

**28. Please provide feedback on the JAMAICA 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	18	1	
CFFPB	1		It's simple, I like it. A bit of ground lost from the Thames management zone, small scale fishery determined by catch rather than vessel size. Merge Kent and Essex areas in the CMZ so we can fish all round keep to 14 licences on the Thames management zone. No Thames management zone boats to fish in the CMZ. We know the areas traditionally for cockles so why trial areas, we know dredges can work, not really sure the point in trialling will require a lot of management. Say maybe 8 permits in CMZ depending on TAC. (x2: 050605, 050606)
Other - Catching Sector	5		This is the best option for <10m boats using alternative methods for cockles. Over the years we have found cockle beds with our bottom drift nets but have to watch starfish eat the lot! (050601)
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	17	1	There is always too much paperwork (042202)
CFFPB	1		
Other - Catching Sector	5		
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	17	1	Enforcement will be a key issue (042202)
CFFPB	41		
Other - Catching Sector	5		
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	1		Not when used as a fact finding exercise for trials (x14:050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801)
			impossible to answer this when 2 trials, which have never been done before, are being carried out under this option. Surely the aim of the trials is to answer the above questions about the impact of a new fishery on the seabed. (050802)
			No. This would cause problems. (050705)
CFFPB	1		
Other - Catching Sector	5		The suction fishery can create starfish blooms which impacts gill net fishing. But allowing small boats to partake might make up for loss of fishing caused by starfish. (050601)
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	1		Not when used as a fact finding exercise for trials (x14: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801)
			14 boats hemmed into a smaller area would make the impact disastrous. (050704)
			No. This would cause problems. (050705)
			impossible to answer this when 2 trials, which have never been done before, are being carried out under this option. Surely the aim of the trials is to answer the above questions about the impact of a new fishery on the seabed. (050802)
CFFPB	1		The seabed won't be surveyed as a lot of these areas don't dry out, having inexperienced fishermen dragging gear around won't help set catch limits. the suction dredging has sustained a fishery so far. How many small boat fishermen have really made an effort for the outside areas, they are going to see it as a get rich quick scheme and smash the ground to pieces, and gain nothing (x2: 050605, 050606)
Other - Catching Sector	4		Bearing in mind unless you come down the edges you do not see anything else only cockles it's interesting that nothing much was said about the new container port taking away millions of tons of fertile sea bed (just a point) (050813)
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	1	1	Not when used as a fact finding exercise for trials (x14: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801)
			this Thames management zone would not survive, some years we work in EVERY area of the Thames to limit pressure on the Maplin sands. The Maplin would be under too much pressure and the MSC would be lost. (050704)

			No. This would cause problems. (050705)
			impossible to answer this when 2 trials, which have never been done before, are being carried out under this option. Surely the aim of the trials is to answer the above questions about the impact of a new fishery on the seabed. (050802)
CFFPB	1		
Other - Catching Sector	4		MSC we all probably watched Seaspiracy make of that what you want. Wider dredges and ashore in a closed area etc something to do with flag of convenience boats? enough is never enough for some (050813)
Other Sector			Very concerned about MSC status. Some fishing for cockle methods could put this in jeopardy. (042201)

**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		1	A total misconception of area 15 when the bed does not open regularly and who is going to pay for the collecting of the classification samples, as local authorities won't fund it and the PLA don't have the manpower or vessel availability (x15: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704)
			No because you are increasing effort in a smaller area. (042202)
			absolutely not, it will have the opposite effect by limiting areas which need careful monitoring and harvesting if stock levels are high enough by tested and sustainable dredging methods (as used by the TECFO fleet) (050802)
			The current regulated fishery has had years when it has been reliant on some of the beds that have been removed (050902)
CFFPB	1		
Other - Catching Sector	3		Yes, if given a proper chance and watch more carefully it's got to happen with a positive vision (050813)
			yes, it could do (050601)
Other Sector			

(h) Will the option help support local skilled employment?

Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO	1	1	No, because any plan which detrimentally affects the cockle industry, as this option does, will adversely impact local skilled employment currently dependent on the cockle industry (050802)
CFFPB	1		
Other - Catching Sector	4		Yes definitely as long as it's not just the usual suspects shaping it for themselves (050813)
			yes, it could do (050601)
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		2	No, because any plan which detrimentally affects the cockle industry, as this option does, will adversely impact local skilled employment currently dependent on the cockle industry (050802)
			Not if the Thames Management zone has limited TAC and relies on one of these years to sustain itself. (050902)
CFFPB			There won't be any long term investment in a boat catching 1 ton ..... (x2: 050605, 050606) Possibly (050301)
Other - Catching Sector		1	yes, it could do (050601)
			I had a long term investment in the fishing industry in this estuary and due to absolute rotten and bad management had to leave after 40 years So investment for my 2 sons here at West Mersea is the main sticking point do they invest only if its affair distribution to grow the business and keep some younger generations fishing out of Mersea and would hopefully employ others through the supply chain and infrastructure (050813)
			Yes if promoting hand-raking (050910)
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		2	impossible to tell but probably not (050802)
CFFPB			only if processors do not own licenses (050301)
Other - Catching Sector	3		well from our point of view have interchangeable riddles maybe 18mm and 20mm; 20mm to get better size if workable. (050813)
			yes, it could do (050601)
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	1	2	This option does not support the long-term viability or investment to become a successful option (x14: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801)
			Investment would need to be made in the hope that a fisher gets one of three permits in an application process that may have hundreds of applicants. (050704)
			The Jamaican option will have a huge detrimental impact on investment and this will have devastating consequences for the local workforce and communities, which has been built up progressively by the cockle industry over the last three decades. (050802)
CFFPB			Possibly (050301)
Other - Catching Sector	3		yes, it could do (050601)
			Well that's the QUESTION ,,,,,, does it? (050813)
			The fairest yet (050910)
Other Sector			

(l) Will the option help encourage businesses to invest in a safe and skilled workforce?			
Response Category	Yes	No	Comments
TECFO	2		this option would run all zones on a shoestring. (050704)
			Help one but decrease the other. (042202)
			The Jamaican option will have a huge detrimental impact on investment and this will have devastating consequences for the local workforce and communities, which has been built up progressively by the cockle industry over the last three decades. (050802)
CFFPB	1		
Other - Catching Sector	2		Well that's another question that depends on the committee and how they view a proper reform and not tinkering around the edges for the existing fleet. We can have a safe work force on our boat what do you think I've been doing for the last 52 years? That's why I would train my 2 sons. (050813)
			yes, it could do (050601)
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		2	not if it destroys the cockle industry, No. (050704)
			This suggestion will change the heritage. (042202)
			The Jamaican option will have a huge detrimental impact on investment and this will have devastating consequences for the local workforce and communities, which has been built up progressively by the cockle industry over the last three decades. (050802)
CFFPB	1		I think that all options tick boxes in some ways but really most schemes do the same, regarding the community. (x2: 050605, 050606)
Other - Catching Sector	3		will reduce the 'monopoly effect' (050910)
			yes, it could do (050601)
Other Sector			
<b>29. What comments do you have regarding the limitation of licences issued under the JAMAICA option to 15-20 licences in the new Thames Management Zone?</b>			
Response Category	Comments		
TECFO	It would clearly see the demise of investment and skilled workforce and be catastrophic to the coastal community (x14: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801)		
	How are you limiting the licences when there are only 14 at present. In addition, you want to increase the number of vessels fishing into a smaller area. D, E, F, G and H Evaluation Criteria doesn't agree with what you are suggesting. (x2: 050603, 050604)		
	it would clearly see the demise of investment and skilled workforce and be catastrophic to the coastal community. This Thames management zone would only be sustainable for 7 licences. 20 dredgers in such a small area regardless of a any tac would destroy the Maplin sands in time. (050704)		

