

RISK RANKING TABLE

Probability of risk arising:

A - Common or repeating risk

B - Known to occur

C - Could occur

D - Not likely to occur if no action taken

CONSEQUENCE OF RISKS

| | |
|---|--|
| 1 Serious impact on the sustainability of fish stocks (red) | |
| 2 Major damage to marine environment (red) | |
| 3 Moderate impact on sustainability of fish stocks (amber) | |
| 4 Moderate damage to marine environment (amber) | |
| 5 Minor impact on sustainability of fish stocks (green) | |
| 6 Minor damage to marine environment (green) | |
| 7 No loss or damage to fish stocks or marine environment (green) | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| RISK 1 POTTING COMMERCIAL | | Feature: Rocky reef, Shellfish Stocks |
| Area: Whole district Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln Estuary MCZ | | IFCA Objective affected: Protection of rocky reefs/shellfish stocks at sustainable levels A (Common) |
| Moderate impacts on shellfish stocks | This activity occurs throughout the district and has the potential to impact on stock levels of the target species. Main species are lobster, brown crab, velvet crab, and nephrops. Current levels of fishing are believed to be sustainable, and are managed by NIFCA byelaws and National legislation. | |
| Minor damage to marine environment | While widespread this activity is not believed to cause damage beyond a background level. | |
| Outline of Risks: | Potting activity could physically damage parts of the reef due to actual contact with pots or associated gear (ropes etc.). Removal of target species could result in imbalances in ecosystem. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The implications are high but severity is low. Potting has occurred for many years with no noticeable damage to reefs being reported. With regard to the removal of target species, exploitation has not significantly changed for many years and therefore the ecosystem is likely to be in a state of equilibrium. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | A. Common or repeating occurrence. | |
| Consequence of risk | 3 – Moderate impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 6- Minor damage to marine environment. | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | NIFCA byelaws 3, 4 & 5. National minimum size limits. National Shellfish entitlement attached to licence. NIFCA committed to continue with the lobster v-notching programme (releasing 1000+ egg-bearing lobsters annually). | |
| Risk strategy/action | Continue to work with others on research into shellfish populations and continue to monitor levels of potting activity and undertake regular surveys of catch aboard potting vessels at sea and at point of landing. Newcastle University study into impacts of potting on reefs (unpublished 2016) indicating potting has minimal impacts to reefs and sub features. | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going monitoring of shellfish potters. University PhD report (unpublished 2016). | |
| Owner | Crown Estate. | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1) | |
| Key stakeholders | Fishermen | |
| Risk status | Amber | |
| Risk ranking | 3 | |
| Key valuation criteria | Although an important area for potting this activity is not deemed to be damaging to habitats at current levels. Recent research by NIFCA also indicates lobster stocks are being fished at a sustainable level. CEFAS has indicated that stocks are under threat. In the future NIFCA byelaws could restrict the overall number of permits or reduce the amount of pots being fished. | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| RISK 2 POTTING COMMERCIAL (Nephrops) | | Feature: Sand and Mud Seabed |
| Area: Whole district Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln Estuary MCZ | | IFCA Objectives affected: Ensure sustainable fishery (sand and mud sea bed). A (Common) |
| Minor impacts on shellfish stocks | This activity can occur throughout the district and has the potential to impact on stock levels of the target species. Current levels of fishing are very low (particularly compared to trawling for nephrops) and believed to be sustainable and managed, and is managed by NIFCA byelaws and National legislation. | |
| Minor damage to marine environment | While widespread this activity is not believed to cause damage beyond a background level | |
| Outline of Risks: | Potting activity could physically damage parts of the reef, sand and mud due to actual contact with pots or associated gear (ropes etc.). Removal of target species could result in imbalances in ecosystem. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The implications are high but the severity is low. Potting for nephrops occurs throughout the district but not on areas of reef habitat and therefore damage to the environment will be extremely low. Likewise the total quantity of nephrops caught in comparison to trawling is extremely low. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | A. Common or repeating occurrence. | |
| Consequence of risk | 5 – Minor impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 6 - Minor damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | NIFCA byelaws 3, 4 & 5. National legislation. | |
| Risk strategy/action | Continue to work with others on research into shellfish populations and continue to monitor levels of potting activity. | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going monitoring of shellfish potters. | |
| Owner | Crown Estate | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1) | |
| Key stakeholders | Fishermen | |
| Risk status | Green | |
| Risk ranking | 5 | |
| Key valuation criteria | Although an important area for potting this activity is not deemed to be damaging to habitats at current levels. | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| RISK 3 POTTING RECREATIONAL | | Feature: Rocky reefs, shellfish stocks |
| Area: Whole district (particularly inshore reefs) Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln Estuary MCZ | | IFCA Objectives affected: Protection of shellfish stocks/rocky reefs A (Common) |
