

T: +44 (0)131 244 2500

E: MSS_Advice@gov.scot

██████████
Marine Scotland Licensing Operations Team
Marine Laboratory
375 Victoria Road
Aberdeen
AB11 9DB

30 March 2022

EAST COAST - EC06 – RIVER TAY SEAL LICENCE CONSULTATION

Marine Scotland Science have reviewed the relevant documentation and have provided the following comments.

Application

This application covers the River Tay. The River Tay is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), for which Atlantic salmon is a Qualifying Interest.

Salmon stocks

The most up to date stock assessment of salmon in the River Tay SAC indicates that the overall stock is in good conservation status. However, recent declines in the number of salmon returning to Scotland have led SG to determine that this is a crisis point for salmon, leading to the launch of a [Wild Salmon Strategy](#).

In addition to the national measures outlined in the strategy there are a large number of local measures which are aimed at protecting and enhancing salmon stocks. This application is therefore part of a larger effort aimed at conserving salmon in the River Tay SAC.

In common with all rivers in Scotland there are national conservation measures in place to protect vulnerable spring stocks. Protection of all components of the salmon stock is also required by the designation of the River Tay salmon SAC. In relation to salmon conservation, we would recommend issuing a licence to cover grey and harbour seals during January-March.

Number of seals and feeding activity

The applicant has reported 1 instance of harbour seals and 4 instances of grey seals in the River Tay in the last year, between July-December only.

The applicant has witnessed no predation events by either harbour seals or grey seals in the River Tay in the last year.

Interpretation of these numbers is difficult because no information is provided on how they were collected and they are not effort related.

Number of seals requested on the licence

The NERC Special Committee on Seals (SCOS) reports to Scottish Government annually on Potential Biological Removal (PBR) numbers for the two resident seal species. These numbers represent the maximum anthropogenic take from the seal populations within a seal management area in order for the populations to be sustainable, and reflect both the population size and trend. Takes from shooting must be cumulated and assessed alongside all other anthropogenic takes of seals within the management area, including, for example, bycatch and collision with tidal turbines.

We note that seals taken through bycatch and other incidental takes are not planned and are therefore difficult to cumulate for annual assessment. Bycatch data from previous years are also not produced at the same spatial scale as the seal management areas making their inclusion in considerations more complicated. As a result, MSS recommend that MS-LOT take a cautious approach to determining the number of licences for seal takes that can be issued.

The PBR limits advised by SCOS (2021) for seals in this seal management area are 823 for grey seal and 2 for harbour seal. To our knowledge, there are no other planned anthropogenic takes from the seal populations in this seal management area.

The applicant has requested licences to take 5 grey seals and 1 harbour seal. The total requested seals from all applications in the East Scotland seal management area in 2022 is 14 grey seals and 2 harbour seals. MSS advise that the requested licences for grey seals fall well within the PBR limit for the seal management area, both individually and cumulatively. However, the declining harbour seal population in this seal management area, and the correspondingly small PBR, mean that there is limited capacity to account for any bycatch or other incidental take from the harbour seal population.

MSS's general advice would be that no licences should be granted for harbour seals in this management area. However, given the particular concerns around spring salmon, it may be appropriate for MS-LOT to licence one removal during the January to March period.

Non-lethal deterrents

The applicant has provided evidence on the use of alternative non-lethal techniques to reduce seal predation. The Tay District Salmon Fishery Board was informed in the past after a visit from the Sea Mammal Research Unit (SMRU) that ADDs would not work due to the width of the river (100 m). Physical barriers were deemed unsuitable for the same reason. A range of physical and acoustic harassment techniques have been trialled, with little success at displacing seals wider than the immediate area. Further noise harassment measures are not appropriate due to the proximity to tourist attractions.

MSS recommend that prior to lethal removal, applicants explore further non-lethal measures to reduce depredation or displace seals from critical areas of the river. These non-lethal measures have been extensively reviewed in a recent Marine Scotland report (Thompson et al. 2021).

