Appendix 2.1: Sample Selection for vessels by segment & region

Appendix 2.1.1 Sample composition in relation to population of vessels in the group by segment and region: Group 1 - vessels accepting decommissioning. The average of the VCUs of each sub-group of the whole population compared to the average of the VCUs of the sample. Where significant differences occurred (p=0.05) between the means this is indicated by “-” where the sample mean is lower and by “+” where the sample mean is higher. See Chapter 2 for explanation.

Region	0					1					2					3					4					5					6		
SEGMENT	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count
A																																77.4	
B																																	
C/E						8	151	3	116	-	26	248	9	237		2	207				2	96.3				1	184	1	184		3		
D						20	126	12	127		28	177	9	180							1	127				25	132	10	134		18	338	2
F						1	83.2																			1	65.4					159	6
G						2	204	2	204																	3	126	1	179			428	4
H						1	117				1	240				2	152				2	74.7				17	100	4	78	-	3	201	10
I						1	77.5	1	77.5												2	81.3				3	95.9	1	120			94.6	
J											1	309														1	83.3						
X						1	88.5																								3	153	

Region	7					8					9					10					11					12					13		
SEGMENT	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count
A	8	273	4	244																													
B						2	129				1	178				1	210	1	210		1	167				20	391	13	494				
C/E	14	239	8	228		28	147	11	168		6	120	3	119		40	121	18	128		20	110	8	127		54	175	32	183		17	134	5
D	44	200	21	195		5	170	2	172							1	113									1	87.1				14	129	6
F											2	95.9				14	175	9	152		3	78.4				15	94.1	5	107		5	54.5	2
G	2	174	1	152							1	165				16	138	9	147		2	93.6				2	154	2	154		16	60.3	3
H	1	206									1	86				1	78.4	1	78.4		2	94.7				8	74.1	6	74.8		4	60.4	3
I	1	276									3	89.9	2	88.4												3	67.8	2	76.4	+	4	70.9	3
J											3	85.4	1	92		6	109	5	104		7	89.8	1	79.8		2	66.3	1	67.9		4	91.4	1
X						1	148				1	52.7	1	52.7		4	116				2	72.5				1	167	1	167		4	55.9	1

Appendix 2.1.2 Sample composition in relation to population of vessels in the group by segment and region: Group 2 - vessels rejected because their bids were to high.
The average of the VCUs of each sub-group of the whole population compared to the average of the VCUs of the sample. Where significant differences occurred (p=0.05) between the means this is indicated by “-” where the sample mean is lower and by “+” where the sample mean is higher. See Chapter 2 for explanation.

Region	0					1					2					3				
SEGMENT	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific
A																				
B						1	925	1	925		1	442				2	205			
C/E						8	252	3	175		38	299	13	299		3	412	1	113	
D						11	120	3	104		6	186	4	166						
F																				
G																1	132			
H											1	548				1	103	1	103	
I						1	86.9	1	86.9											
J											1	246								
X						1	228													

Region	4					5					6		
SEGMENT	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count
A													
B													
C/E	4	283	2	346		6	263	1	137		1	535	
D	3	206	2	185		23	142	13	140		9	145	5
F													
G						1	144				1	177	
H						5	157	3	155				
I	3	91.4	1	89.4		1	165						
J											1	118	
X													

Region	7					8					9					10				
SEGMENT	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific
A	5	329	3	314																
B											1	579	1	579		6	349	3	384	
C/E	11	281	3	273		12	184	6	212		5	205	3	151		12	204	4	108	-
D	46	189	16	189		3	209	2	215											
F											1	123				7	284	3	110	-
G	2	157	2	157							1	161				8	168	2	148	-
H	1	286									1	223	1	223		4	170	1	148	
I																				
J	5	208	1	199							1	76.4	1	76.4		1	87.2			
X	1	82									4	263	2	262		1	116			

Region	11					12					13		
SEGMENT	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count
A													
B						9	329	4	131	-			
C/E	11	113	3	132	+	29	213	15	170	-	3	164	1
D						3	153	2	185	+	7	151	4
F	1	87.4	1	87.4		2	125	2	125		1	74.3	
G	1	99				5	173	5	173		1	55.6	
H						4	89.3	2	94.2				
I													
J	1	108				1	942						
X	3	66.2				2	87.2	2	87.2		1	226	

