

34. Please provide feedback on the ARUBA option below using the evaluation criteria as a guide. These are designed to help you structure and focus your response.

Creating a well-managed fishery

(a) Does the option provide a simple framework that is easy for fishers, Authority members and other stakeholders to understand and work within?

Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO		19	Losing three main areas to handraking isn't an option. How are you meeting any of the Evaluation Criteria boxes here? This will create havoc for the KEIFCA, the Police and the local EHOs, and could jeopardise the fishery's reputation. (x2: 050603, 050604)
CFFPB		1	
Other - Catching Sector	3	1	
Othe Sector			

(b) Will the option be easy and cost-efficient to administer, and not create too much paperwork for applicants to fill in?

Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO		19	Losing three main areas to handraking isn't an option. How are you meeting any of the Evaluation Criteria boxes here? This will create havoc for the KEIFCA, the Police and the local EHOs, and could jeopardise the fishery's reputation. (x2: 050603, 050604)
CFFPB	1		Hard to administer (x2: 050605, 050606)
Other - Catching Sector	3	1	
Other Sector			

(c) Will the option help create clear rules and regulations and be straightforward for KEIFCA officers to enforce and fishers to comply with?

Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO		19	Losing three main areas to handraking isn't an option. How are you meeting any of the Evaluation Criteria boxes here? This will create havoc for the KEIFCA, the Police and the local EHOs, and could jeopardise the fishery's reputation. (x 2: 050603, 050604) This would be disastrous (050902)
CFFPB		1	
Other - Catching Sector	3	1	
Other Sector			

Creating an environmentally responsible fishery

(d) Does the option help ensure the cockle stock population is fished within clear limits that consider stock assessments and breeding stock?

Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
-------------------	-----	----	----------

TECFO		19	Losing three main areas to handraking isn't an option. How are you meeting any of the Evaluation Criteria boxes here? This will create havoc for the KEIFCA, the Police and the local EHOs, and could jeopardise the fishery's reputation. (x 2: 050603, 050604)
			Poaching becomes a huge threat to the fishery as a whole. (050902)
CFFPB		2	Possibly (050301)
Other - Catching Sector	3	1	
Other Sector			
(e) Does the option help assess and monitor the impact of the fishery on the seabed, and strive to make the impact as small as possible?			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO		19	Losing three main areas to handraking isn't an option. How are you meeting any of the Evaluation Criteria boxes here? This will create havoc for the KEIFCA, the Police and the local EHOs, and could jeopardise the fishery's reputation. (x 2: 050603, 050604)
CFFPB		3	
Other - Catching Sector	3	1	
Other Sector			
(f) Does the option help consider the impact of the cockle fishery management on the wider ecosystem (including carbon footprint) and support internationally recognised accreditation systems (e.g. Marine Stewardship Council)?			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO		19	Losing three main areas to handraking isn't an option. How are you meeting any of the Evaluation Criteria boxes here? This will create havoc for the KEIFCA, the Police and the local EHOs, and could jeopardise the fishery's reputation. (x 2: 050603, 050604)
CFFPB	1	2	
Other - Catching Sector	3	1	
Other Sector			
Helping to support a successful and resilient local coastal economy			
(g) Does the option provide a framework that will help sustain a viable long-term cockle industry in the KEIFCA district?			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO		19	Losing three main areas to handraking isn't an option. How are you meeting any of the Evaluation Criteria boxes here? This will create havoc for the KEIFCA, the Police and the local EHOs, and could jeopardise the fishery's reputation. (x 2: 050603, 050604)
CFFPB	1		possible not in handwork areas (050301)
			It would cause so many problems with hand raking (x2: 050605, 050606)