References

Thompson, D, A J Coram, R N Harris and C E Sparling. (2021). Review of non-lethal seal control options to limit seal predation on salmonids in rivers and at finfish farms. Scottish Marine and Freshwater Science Vol 12 No 6, 136pp. DOI: 10.7489/12369-1
<https://data.marine.gov.scot/dataset/review-non-lethal-seal-control-options-limit-seal-predation-salmonids-rivers-and-finfish-0>

Hopefully these comments are helpful to you. If you wish to discuss any matters further then please contact the REEA Advice inbox at MSS_Advice@gov.scot

Yours sincerely,

Renewable Energy Environmental Advice
Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries
Marine Scotland Science

██████████
Marine Licencing Officer,
Marine Scotland – Marine Planning & Policy

22 March 2022

By email

Our ref: A3687244

Dear ██████████

2022 Seal Licence Consultation – Applications for a licence authorising the killing or taking of seals to conserve seals or other wild animals (including birds) or wild plants in Scotland

Thank you for consulting us on this year's seal licensing applications (Table 1). These constitute the second year of applications following the amendment to the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010, and the first following Marine Scotland's updated guidance.

Overarching considerations

The number of Atlantic salmon returning to Scottish coastal waters have declined since the 1970s¹, and the estimated number of spawning salmon has declined from 2010¹. There are a number of potential factors driving the decline throughout the lifecycle, *i.e.* within the river system and the open seas. These factors include; climate change (especially water temperature), marine development, water quality, in-stream barriers to movement, overfishing, exploitation, and predation. Predators include otter, piscivorous birds, other fish, cetaceans, as well as both seal species (harbour and grey).

River Status- Salmon Grade

Scottish Government assess the conservation status of salmon on a river-by-river basis² annually. Conservation status is defined by the probability of stock meeting its egg deposition target over a five-year period. The assessment result in a grading award of 1, 2 or 3 to each river.

¹ <https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-wild-salmon-strategy/>
<https://www.gov.scot/publications/salmon-fishery-statistics-2020/>

² <https://www.gov.scot/publications/salmon-fishing-proposed-river-gradings-for-2022-season/>

Table 1 - Seal Licence applications for 2022

| Seal Management Areas | Applicant | River Grading | MPA consent | Licence recommendation | Page |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------|-------------|------------------------|------|
| Southwest Scotland | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] [REDACTED] | ■ |
| | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] | ■ |
| West Scotland | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] | ■ |
| | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] | ■ |
| | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] | ■ |
| Western Isles | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] | ■ |
| | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] | ■ |
| | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] | ■ |
| Orkney & North Coast | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] | ■ |
| | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] | ■ |
| Moray Firth | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] | ■ |
| | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] [REDACTED] | ■ |
| | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] | ■ |
| | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] | ■ |
| | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] | ■ |
| | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] | ■ |
| | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] [REDACTED] | ■ |
| East Scotland | EC06 – River Tay SAC | 1 | Yes | Reject ¹ | 17 |
| | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] [REDACTED] | ■ |
| | [REDACTED] | ■ | ■ | [REDACTED] | ■ |

¹reject on the grounds of Grade 1 conservation status

²reject on the grounds that the case for salmon conservation has not been made due to seal presence being 'rare' or 'on occasion'

³reject for harbour seals, but possible permit for grey seals

⁴please see our concerns due to the proximity to the Ythan designated seal haul out

⁵Possible permit for both harbour and grey seals

- **Grade 1** – reflects the probability of at least 80% of stock meeting its egg deposition target over a five-year period - suggests exploitation is sustainable – **Good conservation status**,
- **Grade 2** – reflects the probability of between 60- 80% of stock meeting its egg deposition target over a five-year period - suggesting management action is needed to reduce exploitation - **Moderate conservative status**, and,

- **Grade 3** – reflects the probability at less than 60% of stock meeting its egg deposition target over a five-year period suggesting that exploitation is unsustainable – **Poor conservation status.**

NatureScot Overarching Advice

For the purposes of seal licencing, we remain of the view that although these gradings relate to sustainable exploitation, a grade 1 suggests the salmon stock in that river/area is in good health. The assessment is based on the salmon stock numbers, and therefore exploitation is related to both anthropogenic and natural removal.

Our advice therefore is that there is no case for lethal removal of seals in Grade 1 Rivers.

In any consideration of lethal removal of seals for the purposes of salmon conservation, we also feel it is relevant to highlight emerging evidence³ that the catching of salmon causes stress and damage to the individual, potentially affecting fitness, and suggest that further restrictions on catch and release may therefore merit consideration. Notwithstanding this, for Grades 2 and 3, our consideration is whether the lethal removal requested will make a material difference to the conservation status of the salmon and/or the conservation status of either seal species.