Note: A=Pelagic, B=Beam trawl, C/E=demersal trawl / seine, D=nephrops, F=Lines & nets, G= Shell mob, H=Shell fixed, I=Distant water, J=Non active, X=other
1= East Scotland (Eyemouth - Arbroath), 2=N.E. Scotland (Abroath-Lossiemouth), 3=Shetland, 4=Eastern Highland (Lossiemouth-Scrabsterinc Orkney), 5=Western Highlands & Islands, 6=South West Scotland (Campbeltown to Kirkudbright), 7=N.Ireland, 8=N.W England (Maryport - Hoylake), 9=Wales, 10=S.W. England (Bristol Ch-Plymouth), 11=S.E England (Poole-Dover), 12=East England (Thames - Whitby), 13=N.E. England (Redcar-Holy Is.)

Appendix 2.1.3 Sample composition in relation to population of vessels in the group by segment and region: Group 3 - vessels withdrawing from decommissioning. The average of the VCUs of each sub-group of the whole population compared to the average of the VCUs of the sample. Where significant differences occurred (p=0.05) between the means this is indicated by “**-**” where the sample mean is lower and by “+” where the sample mean is higher. See Chapter 2 for explanation.

Region	0					1					2					3					4					5					6		
SEGMENT	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count
A																																	
B																																	
C/E											4	348	4	348		2	202				2	180	1	201									
D						1	72.5				3	177	2	180												2	150	1	202		1	94.7	
F																																	
G																															1	251	1
H											1	201	1	201																			
J																																	

Region	7					8					9					10					11					12					13		
SEGMENT	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count
A	1	269	1	269																													
B																										4	596	4	596				
C/E	1	336	1	336		1	333	1	333												2	87.5	1	95.3		4	199	3	198		2	173	2
D	4	200	2	216																											5	159	4
F																3	122	2	139							1	84.6	1	84.6				
G	2	114	2	114																						1	219						
H																																	
J																										1	967	1	967		1	36.7	1
X						1	85.1																										

Appendix 2.1.4 Sample composition in relation to population of vessels in the group by segment and region: Group 4 - vessels not applying for decommissioning. The average of the VCUs of each sub-group of the whole population compared to the average of the VCUs of the sample. Where significant differences occurred (p=0.05) between the means this is indicated by "-" where the sample mean is lower and by "+" where the sample mean is higher. See Chapter 2 for explanation.

Region	0					1					2					3					4					5					6				
SEGMENT	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific
Other	51	337	3	659		1	188	0			10	415	2	347				0					0			1	173	0			1	77.4	0		
A			0					0			33	953	22	1071		9	1404	4	1308		1	1679	1	1679		1	675	0					0		
B			0			1	509	0			13	933	7	1005				0					0					0					0		
C/E	15	193	0			56	270	10	234		292	329	49	329		39	328	4	296		8	263	3	256		16	295	4	188	-	13	338	2	269	-
D	3	107	0			41	116	7	103		35	208	5	206		1	116	0			1	116	0			66	136	8	119		52	159	6	150	
F	4	159	0					0			4	88.5	0			1	85.2	0					0			5	178	0			13	428	4	401	
G	3	140	0					0			12	177	0			12	126	2	129				0			11	160	4	162		32	201	10	214	
H	5	151	0			6	79.3	3	78.6		9	104	2	102		5	90.5	0			6	112	0			70	90.8	13	93.2		6	94.6	0		
I			0					0					0					0					0					0					0		
J	27	121	0			2	80.4	0			22	345	6	420	+	3	183	0			2	80.3	0			3	76.3	0			5	153	0		
X	2	86	0			1	82.7	0			1	78.5	0					0					0			2	106	0			3	76	0		