| Minor impacts on shellfish stocks | This activity occurs throughout the district and while common the intensity is low and as a result damage to fish stocks is low. Restrictions on the number of pots being fished and minimum landing sizes also aid in preventing overfishing. | |
| Minor damage to marine environment | While widespread this activity is not believed to cause damage beyond a background level. | |
| Outline of Risks: | Potting activity could physically damage parts of the reef due to actual contact with pots or associated gear (ropes etc.). Removal of target species could result in imbalances in ecosystem. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The implications are low as is the severity. Potting as a recreational pursuit either from boats or the shore has occurred for many years with no noticeable damage to reefs being reported. This is a low occurrence activity with much reduced risks to the ecosystem. The primary target species for these persons is lobster and unfortunately, if not well enforced, quantities of juvenile lobsters could be removed; loss of large numbers of juvenile lobsters could have potential recruitment effect on local lobster population. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | A. Common or repeating occurrence. | |
| Consequence of risk | 5 – Minor impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 6 - Minor damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | NIFCA byelaws 3, 4 & 5. National legislation. | |
| Risk strategy/action | Continue to monitor levels of potting activity. Newcastle University study into impacts of potting on reefs. | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going monitoring of shellfish potters. | |
| Owner | Crown Estate. | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1). | |
| Key stakeholders | Fishermen | |
| Risk status | Green | |
| Risk ranking | 5 | |
| Key valuation criteria | While the taking of juvenile lobsters is acknowledged as a problem within the Authority's district the overall scale of the landings is small (relative to the quantities of mature lobsters landed by licenced fishermen) and therefore is not likely to impact on overall stock levels of lobsters. The activity is however widespread and therefore educating or carrying out enforcement on transgressors needs to be maintained at a high level. | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| RISK 4 CLEEKING | | Feature: Rocky shore |
| Area: Whole district Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln Estuary MCZ | | IFCA Objectives affected: Protection of lobsters (particularly juveniles) and damage to rocky reefs, disturbance of birds. A (Common) |
| Minor impacts on shellfish stocks | This activity occurs throughout the district in the intertidal zone and while common the intensity is low and as a result damage to fish stocks is low. | |
| Minor damage to marine environment | The main damage to the marine environment will result from individuals crossing the foreshore which could impact on non-mobile species or disturb mobile species such as birds. Impacts could also occur when rocks are turned over and not replaced. This is not seen as a major issue as it tends to be in high energy environments where naturally occurring movement of rocks occurs. | |
| Outline of Risks: | During the search for lobsters in the intertidal area along some of the rocky shoreline, boulders are turned over and not replaced. In addition some people will potentially remove significant quantities of lobsters. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | Loss of large numbers of juvenile lobsters could have potential recruitment effect on local lobster populations. The turning over and not replacing of boulders while gather shellfish can have negative effects on biodiversity. Disturbance of feeding birds does occur but the level of activity is low and birds are able to feed extensively at other locations. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | A. Common or repeating occurrence. | |
| Consequence of risk | 5 – Minor impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 6 - Minor damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | NIFCA byelaws 3 & 4. National legislation (minimum sizes). | |
| Risk strategy/action | Continue to work with others on research into shellfish populations. Regular patrols of known hot spot areas where cleeking occurs. | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going continue | |
| Owner | Crown Estate. | |
| Key resources | NIFCA officers | |
| Key stakeholders | Fishermen | |
| Risk status | Green | |
| Risk ranking | 5 | |
| Key valuation criteria | While the taking of juvenile lobsters is acknowledged as a problem within the Authority's district the overall scale of the landing is small (relative to the quantities of mature lobsters landed by licenced fishermen) and therefore is not likely to impact on overall stock levels of lobsters. The activity is however widespread and therefore educating or carrying enforcement on transgressors needs to be maintained at a high level. The nature of the intertidal zone is a high energy area where boulders are likely to be turned by wave action on a regular basis and therefore boulders turned by shellfish gatherers unlikely to be significant. | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| RISK 5 BAIT DIGGING (outside BNNC EMS) | | Feature: Sand and muddy foreshore, Seagrass, birds |
| Area: Intertidal areas of sand and mud Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln Estuary MCZ | | IFCA Objectives affected: Bait is collected in a suitable way. A (Common) |
| Minor impacts on Lugworm & Ragworm stocks although locally the effect maybe moderate | This activity occurs throughout the district on areas of sandy and muddy shoreline and while common the intensity is low and as a result damage to fish stocks is low but levels require to be monitored. | |
| Minor damage to marine environment | The main damage to the marine environment will result from individuals crossing the foreshore which could impact on non-mobile species or disturb mobile species such as birds. | |
