**Consultation on wild fisheries reform in Scotland**



RESPONDENT INFORMATION FORM

**Please Note** this form **must** be returned with your response to ensure that we handle your response appropriately

**1. Name/Organisation**

**Organisation Name**

|  |
| --- |
| Northern Farmers & Landowners Group |

**Title**  **Mr x[ ]  Ms [ ]  Mrs [ ]  Miss [ ]  Dr [ ]  Please tick as appropriate**

**Surname**

|  |
| --- |
| Collingwood-Cameron |

**Forename**

|  |
| --- |
| Angus |

**2. Postal Address**

|  |
| --- |
| Old School |
| Glanton |
| Alnwick |
| Northumberland aecc@nrpg.co.uk |
| **Postcode** NE66 42D      | **Phone** 01665 578458 | **Email** aecc@nrpg.co.uk |

**3. Permissions - I am responding as…**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | **Individual** | **/** | **Group/Organisation** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | *[ ]*  |  | **Please tick as appropriate** |  | *x[ ]*  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(a)** | Do you agree to your response being made available to the public (in Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site)?**Please tick as appropriate*[ ]* Yes *[ ]*  No** |  | **(c)** | The name and address of your organisation **will be** made available to the public (in the Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site). |
| **(b)** | Where confidentiality is not requested, we will make your responses available to the public on the following basis |  |  | Are you content for your **response** to be made available? |
|  | **Please tick ONE of the following boxes** |  |  | **Please tick as appropriate*****x[ ]* Yes *[ ]* No** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes, make my response, name and address all available | *[ ]*  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **or** |  |  |  |  |
|  | Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address | *[ ]*  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **or** |  |  |  |  |
|  | Yes, make my response and name available, but not my address | *[ ]*  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(d)** | We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?**Please tick as appropriate *[ ] x* Yes *[ ]* No** |

**CONSULTATION QUESTIONS – RESPONSE TEMPLATE**

# **Q1.** Do you agree with the balance of functions as set out in Table 1?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  |  | No | x |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| The majority of functions should sit at a local level, with a national body (best an existing body) having an over arching function for dissemination of best practice. It is not clear what a “National Strategy” would achieve, when any actual benefits will be achieved at a local level. There is no mention of what this additional layer would cost, nor how it would be funded. The fear is that it will simply eat into funds that would now be spent on positive actions at a local level.The tables suggest two routes to advising Ministers – national and local. Is this a recipe for confusion? |

**Q2.** Do you consider that any main functions are missing? If so, please state what these are. Do you think that any of these functions might be best fulfilled at a different level?

|  |
| --- |
| See above. |

# **Q3.** Do you agree that FMOs should be charitable bodies?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | x |  | No |  |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Should we just call them “Rivers Trusts”? |

# **Q4.** Do you have any comments about the WFR’s view that FMOs should be Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organisations rather than charitable companies?

|  |
| --- |
| No |

**Q5.** Do you agree that in order to ensure appropriate governance and fitness for purpose, FMOs should operate to a model constitution?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | x |  | No | x |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| A model constitution approach may be helpful, but it should be flexible to allow it to be adapted to local circumstances. A “one-size-fits-all” approach would not be helpful. |

**Q6.** What do you consider is an appropriate balance of interests on the board and wider membership of FMOs?

|  |
| --- |
| There is scope for conflict in broadening the membership. While inclusivity is desirable, it seems that these bodies are being paid for by the riparian owners, so should they not have the main say? If it becomes too inclusive, then it will become too large to function.There must be a case for a twin approach, very much along the lines of what works so well on the Tweed, with the Tweed Forum and the Tweed Commissioners. |

# **Q7.** Do you agree that bodies wishing to become FMOs should do so through seeking approved body status from Scottish Ministers?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | x |  | No |  |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments |

