Final Island Communities Impact Assessment (ICIA) – Fisheries Management Measures within Scottish Offshore Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)

September 2025

Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

1. Step One- Develop a clear understanding of your objectives:

1.1 What are the objectives of the policy, strategy or service?

Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) are sites containing habitats and species that have been identified as being of conservation importance to Scotland, most are a subset of species and habitats identified on national, UK or international lists. In the offshore waters of Scotland (12-200 nautical miles) there are 20 sites which require the implementation of fisheries management measures to support the achievement of site conservation objectives.

These sites have been designated as MPAs or Special Areas of Conservation (SACs). From here on the term “MPAs” will encompass both types of designation. Each protected site is assigned conservation objectives for special features found within the site, these may be to conserver or to recover the feature to favourable condition. Therefore, to ensure conservation objectives are met it may be necessary to implement fisheries management measures. The measures required will depend on the sensitivity of protected features and could include spatial or temporal restrictions on certain gear types.

The Scottish Government is committed to delivering fisheries management measures for existing MPAs where these are not already in place, as well as key coastal biodiversity locations outside of these sites, directly following the consultation of the required statutory consultation processes. These measures will give protection for MPA features as well as those priority marine features identified as most at risk from bottom-contacting mobile fishing gear out with MPAs.

Proposed measures were developed for Turbot Bank MPA in which it was proposed that targeted sandeel fishing across the full site would be prohibited. In 2023 the Scottish Government consulted on a closure to all fishing for sandeel in all Scottish waters. As a result of this consultation the Scottish Government has prohibited fishing for sandeel in all Scottish waters. The Sandeel (Prohibition Of Fishing) (Scotland) Order 2024 came into force on 26 March 2024 ahead of the 2024 fishery season and applies to all vessels (UK and EU) fishing within Scottish waters.

Subsequently, we are no longer proposing site specific measures for Turbot Bank MPA and therefore measures for this site were not included within the consultation. The site still featured within the package of consultation documents as removing the site from the documents was not considered practical at this stage. This is because in addition to site specific assessments, overall assessments have been undertaken for the impacts of implementing measures as a full package.

1.2 Is the policy, strategy or service new?

This is a new policy which the Scottish Government is implementing. This policy for fisheries management measures is already reflected under various requirements under UK legislation.

Under the UK Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 and Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 Scottish Ministers have a duty to designate Nature Conservation Marine Protected

Areas (NCMPAs) which contribute to a UK network of protected marine sites. This network also includes Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs). The Conservation of Offshore Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 outline the requirement for SACs and SPAs to be managed in a way that maintains or restores the protected feature to favourable conservation status.

There are also national and international obligations, including the commitment for Good Environmental Status under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive to adhere too as well. A well-managed MPA network also helps the Government to fulfil the UK's commitment to the OSPAR Commission's strategic objective to establish ecologically coherent network of marine protected areas. In addition, the Fisheries Act 2020 amends the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 to allow Scottish Ministers to make orders for the purpose of conserving marine flora, fauna or habitats.

1.3 How are islands identified for the purpose of the policy, strategy or service?

The Islands (Scotland) Act 2018 defines an island community as a community which consists of two or more individuals, all of whom permanently inhabit (whether or not the same island), and is based on common interests, identity or geography (including in relation to any uninhabited islands whose natural environment and terrestrial, marine and associated ecosystems contribute to the natural or cultural heritage of and inhabited island).

1.4 What are the intended impacts or outcomes and do these potentially differ in the islands?

The strategic outcomes for this policy is set out under paragraph 1.1.

The intention is that these fisheries management measures will result in potential changes to fishing access within offshore MPAs as measures may include restrictions on certain gear types, spatial or temporal restrictions.

These management measures are proposed for existing sites between 12 to 200 nautical miles within MPAs. The management proposals are dependent on the site location, conservation objectives of the site and the associated risk to the features within the site. Due to the location of the sites, it is not envisaged that the measures will impact more significantly on islands, between various islands or between the islands and the mainland. Mitigation strategies included adopting a zonal management approach to measures, enabling valuable fishing to continue where possible if there would be no impact on the conservation objectives of the sites or the level of risk to features or meeting conservation objectives were considered low.

Impacts assessed include changes to fish landings and local processing (if undertaken), however there is potential impact for individuals reliant on fishing activities within areas due to be subject to prohibitive measures. To mitigate these impacts fisheries management measures were developed with engagement with the fishing industry.

A Socio-Economic Impact Assessment (SEIA) has been undertaken to explore and understand potential socio-economic impacts of the implementation of these fisheries management measures within offshore MPAs. Section 4 provides more information on the results of the SEIA assessment.

2. Step Two- Gather your data and identify your stakeholders

2.1 What data is available about the current situation in the islands?

Scotland's commercial fishing fleet and sea fisheries are significant contributors to Scotland's rural and coastal economies and the Scottish Islands are a key location for seafood production. The commercial fishing industry contributes significantly to Scotland's food and drink economy, in particular playing an important part in many remote and potentially fragile communities.