| Outline of Risks: | If worms are removed in large numbers this could lead to an ecological imbalance. Bait digging can have impacts on other marine species present at the site particularly mussels. Large numbers of diggers can cause disturbance to bird species. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The removal of worms has the potential for localised ecological imbalance but generally recovery is relatively rapid. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | A. Common or repeating occurrence. | |
| Consequence of risk | 5 – Minor impact on sustainability of worm stocks, 6 - Minor damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | Outside of the BNNC EMS this activity is largely unregulated, code of conduct in place in Blyth Estuary and restrictions at Cullercoats harbour. | |
| Risk strategy/action | NIFCA Bait collection and hand gathering work plan. Newcastle University PhD looking into the impacts of hand gathering and bait digging | |
| Dates and milestone | Work plan to be completed by 2017 | |
| Owner | Crown Estate. | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers | |
| Key stakeholders | Anglers and LAs. | |
| Risk status | Green | |
| Risk ranking | 5 | |
| Key valuation criteria | Currently other than the Blyth estuary, where digging worms is allowed it is not seen as a significant problem, but levels of extraction are being monitored. Levels of bait digging in Blyth estuary are currently being monitored. | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| RISK 6 BAIT DIGGING (within BNNC EMS) | | Feature: Sand and muddy foreshore, Seagrass, birds |
| Area: Intertidal rocky reef areas Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA | | IFCA Objectives affected: Bait is collected in a sustainable way. A (Common) |
| Minor impacts on worms | This activity occurs throughout the district on areas of sandy and muddy shoreline and while common the intensity is low and as a result damage to fish stocks is low but levels require to be monitored. | |
| Moderate damage to marine environment | Bait digging on areas of Seagrass is considered to cause significant damage to this sub feature of the BNNC EMS. Additional main damage to the marine environment will result from individuals crossing the foreshore which could impact on non-mobile species or disturb mobile species such as birds. | |
| Outline of Risks: | Bait digging on areas of Seagrass could negatively impact this feature of the BNNC EMS. Disturbance of birds feeding could negatively impact population numbers. If worms are removed in large numbers this could lead to an ecological imbalance. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | Destruction of the Seagrass beds could lead to a lack of food for over wintering water fowl the severity is moderate but the risk low. Disturbance of birds feeding could negatively impact population numbers the severity is moderate but the risk low. The removal of worms has the potential for localised ecological imbalance but generally recovery is relatively rapid. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | A. Common or repeating occurrence. | |
| Consequence of risk | 5 – Minor impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 4 - Moderate damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | NIFCA byelaw 8 prohibits bait digging on areas of Seagrass within the BNNC EMS. Other byelaws exist in several parts of the district, notably in at, Lindisfarne National Nature Reserve (Natural England) and Boulmer Haven (Northumberland County Council) | |
| Risk strategy/action | NIFCA monitor levels of bait digging and ensure compliance with the byelaw prohibiting bait digging on areas of Seagrass. NIFCA Bait collection and hand gathering work plan. Newcastle University PhD looking into the impacts of hand gathering and bait digging | |
| Dates and milestone | Ongoing monitoring. Work plan to be completed by 2017 | |
| Owner | Crown Estate. | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1). | |
| Key stakeholders | Anglers NGO's and LAs. | |
| Risk status | Amber | |
| Risk ranking | 4 | |
| Key valuation criteria | Currently where digging worms is allowed it is not seen as a significant problem, but levels of extraction are being monitored. | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| RISK 7 HAND GATHERING MUSSELS – COMMERCIAL EMS | | Feature: Mussel beds, birds |
| Area: Fenham Flats Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA | | IFCA Objectives affected: Ensure fishery is sustainable, and limit impacts to habitat and associated species. B (Known to have occurred) |
| Minor impacts on mussel stocks | At only one site within the district has commercial gathering of mussels been undertaken (Holy Island) in recent years. This is a private fishery managed by the Lindisfarne Nature Reserve which sets quotas and the number of individuals who may harvest mussels. Currently this fishery is not being prosecuted. | |
| Minor damage to marine environment | While this activity could impact on feeding and roosting birds the Natural England byelaws restrict the number of persons who can work the beds at any one time. | |
| Outline of Risks: | Potential for stock collapse, and disturbance of feeding/roosting birds. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The risks and severity are low due to the low level of human activity at this site. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | B. Known to have occurred. | |
| Consequence of risk | 5 – Minor impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 6- Minor damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | Natural England byelaws and regulations limit this fishery with a low quota and number of persons allowed to work the beds. | |
| Risk strategy/action | Continue to work with others on research into shellfish populations. | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going annual survey. | |
| Owner | Southerland family and Natural England | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers | |
| Key stakeholders | Land owner, NE and fishermen | |
| Risk status | Green | |
| Risk ranking | 5 | |
| Key valuation criteria | Annual survey | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| RISK 8 HAND GATHERING MUSSELS – COMMERCIAL (outside EMS) | | Feature: Mussel beds, birds |
| Area: Blyth estuary Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: Blyth estuary SSSI | | IFCA Objectives affected: Ensure fishery is sustainable, and limit impacts to habitat and associated species. B (Known to have occurred) |
| Moderate impacts on mussel stocks | At only one site outside of the EMS does harvesting mussels at a commercial scale occur, this is in the Blyth estuary. It is believed that mussels gathered from here are sold to angling outlets for bait and not for human consumption. | |
| Moderate damage to marine environment | While this activity could impact on feeding and roosting birds, levels of harvesting are currently seen as low. | |
| Outline of Risks: | Potential for stock collapse, and disturbance of feeding/roosting birds. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The risks and severity are moderate due to the potential for unregulated access to the site | |
| Probability of Risks arising | B. Known to occur. | |
| Consequence of risk | 3 – Moderate impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 4 - Moderate damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | NIFCA code of conduct in place at site | |
| Risk strategy/action | Continue to monitor exploitation at the site | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going quarterly surveys. | |
| Owner | Blyth harbour commission | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers | |
| Key stakeholders | Land owner, and fishermen | |
| Risk status | Amber | |
| Risk ranking | 3 | |
| Key valuation criteria | Quarterly stock assessment surveys and regular monitoring of the site | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| RISK 9 SHORE GATHERING (COMMERCIAL) WINKLES | | Features: Rocky Shore, Seagrass, Birds |
| Area: Whole district (particularly intertidal reefs) Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln estuary MCZ | | IFCA Objectives affected: Protection of shellfish stocks/rocky reefs/Seagrass A (Common) |
| Minor impacts on winkle stocks | This activity occurs throughout the district on areas of rocky shoreline and while common the intensity is low and as a result damage to fish stocks is low but levels require to be monitored. | |
| Moderate damage to marine environment | The main potential damage is to the Seagrass beds within the BNNC EMS. Additional minor damage to the marine environment will result from individuals crossing the foreshore which could impact on non-mobile species or disturb mobile species such as birds. Impacts could also occur when rocks are turned over and not replaced. This is not seen as a major issue as these tend to be in high energy environments where naturally occurring movement of rocks occurs. | |
| Outline of Risks: | Destruction of Seagrass beds. Potential for stock collapse, and disturbance of feeding/roosting birds. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The risks and severity to Seagrass is moderate, while other risks are low due to the low level of human activity. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | B. Known to occur. | |
| Consequence of risk | 5 – Minor impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 4 - Moderate damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | Hand gathering within Lindisfarne SPA is banned by Natural England byelaws and hand gathering on areas of Seagrass is banned by NIFCA byelaw 8. Fishery in other parts of the district is unregulated. | |
| Risk strategy/action | Continue to work with Newcastle University particularly with regards to Bait Digging and Hand Gathering project. | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going | |
| Owner | Crown Estates, Southerland family, and NE | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers and Nature reserve warden | |
| Key stakeholders | Land owner, NE and fishermen | |
| Risk status | Amber | |
| Risk ranking | 4 | |
| Key valuation criteria | Continue to monitor levels of harvesting | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| RISK 10 SINGLE RIG TRAWLING (within EMS) | | Features: Sea bed (particularly reefs), Fish stocks |
| Area: Whole district Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln estuary MCZ | | IFCA Objectives affected: Ensure fishery is sustainable and limit impact to the marine environment particularly within MPAs. A (Common) |
| Moderate impacts on whitefish and nephrops stocks | Trawling is a highly efficient form of fishing that can impact stock levels | |
| Moderate damage to marine environment | This style of fishing has the potential to negatively impact habitats particularly reefs. | |
| Outline of Risks: | Damage to reefs particularly within the BNNC EMS. Potential for stock collapse. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The risks of stock collapse are moderate and potentially could have significant impact. Risk to habitat is viewed as moderate as the location of the reefs are well known and are avoided by trawlers due the consequence of damage to fishing gear. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | A. Common | |
| Consequence of risk | 3 - Moderate impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 4 - Moderate damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | NIFCA byelaws 1 & 7. National and European legislation | |
| Risk strategy/action | Monitor level of fishing particularly to observe any increase in level of activity. Byelaw 7 prohibits trawling within the B&NNC EMS and protects the reef features from impacts. | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going | |
| Owner | Crown Estates | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1). | |
| Key stakeholders | Fishermen | |
| Risk status | Amber | |
| Risk ranking | 3 | |