**Q8.** Do you agree that the cornerstone of the relationship between national and local management bodies should be the proposed plan-led approach? If not, why not?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | x |  | No | x |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Spending money to an agreed plan does not seem unreasonable, if the money is actually going to be allocated in this way. If money is going to be distributed on a more ad hoc basis (ie such as the approach to WFD expenditure in England), then there is little point in developing plans. If the former, then it is important that plans are simple and flexible. There is a danger that far too much effort will be expended in creating local strategies and action plans, with associated consultation, plus reviewing said strategies and action plans. The time and money will be better spent in actually doing something. |

# **Q9.** Do you agree that the proposed package of measures in terms of constitution, governance and a plan-based approach provides an appropriate framework for decentralised delivery of fishery management functions?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  |  | No | x |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| This seems the most bizarre question. The current system is the ideal model of decentralised fishery management. The proposal is to centralise fishery management and then give a little back to the local level. If decentralisation is the objective, why seek to change what is already in place? |

**Q10.** Do you agree that the FMO network should cover the whole of Scotland?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | x |  | No |  |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments |

**Q11.** Do you agree that Scottish Ministers, following discussion with stakeholders, should set out the boundaries of FMO areas?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  |  | No | x |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| But should suggest a catchment based approach. But what of England? |

**Q12.** What factors should be considered in determining the number and optimal coverage of FMOs?

|  |
| --- |
| Comments |

**Q13.** Do you agree that bodies designated as FMOs should be able to deliver analogous work on behalf of local or national interests?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | x |  | No |  |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| This may well be desirable for the effective delivery of fishery and WFD objectives. |

**Q14.** Are there any potential conflicts of interest in this approach?

|  |
| --- |
| Yes – in England. For example the CSF initiative in the Till catchment has the involvement of the Tweed Forum but is run by Defra. |

**Q15.** Do you agree that funding raised from proprietors should continue to provide the core strand of revenue for local fishery management?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | x |  | No | x |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Yes, but only if it continues to be collected locally and spent locally. This system works due to self interest and peer pressure. To collate such funds centrally for possible distribution elsewhere turns the salmon levy into just another tax, with associated costs of collection and efforts of avoidance. It will diminish the effectiveness of the spend and/or greatly increase the burden on those that pay.No where is the actual cost mentioned of establishing and running the new system. The central unit, national strategy and FMOs will require considerable funding. Is this to be paid by riparian owners? If so, what % of their tax will be available for actual fishery management work? |

**Q16.** Do you agree that we should explore the potential for extending the responsibility for paying the levy to the owners of all fishing rights?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  |  | No | x |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| This would appear to be the re-introduction of the old discredited “sporting rates”. Why should some one be taxed just because they own something, even when they may derive no benefit? Who determines the “potential”?Worst of all, it seems as if this idea could be extended to riparian owners deep within England. This appears wrong on many levels, not least “No taxation, without representation.” |

# **Q17.** Do you agree that responsibility for collecting and distributing resources from fisheries proprietors for the purpose of delivering the national strategy at a local level should rest with the national unit?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  |  | No |  |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Absolutely not. Funding from riparian owners should be collected and spent locally. Even if all funds were returned locally, the involvement of a national unit would simply add cost and reduce the funds available for fishery management. |

**Q18.** Do you agree that we should explore the recommendation that redistribution of funds should form part of the new management system?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  |  | No | x |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| It seems grossly unfair that money for fishery management could be taken from an owner at one end of the country and spent at the other. Even worse, why should riparian owners in England contribute to general Scottish tax and spend?If there are shortfalls in particular areas, then alternative funding sources should be sought, such as what already happens with fish farms on part of the west coast, or Wind Farm Community Funds. |

**Q19.** If not, what other means might be used for funding local fisheries management at appropriate levels across the country?

|  |
| --- |
| See above. Increasing the administrative and bureaucratic burden with the creation of a central unit, national strategy, local plans etc etc will do nothing to address funding fishery management at an appropriate level across Scotland. |

**Q20.** Do you agree that we should explore the recommendation for a two-tier levy system?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  |  | No | x |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Completely unnecessary if the existing system was to be retained. It sounds like double taxation with double the administration. |

**Q21.** Do you agree that Ministers should have powers to control harvesting of all fish species on the grounds of conservation and be able to do so in line with the precautionary principle?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  |  | No |  |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| This issue appears to have already been settled. |

