

11. Please provide feedback on the BERMUDA 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	22		
CFFPB	1		This still keeps everything very easy for KEIFCA, except for the extra licences. It's still great if you are/to become a licence holder in the Thames Management zone. However, it does help current KEIFCA permit holders, fishing the coastal management zone, who have had a poor fishery in recent years, with a lot of expense. (x2: 050605, 050606)
			This option could be the most simple and cost effective of all options on the table for KEIFCA to run. (050808)
			The Cayman option to me seems the best way forward (050809)
			I feel this option provides a simple framework for all involved in the fishery to work within (050811)
			Yes I feel that the Cayman idea is the most simple way and most understanding (050812)
			I don't think this is not the simplest framework. (050811)
			I think that this option is a more complicated framework than the Cayman option and would be less cost efficient as more separate areas need different streams of data, surveys and sets of paperwork which is less cost effective, less environmentally friendly and a less streamline approach. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	3		This is only ok for suction dredge licence holders (050805)
Other Sector	1		

(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	21		Depends, will fishers that fish in the Thames management zone be able to fish in the other zones? I believe they should not, in this case only one lot of paperwork is acceptable. (042202)
CFFPB	1		Regarding paperwork etc, this is reasonably straight forward and there is lots of help available, and I don't think this impacts anything. (x2: 050605, 050606)
			this option should be easy, cost efficient and limit the amount of paperwork applicants have to fill in. (050811)
			by bringing the majority of the area into one this will mean that there will only be one area in which there is paperwork instead of different pieces of paperwork for different areas which is the most simple and easy way for not only the fishers involved but for the IFCA as well. I also think it will be cost effective as well as you will have all involved contributing to one area. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	3		Yes this option would be fairly easy for the authority to administer and enforce (050810)

Other Sector	1		
(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	21		Easy rules yes, enforcement is more tricky (042202)
CFFPB	1		The rules are the same there are no grey areas, the zones are the zones, it is just suction dredging which is straight forward for gear (x2: 050605, 050606)
			I think this option could create unclear rules as they will differ in the different areas of the district. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	3		
Other Sector	1		
<u>Creating an environmentally responsible fishery</u>			
(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	22		
CFFPB	1		Any fishery looked after by KEIFCA will be looked after. The TAC is set, and if catch rates fall the areas can be open/closed to suit. (x2: 050605, 050606)
			I think that this will be a lot harder to achieve as there are more areas which need to be policed and surveyed which will put an increased work load on the IFCA instead of having one main area resulting in a less efficient and cost effective method. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	3		
Other Sector	1		
(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	1	1	YES if the management zones are limited on vessel numbers (x 20: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050603, 050604, 050704, 050802, 050911, 050801, 050902)
CFFPB	1		With any new fishery there is going to be an impact due to the lack of experience in these areas, however those with experience who have applied for the current KEIFCA permit, will probably do less damage than those who have no idea. (x2: 050605, 050606)
			I don't think this will reduce impact on the seabed as much as if there was one area with a limited amount of licences which can be spread out over a larger area instead of a certain number of vessels targeting one smaller restricted area. (050812)

Other - Catching Sector	2		Not with limited harvesting options (050910)
Other Sector	1		
(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		1	Yes, if the management zones are limited on vessel numbers (x 19: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050603, 050604, 050704, 050802, 050911, 050801)
			Any change in the number of licenses would have to be reviewed by the MSC. (050902)
CFFPB	1		It would be approved the MSC, especially if vessels that weren't fishing the Thames management zone were allowed to experiment and try different gear (x2: 050605, 050606)
			I don't think this creates an environmentally responsible fishery. (050811)
			I think it would be better for the environment to have one larger area with the chance of a small scale handwork fishery where the vessels can spread out over this area. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	2		No as opening up more ground to be disturbed (050910)
Other Sector	1		
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	3		On the Thames Management zone if 14 licenses issued Essex Coastal management zone 7.18.19.20. and areas 10.14.17., if limited number of licenses and restrictions on gear type and no limit on vessel size if it is within the KEIFCA vessel size limit and limited TAC to enable a fishery. Our Criterion for a small-scale fishery is limited to local vessels and limited catch i.e., 2-4 ton (x14: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801)
			On the TMZ, as long as 14 licences only are issued, and on the two CMZs, the tonnage taken is limited and the gear type is dredged, along with meeting other KEIFCA fishery criteria (vessel size) the fishery could be sustainable. (x2: 050603, 050604)
			14 licenses in the Thames Management Zone. The coastal Management Zones would be viable if the Numbers were limited and quota limited. Not Suction dredge only but fishing methods monitored to meet current criteria, as has always been the case. (050704)
			Only if the Thames Management zone is limited to 14 licenses. (050705)

