



Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government

Number: WG54060

Welsh Government
Consultation – summary of responses

Scallop fishing management measures in Wales

March 2026

Mae'r ddogfen hon ar gael yn Gymraeg hefyd / This document is also available in Welsh
Rydym yn croesawu gohebiaeth a galwadau ffôn yn Gymraeg / We welcome correspondence and telephone calls in Welsh

Overview

This document provides a summary of responses to a public consultation on 14 proposed changes to scallop fishing management measures in Wales held between 24 October 2025 and 31 January 2026.

36 responses were received within the deadline. Most respondents provided detailed and considered views regarding the detail and implementation of the proposed measures. The responses were supportive of the proposals.

This report does not include the Welsh Government's response to the consultation feedback which will be considered separately.

Action Required

This document is provided for information. The report and associated evidence will be used to support future policy recommendations.

Further information and related documents

Large print, Braille and alternative language versions of this document are available on request.

Contact details

For further information:

Fisheries Division
Welsh Government
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Email: fisheries@gov.wales

Additional copies

This summary of response and the consultation documentation are published in electronic form only and can be accessed on the Welsh Government's website.

Link to the consultation documentation: [Scallop fishing management measures in Wales \[HTML\] | GOV.WALES](#)

Contents

Contents.....	3
Summary of consultation responses	4
Summary of answers to questions	5
Analysis of responses	6
Summary of free text responses for each question	6
Overarching themes from responses	18
Evidence and academic research cited by respondents	19

Scallop fishing management measures in Wales

Summary of consultation responses

A consultation on proposals to change scallop fishing management measures in Wales launched on 24 October 2025 and closed on 31 January 2026. The main purpose of the consultation was to seek the views of stakeholders and the public on a range of proposed changes to scallop management measures in Wales following policy commitments made in the fisheries management plan for king scallops (*pecten maximus*) in English and Welsh waters (2023).

The consultation was developed with the Wales King Scallop Advisory Group. Officials held several engagement sessions for members of the public to ask questions about the proposals to encourage stakeholders to submit their views. Officials also engaged with representatives of the EU Commission and Member States.

Many respondents chose to remain anonymous. The Welsh Government policy has also changed since the consultation was launched to anonymous unless requested otherwise. To ensure anonymity of the respondents who have requested it, the Welsh Government has anonymised all responses in this report.

Breakdown of responses

In total, 36 responses were received:

- 27 responses were submitted through the online smart survey form.
- 9 responses were received through the Fisheries Division email inbox.

One response was in Welsh and 35 were in English.

Breakdown of respondents

6 Fishing industry organisations.

25 responses from members of the public (including fishing businesses and fishermen and women).

3 environmental Non-Governmental Organisations (eNGO).

2 Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCB) (Natural Resources Wales (NRW) and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC)).

21 responses were received from citizens/businesses based in Wales.

12 responses were received from citizens/businesses based outside Wales.

1 respondent did not provide details.

Summary of answers to questions

17 questions were asked. Each question gave the option to show support or opposition to the proposed change or 'don't know'. Each question also allowed the respondent a free text box to provide views and evidence to support their position for policy makers to consider when assessing how to proceed.

- 13 related to the king scallop fishery
- 1 related to the queen scallop (*aequipecten opercularis*) fishery
- 2 related to the Welsh language
- 1 open question for any views not covered by the specific questions on each proposal

Not all responses answered every question and several of the emailed responses did not use the questionnaire format to provide their comments. Where the text showed support or opposition to the consultation questions, this has been included in the overall summary but was not always possible.

Table 1: Summary of respondents' results to whether they agree to each proposal in Scallop fishing management measures in Wales consultation

Proposal number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Blank (%)
1	27	4	3	2	75	11	8	6
2	21	11	1	3	58	31	3	8
3	28	5	2	1	78	14	6	3
4	32	3	0	1	89	8	0	3
5	31	2	2	1	86	6	6	3
6	26	7	1	2	72	19	3	6
7	29	3	3	1	81	8	8	3
8	25	9	1	1	69	25	3	3
9	28	4	3	1	78	11	8	3
10	29	3	2	2	81	8	6	6
11	32	1	1	2	89	3	3	6
12	31	2	1	2	86	6	3	6
13	28	5	1	2	78	14	3	6
14	25	1	8	2	69	3	22	6

Table 1 shows the numbers and percentages of answers by respondents to the question of whether they agree "yes", "no" or "don't know" (or left blank) with each of the 14 proposals in Scallop fishing management measures in Wales consultation

Table 2: Responses to general question related to effect on Welsh language

Question number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Blank (%)

15	6	4	18	8	17%	11%	50%	22%
-----------	---	---	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----

Table 2 shows the numbers and percentages of answers by respondents to the question of whether they agree “yes”, “no”, or “don’t know” (or left blank) with the question regarding likely effects of the proposals on the Welsh language?”

