

From: [Adrian, Alex](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Hand Harvesting of Seaweeds - Harvest Options Process
Date: 31 May 2018 13:42:00

Morning [REDACTED],

Thanks for your response. I've responded alongside your queries themselves below. Most appear to be about licensing – which we are already doing and have been for some years – rather than the options process but I've responded as best I can anyway

I'm awaiting responses from others, so will probably revert with any recommendations/changes once I've seen all. I met with [REDACTED] from Heb Seaweed a couple of weeks back and in addition to discussions (referenced below) he intends to provide a written response as well.

Kind regards

Alex

Alex Adrian
Aquaculture Operations Manager
Crown Estate Scotland (Interim Management)
0131 260 6076 / 07920 536823
6 Bells Brae, Edinburgh, EH4 3BJ
www.crownestatescotland.com
[@crownestatescot](#)

Legal disclaimer – important notice

The information in this message, including any attachments, is intended solely for the use of the person to whom it is addressed. It may be confidential and it should not be disclosed to or used by anyone else. If you receive this message in error please let the sender know straight away. We cannot accept liability resulting from email transmission. Crown Estate Scotland's head office is at 6 Bells Brae, Edinburgh EH4 3BJ

From: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 11:30 AM
To: Adrian, Alex <alex.adrian@crownestatescotland.com>
Subject: RE: Hand Harvesting of Seaweeds - Harvest Options Process

Hi Alex,

Finally got round to this!

First point is pedantic, but 100m below MLWS would cross the North Sea! Perhaps 100m from shore would be better? **Take your point, wording could have been better! 'Below' MLWS is meant as 'seaward of'. We tend to speak of developments as 'below' or 'above' MLWS but I can see this can be unclear. In effect the process described will apply to 'foreshore and near-shore' (out to 100m from MLWS), since [REDACTED] raised the point that much of their harvest is not by hand but by the bespoke seaweed mower that they use, but is still part of the harvesting that will not be covered by statutory licensing (far as I'm aware anyway)**

What about licensing for different species on the same area of shore? My initial suggestion would be that the licence should cover all species, as multiple leases for the same area of shore for different species would be hard to manage and monitor. **We already have the licence we will**

use and the terms are already in place – Heb Seaweed, Mara, New Wave Foods, etc all are subject to the licence and have been for some years. This process is about an Options process that will precede licensing, to accommodate the increasing competition we are seeing and are anticipating, for larger (volume/extent) harvesting proposals not covered by any statutory process. The current agreement terms will essentially licence what has been sought from where, subject to SNH confirmation of no evident unacceptable environmental effects (or conflicts and as long as it's on Crown land). So some existing licences are single species, while most are multi-species. With respect to the Options, █████ raised a point about different Option terms – chiefly the extent over which an Option might apply - for single versus multi-species proposals. His argument is that while multi-species harvesting tends to be more concentrated in particular areas, single species is more extensive. I will await his written response but that is something we might look at so that we reflect business need

Would the licence grant exclusivity? If not, multiple operators sharing a resource could get messy! In word, no. Existing (and future) foreshore/near shore licenses do not grant exclusivity to the ground or a stock – they simply licence a consented volume for identified species at identified location(s). Think of it as a fishing quota – having a quota doesn't mean you have exclusivity to that whole fish stock within the waters in which you fish but that you may legally take and land the volume agreed. If harvesters wish to take as much as is sustainably available at any particular location, then it will be the scientific robustness of their stock assessment in accurately identifying that volume (in SNH's view) that will confer a de facto exclusivity such that further harvesting is highly unlikely to be licensed. On-going monitoring will serve to confirm this. There is nothing to prevent more than one harvesting interest at any one location, particularly if they are taking different species. Their cumulative effects ref things like biodiversity, disturbance, etc would have to be the subject of a collective management agreement though. That is a matter for the industry to address, if sustainably available volumes of particular commercially interesting species are in effect sterilized by an inability by parties to work sustainably alongside one another.

How long does a harvesting licence last for? Licences are granted for an initial period, usually three years, and renewable thereafter subject to satisfactory review. Licences include reporting terms for harvesting activity and associated monitoring. As long as these show that licensees are sticking to the terms of the agreement and that no adverse environmental effects are evident, the licence can persist indefinitely, in theory anyway. Given we are at a very early stage in seaweed harvesting, the effects may well take time to manifest themselves. Heb Seaweed for example take an approach of taking less so that they can return sooner, for particular locations. The whole topic of harvesting sustainability however is likely to be a moveable feast over time given things like climate change, local social acceptance and conflicting interest, etc.

Controls and regulations only work if they are policed. Who would be responsible for making sure operators were abiding to the proposal for volumes they applied for? There is the reporting requirement I've referred to above, and ultimately if the harvesting levels are unsustainable, the business will suffer itself. Seaweed harvesting of this nature cannot be policed frankly by any authority outside of reporting and perhaps auditing of volumes handled/sold. Essentially if those undertaking wild harvesting need to be policed, then it is unsustainable by definition. Sustainability must be integral to the practices employed, not subject to how effectively harvesters are policed. As you know, in my view this is an industry issue – if the perception is arrived at that seaweed harvesting is essentially uncontrolled and unsustainable, then everyone

suffers. A badged industry CoC that is integral to sales and marketing of wild seaweeds would be my recommendation, that 'polices' at delivery rather than harvest. The MSC fisheries certification requirement (which I understand is now almost mandatory to get retail sales in the UK?) is an example of how this might work.

Happy to discuss,

Thanks,

██████████

From: Adrian, Alex <alex.adrian@crownestatescotland.com>

Sent: 17 May 2018 09:25

To: ██████████@newwavefoods.co.uk>; ██████████
██████████@newwavefoods.co.uk>; ██████████@maraseaweed.com>; ██████████
██████████@maraseaweed.com>; ██████████; ██████████
██████████@arramara.ie>; ██████████
Cc: ██████████@snh.gov.uk>; Hendron, Hannah
<hannah.hendron@crownestatescotland.com>; ██████████@gov.scot>; ██████████@gov.scot
Subject: Hand Harvesting of Seaweeds - Harvest Options Process

Dear All,

With apologies for the delayed distribution, please see the attached draft of our proposed Harvest Licence Options (HLO) process that seeks to more fairly address competing interest between larger scale applications for hand harvesting of wild seaweeds on Crown foreshore/seabed in Scotland.

It has turned out to be more complex than first anticipated in light of volume and extent having to be factored into scale considerations, the Option extents themselves, and then how these might work with respect to overall distance across which interest may be sought. So I hope reality turns out be simpler than might at first appear in the attached document.

I would be grateful for any thoughts, but particularly on the proposed extents – both of individual Options and then the overall coastal distances within which interests are deemed to constitute either a single or more than one Option – in relation to your own business circumstances. I have left the document in Word format so that you can edit and track changes in your response if you so wish.

If you require clarification on any points please come back to me.

Kind regards

Alex

Alex Adrian

Aquaculture Operations Manager

Crown Estate Scotland (Interim Management)

0131 260 6076 / 07920 536823

6 Bells Brae, Edinburgh, EH4 3BJ

www.crownstatescotland.com

[@crownestatescot](mailto:alex.adrian@crownestatescotland.com)

Legal disclaimer – important notice

The information in this message, including any attachments, is intended solely for the use of the person to whom it is addressed. It may be confidential and it should not be disclosed to or used by anyone else. If you receive this message in error please let the sender know straight away. We cannot accept liability resulting from email transmission. Crown Estate Scotland's head office is at 6 Bells Brae, Edinburgh EH4 3BJ