All commercial fishing vessels are required to provide information on their fishing activities. This includes species caught, area of capture, type of fishing gear used, and port of landing. Given the number of vessels involved, this gives rise to a significant data set. Annex A contains data held in relation to landings by all vessels registered in selected island communities from 2015 to 2019.

The fishing industry, across Scotland, generated £329 million Gross Value Added (GVA), accounting for 0.22% of the overall Scottish economy and 6.5% of the marine economy GVA, and provided employment for 4,886 people (headcount) in 2019[3]. Vessels registered in Aberdeenshire and Shetland Islands local authority areas were responsible for over 60% of the value of landings. Employment was attributed particularly to vessels registered in Aberdeenshire, Highlands, Shetland Islands, Argyll and Bute, Na h-Eileanan Siar and Orkney Islands (each over 5% of employment headcount).

Together with aquaculture production and imported fish, commercial fisheries provide inputs to the processing industry. The fish processing industry is important in Scotland, contributing £390 million (GVA) and employing 6,800 people (headcount) in 2019[3]. Whilst the majority of landings and fish processing occur in the Grampian region, the fishing and processing industries provide an important contribution to local economies in rural and island communities, particularly in Orkney, Shetland and the Western Isles.

In the Scottish fish processing industry, there were 127 businesses processing sea fish in 2020[1]. Table 1 shows that processing activity is concentrated in the north-east of Scotland (Grampian) with more modest levels of processing activity in "Other Scotland" and in the Highlands and Islands (where processing is on a smaller scale). 40% of processing units are located in Grampian and together they account for over 46% of total employment in the fish processing industry in Scotland.

[1] Scottish Government (2022) Scotland's Marine Economic Statistics 2019. Accessed September 2022.

Table 1 Number of Sea fish processing units in Scotland and industry employment, 2020.

Area	Sea Fish Processing Units	Industry FTE Employment
North East (Grampian)	51	3,563
Other Scotland	34	2,810
Highland and Islands	42	1,434
Total	**127**	**7,807**

Source: SeaFish, 2021[2]

2.2 Do you need to consult?

We engaged with sector stakeholders in the preparation of the policy (see paragraph 3.1). There was also an eight-week public consultation on the proposed fisheries management measures, where we invited the public and stakeholders to comment and respond to these proposals. Within this consultation we asked if this policy document appropriately reflects the potential impacts to island communities. The consultation analysis report can be found here Fisheries management measures within Scottish Offshore Marine Protected Areas (MPAs): consultation analysis - gov.scot.

2.3 How does any existing data differ between islands?

The data used in modelling is of the same standard for all islands.

2.4 Are there any existing design features or mitigations in place?

Extensive engagement with a full range of stakeholders has been undertaken through this work package, from the initial designation of MPAs to the development of the fisheries management measures referred to here. By developing measures with extensive stakeholder input, this helps to ensure the correct balance between achieving the conservation objectives of the sites and allowing sustainable fishing activities to continue where possible. The majority of proposals were developed between 2013-2017 with stakeholders, and underpinned by scientific and conservation advice provided by JNCC. Following this initial round of engagement, further scientific evidence became available for some sites in 2022 and measures were updated accordingly with stakeholder input.

Some proposed measures included a zonal management approach, where fishing is restricted in certain areas within the protected area enabling fishing to continue where there would be no impact, or the risk to features was minimal. In line with The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004[3], a

[2] SeaFish 2021. Seafood processing industry performance report. Accessed 13 September 2022.
[3] The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 [online] (accessed 07/03/2024)

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) has been undertaken. In addition, a Socio-economic Impact Assessment (SEIA) has also been conducted.

All proposed fisheries measures were subject to public consultation. The responses to the consultation were analysed and the proposals were reviewed accordingly where relevant.

3. Step Three- Consultation

3.1 Is there any information already gathered through previous engagement. Who are your key stakeholders?

Extensive engagement with a full range of stakeholders has been undertaken, and the fisheries management measures referred to here were developed with stakeholders to ensure the correct balance between achieving the conservation objectives of the sites and allowing sustainable fishing activities to continue where possible. All proposed measures were subject to public consultation and consultation results were assessed and addressed as needed.

From 2013-2016 Scottish Government held a series of stakeholder workshops where the potential fisheries management measures were discussed for the offshore sites. These workshops were attended by fishing industry representatives, environmental Non-Governmental Organisations (eNGOs) and marine scientists. The proposals and views expressed for each site were taken into account at each workshop with the aim to balance the protection of the marine ecosystem against the socio-economic fishing interests. Following delays due to Brexit and Covid-19, updates to proposals following the availability of new evidence were presented to stakeholders in throughout in January to April 2022.

Prior to Brexit, co-ordination and consultation with EU member states and the relevant involvement of the North Sea Advisory Council and North Western Waters Advisory Council has taken place. This engagement involved presentations of revised fisheries management proposals and invites to the previously mentioned workshops. We shared the proposals with the EU commission and relevant member states and invited them to comment and share their views in the public consultation.