**Q22.** If not, what other mechanisms should exist in order to ensure a flexible regulatory system which can ensure delivery of legal obligations and policy priorities for management of species and is capable of responding to future changes?

|  |
| --- |
| Comments |

**Q23.** Do you agree that, in the context of the wider proposals in this paper, the creation of an offence of reckless or irresponsible exercise of fishing rights should not be pursued?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | x |  | No |  |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments |

# **Q24.** Do you agree that data collection priorities and processes for fisheries management at a local and national level should be predicated on a consistent approach and that this should be via a national research and data strategy?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  |  | No |  |  | Don’t know | x |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments |

# **Q25.** Do you have any suggestions for additional means to ensure that evidence-based decision making is embedded within the fisheries management system?

|  |
| --- |
| In many cases “evidence-based decision making” is a thoroughly sensible approach. In fisheries management, it needs to be treated with caution. It is essentially impossible, or impossible within a sensible time scale, to gather hard evidence on many issues that affect fishery management. Local knowledge, whilst perhaps not evidence based, may be far more valuable when making fishery management decisions.  |

# **Q26.** Do you have any suggestions for additional skills areas which might usefully be covered in training and CPD programmes?

|  |
| --- |
| Sport Fishing should be considered as an industry, rather than a hobby which it seems to be at present. Lessons should be learnt from Scandinavia, where sport fishing can be studied at university. We should not be surprised that many of the latest tackle innovations come from there, and that Scandi guides can be found all over the world. Surely time for Scotland to catch up. |

**Q27.** Do you agree that annual and weekly close times should remain a key part of the management system for wild fisheries?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | x |  | No |  |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments |

**Q28.** Do you agree that the proposed local management organisations should have responsibility for considering such close times in line with the national strategy and the local fisheries management plan?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | x |  | No |  |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments |

# **Q29.** Do you agree that the purpose behind Protection Orders can be achieved via the design of the new management system in line with the fundamental principles set out in chapter 2?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  |  | No |  |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments |

**Q30.** Do you agree that the principles of the existing bailiffing system should be retained, but with amendment to set compliance within an appropriate framework of accountability with warrants issued by the national unit?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  |  | No |  |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments |

**Q31.** Are there other mechanisms for enforcing fisheries legislation that should be considered?

|  |
| --- |
| Comments |

# **Q32.** Do you consider that there are advantages in the bodies involved in recreational fishing being able to come together to speak through one lead body?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | x |  | No |  |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Simple to say, but not to achieve ! |

# **Q33.** If so, do you have views on how this could be facilitated and in what timescale?

|  |
| --- |
| Comments |

**Q34.** Do you agree that promotion of opportunities and access should be a central theme for the strategy?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  |  | No |  |  | Don’t know | x |

|  |
| --- |
| The report highlights many of the initiatives that are ongoing. The internet provides incredible levels of access to fishing, with innovations such as Fishpal leading the way, but many clubs and associations also use this means to broaden their access. Is there really anything more that an element in the national strategy can achieve? |

**Q35.** We are interested to hear views on how increasing opportunities and access to fishing can be embedded within the fisheries management system.

|  |
| --- |
| Comments |

**Q36.** Do you support the concept of the angling sector coming together to develop a programme for development of angling (Angling for All), including an emphasis on opportunities for young people and promoting social and economic benefits?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  |  | No | x |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| This seems to already go on with various initiatives from various organisations. Is there really any need for more ? |

**Q37.** Should funding for Angling for All come from a rod licence? If not, where should resources be found to support the programme?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  |  | No | x |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| If seeking to increase access to fishing, it would seem perverse to introduce an additional cost for anyone wanting to try ! The English system creates a barrier for getting young people into fishing – I write as a Father of 3 daughters who I would like to fish, but only want to on an occasional basis. Ie £210 for not very much ! |

**Q38.** Do you agree that a rod licence should only be used to fund Angling for All, rather than also being used to support wider management activity?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  |  | No |  |  | Don’t know |  |

|  |
| --- |
| See above. |