

Aquaculture and Fisheries Bill

Oban Workshop

7th February 2006

1 Summary

This meeting was one of ten held throughout Scotland during January and early February 2006. Twenty six individuals attended the meeting, which followed a facilitated workshop format. The meeting was facilitated by officials from the Freshwater Fisheries and Aquaculture Division in the Scottish Executive. The team guided the discussion and recorded the points made.

Two key questions were put to the audience:

- 1 What proposals in the consultation paper **did you not like? Why?**
- 2 What proposals in the consultation paper **did you like? Why?**

2 Record of proceedings

The attached record of proceedings contains points made by attendees concerning not only the proposals for the aquaculture and fisheries Bill but also their views on the future of fisheries management. Please note that the views expressed in this, and other workshops do not necessarily reflect the views of the Scottish Executive.

2.1 Aquaculture

1 Regulator

Will it have the competence?

Will it conflict with the company vet?

Will the regulator police the Industry CoGP? The relationship with the CoGP needs to more clearly defined.

2 Charging

There is a potential duplication of costs, being audited for the CoGP and charged by a regulator for the same information – this is a disincentive for being signed upto the CoGP.

3 Parasite Control

Support is needed for industry to allow parasite problems to be dealt with.

4 Containment

Provisions are required to identify escapees in areas experiencing serial escapes.

Compensation is required for wild fish interests to recover costs following escapes.

Containment plans should include something relating to predator control.

Definition of farms – hatcheries should be subject to containment proposals. Hatcheries should be restricted to finfish and not applicable to shellfish (both sea and freshwater).

5 Data collection

Not necessary as this is done through voluntary means.

Information should be made more easily accessible to the public.

6 Relocation

Welcome proposals to compensate for compulsory relocation.

How will 'clear public interest' be defined. Compensation should be made available where a farm is purchased compulsorily.

7 Compensation for compulsory slaughter

Freshwater aquaculture should be included in this and any other proposals relating to compensation.

Compensation should cover all stock, not just those showing clinical signs of disease.

Shellfish should be included.

8 Fish Movements

Farms should not be charged by the regulator.

Would prefer to notify the regulator of a movement rather than have to obtain permission from the regulator for every fish movement. Therefore opposed to a consenting regime for this.

9 General points

Generally supportive of the proposals relating to aquaculture, this provides further opportunities for wild fisheries and aquaculture industry to work together.

It should be made clear which proposals to not apply (or apply) to the shellfish farming industry.

The proposals are so concerned with and directed at finfish farming and so shellfish farming should be excluded completely from the proposals.

Where proposals to affect shellfish farmers then farmers have to be consulted on each and every issue in a separate series of meetings.

Provision for compulsory slaughter and/or relocation should apply to shellfish.

2.2 Freshwater Fisheries

1 GS

There should be compensation for fish farms and fisheries.

2 Access

The process for establishing a PO should be streamlined to allow smaller groups to obtain a PO more easily, essentially the process should be fit for purpose.

3 Fish Movements

Section 30 should be the model and should include disease certification.

The definition of wild fish needs clarification.

How will the fish movement proposals be enforced?

4 Miscellaneous Amendments

Definition of fishing with a rod & line

The proposals on rod rests need to be able to deal with trout. 4 rods are too many for coarse fishing, this compromises the aims of other proposals to conserve stocks.

Prohibit obstruction of fish

The proposals to prohibit the obstruction of all fish should be applied retrospectively. Are there overlaps here with the Water Framework Directive and the regulation of abstractions.