	8%	3	23%	13	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	0	0%	1	7%	4	27%	2	13%	8	53%	15	100%
• Energy providers	3	33%	3	33%	2	22%	1	11%	0	0%	9	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	4	80%	5	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	3	43%	1	14%	0	0%	3	43%	7	100%
• Political parties	2	40%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	5	100%
• Other organisations	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%
Total organisations	19	10%	50	26%	47	25%	18	9%	56	29%	190	100%
Total individuals	128	10%	217	16%	218	16%	140	11%	629	47%	1332	100%
Total, all respondents	147	10%	267	18%	265	17%	158	10%	685	45%	1522	100%

Table A1.24: Q8.1 – What is your view of the proposal that HPMA site identification should be based upon the ‘functions and resources of significance to Scotland’s seas,’ including BLUE CARBON, as set out in Annex B of the draft Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	1	3%	0	0%	7	20%	1	3%	26	74%	35	100%
• Community organisations and groups	3	12%	3	12%	8	32%	3	12%	8	32%	25	100%
• Environmental organisations	18	67%	9	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	27	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	5	29%	5	29%	2	12%	0	0%	5	29%	17	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	4	17%	3	13%	6	26%	1	4%	9	39%	23	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	17%	4	33%	3	25%	0	0%	3	25%	12	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	0	0%	3	21%	4	29%	1	7%	6	43%	14	100%
• Energy providers	5	63%	2	25%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	5	83%	6	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	3	50%	6	100%
• Political parties	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	5	100%
• Other organisations	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	4	100%
Total organisations	39	21%	32	18%	37	20%	7	4%	67	37%	182	100%
Total individuals	165	11%	120	8%	282	19%	77	5%	830	56%	1,474	100%
Total, all respondents	204	12%	152	9%	319	19%	84	5%	897	54%	1,656	100%

Table A1.25: Q8.2 – What is your view of the proposal that HPMA site identification should be based upon the ‘functions and resources of significance to Scotland’s seas,’ including ESSENTIAL FISH HABITATS, as set out in Annex B of the draft Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	1	3%	1	3%	6	17%	1	3%	26	74%	35	100%
• Community organisations and groups	5	20%	2	8%	6	24%	4	16%	8	32%	25	100%
• Environmental organisations	21	81%	5	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	26	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	8	44%	3	17%	1	6%	1	6%	5	28%	18	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	3	14%	5	23%	5	23%	1	5%	8	36%	22	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	17%	4	33%	3	25%	0	0%	3	25%	12	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	1	7%	2	14%	4	29%	1	7%	6	43%	14	100%
• Energy providers	5	63%	2	25%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	5	83%	6	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	3	50%	6	100%
• Political parties	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	5	100%
• Other organisations	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	4	100%
Total organisations	47	26%	28	15%	31	17%	9	5%	66	36%	181	100%
Total individuals	259	17%	156	10%	161	11%	73	5%	841	56%	1,490	100%
Total, all respondents	306	18%	184	11%	192	11%	82	5%	907	54%	1,671	100%

Table A1.26: Q8.3 – What is your view of the proposal that HPMA site identification should be based upon the ‘functions and resources of significance to Scotland’s seas,’ including STRENGTHENING THE SCOTTISH MPA NETWORK, as set out in Annex B of the draft Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	0	0%	1	3%	3	9%	6	17%	25	71%	35	100%
• Community organisations and groups	3	12%	2	8%	3	12%	6	24%	11	44%	25	100%
• Environmental organisations	19	68%	7	25%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	28	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	3	17%	6	33%	2	11%	1	6%	6	33%	18	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	0	0%	4	18%	4	18%	6	27%	8	36%	22	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	17%	4	33%	1	8%	2	17%	3	25%	12	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	0	0%	0	0%	2	14%	4	29%	8	57%	14	100%
• Energy providers	3	38%	1	13%	3	38%	1	13%	0	0%	8	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%	6	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	3	50%	6	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	2	40%	5	100%
• Other organisations	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	4	100%
Total organisations	31	17%	30	16%	22	12%	27	15%	73	40%	183	100%
Total individuals	199	13%	89	6%	174	12%	144	10%	884	59%	1,490	100%
Total, all respondents	230	14%	119	7%	196	12%	171	10%	957	57%	1,673	100%