| Key valuation criteria | Level of trawling changes throughout the year with main fishery in late autumn. This varies on a year by year basis and depends on stock levels. In the past over-exploitation has occurred outside of NIFCA district and this level of fishing could have implications for local stock. | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| RISK 11 SINGLE RIG TRAWLING (outside EMS) | | Features: Sea bed (particularly reefs), Fish stocks IFCA Objectives affected: Ensure fishery is sustainable and limit impact to the marine environment particularly within MPAs. A (Common) |
| Area: Whole district Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & AIn Estuary MCZ | | |
| Moderate impacts on whitefish and nephrops stocks | Trawling is a highly efficient form of fishing that can impact stock levels | |
| Moderate damage to marine environment | This style of fishing has the potential to negatively impact habitats particularly reefs. | |
| Outline of Risks: | Damage to reefs particularly within the Coquet to St. Mary's MCZ. Potential for stock collapse. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The risks of stock collapse are moderate and potentially could have significant impact. Risk to habitat is viewed as moderate as the location of the reefs are well known and are avoided by trawlers due the consequence of damage to fishing gear. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | A. Common | |
| Consequence of risk | 3 - Moderate impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 4 - Moderate damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | NIFCA byelaws 1 & 7. National and European legislation | |
| Risk strategy/action | Monitor level of fishing particularly to observe any increase in level of activity. NIFCA are currently awaiting conservation advice for the Coquet to St. Mary's MCZ and will review management once the advice has been given | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going | |
| Owner | Crown Estates | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1). | |
| Key stakeholders | Fishermen | |
| Risk status | Amber | |
| Risk ranking | 3 | |
| Key valuation criteria | Level of trawling changes throughout the year with main fishery in late autumn. This varies on a year by year basis and depends on stock levels. In the past over-exploitation has occurred outside of NIFCA district and this level of fishing could have implications for local stock. | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| RISK 12 SCALLOP DREDGING (within EMS) | | Features: Sandy and muddy sea bed, reefs, scallop stocks |
| Area: Whole district intertidal rocky reefs Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Farnes SPA | | IFCA Objectives affected: Ensure fishery is sustainable and limit impact to marine environment particularly within MPAs B (Known to Occur) |
| Moderate impacts on Scallop stocks | Dredging is a highly efficient form of fishing that can impact stock levels | |
| Moderate damage to marine environment | This style of fishing has the potential to negatively impact habitats particularly reefs. | |
| Outline of Risks: | Potential for stock collapse and potential damage to reef habitats. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The risks of stock collapse are moderate and potentially could have significant impact as is the risk to reef areas. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | B. Known to Occur | |
| Consequence of risk | 3 - Moderate impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 4 - Moderate damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | NIFCA byelaws 2 & 7. National and European legislation | |
| Risk strategy/action | Monitor level of fishing particularly to observe any increase in level of activity. Byelaw 7 prohibits dredging within the B&NNC EMS and protects the reef features from impacts. | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going | |
| Owner | Crown Estates | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1). | |
| Key stakeholders | Fishermen | |
| Risk status | Amber | |
| Risk ranking | 3 | |
| Key valuation criteria | For legal scallop dredging the risk to the site is relatively low, however illegal fishing could increase the risks to the stocks and environment as these vessels are usually larger, have more power and fish significantly and more dredges. | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| RISK 13 SCALLOP DREDGING (outside EMS) | | Features: Sandy and muddy sea bed, reefs, scallop stocks |
| Area: Whole district Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & AIn Estuary MCZ | | IFCA Objectives affected: Ensure fishery is sustainable and limit impact to marine environment particularly within MPAs B (Known to Occur) |
| Moderate impacts on Scallop stocks | Dredging is a highly efficient form of fishing that can impact stock levels | |
| Moderate damage to marine environment | This style of fishing has the potential to negatively impact habitats particularly reefs. | |
| Outline of Risks: | Damage to reefs particularly within the Coquet to St. Mary's MCZ. Potential for stock collapse. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The risks of stock collapse are moderate and potentially could have significant impact as is the risk to reef areas. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | B. Known to Occur | |
| Consequence of risk | 3 - Moderate impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 4 - Moderate damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | NIFCA byelaws 2 & 7. National and European legislation | |
| Risk strategy/action | Monitor level of fishing particularly to observe any increase in level of activity. NIFCA are currently awaiting conservation advice for the Coquet to St. Mary's MCZ and will review management once the advice has been given. | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going | |
| Owner | Crown Estates | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1). | |
| Key stakeholders | Fishermen | |
| Risk status | Amber | |
| Risk ranking | 3 | |
