

## CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

### Question 1: Capacity Penalties

Do you agree that capacity penalties on licence aggregations bring unnecessary costs to industry and should therefore be removed?

*Comments: Yes. As the tonnage and kilowatts of the fleet has reduced significantly below MAGP requirements, it is fair and reasonable to abolish capacity penalties on licence aggregations.*

### Question 2: Licence categories

A) In light of the forthcoming landing obligation, do you agree that there is a need to change the current licensing structure?

B) Do you agree with a proposal to have only one 10m & Under Licence and one Over 10m Licence?

C) Do you agree that the lowest common denominator (see section 3.2.3) should apply when transferring or aggregating a licence within Scotland?

*Comments: A – WIFA agrees with the need to change and simplify the current licensing structure to be more flexible to accommodate vessels meet the forthcoming landing obligation, however, it should not be used to give additional entitlements to vessels that currently do not fish TAC species, namely nephrops.*

*B – there is a clear need to introduce one 10 metre and under licence to enable vessels in that category to engine vessels with a fit for purpose engine to provide maximum benefit from the design of those vessels, something that has been lacking in the past due to new vessels having to be built with de-rated engines to comply with maximum kilowatts on licence aggregation in both the under 8 metre and under 10 metre categories.*

*The main risk in introducing a one licence for over 10 metres is that vessels with a current Category C Licence on the West Coast of Scotland, large vivier vessels and scallopers will target static gear in the nephrops fishery. This will increase gear conflict, cause over-supply in the live nephrops market, reduce prices for the large number of nephrops static gear vessels which have no alternative fishing opportunities. Those large vivier vessels have already over-supplied the brown crab market, with prices now lower than they were 20 years ago, in addition vivier lorries no longer travel to remote coastal communities as they can source a full load from one vivier vessel at either Ullapool or Scrabster.*

*The vessels with Category C licences do not fish for any quota species, therefore, there is no need for them to discard any TAC species to comply with the landing obligation. It would be morally wrong to issue those vessels with a licence that would entitle them to land nephrops in an area where fishing for nephrops is considered to be fully exploited. Category C licensed vessels do not fish on grounds where nephrops are caught, therefore, giving them an entitlement to fish for nephrops will increase conflict on grounds which are already saturated with pots and will create additional problems at sea and create marketing problems for the onshore sector dealing in the live nephrops sector.*

*A nephrops entitlement or nephrops permit must be introduced, for the over 10 metre sector, to prevent the risk of an influx of vivier vessels, currently targeting brown crab, or scallopers diversifying into the nephrops fishery.*

*Shellfish and scallop entitlements has successfully managed the risk of over-exploitation and entry into the static shellfish and scallop sectors, therefore similar prudent management must be given to support the large numbers of small vessels in fragile West Coast fragile communities that are dependent on having a buoyant market for live nephrops.*

*C – WIFA agrees that the lowest common denominator principle should apply to licence transfers or aggregations to ensure no increase in effort with either shellfish or scallop entitlements.*

### **Question 3: Mismatches**

A) Do you agree to the removal of the mis-match provisions on transactions involving the use of dis-aggregated entitlements?

B) Do you agree to the proposed change in the way mis-match provisions will be recorded on the licence?

*Comments: A – WIFA agrees with the proposal for removal of the mis-match provisions on dis-aggregated entitlements.*

*B – WIFA agrees with the proposed change in the way mis-match provisions will be recorded on the licence.*

### **Question 4: The validity period for unattached licence entitlements (shelf life)**

Do you believe the entitlement validity period should be extended to a 10 year period?

*Comments: The entitlement validity period should be extended to a 10 year period for both over 10 metre vessels and 10 metre and under vessels.*

### **Question 5: Scallop and Shellfish Entitlements**

Do you agree with the Scottish Government's proposal for the removal of scallop entitlements that have not been used within the last seven years i.e. entitlements that have not been placed on board a vessel that is rigged and operational within the fishery?

*Comments: WIFA agrees with the removal of scallop entitlements that have not been used in the last seven years and consider that a six month notice period is a fair period being offered to vessels that wish to active their entitlement.*

### **Question 6: New Entrants**

Do you agree with the concept of licensing incentives to support and promote a new entrants scheme to the Scottish fishing industry?

*Comments: WIFA supports any licensing incentives that could be developed to promote new entrants to the Scottish fishing industry. WIFA has been actively involved in partnership with Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar and the Royal Bank of Scotland in supporting and promoting new entrants to the industry through the Outer Hebrides Fisheries Support Scheme and the Comhairle's Community Quota Scheme.*

*Thorough research needs to be undertaken to ascertain the segments of the fleet that show an ageing profile of skippers, with no succession planning in place for suitably qualified local crew being able to progress to be the next generation of skippers/owners.*

**Question 7: Days at Sea/Effort Eligibility**

A) Do you agree with the removal of CRZ eligibility completely?

Or

B) Do you agree that CRZ eligibility should be kept, with an updated reference period that will roll forward annually?

*Comments: Careful consideration and prudent management must be taken to protect and sustain the social and economic fabric of the fragile coastal communities of the West Coast of Scotland, with an ageing fleet that are dependent on having all year access to West Coast inshore nephrops fishing grounds. Those vessels are not capable of fishing further offshore grounds and provide important local landings to a processing sector in areas where there are no alternative employment opportunities. Any relaxation or amendments to CRZ eligibility must address and management the risk that might affect the viability of the traditional inshore nephrops trawlers that have fished the West Coast grounds in a sustainable manner for the last 50 years.*

*Option A*

*The abolishment of Cod Recovery Zone eligibility is considered to be a significant risk. The risk of sudden and unplanned early closure as was evident in 2012 would be catastrophic for West Coast communities. Significant safeguards must be considered to protect the local inshore fleet who have no alternative fishing opportunities and have not contributed to depletion of cod stocks.*

*Option B*

*Updated the reference period to include 2006 to 2012 with an annual roll forward has the potential to create erode West Coast fishing opportunities as the problems which arose in 2012 will be transferred to future reference periods. Updating the reference period could be considered with 2012 being permanently removed from the reference period. The reason for removal of 2012 being that the exceptional circumstances experienced in effort uptake that year should be permanently removed and with future prudent safeguards the future of the fleet domiciled on the West Coast could be managed to ensure an all year fishery on their local grounds.*