The numbers of seal take requested are considered with regard to the regional Potential Biological Removal (PBR) values (Table 2) for the Seal Management Area (SMA) concerned. PBR values are calculated annually by the Sea Mammal Research Unit, and reflect a calculation as to how many animals may be removed from a population. **Our view is that, under this licensable purpose, it is not enough for the requested take to be below the seal PBR, the evidence needs to show that lethal removal is necessary for salmon conservation.**

Consistent with advice provided by NatureScot last year, we recommend that all licences for Grade 1 Rivers should be rejected because the stock is classed as being at a good conservation status, and therefore the lethal removal of seals is not necessary for the conservation of salmon.

We also remain of the view that licences for the lethal removal of harbour seals in the East coast and Orkney and north coast management areas are rejected due to the continued population decline of this species in these areas.

Where licensing is deemed appropriate by MSL0T, we recommend that each method statement should specifically detail the non-lethal methods deployed including methods, duration and

³ Lennox, R.J., Cooke, S.J., Diserud, O.H., Havn, T.B., Johansen, M.R., Thorstad, E.B., Whoriskey, F.G., Uglem, I., 2016. Use of simulation approaches to evaluate the consequences of catch-and-release angling on the migration behaviour of adult Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). *Ecol. Model.*, 333, 43–50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2016.04.010>

Lennox, R.J., Uglem, I., Cooke, S.J., Naesje, T.R., Whoriskey, F.G., Havn, T.B., Ulvan, E.M., Solem, O., Thorstad, E.B., 2015. Does catch-and-release angling alter the behavior and fate of adult Atlantic salmon during upriver migration? *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, **144**, 400–409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00028487.2014.1001041>

Travis E. Van Leeuwen, J. Brian Dempson, Chantelle M. Burke, Nicholas I. Kelly, Martha J. Robertson, Robert J. Lennox, Torgeir B. Havn, Martin Svenning, Ross Hinks, Matthew M. Guzzo, Eva B. Thorstad, Craig F. Purchase, and Amanda E. Bates. Mortality of Atlantic salmon after catch and release angling: assessment of a recreational Atlantic salmon fishery in a changing climate. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*. **77**(9): 1518-1528. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2019-0400>

recording of methods used, it should also provide details of any Acoustic Deterrent Device (ADD) use.

Table 2 - Seal Licence applications for 2022, together with the regional Potential Biological Removal (PBR) figures

| Seal Management Areas | Regional PBR for 2021 ⁴ (draft 2022) ⁵ | | Applicant | Requested take | |
|-----------------------|---|-------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------|
| | Harbour seal | Grey seal | | Harbour seal | Grey seal |
| Southwest Scotland | 71 (71) | 116 (119) | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| | | | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| West Scotland | 936 (936) | 933 (966) | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| | | | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| | | | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| Western Isles | 105(105) | 1291 (1336) | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| | | | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| | | | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| Orkney & North Coast | | | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| | | | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| Moray Firth | 6 (6) | 370 (383) | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| | | | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| | | | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| | | | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| | | | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| | | | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| | | | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| East Scotland | 2 (2) | 823 (852) | EC06 – River Tay SAC | 1 | 5 |
| | | | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |
| | | | [REDACTED] | █ | █ |

Where MS LOT determine a licence could be granted for grey seals and not harbour seals (e.g. Moray Firth) correct species identification will be of the utmost importance.

Where lethal removal is licenced, we suggest that recent evidence⁶ of the physiological and other impacts associated with the catch and release of Atlantic salmon should be reviewed, and

⁴ <https://www.gov.scot/publications/marine-licensing-map-of-seal-management-areas-and-provisional-pbr/>

⁵ Draft SCOS 2021 (unpublished)

⁶ Travis E. Van Leeuwen, J. Brian Dempson, Chantelle M. Burke, Nicholas I. Kelly, Martha J. Robertson, Robert J. Lennox, Torgeir B. Havn, Martin Svenning, Ross Hinks, Matthew M. Guzzo, Eva B. Thorstad, Craig F. Purchase, and Amanda E. Bates. 2020. Mortality of Atlantic salmon after catch and release angling: assessment of a recreational Atlantic salmon fishery in a changing climate. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*. **77**(9): 1518-1528. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2019-0400>

consideration given to the need for further measures or regulation on the catching of salmon in those rivers. The potential impacts associated with catch and release of salmon are not mentioned in any of the applications and perhaps should be, as the aim here is the conservation of Atlantic salmon.