| Key valuation criteria | For legal scallop dredging the risk to the site is relatively low, however illegal fishing could increase the risks to the stocks and environment as these vessels are usually larger, have more power and fish significantly and more dredges. | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| RISK 14 DRIFT NETTING | | Features: Birds and cetaceans. Fish stocks |
| Area: Whole district Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln Estuary MCZ | | IFCA Objectives affected: Maintain sustainable fish stocks and minimise environmental impacts. B (Known to Occur) |
| Moderate impacts on fish stocks | This activity occurs throughout the district but at levels at an historic low and is unlikely to have any major impact on fish stocks. Main target species Salmonids but some bass and mackerel fishing occurs. | |
| Moderate damage to marine environment | The main environmental issue relates to the mixed fisheries with salmonids returning particularly to Scottish rivers, by-catch of sea birds and cetaceans although this is not a major issue locally but has been in some parts of the world. Drift nets for salmonids over the summer require to be attended at all times reducing the chance of by-catch. | |
| Outline of Risks: | Overfishing could result in fish stocks falling to below sustainable levels. By-catch of non-target species particularly birds and cetaceans. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The severity of the risk is low as drift netting is occurring at an historic low. If the fishery takes a disproportionate amount of fish returning to Scottish rivers these could struggle supporting a viable stock of fish. By-catch of non-target species seen as a potential problem but from anecdotal evidence this type of by-catch is low. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | B. Known to Occur | |
| Consequence of risk | 3 - Moderate impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 4 - Moderate damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | Fishery managed by Environment Agency. | |
| Risk strategy/action | Maintain a watching brief | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going | |
| Owner | Crown Estate/riparian owners. | |
| Key resources | EA officers, NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1). | |
| Key stakeholders | Fishermen | |
| Risk status | Amber | |
| Risk ranking | 3 | |
| Key valuation criteria | None at present | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| RISK 15 BEACH NETTING | | Features: Fish stocks, By-catch |
| Area: Whole district Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln Estuary MCZ | | IFCA Objectives affected: Maintain sustainable fish stocks and minimise environmental impacts. B (Known to Occur) |
| Moderate impacts on fish stocks | The main environmental issues relate to by-catch of non-target fish species and sea birds. Because this activity occurs in shallow water there is a potential to capture diving birds. This is not seen as a significant problem as fishermen are required to stay with the net at all times. By-catch of fish does occur but at low levels. | |
| Moderate damage to marine environment | This activity occurs throughout the district but at historically low levels and is unlikely to have any significant impact on targeted fish stocks. Some concern expressed over levels of non-targeted by-catch in localised areas (level of this by-catch to be assessed). Salmonid fishery managed by the Environment Agency. | |
| Outline of Risks: | Overfishing could result in fish stocks falling to below sustainable levels. By-catch of non-target species particularly birds and cetaceans. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The severity of the risk is low as drift netting is occurring at an historic low. If the fishery takes a disproportionate amount of fish returning to Scottish rivers these could struggle supporting a viable stock of fish. By-catch of non-target species seen as a potential problem but from anecdotal evidence this type of by-catch is low. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | B. Known to Occur | |
| Consequence of risk | 3 - Moderate impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 4 - Moderate damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | Fishery managed by Environment Agency. | |
| Risk strategy/action | Maintain a watching brief | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going | |
| Owner | Crown Estate/riparian owners. | |
| Key resources | EA officers, NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1). | |
| Key stakeholders | Fishermen | |
| Risk status | Amber | |
| Risk ranking | 3 | |
| Key valuation criteria | None at present. | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| RISK 16 BOAT ANGLING | | Features: Sea Bed, Birds and Fish stocks |
| Area: Whole district Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln Estuary MCZ | | IFCA Objectives affected: Sustainability of fish stocks, protection of the environment. A (Common) |
| Minor impacts on fish stocks | This activity occurs throughout the district and while common the intensity is low and as a result damage to fish stocks is low. | |
| Minor damage to marine environment | While widespread this activity is not believed to cause damage at more than a background level. The main environmental risk is probably lost and discarded gear that is a minor pollution problem but may account for a small level of bird mortality. Boat angling also has potential to impact on feeding birds. | |
| Outline of Risks: | Intensive angling could lead to a depletion of fish stocks on a localised basis. Angling waste not only can be visual pollution but is also a hazard to wildlife both marine and terrestrial. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The implications are low as is the severity. Angling generally occurs at very low levels in terms of size of stock extraction for the whole district and target species currently have relatively stable stock levels. Even during competitions extraction rates are low. Club anglers generally have a good regard for the environment and remove their waste. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | A. Common | |