Table A1.27: Q8.4 – What is your view of the proposal that HPMA site identification should be based upon the ‘functions and resources of significance to Scotland’s seas,’ including PROTECTION FROM STORMS AND SEA LEVEL RISE, as set out in Annex B of the draft Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	2	6%	0	0%	5	14%	8	23%	20	57%	35	100%
• Community organisations and groups	5	19%	3	11%	8	30%	3	11%	8	30%	27	100%
• Environmental organisations	14	52%	7	26%	6	22%	0	0%	0	0%	27	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	3	17%	5	28%	4	22%	0	0%	6	33%	18	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	1	5%	5	23%	6	27%	2	9%	8	36%	22	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	3	25%	5	42%	1	8%	0	0%	3	25%	12	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	1	7%	3	21%	4	29%	2	14%	4	29%	14	100%
• Energy providers	2	25%	4	50%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	4	67%	6	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	3	50%	6	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	5	100%
• Other organisations	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	4	100%
Total organisations	32	17%	35	19%	41	22%	17	9%	59	32%	184	100%
Total individuals	189	13%	195	13%	281	19%	64	4%	758	51%	1,487	100%
Total, all respondents	221	13%	230	14%	322	19%	81	5%	817	49%	1,671	100%

Table A1.28: Q8.5 – What is your view of the proposal that HPMA site identification should be based upon the ‘functions and resources of significance to Scotland’s seas,’ including RESEARCH AND EDUCATION, as set out in Annex B of the draft Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	3	9%	0	0%	11	31%	5	14%	16	46%	35	100%
• Community organisations and groups	3	12%	4	15%	8	31%	3	12%	8	31%	26	100%
• Environmental organisations	16	59%	7	26%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	27	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	5	28%	3	17%	5	28%	0	0%	5	28%	18	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	0	0%	6	27%	5	23%	3	14%	8	36%	22	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	17%	4	33%	3	25%	0	0%	3	25%	12	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	2	14%	1	7%	7	50%	0	0%	4	29%	14	100%
• Energy providers	4	50%	3	38%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	4	67%	6	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	2	33%	1	17%	0	0%	3	50%	6	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	2	40%	2	40%	0	0%	1	20%	5	100%
• Other organisations	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	4	100%
Total organisations	37	20%	32	17%	49	27%	12	7%	53	29%	183	100%
Total individuals	238	16%	208	14%	253	17%	51	3%	733	49%	1,483	100%
Total, all respondents	275	17%	240	14%	302	18%	63	4%	786	47%	1,666	100%

Table A1.29: Q8.6 – What is your view of the proposal that HPMA site identification should be based upon the ‘functions and resources of significance to Scotland’s seas,’ including ENJOYMENT AND APPRECIATION, as set out in Annex B of the draft Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	2	6%	1	3%	6	17%	8	23%	18	51%	35	100%
• Community organisations and groups	4	15%	2	8%	6	23%	5	19%	9	35%	26	100%
• Environmental organisations	14	52%	9	33%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	27	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	5	28%	4	22%	3	17%	0	0%	6	33%	18	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	0	0%	4	18%	4	18%	6	27%	8	36%	22	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	17%	3	25%	2	17%	1	8%	4	33%	12	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	1	7%	1	7%	7	50%	1	7%	4	29%	14	100%
• Energy providers	3	38%	3	38%	1	13%	1	13%	0	0%	8	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	33%	4	67%	6	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3	50%	6	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	1	20%	1	20%	5	100%
• Other organisations	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	4	100%
Total organisations	33	18%	31	17%	36	20%	25	14%	58	32%	183	100%
Total individuals	215	14%	202	14%	207	14%	94	6%	767	52%	1,485	100%
Total, all respondents	248	15%	233	14%	243	15%	119	7%	825	49%	1,668	100%

Table A1.30: Q8.7 – What is your view of the proposal that HPMA site identification should be based upon the ‘functions and resources of significance to Scotland’s seas,’ including OTHER IMPORTANT ECOSYSTEM SERVICES, as set out in Annex B of the draft Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	1	3%	0	0%	11	32%	5	15%	17	50%	34	100%
• Community organisations and groups	3	13%	4	17%	6	25%	3	13%	8	33%	24	100%
• Environmental organisations	18	67%	7	26%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	27	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	2	12%	4	24%	5	29%	0	0%	6	35%	17	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	2	9%	4	18%	7	32%	1	5%	8	36%	22	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	17%	4	33%	3	25%	0	0%	3	25%	12	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	0	0%	3	21%	5	36%	1	7%	5	36%	14	100%
• Energy providers	4	50%	1	13%	1	13%	1	13%	1	13%	8	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	4	67%	6	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	3	50%	6	100%
• Political parties	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	5	100%
• Other organisations	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	4	100%
Total organisations	34	19%	30	17%	45	25%	13	7%	57	32%	179	100%
Total individuals	196	13%	150	10%	306	21%	56	4%	754	52%	1,462	100%
Total, all respondents	230	14%	180	11%	351	21%	69	4%	811	49%	1,641	100%

