

## 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, we agree.*

### 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) We agree that as the present structure is inconsistent with the landing obligation, it has to be changed. That said, we would warn that breaking down existing fleet segmentation between the pelagic, whitefish and shellfish sectors could generate additional pressure on quotas.*

*B) Although the move would be more consistent with the landing obligation, and a more streamlined structure would indeed reduce the workload on fishery officers, it could also increase the burden on POs.*

*C) As a general principle, we do not welcome changes that could remove flexibility from fishing operations.*

### 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) Yes B) Yes*

### 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: *In our view, there is no good reason for any shelf life. The validity period should be indefinite.*

### 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: *No, partly because a decline in the number of entitlements could drive*

*licence prices up, making it more difficult for new entrants, and partly because there is no good reason for removing flexibility. If entitlements are not being used there is presumably a good business reason why not, but that does not preclude the possibility of more favourable business conditions in the future.*

**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: We would be extremely wary of top-down initiatives such as these. In Shetland we are studying in some depth various options to encourage new entrants, and right from the start it has been clear to us that our solutions would not necessarily suit other parts of the Scottish fleet. We urge support for local efforts such as these rather than imposing any 'one size fits all' solution.*

**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: We agree wholeheartedly with the removal of CRZ eligibility from licences. Licences are not appropriate places for what ought to be temporary management rules. The merits of the CRZ itself are another, separate issue.*