Region	7					8					9					10					11					12					13				
SEGMENT	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific	Overall count	Overall avg	Sample count	Sample avg	Signific
Other	9	166	0			2	89.2	0			8	341	0			3	122	0			3	161	0			5	85.9	0			1	135	0		
A	7	629	2	1393				0					0			5	176	1	249		1	152	0			5	1785	3	2900	+			0		
B	4	757	4	757		3	139	0			7	482	1	984		68	372	28	415	+	19	244	4	113	-	57	474	26	720	+			0		
C/E	35	332	4	341		25	137	3	127		35	405	8	448		94	231	11	229		45	117	10	130		85	182	22	260		34	154	5	210	
D	48	185	13	186		2	129	0					0			2	351	0					0			3	125	0			34	119	9	132	
F	1	227	0			1	160	0			25	433	7	474		56	189	7	189		12	93.2	4	97.9		49	122	8	174	+	7	86	1	61.4	
G	6	135	0			1	257	0			1	215	0			10	268	4	348		6	210	0			2	103	0			2	124	0		
H	38	95.3	8	79.9	-			0			1	155	0			29	154	11	158		5	95.2	3	87.6	-	10	112	4	171		12	65.7	4	63	
I			0					0					0					0					0			10	1228	9	1260				0		
J	10	124	3	124		17	122	2	75.8	-	30	147	4	101	-	38	153	12	193		65	115	8	111		81	109	13	117		12	77.1	0		
X	7	90.7	0			2	87.9	0			8	94.4	0			14	111	2	106		14	112	2	78.8	-	19	87.6	2	93.5		11	69.8	1	45.9	

Appendix 2.2: Comparison between vessel gross sales and insurance values

insuran ce value

GROUP	TURNOVER	<>		Don't know	< £50,000	£50,000 - £100,000	£100,000 - £200,000	£200,000 - £300,000	£300,000 - £400,000	£400,000 - £500,000	£500,000 - £750,000	£750,000 - £1M	£1M - £1.5M
1			1	1	3	2	1						
1	< £50,000		5		68	15	1						
1	£50,000 - £100,000	1	2		21	45	5						
1	£100,000 - £200,000				2	22	29	1					
1	£200,000 - £300,000						8	3	1	3	2		
1	£300,000 - £500,000							2		1			
1	£500,000 - £1M									1	1		
2					4	5	4	2					
2	< £50,000		1		13	7	3						
2	£50,000 - £100,000		1		5	18	2	1					
2	£100,000 - £200,000				1	14	31	2					
2	£200,000 - £300,000		1		2	2	3	8	2				
2	£300,000 - £500,000							1	3	4			
2	£500,000 - £1M									2		1	

Appendix 2.2 - continued

	TURNOVER			Don't know		£50,000 -	£100,000 -	£200,000 -	£300,000 -	£400,000 -	£500,000 -	£750,000 -	£1M - £1.5M
3						1							
3	< £50,000				3	1	1						
3	£50,000 - £100,000				1	5							
3	£100,000 - £200,000					5	6	2					
3	£200,000 - £300,000						1	1	2				
3	£300,000 - £500,000					1		1		1			
3	£500,000 - £1M										1		
3	£1M - £2M												1

Source: *Nautilus* Survey

Appendix 2.3: Interviewed vessels consistently making profit, loss or breaking even

	Segment	At a profit	Breaking even	Making a loss	no answer	n =
Group 1	Pelagic Trawl	25%	25%	50%	0%	4
	Beam Trawl	7%	29%	57%	7%	14
	Demersal Trawl / Seine	43%	28%	26%	3%	100
	Nephrops Trawl	56%	14%	27%	3%	66
	Nets and lines	25%	31%	44%	0%	16
	Shellfish Mobile	39%	17%	39%	6%	18
	Shellfish Static	53%	27%	13%	7%	15
	Distant Water	67%	22%	11%	0%	9
	Non Active	44%	22%	33%	0%	9
	Other	100%	-	-	0%	3
	All	45%	23%	29%	3%	254
Group 2	Pelagic Trawl	67%	33%	-	0%	3
	Beam Trawl	67%	33%	-	0%	9
	Demersal Trawl / Seine	53%	24%	16%	7%	55
	Nephrops Trawl	57%	25%	14%	4%	51
	Nets and lines	83%	-	17%	0%	6
	Shellfish Mobile	67%	11%	22%	0%	9
	Shellfish Static	25%	38%	38%	0%	8
	Distant Water	100%	-	-!	0%	2
	Non Active	50%	-	50%	0%	2
	Other	25%	50%	-	25%	4
	All	56%	24%	15%	5%	149
Group 3	Pelagic Trawl	-	100%	-	0%	1
	Beam Trawl	-	75%	25%	0%	4
	Demersal Trawl / Seine	62%	8%	15%	15%	13
	Nephrops Trawl	56%	22%	22%	0%	9
	Nets and lines	33%	-	33%	33%	3
	Shellfish Mobile	33%	-	67%	0%	3
	Shellfish Static	-	-	100%	0%	1
	Distant Water	50%	-	50%	0%	2
	Non Active	-	-	-	-	
	Other	44%	19%	28%	8%	36