We consider that the assessment of seal predation in rivers should be based on the number of seals that can be clearly identified as taking salmon, and not on the number of seals observed in the area, because not all seals present in the river are 'salmon/river specialists'. In addition, whilst some seals may have a direct impact on salmon through feeding, fisheries also include the indirect impact on their fishery by affecting the rod activity. Our view is that seal shooting should only be used as a last resort where all appropriate non-destructive alternatives have been exhausted. **We wish to see greater demonstration that there is no satisfactory alternative way to mitigate seal predation/damage on salmon.**

Both harbour and grey seals are protected species. We have therefore considered each location's connectivity to Seal SACs, together with any overlap with Seal Designated haul-outs. Where a licence location is within 20km of a grey seal SAC, or 50km of a harbour seal SAC, we offer advice on HRA.

The lethal removal of individual seals has obvious welfare issues for the seal. The licence requires that the shooting is undertaken by a suitably qualified named person. Although the retrieval of the carcass is not often done, we strongly recommend that there should be greater effort to comply with this recommendation should licences be approved.

The shot seal should be retrieved and either taken to Scottish Marine Animal Stranding Scheme (SMASS)⁷, or retrieved by SMASS so that a necropsy can be undertaken. We would welcome further discussion regarding compliance monitoring with yourselves in connection with species identification and numbers of seals actually shot.

In the annex to this letter we provide advice for all applications, and a consent response under section 116 (2) of the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010, for those applications where shooting is proposed within a protected area.

General comments on quality of licence applications

Whilst the quality of applications is much improved from last year, the evidence supplied to support the lethal removal on the conservation of salmon is still weak. The argument put forward by the applicants is that any seal seen in the area will be preying on salmon, and any adult salmon removed from the population, or damaged will have an impact on the number of eggs laid. Whilst we agree with this in general terms, it is difficult to evidence how the removal of seals will

Magdalene Papatheodoulou, Libor Závorka, Barbara Koeck, Neil B. Metcalfe, and Shaun S. Killen. 2021. Simulated pre-spawning catch and release of wild Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) results in faster fungal spread and opposing effects on female and male proxies of fecundity. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*. **79**(2): 267-276. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2021-0089>

⁷ <https://strandings.org/>

result in a significant benefit to salmon numbers, in the context of all other variables relating to in river salmon stock and therefore improve conservation status.

Covid was highlighted as a reason why there was a lack of recorded observations of seals in the rivers applied for. However, there was also mention of an app. under development by the Scottish Fisheries Coordination Centre that should provide more formal data in the future.

The locational detail supplied this year was very useful for our considerations.

Non-lethal methods sections were completed in all cases. Our view on these methods identified is as follows.

- *Barriers*

Some applicants misunderstood this section and detailed what barriers were or were not within the particular stretch of river, rather than implementing a barrier to restrict seals from key locations. Most put forward the argument that the introduction of barriers in order to keep seals out of the area would be counterproductive, in that they would hinder passage of the fish, and that they would catch river debris and further impede flow. We agree with this general assessment.

- *Harassment*

All applicants stated that general harassment methods would be tried before shooting of a seal occurred. Methods suggested included, human presence, shouting, clapping of hands, paint ball guns and shooting in the air. Many put forward the view that these do not work well because seals in the area generally habituate to such methods. We tend to agree, but maintain all methods should still be tried, and that applicants should also consider new suggestions arising in the future.

- *Translocation*

All stated that capture and translocation of seals does not work. They highlighted the difficulty in capturing the seal - specifically, that they did not have trained personnel to enable capture, and that most translocated seals generally come back to the area once released. We agree that translocation is currently not practical and can add stress to individual animals.

- *ADDs*

Many highlighted that the efficacy of ADDs is equivocal. Many said the river substrate meant that the noise would not propagate effectively. Some noted that ADDs could not be used as there was not mains power available at the stretch of river under consideration. This is incorrect; ADDs can be operated on a battery. It was unclear in many instances the level of understanding there is of the practical implementation of ADD. We would not advise on the continuous operating of ADD, instead, an ADD should be used to target particular times of greatest risk. Many made the point that the greater risk of seal predation is when the water level is low, therefore it is possible that an ADD could be targeted at the greater risk period when a seal is present in the area. ADD development is ongoing and so this option should not be automatically discounted.