Table A1.31: Q9.1 – What is your view of the general principles that are intended to inform the approach to HPMA selection, including USE OF A ROBUST EVIDENCE BASE, as set out in section 4.1 of the draft Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	15	54%	8	29%	0	0%	0	0%	5	18%	28	100%
• Community organisations and groups	8	33%	7	29%	2	8%	3	13%	4	17%	24	100%
• Environmental organisations	25	83%	4	13%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	30	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	7	47%	4	27%	1	7%	1	7%	2	13%	15	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	10	53%	4	21%	2	11%	2	11%	1	5%	19	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	6	50%	5	42%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	12	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	3	23%	2	15%	4	31%	1	8%	3	23%	13	100%
• Energy providers	6	67%	1	11%	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	9	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	2	33%	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	2	33%	6	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%
• Political parties	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%
• Other organisations	2	40%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	5	100%
Total organisations	92	54%	40	23%	11	6%	9	5%	19	11%	171	100%
Total individuals	394	33%	256	22%	96	8%	49	4%	384	33%	1,179	100%
Total, all respondents	486	36%	296	22%	107	8%	58	4%	403	30%	1,350	100%

Table A1.32: Q9.2 – What is your view of the general principles that are intended to inform the approach to HPMA selection, including HPMA SCALE AND THE USE OF FUNCTIONAL ECOSYSTEM UNITS, as set out in section 4.1 of the draft Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	0	0%	1	4%	7	25%	6	21%	14	50%	28	100%
• Community organisations and groups	3	13%	4	17%	6	26%	4	17%	6	26%	23	100%
• Environmental organisations	18	64%	9	32%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	28	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	6	43%	5	36%	0	0%	1	7%	2	14%	14	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	1	5%	4	21%	6	32%	3	16%	5	26%	19	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	3	25%	3	25%	3	25%	1	8%	2	17%	12	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	0	0%	0	0%	6	46%	2	15%	5	38%	13	100%
• Energy providers	3	38%	3	38%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	8	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	5	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	3	50%	2	33%	0	0%	1	17%	6	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%
• Other organisations	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	5	100%
Total organisations	35	21%	34	21%	38	23%	18	11%	39	24%	164	100%
Total individuals	203	18%	145	13%	258	23%	103	9%	434	38%	1,143	100%
Total, all respondents	238	18%	179	14%	296	23%	121	9%	473	36%	1,307	100%

Table A1.33: Q9.3 – What is your view of the general principles that are intended to inform the approach to HPMA selection, including ENSURING ADDED VALUE, as set out in section 4.1 of the draft Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	1	4%	0	0%	6	21%	9	32%	12	43%	28	100%
• Community organisations and groups	5	22%	3	13%	8	35%	3	13%	4	17%	23	100%
• Environmental organisations	16	57%	10	36%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	28	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	6	43%	5	36%	1	7%	0	0%	2	14%	14	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	6	33%	3	17%	6	33%	2	11%	1	6%	18	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	3	25%	5	42%	3	25%	0	0%	1	8%	12	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	1	8%	2	15%	5	38%	1	8%	4	31%	13	100%
• Energy providers	6	75%	0	0%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	5	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	2	33%	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	1	17%	6	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	3	100%
• Other organisations	1	20%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	5	100%
Total organisations	47	29%	33	20%	37	23%	18	11%	28	17%	163	100%
Total individuals	168	15%	181	16%	312	27%	66	6%	409	36%	1,136	100%
Total, all respondents	215	17%	214	16%	349	27%	84	6%	437	34%	1,299	100%

Table A1.34: Q9.4 – What is your view of the general principles that are intended to inform the approach to HPMA selection, including DELIVERING ECOSYSTEM RECOVERY, as set out in section 4.1 of the draft Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	2	7%	2	7%	7	25%	7	25%	10	36%	28	100%
• Community organisations and groups	4	17%	5	22%	6	26%	3	13%	5	22%	23	100%
• Environmental organisations	27	90%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	30	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	8	57%	3	21%	1	7%	0	0%	2	14%	14	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	3	17%	2	11%	9	50%	2	11%	2	11%	18	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	2	17%	5	42%	4	33%	0	0%	1	8%	12	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	1	8%	2	15%	7	54%	0	0%	3	23%	13	100%
• Energy providers	5	56%	2	22%	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	9	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	5	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%
• Political parties	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%
• Other organisations	2	40%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	5	100%
Total organisations	57	34%	28	17%	41	25%	14	8%	26	16%	166	100%
Total individuals	267	23%	207	18%	256	22%	49	4%	369	32%	1,148	100%
Total, all respondents	324	25%	235	18%	297	23%	63	5%	395	30%	1,314	100%