Question 15 related to the Welsh language.
Questions 16 and 17 were free text responses only.

Analysis of responses

Survey responses were received from stakeholders representing a range of interests from commercial fishing to environmental groups and from across the UK.

No responses were received from stakeholders based in EU Member States.

The number of positive responses outnumbered the negative responses for each proposal suggesting that, in aggregate, stakeholders are in favour of all the proposals.

The least popular proposal was to introduce a fee for an all-Wales king scallop permit although even this proposal received 58% support in comparison to 31% against.

Summary of free text responses for each question

Some of the comments submitted about individual proposals were more closely associated with other proposals, in those cases the comments have been analysed with the relevant proposal rather than where the comments were made.

Question 1: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce an annual all-Wales king scallop permit for all vessels taking king scallop by any method in the Welsh zone?

Proposal number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank
1	27	4	3	2	75%	11%	8%	6%

Three quarters of respondents supported this proposal. Of the respondents who supported this proposal and provided their rationale, several noted the potential benefits of a permitting regime to the aim of adaptive management as well as having a single system to manage the fishery across all fishing methods. Several academic studies were quoted and comparisons were made to other jurisdictions including Devon and Severn and Northwestern Inshore Fisheries Conservation Authorities (IFCAs) and the Isle of Man.

Those who disagreed with this proposal mostly did so on the basis that inadequate detail had been provided regarding exactly how the permitting system would operate. A small number of respondents questioned the need for an additional layer of administration in the offshore part of the zone and raised concerns about complexity and cost.

Concerns were raised that this proposal could be used to apply a “one size fits all” approach to fisheries management which would disproportionately affect larger vessels operating in the offshore part of the Welsh zone.

A small number of respondents did not feel “industry” had been adequately engaged in developing the proposals.

Several of the responses, positive and negative, inferred a permit system could be used to control numbers of vessels. The consultation document made it clear, however, the proposal for an all-Wales permit was not intended to limit the numbers of vessels who have access to the king scallop fishery in the Welsh zone beyond existing restrictions to licence entitlement.

Question 2: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce the ability to charge a fee for the application of a permit?

Proposal number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank
2	21	11	1	3	58%	31%	3%	8%

Although over half the respondents supported this proposal, it is also the proposal which raised the most objections.

Responses in favour of this proposal were largely on the basis that it is reasonable for commercial operations to contribute to the cost of managing and to ensure sustainable funding for the evidence requirements. Several positive responses emphasised that any fee must be reasonable and in consultation with stakeholders.

Several of the positive responses noted that there should be exceptions to fees for less destructive fishing methods or gear or smaller vessels or that the fees should be proportionate to fishing activity in some other way, for example vessel size or number of dredges used.

Details of an alternative ‘over-catch’ funding mechanism for scientific surveys used in the Isle of Man was provided by one recipient. This scheme has the benefit of allowing fishers to fish up to their limit without sanctions if revenue from the ‘over-catch’ is paid towards scientific survey cost.

Responses against this proposal noted that fishing, and in particular scallop dredging, is a high input cost business already. Concerns were raised that further costs could make some operations unviable. Several respondents noted the expectation that some form of economic impact assessment should be completed to

progress this proposal. No respondents provided any figures to assist with an economic impact assessment.

It was also noted by several respondents that some fishers target multiple species throughout the year. Consideration should be given to cumulative costs for other permitted fisheries, such as whelk.

One respondent understood the rationale for charging a fee for a permit but did not support it and asked that implementation be delayed until the finances of the wider industry could manage the additional cost.

One respondent noted that fees are not charged to fish for quota stocks with the necessary scientific evidence funded by governments and questioned why a similar approach is not taken for non-quota stocks.