Source: *Nautilus* Survey

Appendix 2.4: Reason for application by segment

			SEGMENT								
REASON	Pel	Beam	Dem	Neph	Gill	Shell mob	Shell fix	Dist water	Non active	Other	Total
Vessel reached end of itseconomic life	1	1	**30**	24	2	5	**7**	**3**	**2**	1	76
Means of buying / financing another vessel	2	4	22	**29**	**6**	5	3	2	**2**	1	76
Finding the fishery unprofitable	**3**	2	19	12	4	6	3	1	**2**	1	53
Nearing age of retirement		1	17	13	1	4	2	1	**2**		41
Bank called in loan	2		**30**	5		1					38
Over regulation / too much bureaucracy		3	15	9	4	2	1		1	1	36
No response			10	10	1	1	2		1		25
Use to rationalise fleet activities		**13**	3		1		2		1	**2**	22
State of health		1	5	9	1	2	1		1	1	21
Depleting fishing opportunities			4	4	1	2	1	1			13
Want to take up other means of employment			4	2	1	2	1				10
Other		2	3	1	2				1		9
Difficulty in crewing vessel			3	3	1			2			9
Prospect of high bid being accepted			1	5			1	1			8
No family to replace you			2	0							2
Grand Total	8	27	168	126	25	30	24	11	13	7	439

Source: *Nautilus* Survey

Appendix 2.5: Reasons for withdrawing from the decommissioning scheme by segment.

Segment								
	Pel	Beam	Dem	Neph	Gill	Shell mob	Shell fixed	Non act
No response			2	1	1	1		1
Higher prices offered for licences/track record on open market		1	3	3		2	1	
Higher prices offered for vessel on open market		1	3	3	1			
Fishing prospects improving			1					
Future opportunities for self and family			1	1				
Tax burden			1	1				
Bid was purely speculative		1						
Decided to wait a few years		1	1					
Couldn't face scrapping vessel				1				1
Delays in the timing of the announcement								1
Boat sank			1					

Source: *Nautilus* Survey

Appendix 2.6: Key determinants of the vessels valuation when applying for decommissioning. responses

Percentage of applicants ranking each determinant of bid first - by year of application

Determinants	1993	1994	1995	1996	Total
No response	**11**	**7**	**8**	**10**	**9**
Current debts	**14**	**6**	**7**	**7**	**8**
Vessel value	**39**	**41**	**27**	**24**	**33**
Licence value	**1**	**2**	**2**	**10**	**4**
Knowledge of previous decommissioning bids		**34**	**32**	**29**	**24**
Required capital for future investment	**11**	**5**	**9**	**12**	**9**
Expected size of competing bids	**9**	**10**	**18**	**10**	**11**
Past profits from fishing	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Expected future profits from fishing	**3**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**1**
Cost of scrapping	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

Percentage of applicants ranking each determinant of bid second - by year of application

Determinants	1993	1994	1995	1996	Total
No response	**73**	**70**	**63**	**55**	**65**
Current debts	**1**	**2**	**6**	**2**	**2**
Vessel value	**4**	**5**	**11**	**10**	**8**
Licence value	**10**	**13**	**4**	**10**	**10**
Knowledge of previous decommissioning bids	**4**	**3**	**8**	**7**	**6**
Required capital for future investment	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**4**
Expected size of competing bids	**0**	**4**	**2**	**7**	**4**
Past profits from fishing	**2**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**1**
Expected future profits from fishing	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**
Cost of scrapping	**2**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

Percentage of applicants ranking each determinant of bid third by the year of application