Key Stakeholders

Fisheries management measures are likely to be of interest to all sea users, group and individuals who have a vested interest in the marine environment and its health and protection.

Due to the location and level of restriction that these proposed fisheries management measures will place on sea users, particularly the commercial fishing sector, we would envisage that stakeholders most likely to be impacted by their implementation would include commercial fisheries sector and environmental groups.

We would not rule out the possibility of other sectors such as Miliary and Defence, Oil and Gas, Seabed Mining, Shipping, Aquaculture (Finfish, Shellfish and

Seaweed), Recreational Angling and Boating and Tourism having an interest in these management measures.

Specifically, a number of stakeholders who have engaged with Officials throughout the development process of the draft management measures include the following:

- Aberdeen Producers Organisation
- Hooktone Ltd
- Oceana
- Orkney Fisheries Association (OFA)
- Open Seas
- Scottish Fishermen's Federation (SFF)
- Scottish White Fish Producers Association (SWFPA)
- SE Link (and associated members)

3.2 How long will you carry out your consultation and in what timescales? Public meetings/ local authorities/ key stakeholders?

We have engaged with sector stakeholders and eNGOs in the preparation of this strategy (see paragraph 3.1). As part of the legislative process of implementing new policy, we consulted on the proposed fisheries management measures in an eight-week public consultation in 2024.

This would therefore be an appropriate stage in the process to carry out further engagement on how to ensure the policy may impact the needs of different island communities, if they have not already been quantified through targeted stakeholder engagement and assessments.

As we progress the policy development stages we will undertake stakeholder engagement events, as necessary. Planned consultation events will be sent through the stakeholder mailing list and through Marine Directorate social media channels and information available upon request to marine_biodiversity@gov.scot. We encourage and are always keen to hear the views of our stakeholders at any point throughout the process.

Some of the main points for engagement with stakeholders throughout the policy process has been:

1. Meetings with representative stakeholders to inform of site development progress.
2. Workshop sessions with representative stakeholders prior to the launch of the public consultation to inform of the Sustainability Appraisal completion.
3. An eight-week statutory public consultation on the proposed fisheries management measures, both for inshore and offshore programmes respectively.
4. Engagement sessions and requested meetings during the public consultation on the fisheries management measures while the consultations were live.

3.3 What questions will you ask when considering how to address island realities?

Throughout the consultation document we provided opportunities for the public and stakeholders to provide comments and feedback under each site proposal where respondents were able to highlight if there are specific impacts to island communities which have not been accounted for. In addition, we also provided the opportunity for specific feedback on the various impact assessments including the Sustainability Appraisal, SEIA, SEA, partial Business Regulatory Impact Assessments (BRIAs), draft Fisheries Assessments and this partial ICIA.

3.4 Will there be separate consultation events for island communities/Local Authorities/ key stakeholders?

See paragraph 3.2. We held consultation engagement sessions while the public consultation was live. These were open for the public and stakeholders to attend in person and online, irrespective of whether they are based on the mainland or on the islands.

3.5 How will the views of island communities be gathered through consultations.

This ICIA was available for the public and stakeholders to view and comment on during the eight-week public consultation process. There was a specific question within the consultation relating to the ICIA and those wishing to were able to submit their views. We have gathered and analysed all responses and in a consultation analysis report, found here: Fisheries management measures within Scottish Offshore Marine Protected Areas (MPAs): consultation analysis - gov.scot..

4. Assessment

4.1 Does your assessment identify any unique impacts on island communities?

No data has been collected from stakeholders or revealed within the other associated assessments which would indicate that there are any unique impacts on island communities that are required to be considered.

Demographic

It is not anticipated there will be any unique impacts.

Gaelic:

N/A

Economic and Social

The introduction of this policy will impact vessels fishing within offshore MPAs. The policy will add restrictions on certain gear types, spatial or temporal restrictions.

The policy change will impact vessels with an island home port the same way it will impact vessels with a mainland home port. The management measures for each site are dependent on the features of the site, conservation objectives and the risk to the features from the pressures of fishing activity. In addition, the anticipated impacts, both positive (e.g., conservation of site features*)* and negative (e.g., potential loss in landings) are expected to be similar for mainland and island communities.

The policy is not expected to have unique social impact on island communities in terms of deprivation and social exclusion in the islands.

Part of the SEIA investigates the potential cumulative economic benefits and costs, and associated potential social impacts, of implementing the proposed management measures at each site. The impacts relating to the distribution of the economic costs and consequent social impacts as a result of these proposed fisheries management measures are most relevant for this partial ICIA.

The SEIA presents an estimated value range for each proposed management option. Estimates for Option 1 represent the measures which restrict gears identified as damaging to designated features, for 15 sites these are zonal and for the remaining 5 these are across the full site. The Option 2 estimate range represents management measures that restrict affected fishing gears across the entire site boundaries.

