

**16. Please provide feedback on the GRENADA 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)<br>I feel this option provides a simple framework for all involved in the fishery to work within (050811) |
| Other - Catching Sector | 2   |    |   |
| Other 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                   | 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)<br>this option should be easy, cost efficient and limit the amount of paperwork applicants have to fill in. (050811) |
| Other - Catching Sector | 2   |    |  |
| 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) |
| Other - Catching Sector | 2   |    |  |
| 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   | 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. Would help fisherman with suction dredges as the permits are more limited allowing more TAC, and therefore hopefully more turnover, and a more employment and better safety. (x2: 050605, 050606)<br>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   | 1   | 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   | 3   | 2  | No, this option does not allow for the participation of the non-cockle suction dredge fishers within the Local KEIFCA (x15: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704)<br>No, this option does allow enough other local boats to enter into the permit fishery. (x2: 050603, 050604)   |
| 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)  |
| Other - Catching Sector   | 1   | 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   | 2   | 2  | No, this option does not allow for the participation of the non-cockle suction dredge fishers within the Local KEIFCA (x15: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704)<br>No, this option does allow enough other local boats to enter into the permit fishery. (x2: 050603, 050604)<br>With acceptable changes to the MSC, yes. (042202)  |
| 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)   |
|---|-----|----|---|
| Other - Catching Sector   | 1   | 1  |   |
| Other Sector  |     |    |   |
| <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   |    | On the Thames Management zone if 14 licenses issued Essex Coastal management zone 7.18.19.20. and areas 10.14 and 17. If limited number of licenses and restrictions on gear type not just suction dredging as this is against what the local fishing fleet require, and no limit on vessel size as long as it is within the KEIFCA vessel size limit (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)   |
|   |     |    | It should (042202)  |
|   |     |    | No, there are too many licenses in the Thames Management Zone. I think 5 to 8 permits in the coastal areas would not be enough for the local boats that would show interest. (050704)   |
|   |     |    | Only in the Thames Management Zone and only if the Thames Management Zone is limited to 14 licenses. (050705)   |
|   |     |    | Yes if it the framework fits in with the current cockle industry, then it will undoubtedly work (050802)  |
|   |     |    | Will only be viable if 14 licences (050911)   |
| CFFPB   |     |    | Possibly (050301)   |
| Other - Catching Sector   | 1   |    |   |
| Other Sector  |     |    |   |
| (h) Will the option help support local skilled employment?  |     |    |   |
| Response Category   | Yes | No | Comments  |
| TECFO   | 21  |    | Only if access is restricted to local vessels. (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   | 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   | 20  |    | Only in the Thames Management Zone and 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   | 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   | 2  | it is difficult to evaluate this at such an early stage, depending on the methods of fishing employed this is possible (x15) (050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704)   |
|   |     |    | It is difficult to evaluate this outcome at such as early stage. (x2: 050603, 050604)   |
|   |     |    | 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)  |
|   |     |    | It should (042202)  |
| CFFPB   |     |    | if processors do not get licenses then yes (050301)   |
| Other - Catching Sector   |     | 1  |   |
| Other Sector  |     |    |   |
| <b>Strengthening and supporting our dynamic local coastal community</b>   |     |    |   |
| (k) Does the option provide fair opportunities for individuals and businesses, and help support young or new fishers?                               |     |    |   |
| Response Category   | Yes | No | Comments  |
| TECFO   | 21  |    | Yes for the Thames management zone. No for the Coastal zones, as it does not allow for enough gear types. This will not allow some of the smaller vessels to engage in the fishery. (050902)  |
| CFFPB   |     |    | you wouldn't be happy if you got the blue zone and not the orange (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)   |
| Other - Catching Sector   | 1   |    | No it makes it a closed shop (050910)   |

|   |  |    |  |
|---|--|----|--|
| Other Sector  |  |    |  |
| <b>(l) Will the option help encourage businesses to invest in a safe and skilled workforce?</b>   |  |    |  |
| Response Category   | Yes  | No | Comments   |
| TECFO   | 21   |    | Only if the Thames Management zone is limited to 14 licenses. (050705) |
| CFFPB   |  |    | Yes in the orange zone (050301)  |
| Other - Catching Sector   | 1  | 1  |  |
| Other Sector  |  |    |  |
| <b>(m) Does the option help support the heritage and culture of the cockle fishery, including supporting local tourism associated with the Thames cockle fishery?</b> |  |    |  |
| Response Category   | Yes  | No | Comments   |
| TECFO   | 21   |    | Only if the Thames Management zone is limited to 14 licenses. (050705) |
| CFFPB   | 1  |    |  |
| Other - Catching Sector   | 1  | 1  |  |
| Other Sector  |  |    |  |
| <b>17. What comments do you have regarding the limitation of licences issued under the GRENADA option to 15-20 licences in the new Thames Management Zone?</b>        |  |    |  |
| 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 (x17: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050704, 050705, 050801, 050802)                           |    |  |
|   | Keep it at 14 licences. (x2: (050603, 050604)  |    |  |
|   | Still prefer to keep it at 14 (042202)   |    |  |
|   | Should not increase, should stay as 14 licences (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 TECFO 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)   |    |  |