Other - Catching Sector	3	1	
Other Sector			
(h) Will the option help support local skilled employment?			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO		19	Losing three main areas to handraking isn't an option. How are you meeting any of the Evaluation Criteria boxes here? This will create havoc for the KEIFCA, the Police and the local EHOs, and could jeopardise the fishery's reputation. (x 2: 050603, 050604)
CFFPB	1		It would cause so many problems with hand raking (x2: 050605, 050606)
Other - Catching Sector	2	1	
Other Sector			
(i) Will the option help assist long-term investment and growth in the local economy, supporting local shore side infrastructure and supply chains?			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO		19	Losing three main areas to handraking isn't an option. How are you meeting any of the Evaluation Criteria boxes here? This will create havoc for the KEIFCA, the Police and the local EHOs, and could jeopardise the fishery's reputation. (x 2: 050603, 050604)
CFFPB			It would cause so many problems with hand raking (x2: 050605, 050606) Possibly (050301)
Other - Catching Sector		1	
Other Sector			
(j) Will the option help to 'add value' to the cockles that are caught in the cockle fishery?			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO	1	18	Losing three main areas to handraking isn't an option. How are you meeting any of the Evaluation Criteria boxes here? This will create havoc for the KEIFCA, the Police and the local EHOs, and could jeopardise the fishery's reputation. (x 2: 050603, 050604) yes. It's true that hand raked cockles are paid a premium price, but the overall impact of a hand raked fishery would outweigh any financial benefit. (050902)
CFFPB			no unless processors do not get licenses (050301)
Other - Catching Sector	1	1	Yes - hand-raked (050910)
Other Sector			

Strengthening and supporting our dynamic local coastal community

(k) Does the option provide fair opportunities for individuals and businesses, and help support young or new fishers?

Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO		18	Losing three main areas to handraking isn't an option. How are you meeting any of the Evaluation Criteria boxes here? This will create havoc for the KEIFCA, the Police and the local EHOs, and could jeopardise the fishery's reputation. (x 2: 050603, 050604)
CFFPB			It would cause so many problems with hand raking (x2: 050605, 050606) Possibly (050301)
Other - Catching Sector	2	1	
Other Sector			

(l) Will the option help encourage businesses to invest in a safe and skilled workforce?

Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO		19	Losing three main areas to handraking isn't an option. How are you meeting any of the Evaluation Criteria boxes here? This will create havoc for the KEIFCA, the Police and the local EHOs, and could jeopardise the fishery's reputation. (x 2: 050603, 050604)
CFFPB			It would cause so many problems with hand raking (x2: 050605, 050606) Possibly (050301)
Other - Catching Sector	2	1	
Other Sector			

(m) Does the option help support the heritage and culture of the cockle fishery, including supporting local tourism associated with the Thames cockle fishery?

Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO		19	Losing three main areas to handraking isn't an option. How are you meeting any of the Evaluation Criteria boxes here? This will create havoc for the KEIFCA, the Police and the local EHOs, and could jeopardise the fishery's reputation. (x 2: 050603, 050604) Hand raking would have a detrimental effect on tourism. Please refer to your previous report regarding the negative social impacts that are associated with it. (050902)
CFFPB	1		Would do nothing due to hand raking (x2: 050605, 050606)
Other - Catching Sector	2	1	
Other Sector			

35. What comments do you have regarding the limitation of licences issued under the ARUBA option to 15-20 licences in the new Thames Management Zone?

Response Category	Comments
TECFO	Again, this option would be disastrous to the cockle industry and cause under investment and the whole fishery becoming a part time occupation (x15: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704)
	You aren't limiting licences when there are only 14 existing now. Increasing licences will not work when you are decreasing the area and would be detrimental to the cockle industry by causing lack of investment and becoming unviable financially. (x 2) (050603, 050604)
	The number of licenses should not exceed 14 for the reasons stated previously. (050705)
	Should stay at 14 licences, why increase to 15-20 when 14 licences has lasted 30 years? (050911)
	There has been the option to issue more than 14 licenses for the entirety of the existing regulating order. To date, this has not been deemed a feasible option as it would make the fishery unviable. We struggle to find the rationale for it increasing. (050902)
	This option is a very poor option which would not allow the cockle industry to survive (050802)
CFFPB	Good if you are one of the licensee's (050301)
Other - Catching Sector	Just want to be able to fish in the North side (050709)
	Not enough (050901)
	I agree with the option of 15-20 for local able boats within the Thames estuary (050909)
	Too many licences for reduced area (050910)
Other Sector	A smaller daily quota would allow for an increase in licences. The size of the area would easily accommodate 28 licences. (042201)

