

**6. Please provide feedback on the CAYMAN 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	1	
CFFPB			This makes everything very easy for KEIFCA as is as now, except for the extra licences. Its great if you are/to become a licence holder in the Thames Management zone. However, it does nothing to 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)
Other - Catching Sector	1	1	Very simple but not sustainable (050910)
			Easy to administer, but not fair on all fishermen unless they get a licence. Need equal access. (050709)
			This is only ok if you are an existing licence holder (050805)
			Whilst this option is simplest and most easy to administer, it does not provide small scale fishers any opportunity. (050807)
			The Cayman will be the easiest to manage and administer but the least open to all boats and isn't that dissimilar to the current fishery (050810)
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	22	1	If you are a commercial fisherman there is too much paperwork regardless of the species you fish. (042202)
CFFPB	1		Whilst this is a relatively easy system to manage, it would be to the detriment of the fishery. (050902)
			Regarding paperwork I don't think this applies as is quite straight forward and lots of help is available (050605, 050606)
			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)
			This option should be easy, cost efficient and limit the amount of paperwork applicants have to fill in. (050811)

Other - Catching Sector	1	1	there is no mention of 'local' so open to too many applicants (050910)
Other Sector	1		
<b>(c) Will the option help create clear rules and regulations and be straightforward for KEIFCA officers to enforce and fishers to comply with?</b>			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO	22	1	
CFFPB	1		Gear is suction dredging which is easy to monitor and check (050605, 050606)
			Whatever option chosen Rules that are made will always be adhered to if a fair penalty system is in place. (050808)
			overall I think most fishers comply with the rules that an IFCA makes. (050809)
			I believe it will enable all involved to understand what the standard practice is because you will know that the rules set apply to you instead of having different rules for different areas making in unclear which rules people should follow in different areas. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	1	1	
OTHER SECTOR	1		
<b>Creating an environmentally responsible fishery</b>			
<b>(d) Does the option help ensure the cockle stock population is fished within clear limits that consider stock assessments and breeding stock?</b>			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO		22	Control gives sustainability as long as Nature is kind. (042202)
CFFPB	3	1	The addition of extra licences to the current 14 will have a massive impact on the current fishery. It is not always a lucrative fishery and people need to see beyond recent years. As an applicant for the coastal management zone (KEIFCA outside area), how many non TECFO, local vessels have applied? No one was interested except the large wash companies, and a few independents. Now there is this massive interest and it is all about destroying the current fishery, like everywhere else, thinking they are going to get rich in a year. (050605, 050606)
Other - Catching Sector	1	1	If there's more suction dredge licences issued it will need to have better management (050805)
Other Sector	1		I do not feel there should be any more suction licences (050910)
<b>(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?</b>			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO		22	Control lessens the impact. (042202)
CFFPB	3	1	

Other - Catching Sector	1	2	More dredges means more ground exploitation, more catches to be inspected meaning more scope for 'black' cockles (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		22	We do not know if we will be able to keep the MSC with more boats fishing, all the facts and information will have to be presented to the MSC for consideration. (042202)
CFFPB	3	1	Environmentally it is not too bad as the TAC will control the fishery. (050605, 050606)
Other - Catching Sector	1	1	More boats, more effort, more fuel more emissions, less management (050910)
Other Sector	1		
<b>Helping to support a successful and resilient local coastal economy</b>			
(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	1	1	only of it is limited to 14 licences/operatives (x18: 050602, 050603, 050604, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050704, 050705, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050802, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608)
			Only if licenses are limited to a sustainable number. Track record has shown that 14 is sustainable over time. (050902)
CFFPB	2		It can only support a local coastal economy if you keep it to local boats. (050605, 050606)
			This option will sustain a viable long-term cockle fishery. (050811)
			I think that this option offers the framework to provide all involved with a sustainable fishery in the district (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	1	2	Not good for long term, other than 15-20 licenced boat no one makes any money. (050709)
Other Sector	1		
(h) Will the option help support local skilled employment?			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO	1	3	Yes, you need sustainability to keep fishermen in this industry, the industry is losing men and attracting to few. The same goes for the shore jobs that rely on the industry for work. (042202)
			only it is limited to 14 vessels as the TAC would not increase and would therefore have a negative impact on the local skilled employment as only part time employment would be available. (x16: 050602, 050603, 050604, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050802, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608)