	It does not make sense to increase the number of licences in a smaller area. (042202)
	The increase in licenses would see the end of investment in the workforce, vessels and premises and be catastrophic to the coastal community. (050705)
	The Jamaican option will have a huge detrimental impact on investment and this will have devastating consequences for the local workforce and communities, which has been built up progressively by the cockle industry over the last three decades. (050802)
	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	If you take back the licenses that have been sold and re-distribute then it could work (050301)
	Licences are not being limited as more than 14? (x2: 050605, 050606)
Other - Catching Sector	If you're capping the fishery with a TAC then providing that is not broken it should be open to those locally who want to apply. Not all will take it up but it should be offered on a yearly non-monetary basis. (050601)
	Jamaica area is known and local to me. I would use less fuel. I would have the ability to create a new fishery. (050501)
	Well yes the TAC and dredge times on grounds and allow small pump scoop for those who choose to take that option. But a few suction licenses. (050813)
	This does not affect me (050805)
	If area 6 was included this would be very fair (050901)
	I agree with the option of 15-20 for local able boats within the Thames Estuary (050909)
	10-12 would be enough licences to fish the reduced area (050910)
Other Sector	A smaller daily quota would allow for an increase in licences. 28 would be more in keeping with the area in question. (042201)
<b>30. Feedback on suggested management outside of Thames Management Zone.</b>	
Response Category	Comments
TECFO	Currently Area 15 is a sporadic bed not giving constant stock availability, it must also be noted that this bed must be classified and the regular collection of the cockles for the classification testing is carried out on behalf of the TECFO fleet at an annual cost of £5400 funded by the cockle fleet, who will pay for this under the suggested new zones. bearing in mind this is paid even when the bed is not opened to commercial fishing (x15: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704)
	Too few boats involved, trials will be time consuming and expensive. A, B, C, K, L and M Evaluation Criteria doesn't agree with what you are suggesting. The current cockle fleet that keep Area 15 classified at a cost of £5400 from our own funds, keeps this area open. Who will fund this in the new proposed zones? (x2: 050603, 050604)
	Crazy idea. This would see a reduced area for the duration of the regulating order whether the trials were successful or not. This also raises all sorts of questions regarding shellfish testing in some areas and who would pay for it? (050705)
	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	Good if there is stock there (050301)
	Trials won't work (x2: 050605, 050606)
	I feel like this results in vessels which have continuously shown dedication to the area as well as financial commitment being told they can no longer fish in the Thames which they rely on for their yearly income. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	I would like access to the Buxey (050805)
	Personally I don't think it would get to much attention from the Mersea area with pump scoops but time will tell (050813)
	Should be limited to 15 permits not including members of the regulating order (050901)
	Ensure no large nomadic boats can exploit grounds (050910)
Other Sector	At the moment, vessels are rigging up for one day's fishing. This needs to change, so if the permits were limited it would mean more work for vessels. Vessels should not be allowed to fish both fisheries. (042201)
<b>31. Do you have any comments regarding the boundaries of the different management zones?</b>	
Response Category	Comments
TECFO	These areas over many years have saved the TECFO from collapse and it would be disastrous to even consider this option (x14: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801)
	Yes, they won't work – this option does not agree with the Evaluation Criteria. (x2: 050603, 050604)
	Some years the Maplin simply doesn't produce and the fleet will look for cockles elsewhere to ensure the Maplin's future. These boundaries would mean that in years where the Maplin is struggling, the cockle fleet would have to decide whether to risk the Maplin's future or simply not sail. (050704)
	In the last 30 years I have worked in areas 11, 13 and 15 many times, although the beds in these areas are not consistent. Many times the cockles caught in those areas have been the saviour of the industry and every cockle taken from them was not taken from the Maplin Sands, thus conserving them. The industry cannot afford to lose areas 11, 13 and 15. (050705)
	Investment by the current TECFO licence holders through research, trials, hours of manpower and ongoing classification costs resulted in Area 15 being a ground which could be fished for cockles, and it seems incredibly unfair that this ground would be lost to the current TECFO fleet under this option. This ground has not been made a sustainable fishery through any contribution from KEIFCA, but solely through the determination and industriousness of the cockle fleet and therefore I do not feel it should be taken away. (050802)
	Over the years, these areas have been critical to the businesses that operate the vessels. (050902)
CFPB	This is my preferred option, out of all the others merge the management zones, small scale set by catch limits NOT vessel size. (x2: 050605, 050606)
	I don't agree with this idea as it shuts off access to many vessels to allow access to the minority which is unfair. (050812)
	Looks good and workable for <10metre new entrants to the fishery. (050601)

Other - Catching Sector	I would like the opportunity to fish the Margate area small-scale fishery. (050501)
	Area 6 could be 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, however, the Kent coastal management zone under this option still holds an unfair amount of the prime grounds. Access to these grounds should be to both Essex and Kent small scale fishers. (050807)
	Maybe to include area 6 for the clams (050901)
	I would like access to East Barrow and West Barrow (050805)
	It gives more viability for the inshore fisheries to make a living (050909)
Other Sector	Margate sand should be in one area. (042201)
<b>32. 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?</b>	
Response Category	Comments
TECFO	The opposite in fact should be the TECFO fleet should be able to fish at the end of the season as the small-scale fishery may not have taken the quota set (x15: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801, 050704)
	No. We would propose that at the end of the season, the existing TECFO should be able to fish the small-scale fishery if quotas have not been used. (x2: 050603, 050604)
	This is preposterous the cockle beds are rested for a reason. Migrating birds, breeding bird feeding, cockle breeding cycles, plankton spawning times, the list goes on and on. (050704)
	NO, the opposite, the dredge fishery should be allowed to fish the other beds at the end of the season. (042202)
	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)
	Under no circumstances should this be allowed. (050802)
	Detrimental from a commercial stand point. 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	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 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)
Other - Catching Sector	No as then suction has an excuse to ask for access in return. (050601)
	I would like to be able to fish for cockles during June-September, dividing time for larger vessels to fish from 1st week of October. This would create more opportunities for small-scale fishing, giving larger vessels access to