Table A1.35: Q10 – What is your view of the proposed five-stage site selection process, found in sections 4.2 and 4.3 as well as figure 2 and Annex A of the draft Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%	34	94%	36	100%
• Community organisations and groups	2	6%	2	6%	6	19%	13	41%	9	28%	32	100%
• Environmental organisations	3	12%	17	68%	4	16%	1	4%	0	0%	25	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	4	19%	5	24%	2	10%	2	10%	8	38%	21	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	0	0%	1	4%	7	27%	2	8%	16	62%	26	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	1	8%	2	17%	3	25%	3	25%	3	25%	12	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	1	8%	0	0%	2	15%	4	31%	6	46%	13	100%
• Energy providers	2	25%	3	38%	1	13%	2	25%	0	0%	8	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	5	83%	6	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	2	33%	0	0%	1	17%	3	50%	6	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%	2	40%	5	100%
• Other organisations	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	5	100%
Total organisations	14	7%	35	18%	29	15%	29	15%	88	45%	195	100%
Total individuals	111	7%	116	8%	221	15%	126	8%	935	62%	1,509	100%
Total, all respondents	125	7%	151	9%	250	15%	155	9%	1023	60%	1,704	100%

Table A1.36: Q12 – What is your view of the Strategic Environmental Report, summarised within sections 3 and 4 of the Sustainability Appraisal, as an accurate representation of the potential impacts, issues and considerations raised by the introduction of the draft Policy Framework and Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	2	6%	7	19%	27	75%	36	100%
• Community organisations and groups	1	3%	3	10%	10	34%	5	17%	10	34%	29	100%
• Environmental organisations	0	0%	12	55%	10	45%	0	0%	0	0%	22	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	2	11%	3	16%	7	37%	1	5%	6	32%	19	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	0	0%	2	8%	8	33%	1	4%	13	54%	24	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	1	9%	4	36%	4	36%	0	0%	2	18%	11	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	0	0%	0	0%	3	25%	2	17%	7	58%	12	100%
• Energy providers	1	14%	2	29%	0	0%	2	29%	2	29%	7	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	2	33%	0	0%	4	67%	6	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	2	29%	2	29%	1	14%	2	29%	7	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	5	100%
• Other organisations	0	0%	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	5	100%
Total organisations	5	3%	32	17%	52	28%	19	10%	75	41%	183	100%
Total individuals	81	6%	121	8%	230	16%	111	8%	916	63%	1,459	100%
Total, all respondents	86	5%	153	9%	282	17%	130	8%	991	60%	1,642	100%

Table A1.37: Q13 – What is your view of the Socio-Economic Impact Assessment, summarised within sections 3 and 4 of the Sustainability Appraisal, as an accurate representation of the potential impacts, issues and considerations raised by the introduction of the draft Policy Framework and Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	5	14%	30	83%	36	100%
• Community organisations and groups	1	3%	5	15%	4	12%	3	9%	20	61%	33	100%
• Environmental organisations	0	0%	10	40%	9	36%	5	20%	1	4%	25	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	1	5%	2	10%	8	38%	1	5%	9	43%	21	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	1	4%	1	4%	5	21%	2	8%	15	63%	24	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	0	0%	2	18%	3	27%	3	27%	3	27%	11	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%	2	15%	7	54%	13	100%
• Energy providers	0	0%	1	14%	3	43%	1	14%	2	29%	7	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	5	83%	6	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	2	25%	1	13%	1	13%	4	50%	8	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	4	100%
• Other organisations	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	2	40%	5	100%
Total organisations	3	2%	27	14%	41	21%	23	12%	99	51%	193	100%
Total individuals	72	5%	97	6%	200	13%	122	8%	1,009	67%	1,500	100%
Total, all respondents	75	4%	124	7%	241	14%	145	9%	1,108	65%	1,693	100%

Note to table: In addition, 1 respondent who submitted a response by email answered 'Neutral / Opposed' in response to this question.