Across the full suite of sites, the implementation of this policy is estimated to:

- Reduce the average annual value of output landed by the UK commercial fisheries sector by between £0.7–2.7 million (Option 1) and £4.8–8.0 million (Option 2);
- Reduce GVA (direct and indirect) of the UK commercial fisheries sector over the 20-year period by £6.5–22.4 million (Option 1) to £40–66 million (Option 2) (present value); and
- Reduce the average employment (mean number of jobs, direct and indirect) of the UK commercial fisheries sector by between 9 - 34 (Option 1) and 61 - 101 (Option 2) full time equivalents (FTEs).

Distribution of Economic Costs and Consequent Social Impacts

Table 14 and 15 within the SEIA shows the key results of the distributional analysis. A copy of both these tables are provided in Annex B (Table B*1* and Table B*2* respectively).

Under the higher end of the estimated impact of Option 1, the share of total reductions in landings occur predominantly within Scotland (76%). Within this, Fraserburgh, Orkney and Shetland are the home port districts with the highest impacts (Table **A*2***). Under Option 2, the districts with the highest proportion of landings affected are Fraserburgh, Peterhead and Orkney (Table **A*2***). The impacts are concentrated in coastal areas in areas of the North-East and remote rural in North and North-West and Islands.

Under the higher end of the estimated impact of Option 1, Fraserburgh and Orkney would be attributed to the largest absolute employment impact for FTEs. The largest relative employment impact (reduction in FTE as % of total regularly employed in fishing in home port district) is at Orkney (3%), followed by Shetland (1.8%) and Fraserburgh (1.2%). Under Option 2, the largest relative employment impacts were attributed to Orkney (3.9%), Fraserburgh (3.7%) and Peterhead (2.9%), (Table B*3*).

Relating to fish processes under the higher end of the estimated impact of Option 1, Peterhead, Scrabster, Kinlochbervie and Ullapool are most significantly affected with minimal negative effect noted. The ports affected with the largest relative impact (based on landings affected compared to total landings to port of landing, Table **A*3***) for the higher end of the estimated impact of Option 1 within Scotland are at Aberdeen (3.6%), Cullivoe (2.8%) and Kinlochbervie (2.4%). Again, impacts are concentrated in coastal areas; rural in North-East, remote rural in North and North-West and Islands.

Under the higher end of the estimated impact of Option 1 and Option 2, the main gear types affected would include demersal vessels and in turn potentially affect fish processers that cannot offset reductions in local landings with imported fish (at a minimal negative effect) (Table B*2*).

The significance of the impacts depends on their scale relative to the size and socio-economic characteristics of the affected ports. The combined effects of sites are considered in relation to home port district employment and landings at port of landing, in percentage terms. Both show potential for significant consequential social impacts.

Distribution of Economic Costs- Location

The annual average value of landings affected (Table **A*2***) show that:

- In the higher end of the estimated impact of Option 1, the expected costs of the proposed management options are predominantly on Scottish ports. It is estimated that over 76% of the total affected landings would be from vessels registered to Scottish ports. Landings from vessels registered at Fraserburgh are about 27% of the landings affected under the estimate. Note these totals are not the percentage of landings lost at the port of landing which are described in Table **A*3***.

- Under Option 2, the majority of impacts are felt in Scotland (72%), with most losses from vessels registered at Fraserburgh (29% of total losses), followed by Peterhead (10%), Ayr and Orkney (both 8%). Outside of Scotland, the majority of losses arise to vessels registered in the North East of England (15%); with unknown home port registration (11%) account for the remainder.

While these ports may bear the greater proportion of the total effects, the significance of impacts depend on their scale relative to the size of the affected

home port district. The impacts per port district are calculated as relative to total landings per home district. Table B*3* shows the impact on landings;

- The impact on landings is small across all Scottish ports under the lower estimate. The highest is Orkney which has up to 2.5% of total landings potentially affected.
- The employment impacts vary across ports, although they are generally low as a percentage of total employment.
- In the higher end of the estimated impact of Option 1, the value of landings potentially lost as a result of the proposed management options represents a very small proportion of total landings by home port for all of Scotland's districts and ports affected.
- The majority of the impacts on employment under Option 2 are at Orkney and Fraserburgh (based on landings affected by registered home port of the vessels).
- An estimated 16 jobs would be affected in total at these ports, which is 3% of the local fishing workforce in Orkney (6.5 jobs), and 1.2% (9 jobs) in Fraserburgh.

Fish Processing

As described in Section 2.1 the processing activity is concentrated in the north-east of Scotland (Grampian) with more modest levels of processing activity in "Other Scotland" and in the Highlands and Islands (where processing is on a smaller scale).

Management options are, however, anticipated to restrict commercial fishing activity, and have the potential to reduce the quantity of seafish landed locally at Scottish landing ports. This could reduce the supply of locally landed catch to fish processing facilities and the hotel/restaurant, retail and wholesale trades, and/or reduce confidence and hence investment in these sectors, in particular the fish processing industry. The significance of the economic impact will depend upon various factors, including:

- The extent to which the landings of different species are affected (i.e., demersal, shellfish) and the dependency of different processing units on these species;
- The distribution of affected landings across landing ports/regions and the dependency of landing ports on the affected landings; and
- The dependency of fish processing units in these regions/ports on processing locally landed catch, and their ability to offset reductions in local landings with landings that would have gone to ports where impacts are lower, and/or with imported fish.