			Yes. Allowing a small-scale fishery within the coastal management zones will turn these areas into flourishing fishing grounds. (050902)
CFFPB	1		yes if you get a license in the orange zone (050301)
			this would be sustainable and help local employment but would not be for all the others who have shown financial dedication and a great fishing effort to the Thames district and could make it very unsustainable for these vessels who travel a long way a have shown that they are dedicated to the area and rely on the Thames for their yearly income. I would much sooner see one area in which the majority can fish a sustainable fishery instead of a minority. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	3		
Other Sector	1		
(h) Will the option help support local skilled employment?			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO	21		Only if the Thames Management zone is limited to 14 licenses. (050705)
CFFPB	1		This option benefits the local workforce if it is for local boats. I am told that the Essex and Kent coastal management zones allow for all outside Thames boats to fish both these areas. It will provide safer boats, and better catch, as long as the boats are local. (x2: 050605, 050606)
Other - Catching Sector	3		
Other Sector	1		
(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	21		Only if the Thames Management zone is limited to 14 licenses. (050705)
CFFPB	1		I don't think this is the best option to support a local coastal community. (050811)
Other - Catching Sector	3		
Other Sector	1		
(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	1	it is difficult to evaluate this at such an early stage, depending on the methods of fishing employed this is possible (x14: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801)
			It is quite hard to evaluate at this stage with uncertainty on the fishing methods proposed (x2: 050603, 050604)

			<p>this is impossible to tell, it depends on so many factors, which cannot be attributed to a particular management option eg severity of winter, repercussions of dredging in the area – all of which can decrease or increase the value of the cockles (050802)</p> <p>Unlikely to add direct value. It's possible that fishing with an alternative gear type would be detrimental to "Thames cockles" as consumers will not know to differentiate the different areas. Different gear types can damage cockles and sand content varies by fishing method. (050902)</p> <p>It should (042202)</p>
CFFPB	1		yes if processors do not own licenses (050301)
			As I said previously I don't believe this adds value to cockles caught as this is usually a supply and demand issue which the Thames district nor the fishers can control. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	2	1	
Other Sector	1		
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	22		
CFFPB			possibly not as there will be lots more that want to be involved in the fishery and will be happy with a smaller daily catch to be involved in the fishery (050301)
			It should help fisherman in the current KEIFCA permit fishery, however not if its two independent fisheries. It will help create employment, and the local economy. The good thing is these options will normally mean due to the smaller catch limits probably imposed the cockles will be processed locally. (x2: 050605, 050606)
			I don't think this will support or strengthen the local coastal community. (050811)
			I don't believe that this option gives a fair opportunity for people and businesses involved like myself as it seems this is more suited for the locals instead of the people who have shown the same dedication to the fishery but have to face in my opinion a harder time in showing their dedication by travelling long distances to the area to make It fair I think all that have shown this dedication should be given an equal chance. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	2		Fairer than current (050910)
Other Sector	1		
(l) Will the option help encourage businesses to invest in a safe and skilled workforce?			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO	21		Only if the Thames Management zone is limited to 14 licenses. (050705)