Some note the potential for disturbance to non-target species, e.g. cetaceans. Whilst this is true in many circumstances, there is a low likelihood in the river environment under consideration here. In the event that disturbance was the case, we would balance the risk of temporary disturbance of protected cetaceans, against the lethal removal of protected seals.

We trust these comments are useful, but please contact [REDACTED]
([REDACTED]) if you wish to discuss our comments further.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Head of Sustainable Coasts & Seas

Battleby, Redgorton, Perth PH1 3EW
Battleby, Ràth a' Ghoirtein, Peairt PH1 3EW

01738 444177 [nature.scot](https://www.nature.scot)

NatureScot is the operating name of Scottish Natural Heritage

ANNEX: Advice - by seal management unit and applicant

SOUTHWEST SCOTLAND

- [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

| MPA | Protected Features | Does the lethal removal of seals by shooting have any negative impact on these sites conservation objectives |
|------------|--------------------|--|
| [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

■ [Redacted section header]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

WEST SCOTLAND

- [Redacted list item]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

- [Redacted list item]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text line]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted section header]

[Redacted text block]

| MPA | Protected Features | Does the lethal removal of seals by shooting have any negative impact on these sites conservation objectives |
|------------|--------------------|--|
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | [Redacted] |

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted section header]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

| MPA | Protected Features | Does the lethal removal of seals by shooting have any negative impact on these sites conservation objectives |
|------------|--------------------|--|
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | [Redacted] |

[Redacted text block]

ORKNEY & NORTH COAST

[Redacted text block]

⁸ Thompson D., Duck C.D., Morris C.D., Russell D.J.F. (2018). The status of harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*) in the UK. *Aquatic Conservation Marine Freshwater Ecosystems*, **29**(1), 40-60.
⁹ Arso Civil, M., Smout, S.C., Duck, C., Morris, C., Cummings, C., Langley, I., Law, A., Morton, C., Brownlow, A., Davison, N., Doeschate, M., Lacaze, J-P., McConnell, B., Hall, A.J. (2018). *Harbour Seal Decline – vital rates and drivers*. Report to Scottish Government HSD2. <https://marine.gov.scot/sma/content/harbour-seal-decline-vital-rates-and-drivers-report-scottish-government-hsd2>

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

| MPA | Protected Features | Does the lethal removal of seals by shooting have any negative impact on these sites conservation objectives |
|------------|--------------------|--|
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | [Redacted] |

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

MORAY FIRTH

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

¹⁰ Thompson D., Duck C.D., Morris C.D., Russell D.J.F. (2018). The status of harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*) in the UK. *Aquatic Conservation Marine Freshwater Ecosystems*, **29**(1), 40-60.

¹¹ <http://www.smru.st-andrews.ac.uk/scos/scos-reports/>

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

| MPA | Protected Features | Does the lethal removal of seals by shooting have any negative impact on these sites conservation objectives |
|------------|--------------------|--|
| [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |

[Redacted text block]

■ [Redacted text]

[Redacted text block]

| MPA | Protected Features | Does the lethal removal of seals by shooting have any negative impact on these sites conservation objectives |
|------------|--------------------|--|
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | ■ |
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | ■ |

[Redacted text block]

■ [Redacted text]

[Redacted text block]

| MPA | Protected Features | Does the lethal removal of seals by shooting have any negative impact on these sites conservation objectives |
|------------|--------------------|--|
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | ■ |
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | ■ |

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

| MPA | Protected Features | Does the lethal removal of seals by shooting have any negative impact on these sites conservation objectives |
|------------|--------------------|--|
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | [Redacted] |

[Redacted text block]

- [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

EAST SCOTLAND

We recommend that licences for the lethal removal of harbour seals in the East Coast Management Area are rejected due to the continued population decline of this species¹² in these areas.

- **EC06 - Tay DSFB**

NatureScot Consent assessment

We confirm that the lethal removal of **five grey seals and one harbour seal** by shooting will not have any adverse impact on the conservation objectives for the sites listed in Table 11.