| Consequence of risk | 5 - Minor impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 6 - Minor damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | NIFCA angling strategy. Minimum landing sizes. Club anglers have codes of conduct, on which species must be returned alive and which species can be harvested. The EMS Officer has supplied information on beach litter and levels that angling waste contributes to. Anglers have also demonstrated their commitment to improving their image by undertaking beach cleaning projects. NIFCA officers have assisted in beach cleans organised by angling clubs and NWLT. | |
| Risk strategy/action | Continue to conduct angling surveys | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going | |
| Owner | Crown Estate. | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1) | |
| Key stakeholders | Anglers | |
| Risk status | Green | |
| Risk ranking | 5 | |
| Key valuation criteria | None at present. | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| RISK 17 SHORE ANGLING | | Features: Sea Bed, Birds and Fish stocks |
| Area: Whole district Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln Estuary MCZ | | IFCA Objectives affected: Sustainability of fish stocks, protection of the environment. A (Common) |
| Minor impacts on fish stocks | This activity occurs throughout the district and while common the intensity is low and as a result damage to fish stocks is low. | |
| Minor damage to marine environment | While widespread this activity is not believed to cause damage at more than a background level. The main environmental risk is probably lost and discarded gear that is a minor pollution problem. Shore angling also has potential to impact on feeding birds. | |
| Outline of Risks: | Intensive angling could lead to a depletion of fish stocks on a localised basis. Angling waste not only can be visual pollution but is also a hazard to wildlife both marine and terrestrial. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The implications are low as is the severity. Angling generally occurs at very low levels in terms of size of stock extraction for the whole district and target species currently have relatively stable stock levels. Even during competitions extraction rates are low. Club anglers generally have a good regard for the environment and remove their waste. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | A. Common | |
| Consequence of risk | 5 - Minor impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 6 - Minor damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | NIFCA angling strategy. Minimum landing sizes. Club anglers have codes of conduct, on which species must be returned alive and which species can be harvested. The EMS Officer has supplied information on beach litter and levels that angling waste contributes to. Anglers have also demonstrated their commitment to improving their image by undertaking beach cleaning projects. | |
| Risk strategy/action | Continue to conduct angling surveys | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going | |
| Owner | Crown Estate. | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1) | |
| Key stakeholders | Anglers | |
| Risk status | Green | |
| Risk ranking | 5 | |
| Key valuation criteria | None at Present | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| RISK 18 GILL/TRAMMEL NETTING | | Features: Bird by-catch |
| Area: Whole district Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln Estuary MCZ | | IFCA Objectives affected: Sustainability of fish stocks, protection of the environment. B (Known to Occur) |
| Minor impacts on fish stocks | This activity occurs mainly in the southern half of the district at relatively low levels, extraction rates compared with trawling are low and therefore impacts are also likely to be low. | |
| Minor damage to marine environment | The main environmental issue relates to by-catch of sea birds. This is not a major issue locally but has been in some parts of the world Restrictions are in place during the summer months into the depth of water that nets can be set, thereby reducing the chance of bird by-catch. | |
| Outline of Risks: | Removal of excessive numbers of fish could impact stocks locally, by-catch of birds or cetaceans. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The implications are low as is the severity. At certain times of the year this has been a popular form of fishing but low quotas restrict impacts. Most netting takes place in water depths beyond what is accessible to birds. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | B. Known to occur | |
| Consequence of risk | 5 - Minor impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 6 - Minor damage to marine environment | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | Quota restrictions and minimum mesh sizes. NIFCA byelaw 6 governing the seasonal placement of nets. | |
| Risk strategy/action | On-going, monitoring levels of fishing activity. | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going | |
| Owner | Crown Estate. | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1). | |
| Key stakeholders | Fishermen | |
| Risk status | Green | |
| Risk ranking | 5 | |
| Key valuation criteria | None at Present | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| RISK 19 RECREATIONAL BOATING (sail) | | Features: Sea bed, fish stocks |
| Area: Whole district | | IFCA Objectives affected: None B (Known to Occur) |
| Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green | | |
| MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln Estuary MCZ | | |
| No impacts on fish stocks | No impact | |
| Minor damage to marine environment | Some disturbance to birds and marine mammals | |
| Outline of Risks: | Damage to reefs particularly within the BNNC EMS. Potential for stock collapse. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The implications are low as is the severity. Even in areas where regattas take place, sea birds are regularly seen feeding and unless marine mammals are actively pursued they do not appear to be negatively impacted. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | C. Could occur | |