Determinants	1993	1994	1995	1996	Total
No response	**93**	**93**	**85**	**87**	**90**
Current debts	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Vessel value	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**3**
Licence value	**1**	**1**	**3**	**3**	**2**
Knowledge of previous decommissioning bids	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**
Required capital for future investment	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**
Expected size of competing bids	**0**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**2**
Past profits from fishing	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**1**
Expected future profits from fishing	**0**	**0**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Cost of scrapping	**2**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**1**
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

Source: *Nautilus* Survey

Appendix 2.7: Fishermen's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats from the UK decommissioning scheme

STRENGTHS		WEAKNESSES	
• Decommissioning scheme works well	67	• The fishermen that leave are not those responsible for the heavy exploitation of the stocks	42
• Facilitates new investment	46	• Insufficient funds available for an adequate decommissioning scheme	18
• Leaves greater opportunities for those remaining in the industry	12	• Disincentive to decommission because of taxation as applied to fishermen under 55 years;	16
• Concentrates ownership into areas which are most capable of exploiting the fisheries	12	• Fishermen are discouraged because of the prospect of destroying their vessels	16
• Provides an easy means for fishermen seeking to leave the industry	10	• Will contribute to the decline in the infrastructure and employment dependent on the fishing industry	15
• Helps to increase fish prices	10	• Has facilitated investment into the under 10 m sector thereby adding to pressure in this sector	14
• Reduces overcapacity in vulnerable fisheries	8	• Limits the possibilities for new young fishermen entering into the industry.	13
• Reduces the hassle of selling vessels on the open market	5	• Has caused the prices of licences to rise	12
• Removes the number of licenses in circulation	5	• Represents a poor use of vessels and acts as a disincentive to many would-be applicants	12
• Reduces the costs of enforcement	2	• Has caused many vessels to leave the industry at below the market rate	10
		• Increases the percentage of foreign owned vessels operating in the fleet	8
		• Doesn't include the under 10 m sector	7
		• Has caused the prices of second hand vessels to rise	6
		• Has provided creditors with the possibility of acquiring their assets	5
		• Leads to a concentration of capital to larger sized vessels	5
		• Leads to regional concentration of ownership, i.e. North East Scotland and Shetland.	5
		• Has encouraged some company owners to strip their assets	4
		• Is only a substitute for natural wastage	4
		• Misuses public money when the market can achieve similar ends	4
		• Has allowed for some speculators to profit from the scheme	2

Appendix 2.7 - continued

OPPORTUNITIES		THREATS	
• **Allow for selling of track records and decommission the license from the vessel**	**61**	• **The stocks will be irreparably damaged**	**46**
• **Target most efficient vessels doing most damage to stocks**	**46**	• **Difficulty of re-investing in the industry once having left as a result of rising vessel and license values.**	**15**
• **Fixed rates should be introduced**	**37**	• **The increased emphasis in the industry towards the purchasing of licenses and quotas, thereby directly competing against the industry and increasing the marginal price of tenders;**	**5**
• **More funds should be made available for decommissioning**	**21**	**Vessels should not be scrapped**	**2**
• **Target older fishermen who are leaving industry anyway**	**13**		
• **Sell the scrapped vessels outside fishing**	**12**		
• **Should include under 10 m sector**	**7**		
• **Should be replaced by scrap and build policy**	**5**		
• **Compensation should be arranged for crew**	**1**		
• **Need government help to increase fleet of older traditional ways**	**1**		
• **Shouldn't be able to buy in again this is abusing the system**	**1**		

Source: Nautilus Survey

Appendix 2.8: Applicants' feelings regarding the potential for their tender application to succeed

	Successful (Gp 1)		Unsuccessful (Gp 2)		Withdrew	(Gp 3)	All applicants	(Gp 1 to 3)
Attitude	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
No response	7	3%	7	5%	3	8%	17	4%
Guaranteed	73	29%	8	5%	10	28%	91	21%
Reasonable	133	52%	80	54%	16	44%	229	52%
Highly speculative	41	16%	54	36%	7	19%	102	23%
Total	254	100%	149	100%	36	100%	439	100%

Group 1: Successful applicants feeling regarding the potential for their tender application to succeed