Table 11 – River Tay overlap with protected sites

| MPA | Protected feature | Does the lethal removal of seals by shooting have any negative impact on these sites' conservation objectives |
|---------------|---|---|
| River Tay SAC | Atlantic salmon, brook lamprey, aquatic vegetation, otter, river lamprey, sea Lamprey | No |

¹² Thompson D., Duck C.D., Morris C.D., Russell D.J.F. (2018). The status of harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*) in the UK. *Aquatic Conservation Marine Freshwater Ecosystems*, 29(1), 40-60.

Licence recommendation

River Tay is a grade 1 river and therefore our advice is that this application **should be rejected because the stock is classed as being at a good conservation status, and therefore the lethal removal of a few individual seals is not necessary for the conservation of salmon.**

- [Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

- [Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

| MPA | Protected Features | Does the lethal removal of seals by shooting have any negative impact on these sites conservation objectives |
|------------|--------------------|--|
| [Redacted] | [Redacted] | [Redacted] |

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Comments on Applications for Licences to shoot seals in 2022 provided by the Sea Mammal Research Unit, Scottish Oceans Institute, University of St Andrews.

Potential Biological Removal (PBR) values for 2022

The PBR includes all forms of anthropogenic mortality. There is some bycatch of seals of both species in North Sea fisheries and elsewhere, the level of which is unknown.

Table 1. Potential Biological Removal (PBR) values for grey seals in Scotland by Seal Management Unit for the year 2022.

| Seal Management Area | 2016-2019 | | PBRs based on recovery factors F_R ranging from 0.1 to 1.0 | | | | | | | | | | selected | |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------|-------|
| | count | N_{min} | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.0 | F_R | PBR |
| 1 Southwest Scotland | 517 | 1,927.0 | 12 | 23 | 35 | 46 | 58 | 69 | 81 | 92 | 104 | 116 | 1.0 | 116 |
| 2 West Scotland | 4,174 | 15,554 | 93 | 187 | 280 | 373 | 467 | 560 | 653 | 747 | 840 | 933 | 1.0 | 933 |
| 2a West Scotland - Sou | 2,922 | 10,888 | | | | | | | | | | | | 653 |
| 2b West Scotland - Cer | 773 | 2,880 | | | | | | | | | | | | 173 |
| 2c West Scotland - Noi | 479 | 1,785 | | | | | | | | | | | | 107 |
| 3 Western Isles | 5,773 | 21,512 | 129 | 258 | 387 | 516 | 645 | 774 | 904 | 1,033 | 1,162 | 1,291 | 1.0 | 1,291 |
| 4 North Coast & Orkney | 8,599 | 32,043 | 192 | 385 | 577 | 769 | 961 | 1,154 | 1,346 | 1,538 | 1,730 | 1,923 | 1.0 | 1,923 |
| 4a North Coast | 414 | 1,543 | | | | | | | | | | | | 93 |
| 4b Orkney | 8,185 | 30,500 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1,830 |
| 5 Shetland | 1,009 | 3,760 | 23 | 45 | 68 | 90 | 113 | 135 | 158 | 180 | 203 | 226 | 1.0 | 226 |
| 6 Moray Firth | 1,657 | 6,175 | 37 | 74 | 111 | 148 | 185 | 222 | 259 | 296 | 333 | 370 | 1.0 | 370 |
| 7 East Scotland | 3,683 | 13,724 | 82 | 165 | 247 | 329 | 412 | 494 | 576 | 659 | 741 | 823 | 1.0 | 823 |
| SCOTLAND TOTAL | 25,412 | 94,695 | 568 | 1,137 | 1,705 | 2,271 | 2,841 | 3,408 | 3,977 | 4,545 | 5,113 | 5,682 | | 5,682 |

$$PBR = N_{min} (R_{max}/2) F_R$$

where: **PBR** is a number of animals considered safely removable from the population.

N_{min} is a minimum population estimate. A revised analysis of GPS/GSM telemetry data from 60 grey seals, tagged between 2005 and 2018, allowed more accurate identification of haulout times (SCOS-BP 21/02). The revised estimate of proportion of seals hauled out during the survey window was 25.2% (95% CI: 21.5 – 29.1%), compared with the previous estimate of 23.9% (95% CI: 19.2 – 28.6%) (SCOS-BP 16/03). The 20th centile of the distribution of scalars from counts to abundances derived from the revised estimate is 3.73, approximately 3.5% lower than the previous scalar (3.86).