			20 licenses would see skilled employment move to other sectors for a better income (050704)
			Not if there is an increase to 15-20 licenses. The beds included to make the area larger have never produced any quantities of cockles on a regular basis, if any at all. This would lead to an increase in fishing activity on the main beds and reduce commercial viability. (050705)
			Additional licenses, without additional TAC will mean that the existing workforce will have less work This will result in a culture of temporary unskilled workers. (050902)
CFFPB	2		It won't increase employment everything will remain the same. (x2: 050605, 050606)
			It will help support local skilled employment but should also support the current skilled cockle fishers that work in the outside permit fishery, that are not all local boats but rely on the Thames fishery and are committed to it. (050811)
			feel that it would support all skilled employment in the area not just locals but people who have shown financial dedication and that have shown a consistent fishing effort in the district over the years. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	1	2	This will only assist the existing cockle fishermen (050805)
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	1	5	Yes, 100% certainty promotes growth. (042202)
			More licences would be detrimental to long-term investment and growth (x13: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608)
			it would not encourage people to invest long term and growth in the industry as entry costs into the industry are huge. (x2: 050603, 050604)
			The fishery would be too fragile to support long term investment. (050704)
			Definitely not. It would most likely have the opposite effect. (050705)
			Only if licenses are limited to a sustainable number. Track record has shown that 14 is sustainable over time. (050902)
CFFPB	2		Shore side this year there are only probably going to be three processing factories. I think it will soon be two Fruits of the sea and Osbornes. Both have made massive investments and are working very hard for the local industry and employment. Hopefully the other boats within the current TECFO will serve these local processors and help the local infrastructure etc. But at present it is very non-committal. (x2: 050605, 050606)
			This option should encourage long term investment in all areas. (050811)
			I believe that this option offers the chance for all involved to invest into the fishery and this leads to growth in the economy and trade and this will also support the local infrastructure and supply chains as well. (050812)

Other - Catching Sector		3	
Other Sector	1		
<b>(j) Will the option help to 'add value' to the cockles that are caught in the cockle fishery?</b>			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO		20	here again certainty attracts all types of business (042202) Cockles are only worth what the customer is willing to pay. Speaking to other wholesalers/retailers, it is clear that in today's uncertain financial climate, we are pretty much at the top end of what we can charge for our product. Any lowering of the T.A.C per license would have a severe effect on finances and future essential investment (050607).
CFFPB	1	1	I believe that whichever option is picked it will not really affect the value of cockles in the area as this is a totally different sector in itself and relies on supply and demand. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector		1	Only if hand raked are promoted (050910)
Other Sector	1		
<b><u>Strengthening and supporting our dynamic local coastal community</u></b>			
<b>(k) Does the option provide fair opportunities for individuals and businesses, and help support young or new fishers?</b>			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO		10	The World of Commercial fishing is not a fair place, we cannot change the World and to try and change Commercial fishing in this one small part would be interesting. (042202) it does not offer fair opportunities to individuals or business and certainly would be cost prohibitive to the young or new fishers (x13: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608) it doesn't offer either of these things as previously stated, barriers to entry due to cost are too high. (x2: 050603, 050604) The fishery would be too volatile for young fishers to consider a long future within in it (050704)
CFFPB	2		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 doesn't support existing Fisherman in the coastal management zone. It should be remembered the independents who have to work 6/7 days a week, to be able to work the poor current outside area. We have spent and wasted lots of money trying to fish outside the area. This option does not support any of us outside TECFO (x2: 050605, 050606) Young Fishers will only come into the industry if they see a long-term future this is currently a big problem. (050808) I hope that there is a fair opportunity for fishers new and older to carry on coming into the industry and can see a long-term future. (050809)

Other - Catching Sector		2	Only helps the select few licenced boats – same as it is now. Thames cockle fishery (southern Essex) doesn't help North Essex/ Mersea now. (050709)
			This will only help the existing cockle fishermen (050805)
			It may increase employment (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	1	11	20 licenses would make the fishery unstable for investment in anyway (050704)
			No as issuing 15-20 licenses will cut down the prospect of investment as the tac would have to be reduced with consequent negative effect on economies of scale (x16: 050602, 050603, 050604, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050705, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608)
			There would be less investment from the industry if the TAC was reduced by more licences being issued (050802)
			No, a reduced TAC will not encourage investment. It will have a reverse effect of cost cutting. (050902)
CFFPB	2		Whatever plan either ORDER or BYELAW chosen there should be a guarantee to fishers that once they've invested in the cockle fishery they are assured they can take part every year there is stock available. (050808)
			If fishers are to remain and invest in the cockle fishery they must have security to invest long term. (050809)
Other - Catching Sector	2	2	MCA have made no room for unsafe unskilled labour (050910)
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	3	3	This would have no detrimental effect on the tourist industry as people like to visit and see the cockle boats landing (x14: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050704, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608)
			No, this will be detrimental to the tourist industry in Leigh-on-Sea, for which the cockle industry provides a spectacle when people come to see the boats land and leave port. (x2: 050603, 050604)
			Even though the existing system has been so successful for the fishery there has still been a steady decline in shore-based activities over the last 30 years. An increase in license numbers creating a less profitable fishery will only hasten this decline. Really not good for tourism! (050705)
			there wouldn't be a change in levels of tourism (x2) (050802, 050902)
CFFPB	3		A combined TECFO and CFFPB area New Order option will help the Heritage side by sharing the landing of cockles to more ports regularly within the Thames fisheries. If more ports around the Thames are used for commercial cockle fishing more consistently