36. Feedback on suggested management outside of Thames Management Zone.

Response Category	Comments
TECFO	Very poor (x15: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704)
	Too few boats involved, a trial will be time consuming and experience. A, B, C, K, L and M Evaluation Criteria are not met with this proposed plan. (x 2: 050603, 050604)
	Very Poor. What criteria are you going to use to choose the trial boats? (050705)
	Not advisable (050802)
	Disastrous (050902)
CFFPB	Handworking destroys the grounds as with prop washing you take every cockle and it takes years for the ground to recover (050301)
	agree with the handwork fishery but I feel like this should be included in one main area like Cayman but with more licences. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	Want to include East Barrows in North Essex area for small scale fishermen (050709)
	Probably would not go hand picking (050805)
	Should have more areas (050901)

	Prevent nomadic boats to fish (050910)
Other Sector	Vessels should not be allowed to fish both zones. (042201)
37. Do you have any comments regarding the boundaries of the different management zones?	
Response Category	Comments
TECFO	Too Complicated and does not meet the evaluation criteria (x17: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050603, 050604, 050704)
	Ridiculous! (050705)
	Does not meet the evaluation criteria (050802)
	The Thames fishery has often relied on areas 1/2/3. (050902)
CFFPB	Should include at least area 6 and 15 (050901)
	Maximum area for small scale fishery (050709)
	Area 6 could taken out of the Thames management zone and put into the Essex coast management zone because of the reluctance of licence holders to fish the area. This would make The Essex coast management zone a more viable proposition. (050807)
Other - Catching Sector	
Other Sector	Sands should be in one area. They should not have boundary lines going through the middle of them. (042201)
38. Do you think that vessels working in the small-scale fishery should also be able to fish the Thames Management Zone beds for a limited period each year, prior to the suction dredge fishery taking place?	
Response Category	Comments
TECFO	No (x20: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050603, 050604, 050704, 050802, 050905, 050911)
	Really silly Idea. We start the season when we do to allow the cockles to spawn and the spat to settle. This will also increase the fishing effort and reduce the TAC meaning the fishery would be less economically viable for the License holders. Meaning less investment and jeopardizing jobs. Also the MCA approval is based on the current system and practices. It would jeopardize that. (050705)
	Detrimental from a commercial standpoint. Also, dependant on quota, the small-scale fishery may not be able to supply processors with enough cockles to start up their production lines. The small-scale fishery will be strongest if run alongside the suction dredge fishery. (050902)
CFFPB	No as cockles are not ready to be fished before the dredge season (050301)
	Only area 6 in the winter for clams. For example. But it would have to be a separate fishery I think as too much ground damage would occur. Very limited licences no under ten small scale fishery. Set gear type to be agreed. (x2: 050605, 050606)
	Yes (050508)
	I think the option of fishing in the Thames managements zones before the dredge fishery takes place should not happen. I think the fisheries should be kept separate or it will become more complicated. (050811)
	Yes, would be good to have that option (050709)