Question 3: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce variable catch limits for king scallop in the Welsh zone?

Proposal number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank
3	28	5	2	1	78%	14%	6%	3%

Although most respondents supported this proposal, including fishing businesses and organisations, many expressed qualified support on the basis that catch limits should:

- be based on robust stock evidence
- be developed with the commercial fishing businesses affected
- not discriminate against any fleet segment
- could be combined with spatial management
- avoid unintended consequences.

These points were echoed by some of the respondents who opposed the proposal. Several respondents referred favourably to the approach taken by the Isle of Man. A stakeholder based in the Isle of Man shared some lessons learned from applying variable catch limits such as moving towards more dynamic catch limits associated with fishing plans for individual vessels.

One person thought that catch limits should be clear and fixed from the outset rather than changeable.

Question 4: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce a variable Minimum Conservation Reference Size (MCRS) for king scallop in the Welsh zone and change the MCRS offshore south of 52°30' N from 100mm to 110mm?

Proposal number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank

4	32	3	0	1	89%	8%	0%	3%
---	----	---	---	---	-----	----	----	----

Introducing a variable MCRS within the Welsh zone and setting it at 110mm throughout the zone was the most popular proposal. Most respondents considered that this would improve the health of king scallop stocks. Several respondents approved of having a single size within the Welsh zone and other jurisdictions.

One person suggested that there should be an exception for smaller 25mm juvenile scallops gathered to grow in aquaculture farms.

Two respondents recommended trialling a maximum size limit as well to protect most fecund spawners and improve recruitment.

Several respondents noted that the ability to vary the MCRS within the Welsh zone should be based on evidence and could be used to manage other scallop fishing methods such as hand-diving or potting.

The 3 respondents who objected to the proposal thought the measure was unnecessary.

Question 5: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce variable Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) requirements for all vessels fishing for king scallop in the Welsh zone and set the VMS data transmission frequency at 10 minutes for vessels over 12 metres in length in the offshore part of the Welsh zone?

Proposal number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank
5	31	2	2	1	86%	6%	6%	3%

Respondents were highly supportive of this proposal. The comments suggest that fairness is the main rationale for this support. Other points made in support include appropriate locational data for enforcement and data collection at common towing speeds, citing academic studies.

Several respondents noted that the variable nature of the proposal is sensible to adapt to rapidly changing technology.

The two respondents who opposed the proposal did so on the basis that it could increase costs for fishers or that AIS (automatic identification systems), which most vessels have, does an adequate job already.

Question 6: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce remote electronic monitoring (REM) with cameras and sensors to fish for king scallop in the Welsh zone?

Proposal number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank

6	26	7	1	2	72%	19%	3%	6%
---	----	---	---	---	-----	-----	----	----

This proposal was supported by most respondents. The reasons given for support included existing systems for fishing in Scottish waters, evidence for enforcement, evidence demonstrating good practice being applied and evidence to inform responsive fishery management decisions.

Some support was “in principle” based on certain conditions, including: cost of equipment should be reasonable, any REM equipment must be reliable and easily replaceable, REM requirements should be proportionate and tailored to the vessel, REM systems should not include cameras which record on-deck activity.

Two respondents noted opportunities to improve catch recording including removing the requirements for paper logs for some vessels.

One person suggested an exemption for hand-diving and gathering for sea farming.

Most of those who opposed this proposal focused on unnecessary additional costs and complexity for fishers (particularly small-scale fishers) as well as being an invasion of privacy (presumably referring to the camera component of most REM systems).

One fisher with an under 10m vessel noted that another electronic system on his vessel would add clutter and that issues with electronic systems in the past had curtailed fishing activity.

Question 7: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce variable closed season or seasons for king scallop in the Welsh zone and change the offshore seasonal closure so that the fishery is closed from 1 May to 31 October each year to protect the stock during the spawning period?

Proposal number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank
7	29	3	3	1	81%	8%	8%	3%

Common themes in the reasons given for the strong support of this proposal included simplification for scallop dredging within the Welsh zone, allowing adequate time for benthic habitats to recover in between open fishing seasons and stock protection during spawning. Several respondents noted the need for strong evidence for any changes to the closed season (for dredging).