R_{max} is the population growth rate at low densities (by default set 0.12 for pinnipeds), this is halved to give an estimate of the growth rate at higher populations. This estimate should be conservative for most populations at their OSP.

Table 2. Potential Biological Removal (PBR) values for harbour seals in Scotland by Seal Management Unit for the year 2022.

| Seal Management Area | 2016-2019 | | PBRs based on recovery factors F_R ranging from 0.1 to 1.0 | | | | | | | | | | selected | |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------|-------|
| | count | N_{min} | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.0 | F_R | PBR |
| 1 Southwest Scotland | 1,709 | 1,709 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 41 | 51 | 61 | 71 | 82 | 92 | 102 | 0.7 | 71 |
| 2 West Scotland | 15,600 | 15,600 | 93 | 187 | 280 | 374 | 468 | 561 | 655 | 748 | 842 | 936 | 1.0 | 936 |
| 2a West Scotland - Sou | 7,069 | 7,069 | | | | | | | | | | | | 424 |
| 2b West Scotland - Cer | 7,447 | 7,447 | | | | | | | | | | | | 447 |
| 2c West Scotland - Noi | 1,084 | 1,084 | | | | | | | | | | | | 65 |
| 3 Western Isles | 3,532 | 3,532 | 21 | 42 | 63 | 84 | 105 | 127 | 148 | 169 | 190 | 211 | 0.5 | 105 |
| 4 North Coast & Orkney | 1,405 | 1,405 | 8 | 16 | 25 | 33 | 42 | 50 | 59 | 67 | 75 | 84 | 0.1 | 8 |
| 4a North Coast | 109 | 109 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 4b Orkney | 1,296 | 1,296 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7 |
| 5 Shetland | 3,180 | 3,180 | 19 | 38 | 57 | 76 | 95 | 114 | 133 | 152 | 171 | 190 | 0.1 | 19 |
| 6 Moray Firth | 1,077 | 1,077 | 6 | 12 | 19 | 25 | 32 | 38 | 45 | 51 | 58 | 64 | 0.1 | 6 |
| 7 East Scotland | 343 | 343 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 0.1 | 2 |
| SCOTLAND TOTAL | 26,846 | 26,846 | 159 | 319 | 480 | 641 | 803 | 963 | 1,125 | 1,285 | 1,446 | 1,607 | | 1,147 |

$$PBR = N_{min} (R_{max}/2) F_R$$

where: **PBR** is a number of animals considered safely removable from the population.

N_{min} is a minimum population estimate (counts were used directly as values for N_{min}).

R_{max} is the population growth rate at low densities (by default set 0.12 for pinnipeds), this is halved to give an estimate of the growth rate at higher populations. This estimate should be conservative for most populations at their Optimum Sustainable Population (OSP).

F_R is a recovery factor, usually in the range 0.1 to 1. Low recovery factors give some protection from stochastic effects and overestimation of the other parameters. They also increase the expected equilibrium population size under the PBR.

Total number of animals requested by Seal Management Areas

The total numbers of grey seals requested by Seal Management Area are well below the PBR for these SMAs. This is also true for harbour seals in the three SMAs in western Scotland. However, in North Coast & Orkney, Moray Firth, and East Scotland the number of harbour seals requested are either higher than, equal to, or only slightly lower than the PBR values.

Table 3. Summary of the number of animals requested by applicant and by Seal Management Area (SMA), compared to the PBR values for each SMA. The yellow cells highlight values that are close to or above the PBR.