CFFPB	1		This option allows a small number the confidence to invest but leaves the vessels outside the Thames management zone less confidence to invest if there was one area this was make a much more even playing field for all people and businesses and the area itself to thrive. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	2		
Other Sector	1		
(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	21		Only if the Thames Management zone is limited to 14 licenses. (050705)
CFFPB	1		
Other - Catching Sector	2		This will not help people who are not in the cockle industry (050805)
Other Sector	1		
12. What comments do you have regarding the limitation of licences issued under the BERMUDA option to 15-20 licences in the new Thames Management Zone?			
Response Category	Comments		
TECFO	In the new management zone, it needs to be kept at 14 licenses initially until the tac is considerably higher than it currently is, otherwise this will have a detrimental effect on the investment within the industry and shoreside operations (x16: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050704, 050705, 050801)		
	The increase in the licence number is contrary to the Evaluation Criteria and therefore should remain at 14 licences. Consideration for change can be given in the future if the TAC becomes significantly higher. Any increase in licences will jeopardise the investment made by the industry at land and sea. (x2: 050603, 050604)		
	More acceptable than the Cayman option. (042202)		
	The licences should be limited to 14 until the TAC has been increased, this will avoid a decrease in investment within the industry and the wider supply chain (050802)		
	Will not last if you increase the licences, should stay as it has been last 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)		
CFFPB	Great if you get one (050301)		
	Leave the licences at 14. If this is not acceptable then current serving skippers, then other local vessels outside of TEFCO families, past and present should be looked at for criteria in receiving a licence. The financial impact of 20 licences would be felt, and I don't think it would please		

	everyone, and the pressure would still be on to make it a bigger fishery, and a free for all. (x2: 050605, 050606)
	I can't agree with the amount of licences as I don't agree with the area boundaries in this option. (050811)
	This limit on the licences would mean a small few get wealthy and some which struggle instead of having one bigger area such as the Cayman but an increase in licences to enable more vessel to make a living from the Thames instead of a small few. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	Well it seems that is the only option available 24 would be better (050901)
	I agree with the option of 15-20 for local able boats within the Thames Estuary. (050909)
	Sensible as long as TAC managed to fleet increase (050910)
Other Sector	Not in favour of this option. It keeps the status quo. A smaller daily quota would allow more vessels into the fishery. (042201)
13. What comments do you have regarding the limitation of permits issued under the BERMUDA option to 10-14 permits in the Coastal Management Zones?	
Response Category	Comments
TECFO	I believe that it should be probably 7 on the Kent side and up to 10 on the Essex side. This would provide the opportunity of creating a long-term viable fishery that will supplement their earnings of the entrants whilst still continuing with their normal fishing activities (x15: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050704, 050801)
	Local vessels under 14m with catch limitations will help sustain a viable permit fishery. (x2: 050603, 050604)
	Still My Favourite option (042202)
	The option to work in the coastal management zones should only be available to local fishermen who want to supplement their income from other fishing methods. This will limit the number of permit applications. Both zones need to be accessible to all permit holders as there is never a steady supply of cockles in either. (050705)
	I agree with this (050802)
	I believe the Kent side small boats should be able to get permits (050911)
	Maximum 14/15 permits. The fewer the better to allow a select number of vessels to make a decent supplementary income. If too many are granted then the smaller vessels will not be able to justify the investment to get involved (050902)
CFFPB	The cockles that fall there may give a handful of days every other year (050301)
	The coastal management zones need to be bigger, and as one. I understand that the large Thames management zone various areas have helped in the years with poor cockles, however a compromise should be reached. Something has to give a little, to appease pressure on the TEFCO (x2: 050605, 050606)
	I think the coastal management zones will not work, and when taking into consideration the area sizes and how many cockles these areas produce compared within the Thames management zone, the licence numbers are disproportionate. (050811)
	I think this could be challenging to achieve to decide who the permits a given to. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	10-14 will not really be enough (050601)
	My boat is not capable of using a suction dredge so would not be able to fish the area (050805)