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
|                         | I think this needs to be increased like I have said previously especially when you look at the Jamaica option which is 15-20 licences for a smaller area. (050812) |
| Other - Catching Sector | Enough suction dredges as is (050910)  |
|                         | I agree with the option of 15-20 for local able boats within the Thames Estuary. (050909)  |
| Other Sector            | This option is better than Bermuda, but it still does not allow more vessels into the main fishery. (042201)   |

**18. What comments do you have regarding the limitation of permits issued under the GRENADA option to 5-8 permits in the Coastal Management Zones?**

| Response Category   | Comments  |
|---|---|
| TECFO   | I do not believe this is likely to encourage anyone in to cockle fishing as there is more interest (x14: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801)                      |
|   | 5-8 is not enough permits and will not create sufficient opportunities for other vessels. (x2: 050603, 050604)  |
|   | Try it and see (042202)   |
|   | The local fleet interest would be higher than 8. (050704)   |
|   | Limiting permits to local vessels only will restrict the numbers. (050705)  |
|   | 5-8 permits is a small number of permits which would not support a local fishing community, however the number of permits should depend on stock and this can only be determined annually through careful surveys of the grounds (050802)     |
|   | Wouldn't be worth doing (050911)  |
|   | It is a good number to allow for management of stocks. (050902)   |
| CFFPB   | It isn't many (050301)  |
|   | I think it will be better I think 14 permits is too much for the areas you are proposing. (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 would be very challenging to apply and decide who gets these permits. (050812)   |
| Other - Catching Sector   | No good, closed shop (050601)   |
|   | Not enough (050807)   |
|   | Not viable (050909)   |
|   | Will the existing cockle licence owners be able to apply? If so this reduces chance of others gaining a permit (050910)   |
| Other Sector  | This option gives vessels more opportunity to do more days. Will the permits go to the licence vessels? Vessels who have a licence to the main fishery should be excluded from having a permit. (042201)                                      |
| <b>19. Do you have any comments regarding the boundaries of the different management zones?</b> |   |
| Response Category   | Comments  |

| TECFO   | 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 Thames management boundary is good. Local vessels need to access both coastal management zones. (050705)   |
|   | These new boundaries are a large step away from what is already working perfectly at present, and represent a step backwards instead of forwards (050802)  |
|   | Outside area should not be split, should stay as one (050911)  |
| CFFPB   | Don't split the areas, make it slightly larger for the Coastal management zone (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)   |
|   | Any area out of Thames Management Zone should be as one (050909)   |
| Other Sector                                  | There should be no boundaries. There should be just the one zone which would encompass all of the zones. (042201)  |
| <b>20. General feedback on GRENADA option</b> |  |
| Response Category                             | Comments   |
| TECFO   | It is not taking in to account the needs of the Local fishing industry (x16: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704, 050705)   |
|   | Area as a Regulating Order is good for 14 licences, but as previously stated there are not enough permits for new vessels to enter into the fishery (x2: 050603, 050604)   |
|   | Another option (042202)  |
|   | It hasn't been formulated with the local fishing community in mind. (050802)   |
|   | Will not work for the local fishing industry (small vessels) (050911)  |
|   | Lack of additional gear types in the Coastal management zones, means this option doesn't allow much scope for introducing smaller vessels into the small-scale fishery (050902)  |
| CFFPB   | Same as Bermuda not really what I would like, however due to the small-scale fishing suggestion with under 10 metres I have no choice as my boat is an old TEFCO vessel, which have been made larger over the years, for safety, and efficiency (x2: 050605, 050606)   |
|   | This is not a good option (050811)   |
|   | My thoughts are very similar to the Bermuda option I would sooner see one larger area with an increased amount of licences this would not only result in a more beneficial fishery for all but would create a more stream line and dynamic approach to how the fishery is run. I also think one area would be more cost effective and environment friendly and if done correctly there would be no increase in seabed activity but would actually result in a longer period of time that the seabed is left undisturbed which gives a greater chance of sustainability in the Thames district which in my opinion is the main aim for all involved. (050812) |
| Other - Catching Sector                       | New licences/permits must only be given to local Thames estuary fishermen. (050807)  |
|   | Not viable (050909)  |

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
|              | Doesn't seem fair for existing fishers outside the current cockle industry (9050910)  |
| 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 main fishery. (042201) |