Several respondents, whether they supported the proposal or not, cited recent issues resulting from changes to seasonal scallop closures in the English Channel. Caution was advised to avoid displacement, fair approach to different kinds of vessels/fishing methods and unintended consequences such as market disruption.

Of those opposing this proposal, the main reason was the variability of the measure rather than the dates proposed.

Several respondents expressed support for developing a hand-dived fishery and using flexibility for seasonal closures to do so.

A stakeholder based in the Isle of Man provided evidence of recent observations that suggest the spawning period for king scallop is getting later in the year and that the proposed closed season may be too early.

Question 8: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce variable temporal (time at sea or time spent fishing) restrictions or closures within the Welsh zone?

Proposal number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank
8	25	9	1	1	69%	25%	3%	3%

Many of the comments supporting this proposal focused on the benefits to benthic habitats and species of being able to limit or disperse dredging activity.

Several of the respondents supporting the proposal also noted conditions for successful implementation of temporal restrictions including: how it is combined with other measures such as spatial management, the need to base decisions on evidence, involving fishers in design and implementation of temporal restrictions and communicating decisions transparently.

Several respondents positively referenced fisheries in France, English IFCA's and the Isle of Man who use temporal measures to good effect.

The respondents who opposed this proposal provided several key reasons including: curfews are too restrictive on top of weather, tides and other factors, having too little time to fish or be at sea could make commercial fishing financially unviable and could disproportionately affect some vessels more than others.

Several respondents raised concerns that poorly applied temporal restrictions could encourage risky behaviour in terms of weather when some scallop grounds are far from shore.

One respondent advised that they needed more detail of the proposal to give a view.

Question 9: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce variable spatial restrictions or closures within the Welsh zone?

Proposal number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank
9	28	4	3	1	78%	11%	8%	3%

Of the majority who supported this proposal, several respondents advised that successful implementation would depend on: appropriate science and monitoring, involving fishers in decision making, considering cumulative effect with other measures and fisheries, and avoiding displacement and overfishing in areas that are not closed.

One respondent noted Northern Ireland’s use of spatial closures for ‘brood stock’ areas.

One respondent suggested that spatial closures for temporary management goals should be time limited with transparent criteria for reopening.

Several people noted the potential benefits of rotational management of scallop beds using spatial management.

A stakeholder based in the Isle of Man provided detail of lessons learned on combining temporal and spatial restrictions to make management decisions based on stock survey and fishing location evidence. Examples given were to protect areas highly populated with juvenile scallop and to rest over-fished areas.

Several respondents noted that large areas of the Welsh inshore area are already closed to king scallop dredging, including areas of Cardigan Bay that were closed when scallop dredging was less well controlled and have not been reopened. One respondent referred to Bangor University research which may support rotating currently closed areas in Cardigan Bay.

Several of the respondents answering no or don’t know to this question did so on the grounds that the consultation included insufficient detail on the proposal for variable spatial restrictions. Of these submissions some respondents provided advice on which factors need to be considered in applying such a measure, including: seasonality of different fishing metiers, market dynamics and consistent supply of produce, interplay of spatial restrictions with other measures and to avoid undue operating pressures on fishing businesses from making lots of changes to rules at once.

One respondent provided significant detail of the existing restrictions to areas for scallop fishing due to offshore wind and telecommunications cabling to highlight the complex dynamics to consider in implementing further spatial restrictions.

Question 10: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce variable effort restrictions (engine size, towing capability, vessel length) to fish for king scallop within the Welsh zone?

Proposal number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank
10	29	3	2	2	81%	8%	6%	6%

Several respondents noted that there are already area-based engine size and vessel length restrictions in the Welsh zone and having the ability to adjust these would be a useful tool. Many of these responses expressed satisfaction with the existing effort restrictions (see 2010 scallop order framework) or advised against unnecessary complication.

Several respondents support the proposal in principle and expressed the view that existing regulations should be rationalised.

One response suggested limiting fishing to small vessels only.

Three respondents noted towing capacity rather than vessel length or engine power as the key measure.

Some respondents noted changes to variable measures should be evidence-based.

Some of those who objected to this proposal thought the existing measures are adequate and/or already too complicated without another layer of legislation to comply with.

The two respondents who answered 'don't know' to this question, did not feel the proposal was sufficiently detailed.

Question 11: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce catch recording and reporting requirements for catches of king scallop in the Welsh zone?