			<p>this will add to the Dynamic of more local communities around the Thames. (050808)</p> <p>The Cayman option would help heritage by still keeping cockle boats working and bringing in tourism as people love to come and see the fishing boats whether at sea or in port. (050809)</p>
Other - Catching Sector	1	1	Not without promoting hand raked (050910)
Other Sector	1		
<b>7. What comments do you have regarding the limitation of licences issued under the CAYMAN option to 15-20 licences in the new Thames Management Zone?</b>			
Response Category	Comments		
TECFO	<p>As a company that has interests in TECFO boats and also has cockle boats in the Wash this is a very interesting question. Firstly I applaud you for your mechanism in replacing your Fishery Order!!. I am strong supporter of a "Fishery Order" because I think these are the main reasons The Wash and The Thames Fisheries have been successful where other lesser regulated fisheries have failed and gone. The priority must be the continued success of this fishery if by increasing the number of boats you allow to fish it endangers this, then I am against increasing the licences, if you are sure increasing the licences will not have a damaging effect then I would ask how you intend to choose who has these licences because it will be one very difficult task. (042202)</p>		
	<p>The issuing of more licenses under this option will see the demise of the successful Thames cockle fishery and see investment decline (x15: 050602, 050603, 050604, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 0507014, 050608).</p>		
	<p>Licenses need to be limited to 14, history proves that this amount of licenses is sustainable (050704).</p>		
	<p>Increasing the number of licenses under this option will result in reduced investment and the eventual demise of the successful Thames cockle fishery. (050705)</p>		
	<p>Issuing more licences than the current regulating order will have a detrimental impact on the cockle industry as a whole and the local communities which it supports (businesses, suppliers, workforce, services and every retailer involved in supplying the cockle industry) (050802)</p>		
	<p>14 licences should stay as it has been for last Regulating Order (050911)</p>		
	<p>The issuing of more licences under this option will see less days for us, less TAC and leading to a part time job. (050801)</p>		
	<p>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. (050902)</p>		
CFFPB	<p>That could possibly only be one extra licence issued unless you redistribute the seven that have already sold. Current cockle fishers who haven't sold should keep their entitlement (050301)</p>		
	<p>Leave the licences at 14. If this is not acceptable then current serving skippers, 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. (050605, 050606)</p>		
	<p>I feel 15 to 20 is too low if we have a CAYMAN Style fishery (050808)</p>		