Table 21 within the SEIA shows the distribution of all the lost landings across UK and non-UK ports from the MPAs.

- Under Option 1, the port subject to the largest proportion of the affected landings is Peterhead (up to 24.7% of the total impacts across Scotland). This

is followed by Scrabster (19.2%), Kinlochbervie (13.3%),Ullapool (11.2%) and Lerwick (10.5%).

Under Option 2, the most significantly impacted ports are the same, with Peterhead accounting for 36.0% of the total impacts. Note that impacts at Ullapool as a percentage of total impacts decrease under the upper estimate (11.2% to 7.1%),and impacts at Fraserburgh increase from up to 6.5% under Option 1 to 11.6% under Option 2. However, the high percentage of landings affected can be a reflection of the very small size of the port, as well as the absolute size of the impact. The size of the impact on these ports depends on the relative importance of the landings affected within the total landings to the port. The impacts as a percentage of the total landings at each port are provided in Table 22, a copy is provided within Annex D1,:

- Under Option 1, the most significant impacts on Scottish ports are at Aberdeen (3.6%), Cullivoe (2.8%) and Kinlochbervie (2.4%).
- Under Option 2, impacts at Aberdeen show a significant increase (to 13.8%). For other Scottish ports affected (Cullivoe, Kinlochbervie), the landings affected as a percentage of total landings to the port all increase in percentage terms, and in actual value.

At several of these locations, the impacts could potentially affect local fish processing businesses, due to the scale of the landings affected. This could have social consequences, as identified in Table 15 of the SEIA (Annex B2). This is particularly the case where a large proportion of landings, as shown in Table **A3**A3, are potentially affected (particularly Aberdeen, where 13.8% of total landings are affected under Option 2), and where there are fish processing businesses within remote communities.

4.2 Does your assessment identify any potential barriers or wider impacts?

No additional barriers have been identified, however, as identified within the SEIA the estimated of costs and benefits are subject to significant uncertainties. The range of impacts vary greatly on the management options and the assumptions applied.

The combined worst-case impacts from management options for a small number of sites could have locally significant adverse social impacts in specific coastal communities. There are three ports or port districts (Fraserburgh, Shetland and Ullapool) that would be affected in terms of both the loss of landings to the port, and the loss of employment opportunities on vessels for which they are the homeport. Therefore, there are at increased risk of adverse negative socio-economic consequences from the combined effects of the site management measures.

In addition, all of the estimates of costs and benefits are subject to significant uncertainties. The range of impacts vary greatly depending on the management option and assumptions applied. The extend to which fisheries landings affected will be lost, or the activity will be displaced to other areas, and the consequential impacts of this displacement, are uncertain. In addition, the consequential socio-economic

impacts in report or fragile communities may have the potential to be greater than the estimates presented.

Therefore, we welcome any concerns of impacts, relating specifically to island communities, to be submitted via our stakeholder engagement and public consultation process for consideration.

4.3 Are there mitigations already in place for these impacts raised?

No significantly different impacts for island communities are expected therefore no specific mitigations have been put in place to address this. However, policy wide mitigation has taken place during the development process of these measures. See previous Section 2.4 on details of mitigation steps taken.

4.4 Are there mitigations in place for the impacts identified and noted above from stakeholders and community consultations?

See previous section 2.4 on details of mitigation steps taken.

If through the public consultation process any impacts are raised from stakeholder and communities that have not been taken into account, Marine Directorate will address these impacts and develop suitable mitigation options, if relevant and required. The final ICIA will be updated to note these changes.

4.5 Does the evidence show different circumstances or different expectations or needs, or different experiences or outcomes (such as levels of satisfaction, or different rates of participation)?

Engagement with the fishing industry and environmental organisations to date have shown different levels of ambition of fisheries management to be delivered. A range of options have been assessed within the reports and assessments to show level of impact to the environment and socio-economics under each anticipated option. The consultation will help to inform of the stakeholders' issues and concerns of these options. It will then be for Ministers to decide on the option taken forward for the final fisheries management measures.

Although having differing views there has been broad support of the proposed fisheries management for offshore MPAs from the fishing industry and environmental organisations.

4.6 Are these different effects likely?

The policy change will have an impact on certain fishing activity occurring in offshore MPAs. The impact of these measures are dependent on the activity occurring within the site and the risk to features of the site and meeting the conservation objectives of the designated site.

There is the potential for this policy change to have varying effects and impacts across the different ports within Scotland under each of the various estimates. However, the impacts assessed is spread across various homeports based on

landings affected by registered home port of the vessels and does not significantly impact the islands more than the mainland.

4.7 Are these effects significantly different?

No, of the impacts assessed under the various estimates within the SEIA the impacts are spread across various homeports based on landings affected by registered home port of vessels. Island communities are not significantly more impacted and effects are consistent with those on the mainland such as Fraserburgh, Kinlochbervie or Peterhead.