Proposal number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank
11	32	1	1	2	89%	3%	3%	6%

Most respondents supported this proposal. Reasons given included: need accurate real-time data for adaptive management, data can be useful for scientific research and analysis.

One respondent noted that gathering catch data is only worthwhile if it is used.

A stakeholder based in the Isle of Man explained the benefit of real-time reporting via a catch recording 'Nestform' App in the Isle of Man to make management decisions based on fishing intensity. Other respondents also referred positively to the Isle of Man approach.

Several respondents noted how technology (REM, automating catch recording and reporting) could assist with managing the data received via catch recording to make it easier for fishers and fisheries managers.

Removing necessity for paper logbooks for 10m-12m vessels was raised. As was the desirability of consistency with other recording and reporting requirements where possible.

Only one respondent objected to this proposal on the grounds that catch recording is already a requirement and an addition layer of catch record and reporting adds complexity. This was also raised as a concern by those supporting the proposal.

The respondent who answered 'don't know' was concerned that recreational fishers should not have to report catch.

Question 12: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce variable gear specifications to fish for king scallop in the Welsh zone and set a minimum dredge belly ring size of 75mm internal diameter?

Proposal number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank
12	31	2	1	2	86%	6%	3%	6%

A stakeholder from the Isle of Man advised that although the regulation minimum belly ring size is 75mm, they are considering increasing this. This stakeholder provided a useful summary of results from gear trials with different dredge belly ring sizes. Further trials will be conducted in 2026, and the results can be shared with Welsh Government.

Two respondents advised that they use dredges with 80mm belly rings and believed 80mm or larger is already industry standard. Several respondents expressed support for a minimum of 75mm dredge belly ring specifically to align with neighbouring jurisdictions. Several respondents suggested that there may already be sufficient research to recommend a higher minimum belly ring size with 85mm, 92mm and 97mm suggested as options.

Two respondents reiterated that although they support the measure they would prefer to phase out or prohibit dredging altogether.

Several respondents were supportive of the variable nature of the proposed measure as this would allow for improvements to efficiency and selectivity in future. Respondents also expressed the hope that overall dredge design would be considered for improvements, not just the minimum belly ring size.

Respondents who opposed this proposal did so from opposite perspectives. One felt all dredging should be prohibited. The other felt this was unnecessary as fishers need to get the appropriate gear for the MCRS anyway and is in effect a self-managing measure.

Question 13: Do you agree with the proposal to introduce a variable limit on the number of dredges which vessels may use to fish for king scallop in the Welsh zone and set a maximum limit for dredges in the offshore part of the Welsh zone at 28 (14 per side)?

	Total figures	Total percentages
--	---------------	-------------------

Proposal number	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank
13	28	5	1	2	78%	14%	3%	6%

A key factor for those supporting this proposal was limiting the impact of dredging on the seabed with several quoting academic research on the topic.

Some respondents expressed the view that dredging should be banned or phased out altogether (whether they supported or opposed the proposal).

Several respondents encourage the development and requirement for lower impact gears rather than a dredge limit.

One respondent noted the importance of knowing the number of dredges used by each vessel to calculate the area swept for seafloor impact assessment.

The respondents who opposed the proposal mostly noted the negative impact on fishing operations that have invested in larger vessels capable of dragging a higher number of dredges. Two respondents advised that modern vessels with more dredges and fewer 'sweeps' is more efficient, particularly where effort has been concentrated from two smaller vessels into one. They and another respondent also inferred that fewer dredges may lead to more time spent dredging to achieve the same catch yields which may be counterproductive. The requirement to maximise catch within good weather periods was also noted.

Several people noted that this proposal needs to be used alongside other proposals to ensure stocks are protected.

Question 14: Do you agree with the proposal to increase the Minimum Conservation Reference Size (MCRS) for queen scallop from 40mm to 55mm in the Welsh zone?

Proposal number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank
14	25	1	8	2	69%	3%	22%	6%

This question received the highest number of 'don't know' answers, possibly reflecting the fact that it is a different fishery. However, many respondents provided detailed views in support of the proposals.

Several respondents noted that most fishers are thought to target queen scallop at 55mm anyway for commercial reasons including higher meat yields, better market price and easier processing.