Table A1.38: Q14 – What is your view of the partial ICIA screening report as an accurate representation of potential impacts, raised by the implementation of the draft Policy Framework and Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	2	6%	28	85%	33	100%
• Community organisations and groups	4	11%	3	8%	0	0%	3	8%	26	72%	36	100%
• Environmental organisations	0	0%	3	19%	12	75%	0	0%	1	6%	16	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	0	0%	2	11%	6	32%	0	0%	11	58%	19	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	0	0%	2	9%	4	17%	3	13%	14	61%	23	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	0	0%	2	18%	3	27%	2	18%	4	36%	11	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	1	8%	0	0%	3	25%	3	25%	5	42%	12	100%
• Energy providers	0	0%	2	33%	3	50%	0	0%	1	17%	6	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	5	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	0	0%	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	3	50%	6	100%
• Political parties	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	5	100%
• Other organisations	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	3	100%
Total organisations	10	6%	17	10%	34	19%	14	8%	100	57%	175	100%
Total individuals	126	9%	104	7%	167	11%	101	7%	982	66%	1,480	100%
Total, all respondents	136	8%	121	7%	201	12%	115	7%	1,082	65%	1,655	100%

Table A1.39: Q15 – Do you think that the implementation of the draft Policy Framework and Site Selection Guidelines will have any significantly differential impacts – positive and/or negative – on island communities?

Response	Yes		No		Not sure		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	27	82%	2	6%	4	12%	33	100%
• Community organisations and groups	35	97%	0	0%	1	3%	36	100%
• Environmental organisations	10	67%	1	7%	4	27%	15	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	12	60%	1	5%	7	35%	20	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	22	92%	0	0%	2	8%	24	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	7	70%	0	0%	3	30%	10	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	9	75%	1	8%	2	17%	12	100%
• Energy providers	4	67%	0	0%	2	33%	6	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	5	83%	0	0%	1	17%	6	100%
• Political parties	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	5	100%
• Other organisations	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	3	100%
Total organisations	142	81%	6	3%	27	15%	175	100%
Total individuals	1,362	89%	49	3%	116	8%	1,527	100%
Total, all respondents	1,504	88%	55	3%	143	8%	1,702	100%

Table A1.40: Q16 – What is your view of the partial BRIA as an accurate representation of the potential impacts, issues and considerations raised by the implementation of the draft Policy Framework and Site Selection Guidelines?

Response	Strongly support		Support		Neutral		Oppose		Strongly oppose		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	2	6%	30	88%	34	100%
• Community organisations and groups	2	6%	3	9%	4	12%	12	35%	13	38%	34	100%
• Environmental organisations	0	0%	3	21%	9	64%	1	7%	1	7%	14	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	1	5%	4	18%	5	23%	3	14%	9	41%	22	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	0	0%	1	4%	5	22%	2	9%	15	65%	23	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	0	0%	1	9%	4	36%	3	27%	3	27%	11	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	27%	8	73%	11	100%
• Energy providers	1	13%	0	0%	7	88%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%	0	0%	5	71%	7	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	1	11%	1	11%	1	11%	1	11%	5	56%	9	100%
• Political parties	0	0%	1	17%	3	50%	0	0%	2	33%	6	100%
• Other organisations	0	0%	3	50%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	6	100%
Total organisations	6	3%	18	10%	41	22%	28	15%	92	50%	185	100%
Total individuals	61	4%	65	5%	228	16%	141	10%	930	65%	1,425	100%
Total, all respondents	67	4%	83	5%	269	17%	169	10%	1,022	63%	1,610	100%

Table A1.41: Q17 – Do you think that the implementation of the draft Policy Framework and Site Selection Guidelines will have any financial, regulatory or resource impacts – positive and/or negative - for you and/or your business?

Response	Yes		No		Not sure		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
• Fishing organisations / groups	33	87%	1	3%	4	11%	38	100%
• Community organisations and groups	33	92%	1	3%	2	6%	36	100%
• Environmental organisations	6	38%	4	25%	6	38%	16	100%
• Recreation, tourism and culture organisations	14	64%	5	23%	3	14%	22	100%
• Aquaculture organisations / groups	25	100%	0	0%	0	0%	25	100%
• Public sector bodies including regulators and local authorities	6	60%	0	0%	4	40%	10	100%
• Business / private sector organisations	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	11	100%
• Energy providers	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%
• Fish selling and processing organisations / groups	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%
• Shipping, ports and harbours	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	9	100%
• Political parties	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	6	100%
• Other organisations	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	4	100%
Total organisations	159	83%	14	7%	19	10%	192	100%
Total individuals	1,113	78%	142	10%	177	12%	1,432	100%
Total, all respondents	1,272	78%	156	10%	196	12%	1,624	100%