**Table 8. Impacts:** Negative effects of MU implementation in Fisheries-Tourism-Nature Conservation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **SUM** | **1**  **%** | **2**  **%** | **3**  **%** | **4**  **%** | **5**  **%** | **(4+5)**  **%** |
| **Env** | Environmental pollution/marine rubbish created by tourism activities (by non aware tourists, etc.) (Env) | 9 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 8 | 39 | *23.1* | *15.4* | *12.8* | *28.2* | *20.5* | *48.7* |
| **P** | Risk that fishers do not receive compensation for lost chances of fishing activities (P). | 5 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 38 | *13.2* | *18.4* | *28.9* | *26.3* | *13.2* | *39.8* |
| **P** | Additional taxation for tourism activities that makes the combination of fishing and tourism activities a non-viable business activity (P). | 4 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 7 | 38 | *10.5* | *18.4* | *23.7* | *28.9* | *18.4* | *47.3* |
| **Ec** | Potentially increased competition from other professional groups (e.g. other local coastal tourism enterprises) (Ec) | 4 | 7 | 12 | 10 | 5 | 38 | *10.5* | *18.4* | *31.6* | *26.3* | *13.2* | *39.5* |
| **T** | Need to make high investments to adapt the fishing vessels to the requirements of tourism activities (technical adjustments of professional fishing boats, as provided for by law) (T). | 1 | 3 | 8 | 14 | 14 | 40 | *2.5* | *7.5* | *20.0* | *35.0* | *35.0* | *70.0* |
| **S** | Ageing and low educational level of fishers, which in combination with the lack of specialisation of human resources can cause low tourist satisfaction (S). | 3 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 39 | *7.7* | *7.7* | *25.6* | *33.3* | *25.6* | *58.9* |

**Source:** Online Survey

*1-absent, 2-not relevant, 3-low impact, 4-very important impact, 5-extremely important impact*