4.8 Could the effect amount to a disadvantage for an island community compared to the mainland or between island groups?

No, of the impacts assessed under the various estimates within the SEIA the impacts are spread across various homeports based on landings affected by registered home port of vessels. Island communities are not significantly more impacted and is consistent with their equivalents on the mainland such as Fraserburgh, Kinlochbervie or Peterhead and between island groups such as Orkney and Shetland.

However as stated in Section 4.2, it should be recognised that within the SEIA the estimated of costs and benefits are subject to significant uncertainties. The range of impacts vary greatly on the management options and the assumptions applied.

In addition, the consequential socio-economic impacts in remote or fragile communities may have the potential to be greater that the estimates presented within the SEIA assessment.

4.9 Do you consider a full Islands Community Impact Assessment (ICIA) to be required?

In preparing this partial ICIA, I have formed the opinion that our policy, strategy or service is not likely to have an effect on an island community which is significantly different from its effect on other communities (including other island communities). The reason for this is detailed below in Section 4.10.

4.10 What are the reasons for or not completing a full ICIA?

Having considered the results from the SEIA assessment, discussions and engagement with stakeholders likely to be affected by this policy implementation, and the responses to the public consultation, there is no evidence currently to suggest that the policy change will have an effect on island communities which is significantly different from its effect on other communities. Therefore, we do not consider that a full ICIA is required.

Screening Draft ICIA completed by: Aisling Duncan

Position: MPA Programme Manager

Signature: Aisling Duncan

Date completed: 25 July 2024

Draft ICIA approved by: Caroline Cowan

Position: Deputy Director and Portfolio Lead for Marine Environment

Signature: Caroline Cowan

Date approved: 25 July 2024

Screening ICIA completed by: Conor Nangle

Position: Offshore MPA Team Lead

Signature: Conor Nangle

Date completed: 15 August 2025

ICIA approved by: Caroline Cowan

Position: Deputy Director and Portfolio Lead for Marine Environment

Signature: Caroline Cowan

Date approved: 15 August 2025

Annex A Landings data for Orkney, Shetland and Western Isles

Table A1 This data provides an overview of key relevant data held for the fishing sector for three of Scotland's islands communities: Orkney, Shetland and the Western Isles.

Region	Demersal - Tonnes	Demersal - Value (£)	Pelagic - Tonnes	Pelagic - Value (£)	Shellfish - Tonnes	Shellfish - Value (£)	Total - Tonnes	Total - Value (£)
Orkney - Scotland	26,293	46,337,055	189	187,477	22,354	50,040,061	48,836	96,564,593
Orkney - Outside Scotland	460	984,733	0	0	1345	3,275,834	1805	4,260,567
Orkney - Total	26,753	47,321,788	189	187,477	23,699	53,315,895	50,641	100,825,160
Shetland - Scotland	80,392	153,970,462	121,128	99,802,082	10,445	27,206,893	211,966	280,979,437
Shetland - Outside Scotland	274	489,900	351,638	256,613,462	1005	3,162,051	352,917	260,265,413
Shetland - Total	80,667	154,460,362	472,766	356,415,544	11,451	30,368,943	564,883	541,244,850
Western Isles – Scotland	883	6,256,139	8	7,973	18,806	62,531,023	19,696	68,795,135
Western Isles - Outside Scotland	1	1,728	0	5	228	441,393	229	443,126

Western Isles - Total	884	6,257,868	8	7,978	19,034	62,972,415	19,926	69,238,261
Other Scottish Islands - Scotland	336,752	604,664,386	513,118	348,967,932	180,133	576,763,389	1,030,003	1,530,395,707
Other Scottish Islands - Outside Scotland	44,440	71,367,767	410,517	260,646,509	63,909	129,008,218	518,866	461,022,494
Other Scottish Islands - Total	381,192	676,032,153	923,635	609,614,441	244,042	705,771,607	1,548,869	1,991,418,200
Sum Total	489,495	884,072,171	1,396,598	966,225,440	298,226	852,428,861	2,184,318	270,272,6472

Total landings of demersal, pelagic and shellfish species by vessels based in Orkney, Shetland and Western Isles (Stornoway) to Scotland and outside of Scotland between 2015-2019. Other Scottish vessels have been included which represents vessels registers to island ports outside of the three island council areas (Orkney, Shetland and Western Isles).