	<p>Think there is scope for a few more than 20 licences especially if you go for the Cayman option. (050809)</p> <p>I think that this should be reconsidered and increased because in other ideas where there is a smaller area for the Thames management zone there is still a limit of 15-20 licences but this option offers a considerable increase in area so my only issue with this option is the suggested amount of licences. I think there could be more because there is only one TAC if this is taken sooner by more vessels it is the same difference as a smaller quantity of vessels fishing for a longer period of time. This could be achieved by vessels alternating fishing in certain area which would manage the amount of vessels on one area. (050812)</p>
	<p>I don't agree with the 15-20 licences. I feel that the size of the area and the amount of cockles these sands produce would accommodate the 28 licences proposed by industry. Having 28 fishing vessels in this area will not impact the seabed, environment or carbon footprint any more than having 15-20 licences. This is because no matter how many boats there are, they can only take the tac that is given, meaning the amount of cockles being taken and the impact on the sand will be the same (if all fishers have the correct efficient equipment), the only thing being changed is how many cockles each vessel will receive. This means that the only factor left, is does 28 licences in this area make it economically viable. The fishery will still be very economically viable and I would like to use The Wash cockle fishery as an example why. If there was a tac of 6000 tonnes between 28 vessels in the Thames fishery, this would give each vessel around 214 tonnes. There are 61 vessels that work the wash cockle fishery, if there were a tac of 6000 tonnes here, each vessel would receive 98 tonnes. Now taking into consideration that the wash cockle fishery is economically and environmentally viable and has supported the 61 licences through the 30 years of the WFO (with some years producing a smaller tac than this example and still providing a viable fishery), this shows that the Thames could easily provide the industry proposed 28 licences. Also, if there was a worry that 28 vessels working in an area of this size is a safety hazard, the Wash can once again be used as an example as there has been 61 vessels suction dredging in the past in this area with no health and safety issues. The only issue with suction dredging in the Wash was many vessels did not have efficient fishing equipment this would not be an issue in the Thames fishery if all boats had efficient equipment that was maintained to a high standard, as already is the standard practice. There are also other options if it is still felt that it is not safe to have 28 vessels working at once in this area, a few examples being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Limiting the amount of boats on one sand at a time, and alternating the vessels each day so every vessel has their equal share from that area</li> <li>○ Half of the boats fishing the day tide and the other half fishing the night tide, alternating each week so everybody fishes an equal amount of day/night tides</li> <li>○ depending on how many days are fished a week, boats fishing one day on one day off, for example half the boats fish Monday, Wednesday, Friday and the other half fish Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday. Also alternating so each vessel gets the equal amount of weekend work. (050811)</li> </ul>
Other - Catching Sector	<p>Still too many suction licences, no mention of hand-raking, no applicant criteria, no prevention of new permit holders selling out to big companies (050910)</p> <p>Should be more licences for smaller LOCAL boats. (050709)</p>

	More of the same, closed shop! (050601)
	This will attract boats from other areas of the country (050805)
	It's not going to create enough opportunities for the local fishing industry that is struggling. Issuing a few licences would only help a few chosen ones that would most possibly already be involved in the closed shop "\$ licences would be better (050901)
	I agree with the option of 15-20 for local able boats within the Thames Estuary (050909)
Other Sector	A smaller daily quota can allow more licences and more competition. More competition usually means higher prices. (042201)
<b>8. What comments do you have regarding the lack of a regular fishery in the Coastal Management Zones under the CAYMAN option?</b>	
Response Category	Comments
TECFO	If you listen to rumours, I would say you need more control of some of the boats already fishing cockles in the Thames. Or if we are realistic, I would say "We cannot have what Nature does not give". (042202)
	Nature has not provided any options for anyone outside of the cockle fleet to engage within the fishery as has been time proven for the past 40 + years (x10: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050908, 050701, 050608).
	These areas have never been fished and the reason for this is that they are unsustainable according to your current management plan. This should not change if it is an unsustainable area. (x2) (050603, 050604)
	No amount of literature, protocol or management will convince mother nature to put cockles where she doesn't want to put them (050704).
	Nature dictates if there are cockles on any of the beds! The areas in the coastal Management Zones have never produced any amount of cockles on a regular basis. You can't have a regular fishery if there are no cockles there and in many years there are no cockles there! (050705)
	Stock levels have been inconsistent over the last decades (050802)
	The conditions on the cockle beds have not been suitable for anyone outside the cockle fleet to fish, as the last 40 years have shown. (x3: 050803, 050804, 050806)
	There has been plenty of fish and other fisheries up until now. (050801)
	It is too vast and vague. (050902)
CFFPB	Grounds like minis bay (area 14) don't get opened when there is sometimes a huge amount of cockles in a very small area (050301)
	It is not acceptable. (050605, 050606)
	Maybe have some form of criteria where a fisher could maybe go prospecting to see if cockles could be found in these areas. Without this option no one will ever know if anything exists in these areas. (050808)
	Have the chance for fishers to survey grounds themselves as the Thames is a vast area for any authority to survey and could only help all. (050809)
	I feel that the lack of regular fishing will continue for now, but it's crucial there are management measures in place in case a fishery does become viable here in the future. A byelaw seems like the best management option for this area as it is unknown if any fishery, or what type of fishery will take place here. (050811)
Other - Catching Sector	There is no opportunity for small scale fisheries and local economy (050805)
	How would cockles be found in the Coastal management zones and what would qualify as enough to organise a fishery? (050807)