	larger areas. I would then be able to maintain the ground if the ground was allocated to the small-scale fishery. (050501)
	Yes (x2: 050805, 050909)
	No (050807)
	I think this would help massively depending on the amount of days they had to do it. This could also help the authority to back up there survey data (050810)
	Yes they would have a limited effect because of size of boat and weather (050813)
	Yes as it would help to cover the costs off the trials as a lot of other people would eventually gain from it (050901)
	No I think there are enough opportunities as this scheme is (050910)
Other Sector	Yes (042201)
<b>33. General feedback on JAMAICA option</b>	
Response Category	Comments
TECFO	General feedback that only allowing 3 vessels trial times would be of no benefit to the wider local fishing industry and would be disastrous to anyone one else that wanted to trial, This will not keep to the evaluation criteria. (x14: 050602, 050607, 050702, 050703, 050706, 050707, 050708, 050803, 050804, 050908, 050806, 050701, 050608, 050801)
	It doesn't tick any of the Evaluation Criteria boxes. This option is of no benefit to the fishing of the wider community. Jamaica certainly does not meet the Evaluation Criteria you propose. Losing ground within the TMZ will have an impact on grounds within, as we have explained the Maplin Sands need to be protected and as in previous years, these areas have been fished as there has been a lack of TAC on the Maplin Sands. There certainly isn't room for 20 licenced vessels. The permit fishery wouldn't allow more than 3 boats trialling it and this will likely discourage other local fishers from entering the fishery. It would complicate and take valuable resources from the KEIFCA to manage this. It would likely mean many fishers would be unlikely to invest in either fishery because of the lack of TAC and area. (x2: 050603, 050604)
	General feedback that only allowing 3 vessels trial times would be of no benefit to the wider local fishing industry and would be disastrous to anyone one else that wanted to trial. This will not keep to the evaluation criteria. (050704)
	Every suggestion has ideas to consider. (042202)
	This is an ill-conceived idea that shows little understanding of the way the industry has traditionally worked and the importance of it doing so! Should not have been proposed and should not be considered. (050705)
	Only allowing 3 vessels would not support or help the local fishing industry. (050802)
CFFPB	Good for size of area, would prefer this for suction dredging, no trialling 8-10 permits, small scale is catch quota not vessel size. Larger vessels are safer, and current under 10 are bigger then my 12 metre vessel (x2: 050605, 050606)
	I strongly disagree with this option entirely. (050811)
	I don't agree with Jamaica idea I feel that instead of working towards a sustainable fishery for all who have fished the area it creates a highly beneficial fishery for the small few which in my opinion should not be the main aim for the IIFCA but to find a happy medium of a sustainable fishery for all while also creating an environmentally friendly way of running the

	fishery that is why I believe there should be one area with a combined amount of licences for this area but where there is management in place to control the amount of vessels fishing an area at once. (050812)
Other - Catching Sector	Loods good. Hand raking or small boat as used in Solent good open up better returns for small boat fishermen when weed or spider crabs make other fisheries unviable (050601)
	Jamaica is easier to access from Margate harbour where I moor my boat and I am more familiar with the ground. No other areas are of interest to me. (050501)
	This is a good idea (050805)
	New licences/permits must only be given to local Thames estuary fishermen. (050807)
	I think this option is great for the north Kent coast fleet but doesn't benefit us from the blackwater side of the estuary at all (050810)
	This is our choice. Let's see where we go now interesting times ahead for all. (050813)
	I think this is by far the best option and I would be more than willing to be involved in the trials (050901)
	Good for the local boats outside the current fishery, bad for the current cocklers, increase effort in Thames zone (050910)
Other Sector	Hand working started small in the Wash. Now it is all hand working. It has proved to be a disaster for recruitment. Most of the TAC is taken up by juvenile stock. When areas 1,2,3 are fished out they will want more area. Hand working from a vessel means "blowing out" with a propellor. Studies have shown it takes six months plus for the ground to recover. The private fishery which is dredged usually have a fishery every year. The public fishery (which is hand worked) has only had a small fishery three years ago. The Wash cockle fishery will not qualify for an MSC. (042201)
	Only hand raking (050603)