| Consequence of risk | 6 – Minor damage to the marine environment; 7 – No damage to fish stocks. | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | Legislation in place to limit harassment on certain marine species. | |
| Risk strategy/action | Continue to work with Marine Life monitoring cetacean numbers | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going | |
| Owner | Crown Estate. | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1). | |
| Key stakeholders | Recreational boaters and NGO's | |
| Risk status | Green | |
| Risk ranking | 6 | |
| Key valuation criteria | None at Present | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| RISK 20 RECREATIONAL BOATING (motor) | | Features: Seabirds and marine mammals. |
| Area: Whole district Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln estuary MCZ | | IFCA Objectives affected: Disturbance of birds/marine mammals. A (Common) |
| No impacts on fish stocks | No Impact | |
| Minor damage to marine environment | Some disturbance to birds and mammals | |
| Outline of Risks: | Disturbance of birds/marine mammals | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The implications are low as is the severity. Even in areas where regattas take place, sea birds are regularly seen feeding and unless marine mammals are actively pursued they do not appear to be negatively impacted. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | C. Could occur | |
| Consequence of risk | 6 – Minor damage to the marine environment; 7 – No damage to fish stocks. | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | Legislation in place to limit harassment on certain marine species. Code of conduct developed by tourist boat operators and European Marine Site Officer | |
| Risk strategy/action | Continue to work with Marine Life monitoring cetacean numbers | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going | |
| Owner | Crown Estate. | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1). | |
| Key stakeholders | Recreational boaters and NGO's | |
| Risk status | Green | |
| Risk ranking | 6 | |
| Key valuation criteria | None at Present | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| RISK 21 RECREATIONAL BOATING (Kayak angling) | | Features: Seabirds, marine mammals and fish stocks |
| Area: Whole district | | IFCA Objectives affected: Protection of Environment A (Common) |
| Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green | | |
| MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln Estuary MCZ | | |
| Minor Impact on fish stocks | Minor impact | |
| Minor damage to marine environment | Some disturbance to birds and marine mammals | |
| Outline of Risks: | Disturbance of birds/marine mammals, impacts to fish stocks | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | The implications are low as is severity. Even during competitions sea birds are regularly seen feeding close to anglers, and marine mammals can easily move away. Catch rates are extremely low so will not impact fish stocks. | |
| Probability of Risks arising | C. Could occur | |
| Consequence of risk | 6 – Minor damage to the marine environment; 7 – No damage to fish stocks. | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | Legislation in place to limit harassment on certain marine species. Minimum fish size legislation. | |
| Risk strategy/action | Continue to work with Marine Life monitoring cetacean numbers, regular checks on angler's catches. | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going | |
| Owner | Crown Estate. | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1). | |
| Key stakeholders | Kayakers | |
| Risk status | Green | |
| Risk ranking | 6 | |
| Key valuation criteria | None at Present | |

NIFCA Environmental Enforcement Risk Register June 2016

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| RISK 22 DIVING (Recreational) | | Feature: Rocky reefs, shellfish stocks |
| Area: Whole district Key contact: Deputy Chief IFCO Jon Green MPA Present: B&NNC SAC, Lindisfarne SPA, Tweed Estuary SAC, Farnes SPA, Coquet SPA, Northumbria Coast SPA, Coquet to St Mary's MCZ & Aln Estuary MCZ | | IFCA Objectives affected: Protection of shellfish stocks/rocky reefs/wrecks A (Common) |
| Minor impacts on shellfish stocks | This activity occurs throughout the district and while common the intensity is low and as a result damage to fish stocks is low. Restrictions on the number of pots being fished and minimum landing sizes also aid in preventing overfishing. | |
| Minor damage to marine environment | While widespread this activity is not believed to cause damage beyond a background level | |
| Outline of Risks: | NIFCA byelaws 3, 4 & 5. National legislation. Dive clubs codes of conducts. | |
| Implication and Severity of Risks: | 5. Minor impact on sustainability of fish stocks, 6 - Minor damage to marine environment | |
| Probability of Risks arising | A - Common or repeating occurrence. | |
| Consequence of risk | The implications are low as is the severity. Diving has been a popular pastime locally for many years and only a very small amount of incidents of objects being removed have been reported. This is a low occurrence activity with much reduced risks to the ecosystem. The primary target species for these persons is lobster and unfortunately, if not well enforced, quantities of juvenile lobsters could be removed; loss of large numbers of juvenile lobsters could have potential recruitment effect on local lobster population. | |
| Existing methods of dealing with the risks | Diving could physically damage parts of the reef or wreck particularly if items are removed. Removal of target species could result in imbalances in ecosystem. | |
| Risk strategy/action | Continue to monitor levels of diving activity. | |
| Dates and milestone | On-going monitoring of divers. | |
| Owner | Crown Estate. | |
| Key resources | NIFCA Officers, St Aidan & RIBs (St. Aidan TT & Delta 1). | |
| Key stakeholders | Divers | |
| Risk status | Green | |
| Risk ranking | 5 | |
| Key valuation criteria | None at Present | |