Table A2 Distribution of total landings affected across all sites, by region and home district of vessels (adapted from Table 17 of the SEIA)

District location	Home Port District	Management Option 1	Management Option 2
Scottish Districts	Aberdeen	N.D. – <0.1%	<0.1%
Scottish Districts	Ayr	N.D. – 4.2%	7.5%
Scottish Districts	Buckie	N.D. – 1%	2.5%
Scottish Districts	Campbeltown	N.D. – 0.3%	0.2%
Scottish Districts	Eyemouth	N.D. – 0.2%	0.1%
Scottish Districts	Fraserburgh	>10% - 27.2%	29.2%
Scottish Districts	Kinlochbervie	N.D.	N.D.
Scottish Districts	Lochinver	N.D. – 1.6%	4.2%
Scottish Districts	Mallaig	N.D.	N.D.
Scottish Districts	Oban	N.D. – 1.0%	0.6%
Scottish Districts	Orkney	>10% - 19.2%	8.2%
Scottish Districts	Peterhead	N.D. – 7.6%	9.5%
Scottish Districts	Pittenweem	N.D. – 0.2%	0.1%
Scottish Districts	Portree	N.D.	N.D.
Scottish Districts	Shetland	N.D. – 13.2%	6.0%
Scottish Districts	Stornoway	N.D.	N.D.
Scottish Districts	Ullapool	N.D.	2.2%
Scottish Districts	Wick	N.D.	N.D.
Unknown Districts	Unknown	3.2% - 11.3%	11.5%

N.D. = Value cannot be disclosed, as it relates to the operations of fewer than five vessels.

Table A3 Landings affected as a percentage of total landings at each port of landing (adapted from Table 22 of the SEIA)

Port of Landing District	Port of Landing	Option 1	Option 2
Aberdeen	Aberdeen	0% - 3.6%	13.8%
Aberdeen	Arbroath	0% - <0.1%	0.2%
Aberdeen	Gourdon	0%	<0.1%
Aberdeen	Montrose	0% - 1.0%	4.8%
Buckie	Buckie	0% - 0.2%	0.5%
Campbeltown	Campbeltown	0%	0.2%
Eyemouth	Eyemouth	0% - 0.6%	0.8%
Fraserburgh	Fraserburgh	<0.1% - 0.5%	2.4%
Fraserburgh	Macduff	<0.1% - 0.3%	1.0%
Kinlochbervie	Kinlochbervie	0.3% - 2.4%	6.6%
Lochinver	Lochinver	0% - <0.1%	0.1%
Mallaig	Mallaig	0% - 0.3%	0.3%
Oban	Oban	0% - <0.1%	<0.1%
Orkney	Orkney	0% - <0.1%	<0.1%
Orkney	Stromness	0%	<0.1%
Peterhead	Peterhead	0.1% - 0.4%	1.7%
Pittenweem	Pittenweem	0% - 0.2%	0.2%
Portree	Uig	0%	<0.1%
Shetland	Cullivoe	<0.1% - 2.8%	3.7%
Shetland	Lerwick	0.1% - 0.5%	0.9%
Shetland	Scalloway and Isles	<0.1% - 0.2%	0.5%
Shetland	West Burrafirth	0% - <0.1%	<0.1%
Stornoway	Barra	0% - <0.1%	0.1%
Stornoway	Northbay	0%	<0.1%
Stornoway	Stornoway	0% - <0.1%	<0.1%
Ullapool	Ullapool	<0.1% - 1.5%	2.8%
Wick	Scrabster	1% - 1.4%	3.3%

N/A: Unable to calculate affected landings as a percentage of total landings for vessels where home district registration is unknown.

No impact is shown as 0%

Annex B Distribution of economic costs and impacts

Table B1 Distribution of quantified economic costs for commercial fisheries and fish processors (higher end of the estimated impact of Option 1 unless otherwise specified) — Location, age, gender (Table 14 of the SEIA)

Sector/ Impact	Location - Regions	Location - Port (s)	Location - Rural, Urban, Coastal or Island	Age - Children	Age - Working Age	Age - Pensionable Age	Gender - Male	Gender - Female
Commercial Fisheries **Reduction in landed value, GVA and employment, linked back to home port of vessels**	Share of total reductions in landings: Scotland: 76%, with Fraserburgh, Orkney and Shetland most significantly impacted Other UK: 11% Unknown registration: 11%	Largest absolute employment impact for higher end of Option 1 is at Fraserburgh 9 FTEs and Orkney 7 FTEs. Largest relative employment impact (reduction in FTE as % of total regularly employed in fishing in home port district) for the higher end of Option 1 is at Orkney (3%)	x Impacts concentrated in coastal areas; rural in North-East, remote rural in North and North-West, and Islands.	x Potential negative effect if parent loses job/ becomes unemployed	x	0	x 34 FTE job losses	x Potential negative effect if member of household loses job/ becomes unemployed
Fish Processors **Reduction in local**	x Peterhead, Scrabster, Kinlochbervie and Ullapool	Largest relative impact (based on landings affected compared to total landings to port of	x Impacts concentrated in coastal areas; rural in	x	x	0	x 60% of processors male	x 40% of processors female*

landings at landing ports	are most significantly affected in Scotland.	landing for the higher end of the estimated impact of Option 1 is outside Scotland at Londonderry (5.4%). In Scotland, the largest relative impacts are at: Aberdeen (3.6%) Cullivoe (2.8%) Kinlochbervie (2.4%)	North-East, remote rural in North and North-West, and Islands.					

Impacts: xxx: significant negative effect; xx: possible negative effects; x: minimal negative effect, if any; 0: no noticeable effect expected.