	1993		1994		1995			1996
Attitude	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
No response	2	4%	1	2%	2	3%	2	3%
Guaranteed	12	23%	21	33%	24	34%	16	24%
Reasonable	29	55%	36	56%	38	54%	30	45%
Highly speculative	10	19%	6	9%	7	10%	18	27%
Total	53	100%	64	100%	71	100%	66	100%

Appendix 2.8 - continued

Group 2: Unsuccessful applicants feeling regarding the potential for their tender application to succeed

	1993		1994		1995			1996
Attitude	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
No response	1	3%	2	3%	0	0%	4	8%
Guaranteed	3	9%	4	7%	0	0%	1	2%
Reasonable	13	41%	35	60%	5	45%	27	56%
Highly speculative	15	47%	17	29%	6	55%	16	33%
Total	32	100%	58	100%	11	100%	48	100%

Group 3: The feeling of successful applicants who withdrew their application regarding
the potential for their tender application to succeed

	1993		1994		1995			1996
Attitude	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
No response		0%	2	20%	2	29%		0%
Guaranteed	2	33%	6	60%	2	29%		0%
Reasonable	4	67%	1	10%	2	29%	8	62%
Highly speculative		0%	1	10%	1	14%	5	38%
Total	6	100%	10	100%	7	100%	13	100%

Source: *Nautilus* Survey

Appendix 2.9: Changes in skipper's employment following decommissioning or sale of vessel

Admin port	retired	returned to sea	no response	Unemployed	oil rig	fish enforce	recreational	fish proc /ret	other	Total
Aberdeen					1	1			0	2
Arbroath		1				1	1		1	4
Buckie		1				1			0	2
Eyemouth	1	4	1	1		1	2		1	11
Fraserburgh	4	1				2	1		0	8
Lossiemouth	5	1			2	3			0	11
Macduff				1					1	2
Peterhead	1	1	1		1		1		0	5
Pittenweem		3		2	1				1	7
Eastern Scotland	11	12	2	4	5	9	5	0	4	52
Ayr		3					3		1	7
Campbeltown		1				3	1		0	5
Kirkwall							1		0	1
Mallaig	2	5		1			3		0	11
Oban		1		1			1		0	3
Orkney							1		0	1
Ullapool	2	1								3
Kinlochbervie		1								1
Stornoway	1	3	0				3		1	8
Highland & W.Scotland	5	15	0	2	0	3	13	0	2	40
Ardglass		1					1		0	2
Belfast	1	2		1		1			0	5
Kilkeel	3	2	0	4	1	1	2	1	2	16
Portavogie	2	8	0	1		1	7		0	19
N. Ireland	6	13	0	6	1	3	10	1	2	42
Fleetwood		5	1	5	1	1	5		3	21
N.W England	0	5	1	5	1	1	5	0	3	21
Caernarfon	1	2							0	3
Milford Haven		4		1			3		1	9
Wales	1	6	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	12
Brixham	2	3			1	1	3		1	11
Hastings	2	6				2	5		0	15
Newlyn	2	8	1	3	1	1	10		3	29
Plymouth	1	2	1	2		1	4		0	11
Poole		1							1	2
Southern England	7	20	2	5	2	5	22	0	5	68
Grimsby	11	7	1	11		8	8	4	2	52
Lowestoft		7	1	3	1	6	10		2	30
North Shields	1	11	1	5	1	4	8	2	1	34
Eastern England	12	25	3	19	2	18	26	6	5	116

Appendix 2.9 - continued

Region	retired	returned to sea	No response	Unemployed	Fisheries enforcement	Oil rig	recreation	Fish proc / retail	Other	
Eastern Scotland	11	12	2	4	5	9	5	0	4	52
Highland & W.Scotland	5	15	0	2	0	3	13	0	2	40
N. Ireland	6	13	0	6	1	3	10	1	2	42
N.W England	0	5	1	5	1	1	5	0	3	21
Wales	1	6	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	12
Southern England	7	20	2	5	2	5	22	0	5	68
Eastern England	12	25	3	19	2	18	26	6	5	116
	42	96	8	42	11	39	84	7	22	351

Source: *Nautilus* Survey