	It's terrible to take away all opportunities to fish outside the area (050901)
Other Sector	When small areas of cockles have been found it has been problematic to open them, so it is often the case to keep them closed. (042201)
<b>9. Do you have any comments regarding the boundaries of the different management zones?</b>	
Response Category	Comments
TECFO	The vision of this zone area is not a true reflection of the cockling availability (x11: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050908, 050701, 050608, 050801)
	You have created an illusion of an area that is smaller than it looks on a Management Zone. You have taken away the areas that could support a small-scale fishery with limited tonnage. (x2: 050603, 050604)
	Although this area is vast, the cockle grounds within it are not. If this area was twice as big, fishing opportunities would still only be on the small amount of beds within it (050704)
	The enlarged area would seem to allow for an increase in license numbers but it is illusion based on a false assumption. This option also prevents anyone else working in the Coastal Management Zones! (050705)
	The boundaries do not show the current distribution of cockles and therefore this option would not be viable (050802)
	The view of this area is not a true reflection of the availability of cockles according to Q8. response. More territory does not mean more fishing. (x3: 050803, 050804, 050806)
	It doesn't allow for a small-scale fishery, which is something that the local fleets are very keen to have in place. (050902)
CFFPB	The coastal management zones need to be bigger. I understand that within 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 TECFO. (050605, 050606)
	Maybe some zones can be re-drawn to make a more modern look on a chart. (050808)
	I think this is the correct boundary, but I feel that areas 1,2,3 as on the Aruba option, should be created as a handwork fishery to give the inshore fleet and new fishers a chance to come into the fishery. (050811)
Other - Catching Sector	1 larger area is easier to police (050805)
	The inclusion of Area 7 in the regulating order would be a waste as this area would not be worked by vessels who could otherwise work areas of better-quality cockles. Including areas 10 and 14 in the Thames management zone would further disappoint small scale fishers wanting to get involved in the fishery. (050807)
	Can't understand why the whole Thames would be owned by 15-20 licences and why would local fisherman have to lose the opportunity to fish outside the area? (050901)
Other Sector	There should be no different zones, much easier to manage. (042201)
<b>10. General feedback on CAYMAN option</b>	
Response Category	Comments
TECFO	If you feel you have to increase the licences maybe you could have special licences that are only valid for one year so as you could trial it? (042202)
	This option does not seem to involve the general thoughts or wishes of the local fishing communities, I believe this option is not the way forward (x11:

	050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050908, 050701, 050608, 050801).
	Cayman is not an option. It will create a 28 boat fishery, when technically it is a smaller area than is perceived. The evidence to support this is based on lower cockle density in the other areas which are proposed to be included in this model. This will not encourage or create local jobs as it will create a full-scale suction dredge fishery which will not be sustainable and will ultimately destroy the cockle grounds. It won't support a full-scale fishery and will not encourage new fishers into a permit fishery that is a non-starter. (x2: 050603, 050604)
	This option would see 20 boats fishing the exact same beds that 14 always have. There may be opportunities to fish in other parts of the area but the varying value of the cockles will see all of the fishing activity on the Maplin sands, which would then be damaged by extra dredges and die (050704).
	I cannot see that this option reflects the general thoughts or wishes of the local fishing communities. It is not an option that pleases anyone. Definitely not the way to go. (050705)
	This option would not work for the local fishing industries nor the current cockle industry. It is not a well thought out option. Having worked these areas for the last 27 years, I do not believe this option would work. (050802)
	This option does not seem to rely on small local fishing communities. This option is not the way forward. (x3: 050803, 050804, 050806)
	It wouldn't work (050911)
	Track record of fishing in this area will be given to a very large number of vessels. Any vessels that have previously taken part in the permit fishery will have a record of fishing inside this area. This could leave the authority with multiple legal actions for a right to fish. (050902)
CFFPB	Not acceptable (x2: 050605, 050606)
	CAYMAN with more Licences combined with ARUBA for a small hand work Fishery would work (050808)
	Cayman would be best option in my opinion but if that was not an option for some reason then perhaps Cayman and Aruba together. (050809)
	My main point is that the 15-20 licences is nowhere near enough for an area of this size with the amount of cockles it continuously produces and that it is crucial the 28 licences industry proposed must be reconsidered. Also, I feel that this is the correct boundary area, if areas 1,2,3 were made into a handwork fishery. It is the best option and I feel it would be the easiest fishery to run and take part in out of all the options provided. (050811)
	I mostly agree with the Cayman option but I think that the amount of licences in this area should be revised and this would create a financially viable fishery for all and it would also allow investment from all parties involved. I also think that this option could be adapted to offer a small-scale handwork fishery like shown in another option. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	Not a god idea in my opinion (050805)
	No advantages to new cockle fishermen. New licences/permits must only be given to local Thames Estuary fishermen. (050807)
	If I was a licence holder it would be great but not for me I think it's terrible (050901)
	Another closed shop for the big boys (050910)
Other Sector	It is a good option, but for the small amount of licences being made available. 28 is a more realistic number. (042201)