| Seal Management Area | Applicant | No. of rivers | Requested | | PBR | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|------------|---|
| | | | Hg | Pv | Hg | Pv | |
| Southwest Scotland | SW02 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Southwest Scotland | SW06 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Southwest Scotland | | | 3 | 2 | 116 | 71 | |
| West Scotland | WS05 | 3 | 6 | 3 | | | |
| West Scotland | | | 6 | 3 | 933 | 936 | * |
| Western Isles | WI18 | 1 | 5 | 0 | | | |
| Western Isles | WI28 | 1 | 6 | 0 | | | |
| Western Isles | | | 11 | 0 | 1,291 | 105 | |
| North Coast & Orkney | ONC05 | 1 | 4 | 2 | | | |
| North Coast & Orkney | ONC08 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| North Coast & Orkney | | | 5 | 3 | 1,923 | 8 | * |
| Moray Firth | MF01 | 7 | 30 | 8 | | | |
| Moray Firth | | | 30 | 8 | 370 | 6 | |
| East Scotland | EC06 | 1 | 5 | 1 | | | |
| East Scotland | EC07 | 1 | 6 | 0 | | | |
| East Scotland | EC23 | 1 | 3 | 1 | | | |
| East Scotland | | | 14 | 2 | 823 | 2 | |
| TOTAL | | | 69 | 18 | | | |

* Split up by SMA subdivision (based on the proportions of the most recent count) the PBRs for West Scotland – South are: 653Hg & 424Pv, for North Coast they are: 93Hg & 1Pv.






Figure 1. Text boxes indicate applicant (except for Moray Firth where all MF01), river name, and number of animals requested. The PBRs for each Seal Management Area (SMA) are shown with the SMA labels (PBRs for West Scotland and North Coast & Orkney are split up by subdivisions to reflect the proportion of animals counted in each subdivision). The low PBR values for the North Coast and the two eastern SMAs are highlighted. Seal counts from five full censuses are also shown, with the most recent counts (2016-2019) displayed more prominently on top of the older counts.


Individual applicants

The following tables summarise the number of animals requested by each applicant together with the totals for the given SMA (subdivision) and the relevant PBR values. For comparison, the equivalent numbers for the five previous licence periods are also provided, as well as the number of animals granted and shot in those licence periods. Where the number requested is close to the PBR for the SMA (subdivision) the relevant cells are highlighted in yellow. Additional comments may be added to highlight further points of interest.



Southwest Scotland

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the entire content area of the first table.A large black rectangular redaction box covering the entire content area of the second table.



West Scotland




Western Isles




North Coast & Orkney







Moray Firth



East Coast

| Seal Management Area: East Scotland | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Applicant: | | EC06 Tay District Salmon Fisheries Board | | | | | | | | | | | |
| River(s) | Grade | Grey seals | | | | | | Harbour seals | | | | | |
| | | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| River Tay | 1 | | | | | | 5 | | | | | | 1 |
| Applied for | | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Granted | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| Shot | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| SMA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| East Scotland | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No. of applicants | | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Applied for | | 33 | 21 | 21 | 24 | 11 | 14 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 2 |
| Granted | | 14 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| Shot | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| PBR | | 352 | 882 | 845 | 871 | 852 | 823 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Most recent count | | 2,296 | 3,812 | 3,652 | 3,762 | 3,683 | 3,683 | 224 | 368 | 346 | 342 | 343 | 343 |
| Years counted | | (2013; 2015) | (2013; 2015; 2016) | (2013; 2015; 2017) | (2016; 2018) | (2016; 2018; 2019) | (2016; 2018; 2019) | (2013; 2015) | (2013; 2015; 2016) | (2013; 2015; 2017) | (2016; 2018) | (2016; 2018; 2019) | (2016; 2018; 2019) |
| Trend | | Stable / Increasing in some areas | | | | | | Significant decline between 2002-2014; stable at lower level since | | | | | |



Two of the three applicants in the East Scotland SMA have requested a licence to shoot one harbour seal. The harbour seal population in East Scotland has declined significantly since the early 2000s. The average count for the Firth of Tay & Eden Estuary SAC since 2013 (43) is 94% lower than the highest count made in 1992 (773). The harbour seal PBR for East Scotland is set at 2.

General notes

Identification of seals

It is important that the Applicant is able to differentiate the two species of seal with confidence, especially given the state of the harbour seal population on the east coast and in the Northern Isles of Scotland.

Photographs should be taken of seals thought to be feeding on salmon, in order to identify specialist individuals that repeatedly return to a river to predate on salmon. Only once a specialist seal has been identified and no other methods are successful in deterring this individual should the applicant consider making use of a licence to kill a seal.

Carcass recovery

Every effort should be made to recover the carcasses of any seals that have been shot. Fresh carcasses can provide valuable data on diet, condition, and life history parameters. Please contact either SMRU or the Scottish Marine Animal Stranding Scheme at the University of Glasgow.