Several respondents cited academic papers in support of a higher MCRS for queen scallop for multiple reasons including: more spawning events, more larvae of higher quality, resilience against poor periods of recruitment common to the fishery.

Many respondents raised that due to the mechanical grading applied to queen scallop catches, it is not possible to ensure conformity to any minimum size. These respondents suggested a reasonable tolerance for a percentage of undersized queen scallop in any catch as part of the measure if introduced.

One respondent provided useful information from the Isle of Man fishery regarding the comparable numbers of queen scallop that need to be caught at the different sizes for the same weight of scallop meat (~200 at 55mm, ~500 at 40mm).

One respondent suggested phasing in changes to allow industry and market to adapt.

The respondent who raised concerns about increasing the MCRS for queen scallop noted the possibility that the measure may reduce marketable catch in the short term.

Several respondents suggested that queen scallops might benefit from further management. At least two respondents noted the similarities with king scallop and raised the possibility of one permit and adaptive management framework for both fisheries.

Question 15: What, in your opinion, would be the likely effects of the proposals on the Welsh language? We are particularly interested in any likely effects on opportunities to use the Welsh language and on not treating the Welsh language less favourably than English. Do you think that there are opportunities to promote any positive effects? Do you think that there are opportunities to mitigate any adverse effects?

Proposal number	Total figures				Total percentages			
	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank	Yes	No	Don't know	Blank
15	6	4	18	8	17%	11%	50%	22%

This question is included in all Welsh Government consultations. Most respondents had no comment.

Several respondents emphasised the importance of culture and heritage in rural coastal communities and the opportunity to restore or improve the relationship between the people of Wales and the sea.

Question 16: In your opinion, could the proposals be formulated or changed so as to: have positive effects or more positive effects on using the Welsh language and on not treating the Welsh language less favourably than English; or mitigate any negative effects on using the Welsh language and on not treating the Welsh language less favourably than English?

Most respondents had no comment or did not think anything should have been done differently to ensure equal treatment of the Welsh language. One respondent did not feel Welsh translation was necessary.

Question 17: We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them:

In response to this question and elsewhere in the questionnaire, several submissions expressed the view, that dredging for scallops should be phased out or banned completely in Wales.

One respondent advised that an important element of this would be the need for an industry advisory group with a degree of responsibility to ensure that scallop beds are fished sustainably.

One respondent expressed the view that the Welsh Government does not want a viable scallop industry in Welsh waters and that this consultation is a box ticking exercise.

One respondent asked whether a closed area could be opened for fishing one day per week.

Overarching themes from responses

- The majority of respondents supported each of the 14 proposals.
- Most respondents, whether supporting or opposing a particular measure, voiced support for sustainably managed fisheries and minimising any environmental impacts.
- Fisheries management decisions need to be based on robust evidence.
- Effect of changes to measures needs to be monitored and reviewed to ensure objectives being met.
- Transparency of decision making and involving affected stakeholders is vital.
- When making any changes to management measures, Welsh Ministers need to consider the cumulative effects of the whole array of measures on a range of potential outcomes including: stock health and resilience, benthic habitats and species and the wider environment, costs and complexity to fishers, market conditions.
- When using variable measures, the reasons for this need to be clear, rational and where possible give those affected maximum notice of changes.
- Overall, respondents appeared to appreciate and support the aim of creating a new coherent framework of adaptive management measures with the guiding purpose being sustainable management of the king scallop fishery in Wales.

Evidence and academic research cited by respondents

Jentoft, S., 2000. The community: A missing link of fisheries management. *Marine Policy*, 24(1), pp.53–60.

Pomeroy, R.S., Katon, B.M. and Harkes, I., 2001. Conditions affecting the success of fisheries co management: lessons from Asia. *Marine Policy*, 25(3), pp.197–208.

Boris Worm et al., Rebuilding Global Fisheries. *Science* 325, 578-585 (2009). DOI: 10.1126/science.1173146

<https://secure.toolkitfiles.co.uk/clients/40572/sitedata/Byelaws/23-Scallop-Dredging-Byelaw-XXIII.pdf>

Arnason, Ragnar. (2001). *Costs of Fisheries Management: Theoretical and Practical Implications*.

