

41. Please provide feedback on the HAITI 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	26		This is all good for all the areas. We would only want 14 licences. Trialling for 3 vessels isn't enough. This does tick some of the boxes, apart from K and L, which are met from the Evaluation Criteria. (x2: 050603, 050604)
CFFPB			think by keeping 14 licences within the Thames Management zone, then it's still not enough area for coastal management zone. Don't see the point in trialling, we know gear works. The drag dredge etc, has already been used, KEIFCA need to set a gear type and size then go from there. For trialling then money would need to be invested into the trial boats, which must be of the size going to be used. (x2: 050605, 050606)
Other - Catching Sector	3		
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	25	1	
CFFPB			
Other - Catching Sector	3		
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	26		
CFFPB			
Other - Catching Sector	3		
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	25		No, because you are increasing the effort in the management zone. (042202)
CFFPB			
Other - Catching Sector	3		
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	6		Yes, if the management zones are limited on vessel numbers and limited on the method of fishing (x16: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704, 050705)
			No, too much effort in the management Zone. (042202)
			Yes, as long as limited tonnage and method of fishing and all criteria are adhered to. (x2: 050603, 050604)
CFFPB			
Other - Catching Sector	3		
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	6	1	Yes, if the management zones are limited on vessel numbers and limited on the method of fishing (x16: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704, 050705)
			Yes, as long as limited tonnage and method of fishing and all criteria are adhered to. (x2: 050603, 050604)
CFFPB			
Other - Catching Sector	3		
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	3	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 and no limit on vessel size if it is within the KEIFCA vessel size limit (x14: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801)

			14 licences in the TMZ. 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 there are no more than 14 licenses in the Thames management Area (050705)
			yes as long as licences are limited to 14 unless the TAC is radically increased (050802)
			if fished by local people and bona fide fishermen (050904)
			Thames management zone would need to be 14 licenses if TAC is similar to recent years (050902)
CFFPB			
Other - Catching Sector	3		
Other Sector			
(h) Will the option help support local skilled employment?			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO	21	1	in the short term (042202)
CFFPB			Merge the Essex and Kent areas, make sure it is open to all Kent and Essex fisherman that have a permit (x2: 050605, 050606)
Other - Catching Sector	3		
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	21	1	No because the increased effort in the management zone will scare people. (042202)
CFFPB			
Other - Catching Sector	3		
Other Sector			
Strengthening and supporting our dynamic local coastal community			
(j) Will the option help to 'add value' to the cockles that are caught in the cockle fishery?			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO	3	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)
			impossible to tell at this stage (x2: 050802, 050911)
CFFPB			

Other - Catching Sector	1	1	Hard to say (050909)
Other Sector			
(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		This is all good for all the areas. We would only want 14 licences. Trialling for 3 vessels isn't enough. This does tick some of the boxes, apart from K and L, which are met from the Evaluation Criteria. (x2: 050603, 050604)
			The two blue zones will promote this. (042202)
			Yes, if the coastal management areas are only available to local vessels as previously mentioned. (050705)
CFFPB			Small boats cannot catch and process their cockles. They are so weather restricted they will need to go out and random times in the week, most fishermen do not land Monday- Friday, as the weather and tides don't let them. if 3 boats land 1 tonne in Kent who is going to cook them, if they try and process themselves, we will have all sorts of health problems (x2: 050605, 050606)
Other - Catching Sector	2		More equal opportunities (050910)
Other Sector			
(l) Will the option help encourage businesses to invest in a safe and skilled workforce?			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO	21	2	
CFFPB			
Other - Catching Sector	2		
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	21	1	you already have that with what you currently have. (042202)
CFFPB			
Other - Catching Sector	2		Yes by allowing more fishers into the fishery (050910)
Other Sector			

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

Response Category	Comments
TECFO	An increase in vessels could damage the fishery, will void the MSC until new research and fact and figures are available (042202)
	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, 050801, 050704, 050911)
	14 licences works. Increasing the number of licences will jeopardise meeting the Evaluation Criteria and have a detrimental impact on the investment and employment opportunities in the industry on land and sea. (x2: 050603, 050604)
	Agree (050904)
	The increase in license numbers would see the end of investment in the workforce, vessels and premises and be catastrophic to the coastal community. (050705)
	Within this new management zone it would be advantageous to have 14 licences until the TAC is higher (050802)
	Full time fishermen and families (050905)
	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	
Other - Catching Sector	I agree with the option of 15-20 for local able boats within the Thames estuary (050909)
	10-14 licences are plenty (050910)
Other Sector	A slightly smaller daily quota would allow more vessels to enter the fishery. (042201)