	How will the decision be made on who is given a permit? (050807)
	I think that would work as the two areas hold a lot less stock than the Thames management zone (050901)
	I agree with the option of 15-20 for local able boats within the Thames Estuary. (050909)
	Yes providing permits are allocated fairly and accordingly (050910)
Other Sector	A positive proposal but is not much different to what is allowed at present, which is unsatisfactory. (042201)
14. Do you have any comments regarding the boundaries of the different management zones?	
Response Category	Comments
TECFO	These seem reasonable and would allow everyone to earn a fair and sustainable living (x16: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050704, 050705, 050801)
	Keeping the TMZ the same with the 14 licences will work with keeping the permit fishery the same with limited tonnage. We believe this will make a viable fishery. (x2: 050603, 050604)
	The boundaries seem fair and workable (050802)
	Seems fair and opens up to help Kent side small vessels (050911)
	They allow for a good balance (050902)
CFFPB	I don't think we should have an Essex and Kent divide. (x2: 050605, 050606)
	It is not a good idea to split the areas up apart from areas 1,2,3 which should be used for a handwork fishery. (050811)
Other - Catching Sector	Area 6 could taken out of the Thames management zone and put into the Essex Coastal management zone because of the reluctance of licence holders to fish the area. This would make The Essex Coastal management zone a more viable proposition. (050807)
	Maybe include 6 and 15 to make it a bit more fair (050901)
Other Sector	There should be no boundaries. There should be just the one zone which would encompass all of the zones. (042201)
15. General feedback on BERMUDA option	
Response Category	Comments
TECFO	This option has similarities to the Haiti option and therefore this seems to cover the desires of the local fishing industry (x15: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050704, 050801)
	A Regulating Order with 14 licences keeps the fishery viable and sustainable. The permit fishery with limited tonnage keeps it viable for local vessels wanting to come into the fishery. The vision of the future of the cockle fishery is to keep the existing 14 licences in the existing TECFO area, alongside a more productive fishing permit fishery with limited fishers. We are already the most sustainable cockle fishery in Europe. It needs to stay that way but only by keeping the existing fleet the same. The existing fleet has been fished by multi generations of the same families passing down to the existing fishers leading to many years of experience and local knowledge which facilitates the sustainability of the fishery. Any potential new fishers would not have the expertise or local knowledge, leading to potential overfishing of some areas and long-term damage to the grounds. The idea is to keep the TECFO the same and that we sustain our

	<p>MSC accreditation status for the next generation of fishers, who will look after and nurture the fishery as has been done so for generations by their predecessors. The permit fishery is the one that needs to be better managed and made viable as a small-scale fishery. This would look like a fishery for local inshore fleet for vessels of any size up to 14m. They could use any gear type as long as it fished from the vessel and meets the 10% breakage rate rule. (x2: 050603, 050604)</p>
	Possibly a good compromise (042202)
	This option seems to cover the desires of the local fishing industry. (050705)
	This option is more in line with the wishes and thoughts of the local fishing community and is similar to the current TECFO order, hence we know it will be successful. (050802)
	One of the best suggested options (050902)
CFFPB	Only acceptable option along with one other, as you have defined small scale fishing in the other model; personally, it is not preferred (x2: 050605, 050606)
	This is not the best option. (050811)
	I wouldn't like to see the Bermuda option in place but would much rather see one area like the Cayman but tweaked in some area to give an even playing field for all involved in the fishery. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	More closed shop in regulated area and not enough permits for inshore using different methods (050601)
	This would not be good for me (050805)
	New licences/permits must only be given to local Thames estuary fishermen. (050807)
	Its ok it would give more opportunities to other local fisherman as long as the licences aren't swallowed up by the Thames management zone licence holders. But it would be a lot off initial outlay for not a lot of return (050901)
	This seems a better choice in my eyes (050910)
Other Sector	I can see why the present licence holders would favour this option, but it does not allow any other vessels to come into the fishery. (042201)