Bahri, T., Vasconcellos, M., Welch, D.J., Johnson, J., Perry, R.I., Ma, X. & Sharma, R., eds. 2021. Adaptive management of fisheries in response to climate change. *FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Technical Paper No. 667*. Rome, FAO.

Beukers Stewart, B.D., Vause, B.J., Mosley, M.W.J., Rossetti, H.L. and Brand, A.R., 2005. Benefits of closed areas for scallops and other benthic fauna. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 298, pp.189–204.

Hilborn, R., 2010. Pretty good yield and exploited fishes. *Marine Policy*, 34(1), pp.193–196.

<https://www.islandinstitute.org/working-waterfront/commission-approves-lobster-size-rules/>

Hordyk, A., Ono, K., Valencia, S., Loneragan, N. and Prince, J., 2015. A novel length based empirical estimation method of spawning potential ratio (SPR), and tests of its performance, for small scale, data poor fisheries. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 72(1), pp.217–231.

Kaiser, M. J., Clarke, K. R., Hinz, H., Austen, M. C. V., Somerfield, P. J., & Karakassis, I. (2006). Global analysis of response and recovery of benthic biota to fishing. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 311, 1-14.

<https://doi.org/10.3354/meps311001>

Kindt-Larsen, L., Kirkegaard, E., and Dalskov, J. 2011. Fully documented fishery: a tool to support a catch quota management system. – *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 68: 1606–1610.

van Helmond ATM, Mortensen LO, Plet-Hansen KS, et al. Electronic monitoring in fisheries: Lessons from global experiences and future opportunities. *Fish Fish*. 2019;00:1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12425>

Xing, L., Chen, Y., Zhang, C., Li, B., Shin, Y.J. and Ren, Y., 2020. Evaluating impacts of pulse fishing on the effectiveness of seasonal closure. *Acta Oceanologica Sinica*, 39, pp.89–99.

https://pure.bangor.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/82159732/Mainstreaming_Habitat_Management_Objectives_in_an_Ecosystem-Based_Approach_to_Management_of_Scallop_Fisheries.pdf

Ole R. Eigaard, Francois Bastardie, Niels T. Hintzen, Lene Buhl-Mortensen, Pål Buhl-Mortensen, Rui Catarino, Grete E. Dinesen, Josefine Egekvist, Heino O. Fock, Kerstin Geitner, Hans D. Gerritsen, Manuel Marín González, Patrik Jonsson, Stefanos Kavadas, Pascal Laffargue, Mathieu Lundy, Genoveva Gonzalez-Mirelis, J. Rasmus Nielsen, Nadia Papadopoulou, Paulette E. Posen, Jacopo Pulcinella, Tommaso Russo, Antonello Sala, Cristina Silva, Christopher J. Smith, Bart Vanelslander, Adriaan D. Rijnsdorp, The footprint of bottom trawling in European waters: distribution, intensity, and seabed integrity, *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, Volume 74, Issue 3, March-April 2017, Pages 847–865

https://www.legislation.gov.uk/nisr/2022/292/pdfs/nisr_20220292_en.pdf

Beukers Stewart, B.D. and Beukers Stewart, J.S., 2009. Principles for the management of scallop fisheries. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 66(1), pp.72–80
Brand, A.R., 2006. Scallop ecology: distributions and behaviour. In: Shumway, S.E. and Parsons, G.J. (eds.) *Scallops: Biology, Ecology and Aquaculture*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp.651–744.

Bayer, S.R., Wahle, R.A., Jumars, P.A. and Brady, D.C. (2016) 'Measuring scallop fertilization success in the field: chamber design and tests', *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 551, pp. 141–154. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps11684>.

Beukers-Stewart, B.D., Mosley, M.W.J. and Brand, A.R. (2003) 'Population dynamics and predictions in the Isle of Man fishery for the great scallop, *Pecten maximus* (L.)', *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 60(2), pp. 224–242. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1054-3139\(03\)00005-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1054-3139(03)00005-5).

Beukers-Stewart, B.D., Vause, B.J., Mosley, M.W.J., Rossetti, H.L. and Brand, A.R. (2005) 'Benefits of closed area protection for a population of scallops', *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 298, pp. 189–204. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps298189>.
Browne, D., Murphy, S., McHugh, M., Chopin, N., Oliver, M., Minto, C. and Cosgrove, R. (2024) Assessment of scallop dredge ring size selectivity in the western English Channel fishery. [Report].