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

Response Category	Comments
TECFO	Good (042202)
	I believe that it should be probably 7 on the Kent side and up to 10 on the Essex side (x15: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704)
	The areas are good. Trialling with only 3 vessels will not meet the Evaluation Criteria. It should be open to all local fishing vessels. (x2: 050603, 050604)
	No trial period is necessary just open it In line with the regulated fishery and only allow small local boats access. These vessels should have access to both the Essex and Kent management zones. It is completely false to say that "area 7 contains both consistent and productive beds". If that were true the permit fishery would be open every year. We have had extended periods of several years when no fishing was permitted in area 7 because of a lack of stock and the same true of the Kent side. (050705)

	Applications for permits should be restricted to fishermen who reside and fish in the KEIFCA area (050802)
	Must be local skilled fishermen (050904)
	Would work for the outside areas (050911)
CFFPB	Need a larger area for outside. One fishery Kent and Essex side, all boats able to work both areas, no TECFO boats in coastal management zone (x2) (050605, 050606)
	I disagree with the outside management as I feel it is unfair to all other parties who have shown dedication to the fishery. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	No nomadic fishers (050910)
Other Sector	Vessels should not be allowed to fish both zones. (042201)

44. Do you have any comments regarding the boundaries of the different management zones?

Response Category	Comments
TECFO	These zones will allow the current TECFO fleet that do not target any other species to remain sustainable and continue to invest in cockle boats that work with conservation and the marine habitat in mind whilst allowing the new entrants in to the Essex and Kent coastal management zones. to supplement their income against their historic targeted fisheries. (x15: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704)
	These are acceptable as they are the same as what is currently worked. (x2: 050603, 050604)
	These zones will allow the current TECFO fleet that do not target any other species to remain sustainable and continue to invest in the purpose built cockle boats, whilst allowing the new entrants in to the Essex and Kent coastal management zones to supplement their income. (050705)
	These boundaries will help the current TECFO fleet to stay sustainable, continue to invest in their industry and the wider fishing community, whilst supporting new permit holders to the Kent and Essex management zones (050802)
	Some of area 6 should be marked on the outside area (050904)
	Would work well for the current TECFO (050911)
	Maintaining current boundaries will keep the fishery at the sustainable level that it has held for many years. (050902)
CFFPB	Would like to see a larger area (x2: 050605, 050606)
Other - Catching Sector	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 Sector	Boundary lines should not go through sands. (042201)

45. 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 as this would reduce the TAC and then reduce the viability of the TMZ (x15: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704)

	No (x5: 050603, 050604, 042202, 050911, 050906)
	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 jeopardising jobs. Also the MCA approval is based on the current system and practices. It would jeopardize that. (050705)
	No, because this would decrease the TAC and the repercussions of this would detrimentally affect investment from the cockle industry into the local communities (050802)
	No, any reduction in TAC would be to the same detriment as introducing additional licenses. (050902)
	No you have to keep it separate (050904)
CFFPB	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)
	I feel that this would be unfair. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	Yes (x2: 050805, 050909)
	No (050807)
	No need (050910)
Other Sector	Yes (042201)
46. General feedback on HAITI option	
Response Category	Comments
	Apart from increasing the vessels in the management zone I like it. (042202)
	This option is very similar to the Bermuda option and just needs tweaking more for it to become viable and inclusive for the local KEIFCA fishers (x15: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704)
	A better option, apart from increasing the number of licence holders from 14-20. There are not enough permits in the CMZ but this option does tick a lot of the Evaluation Criteria. (x2: 050603, 050604)
TECFO	This option is very similar to the Bermuda option and requires some adjustment to become viable. (050705)
	It is an option which with some changes could be workable for both the current cockle industry and the local fisheries. (050802)
	The cockle beds north & south of the Thames should be shared by the scoop dredge fishermen (050904)
	The two I have agreed on, just need some fine tuning (050911)
	In general it's one of the best options put forward. (050902)
CFFPB	It's ok needs to be larger for the Coastal management zone, trialling boats for a tonne isn't practical the catch probably won't be cooked, unless it can be tied in with processing within Thames management zone, or other processors. Risk of a trial involving three boats being really unsuccessful, we know suction dredging works in these areas. (x2: 050605, 050606)
	I strongly disagree with this option entirely. 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)

	I disagree with this option. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	We need Barrow Sands as well (050805)
	New licences/permits must only be given to local Thames estuary fishermen. (050807)
	Still not enough area for fisherman starting out in a complexed fishery (050901)
	This seems my favourite option (050910)
Other Sector	