* Seafish (2022) Processing Enquiry Tool. Updated Jan 2022.

Table B2 Distribution of quantified economic costs for commercial fisheries and fish processors (higher end of the estimated impact of Option 1 unless otherwise specified) — Fishing groups, income groups and social groups (Table 15 of SEIA)

Sector / Impact	**Fishing Groups - Vessel Category <12 m, >12 m**	**Fishing Groups - Gear Types / Sector**	**Income Group - 10% Most Deprived**	**Income Group - Middle 80%**	**Income Group - 10% Most Affluent**	**Social Groups - Crofters**	**Social Groups - Ethnic Minorities**	**Social Groups - With Disability or Long-Term Sick**
Commercial fisheries **Reduction in landed value, GVA and employment, linked back to home port of vessels**	Impacts on >12 m vessels	Main gear types affected for vessels are demersal trawls.	X Possible negative impact on 10% most deprived	x Possible negative impact on middle income group	x Possible negative impact on upper income group under upper estimate of Option 1, but wage data not available to confirm	0	EU/EEA nationals account for 14% of employment on Scottish vessels, and non-EEA nationals 7% (mostly Filippino) Approximately a third of employment is of non-UK nationals (mostly from outside of the EU)[4]	0 No employment data
Fish Processors **Reduction in local landings at**		Impact on different types of processing units:	X	x	0	0	51% of employment in fish processing in Scotland is of EEA nationals,	No breakdown of fish processing employment data around

[4] Seafish (2022). 2021 Employment in the UK Fishing Fleet. [Online]. Accessed 08 September 2022.

landing ports		Demersal fish processing units that cannot offset reductions in local landings with imported fish: x					1% of 'other/ unknown'[5]	disability or long-term sick

Impacts: xxx: significant negative effect; xx: possible negative effects; x: minimal negative effect, if any; 0: no noticeable effect expected

[5] Seafish (2019) Labour and Employment in UK seafood processing 2019 Annual Report. [Online]. Accessed 08 September 2022.

Table B3 Landings affected as a percentage of total landings and job losses as a percentage of total number of fishermen employed, by home district (Table 18 of SEIA)

Home Port District	Estimated reduction in employment (FTEs) - Option 1	Estimated reduction in employment (FTEs) - Option 2	Affected value of landings as % of total landings by vessels registered to Home District - Option 1	Affected value of landings as % of total landings by vessels registered to Home District - Option 2	In employment as % of total regularly employed in fishing [1] - Option 1	In employment as % of total regularly employed in fishing [1] - Option 2
Aberdeen	0 - <1	<1	0% – <0.1%	0.1%	0%– <0.1%	<0.1%
Ayr	0 - 1	8	0% – 0.8%	4.0%	0%–0.4%	1.9%
Buckie	0 - <1	3	<0.1% – 0.2%	1.4%	0%–0.3%	2.4%
Campbeltown	0 - <1	<1	0% – <0.1%	0.1%	0%–<0.1%	0.1%
Eyemouth	0 - <1	<1	0% – 0.1%	0.1%	0%–<0.1%	0.1%
Fraserburgh	0 - 9	30	0.1% – 0.5%	1.4%	0%–1.2%	3.7%
Kinlochbervie	0	0	0.1% - 0.2%	1.3%	0%–0%	0%
Lochinver	0 - 1	4	<0.1% – 0.3%	2.4%	0%–0.3%	2.1%
Mallaig	0	0	0% – <0.1%	0.4%	0%–0%	0%
Oban	0 - <1	<1	0% – 0.2%	0.4%	0%–0.1%	0.2%
Orkney	0 - 7	8	1.6% – 2.5%	3.2%	0%–3.0%	3.9%
Peterhead	0 – 3	10	<0.1% – 0.2%	0.9%	0%–0.8%	2.9%
Pittenweem	0 - <1	<1	0% – 0.1%	0.1%	*	*
Portree	0	0	0% – <0.1%	<0.1%	0%–0%	0%
Shetland	0 – 4	6	<0.1% – 0.3%	0.4%	0%–1.8%	2.5%
Stornoway	0	0	0% – <0.1%	<0.1%	0%–0%	0%
Ullapool	0	2	0% – 0.3%	1.7%	0%–0%	1.3%

Wick	0	0	<0.1% – 0.1%	0.2%	*	*
Unknown	1 - 4	12	N/A	N/A	*	*

[1] As reported in Scottish Sea Fisheries Statistics 2019

* Employment data for these districts were not available

No impact is shown as 0%

N/A: Unable to calculate affected landings as a percentage of total landings for vessels where home district registration is unknown.

Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

© Crown copyright 2025

OGL

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit **nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3** or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: **psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk**.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at **www.gov.scot**

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at

The Scottish Government
St Andrew's House
Edinburgh
EH1 3DG

ISBN: 978-1-80643-036-9 (web only)

Published by The Scottish Government, September 2025

Produced for The Scottish Government by APS Group Scotland, 21 Tennant Street, Edinburgh EH6 5NA
PPDAS1638426 (09/25)