Bruns, I., Bartholomä, A., Menjua, F. and Kopf, A.J. (2023) 'Physical impact of bottom trawling on seafloor sediments in the German North Sea', *Frontiers in Earth Science*, 11, Article 1233163. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2023.1233163>.

Chauvaud, L., Patry, Y., Jolivet, A., Cam, E., Le Goff, C., Strand, Ø., Charrier, G., Thébault, J., Lazure, P. and Gotthard, K. (2012) 'Variation in size and growth of the great scallop *Pecten maximus* along a latitudinal gradient', *PLoS ONE*, 7(5), e37717. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0037717>.

Hart, D.R. (2003) 'Yield- and biomass-per-recruit analysis for rotational fisheries, with an application to the Atlantic sea scallop (*Placopecten magellanicus*)', *Fishery Bulletin*, 101, pp. 44–57.

Hiddink, J.G., Jennings, S., Sciberras, M., Bolam, S.G., McConnaughey, R.A., Mazor, T., Hilborn, R., Collie, J.S., Pitcher, C.R., Amoroso, R.O., Parma, A.M., Suuronen, P. and Rijnsdorp, A.D. (2017) 'Global analysis of depletion and recovery of seabed biota after bottom trawling disturbance', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 114(31), pp. 8301–8306. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1618858114>.

Hold, N., Robins, P., Szostek, C.L., Lambert, G., Lincoln, H., Le Vay, L., Bell, E. and Kaiser, M.J. (2021) 'Using biophysical modelling and population genetics for conservation and management of an exploited species, *Pecten maximus* L.', *Fisheries Oceanography*, 30(6), pp. 740–756. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fog.12556>.

Jenkins, S.R. and Brand, A.R. (2001) 'The effect of dredge capture on the escape response of the great scallop, *Pecten maximus* (L.): implications for the survival of undersized discards', *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 266(1), pp. 33–50. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0981\(01\)00344-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0981(01)00344-8).

Lambert, G.I., Jennings, S., Kaiser, M.J., Davies, T.W. and Hiddink, J.G. (2014) 'Quantifying recovery rates and resilience of seabed habitats impacted by bottom fishing', *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 51(5), pp. 1326–1336. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12277>.

MacDonald, B.A., Thompson, R.J. and Bayne, B.L. (1987) 'Reproductive effort, value and cost in sea scallops (*Placopecten magellanicus*)', *Marine Biology*, 96, pp. 183–189. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00378981>.

Zhang, W., Porz, L., Yilmaz, R., Wallmann, K., Spiegel, T., Neumann, A., Holtappels, M., Kasten, S., Kuhlmann, J., Ziebarth, N., Taylor, B., Ho-Hagemann, H.T.M., Bockelmann, F.-D., Daewel, U., Bernhardt, L. and Schrum, C. (2024) 'Long-term carbon storage in shelf sea sediments reduced by intensive bottom trawling', *Nature Geoscience*, 17, pp. 1268–1276. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-024-01454-9>.

Bangor University (2015) Fisheries & Conservation Report: Scallop Stock Assessment and Management. Available at: <https://www.bangor.ac.uk/fisheries-conservation> (Accessed: 08 December 2025).

Bord Iascaigh Mhara (BIM) (2024) Assessment of scallop dredge ring size selectivity in the eastern English Channel fishery. December. Available at: https://bim.ie/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Assessment-of-scallop-dredge-ring-size-selectivity-in-the-eastern-English-Channel-fishery_.pdf (Accessed: 08 December 2025).

DEFRA (2024) Queen Scallop Fisheries Management Plan Consultation. Available at: https://consult.defra.gov.uk/fisheries-management-plans-1/queen-scallop-fmp-consultation/supporting_documents/Proposed%20Queen%20scallop%20FMP.pdf (Accessed: 08 December 2025).

Devon & Severn IFCA (2023) Scallop Spawning and Maturity Research Report. Devon & Severn Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority. Available at: <https://www.devonandsevernifca.gov.uk> (Accessed: 05.12.25)

Le Pennec, M., et al. (2003) 'Reproductive strategies of scallops', ICES Journal of Marine Science, 60(2), pp. 413–421. doi:10.1016/S1054-3139(03)00039-8.
Salomonsen, H., et al. (2015)