Other - Catching Sector	Yes (x2: 050805, 050909)
	No (050807)
	Yes definitely to help support all the expenses of setting up for a complexed operation (050901)
	No need (050910)
Other Sector	Yes (042201)
39. What comments do you have regarding a hand worked fishery at Southend (Areas 1-3)?	
Response Category	Comments
TECFO	The implications of a hand worked fishery are immense, I do not think this option has been given enough thought on the wider implications of A Management, B working within the moorings, C the mess that is left behind which is very evident in other parts of the country, D the effect on tourism & leisure, E the current issues with illegal gathering and F the extra officer time that would be needed for the smooth running and enforcement. (x15: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704)
	This will create chaos, create illegal fishing opportunities, and put undue pressure on the KEIFCA, the Police and EHOs. This would also disrupt the tourism industry that the cockle industry supports (x 2: 050603, 050604)
	Ridiculous idea! This proposal really does highlight a complete lack of understanding of the workings and history of the fishery. The reason the industry changed to a dredge system in 1969 was because cockle stock densities dropped to the point where hand raking was no longer financially viable. For unknown reasons cockle stock densities have never returned to the levels that sustained hand raking. This is all well documented. Reintroducing hand raking raises all kinds of problems. Would there be a minimum cockle size? Would undersize cockles be relaid? The foreshore is covered with boat moorings and bait diggers routinely turn over cockles and bury them. Area 3 is still MOD land and you do not always have access to it. It would require a huge number of gatherers to collect a commercial quantity of cockles. We have problems with illegal oyster gatherers and policing them has proven next to impossible. Advertising a hand rake fishery in these areas would only make the illegal gathering problem worse. These areas do not always have stocks. When there are cockles in these areas they are important to the Leigh boats as it gives us somewhere to work if the weather is bad and the Leigh on Sea boats cannot afford to lose these areas. These are just a few of the reasons why a hand raked fishery in this area is a ridiculous idea and there are many more! I cannot believe this option was ever put forward let alone considered. (050705)
	I do not believe a hand worked fishery at Southend would work. It would need a huge amount of controls to prevent the rise in illegal hand gathering currently present nationwide, and take up too much officer time to regulate efficiently. (050802)
	Not good for grounds, also migrating stock for 4, 5 & 6 (050905)
CFFPB	Not a good idea. I have fished for years away from home in the wash and how we fish with prop washing we are destroying the grounds. Dredging is the only way a cockle fishery works properly (050301)
	Totally wrong, would create many problems and bad press. (x2) (050605, 050606)
	Yes I agree this is the best place for a hand worked fishery. (x2: 050808, 050809)

	I strongly agree that these areas should be made into a handwork fishery. (050811)
	I feel like this could benefit anyone who wishes to take place. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	Good as it creates more opportunity (050709)
	Probably would not go hand picking (050805)
	Good idea (050807)
	It could help encourage a lot of youngsters but would be very difficult to manage (050901)
	I think it is good, Margate should be the same (050910)
Other Sector	
40. General feedback on ARUBA option	
Response Category	Comments
TECFO	Too much effort, too many options, impossible to manage. As per your own consultation on hand gathering (x15) (050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704)
	This plan does not fit the Evaluation Criteria proposed. (x 2) (050603, 050604)
	A very poorly thought-out option shows a lack of knowledge and understanding. Impossible to manage as per your own consultation on hand gathering. (050705)
	It is not a well thought out or viable option, too difficult to manage, too complicated and the stock is not always in good enough supply. (050802)
	The positive economic impact for a small number of new hand rakers vs the huge detriment to Southend's tourist industry cannot be overlooked. Any investigation into the impact groups of hand rakers have on local communities and villages of a few hundred locals around the country will give sufficient evidence as to why this would be completely unacceptable on the shores of a city whose lifeblood is tourism. This is something local councillors will be very keen to avoid, as it will sit squarely on their shoulders to fix. You can imagine photos of destruction, rubbish and waste on Southend & East Beach on the front page of the Echo. It would be pandora's box for them, as you can't strip their living away once it's established. (050902)
CFFPB	Not for me unsafe and impossible to manage (x2: 050605, 050606)
	Combine ARUBA with CAYMEN in a New combined Order (050808)
	Cayman with Aruba (050809)
	I strongly disagree with this option apart from the handwork areas 1,2,3 which I strongly agree with. (050811)
	I agree with the handwork fishery but I feel like this should be included in one Thames management zone with more licences. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	Maximum area for small scale fishery would be most fair as Thames area has most productive cockle beds. (050709)
	Good (050805)
	New licences/permits must only be given to local Thames estuary fishermen. (050807)
	I think this creates great opportunities for the local Southend fleet but again nothing for either the north Kent or blackwater fleet (050810)
	Not really for me (050901)

Other Sector	To make investment worthwhile, daily quota should go up to two tons. (042201)
-----------------	--