

Questionnaire: Study supporting the evaluation of the landing obligation – Common Fisheries Policy

By coordinator: Gian Ludovico Ceccaroni

Survey QR Code:

Deloitte.



https://deloittenu.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6rP0t9n51RQrm6i

Questionnaire:

Study supporting the evaluation of the landing obligation – Common Fisheries Policy

- e-survey to understand the implementation of the Landing Obligation from the point of view of different stakeholder groups across Europe.
- Part of the “Study supporting the evaluation of the landing obligation – Common Fisheries Policy”.
- **Purpose of the questionnaire:** to gather evidence to support a future EU Commission evaluation of the landing obligation invention in terms of meeting the objectives of the 2013 reformed Common Fisheries Policy (CFP), outlined under Article (2)(5)(a):



“[the CFP shall] gradually eliminate discards, on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the best available scientific advice, by avoiding and reducing, as far as possible, unwanted catches, and by gradually ensuring that catches are landed.”

Five years on from the full implementation of the landing obligation, the intention of this questionnaire is to aid in the collection and validation of existing data already gathered for an assessment on how the landing obligation has performed and is currently working, and why it is performing as it does.

Structure of the questionnaire

Section 1: Current state of play

To understand more about the current fisheries management and conservation measures in place within your region or Member State regarding the implementation of the landing obligation, and how they have contributed to:

- a) landing all catches in a respective fishery;
- b) increasing selectivity and reducing unwanted catches; and
- c) the handling of unwanted catches.

Section 2: Evaluation of Landing obligation

Structure of the questionnaire

Most questions relate to specific fishing areas, or to particular measures taken by different member states, or to specific fisheries, for example:

1. How would you characterise the trend in discard rates within your area of interest since 2014?

or

2. In line with Article 7 of the CFP Regulation, what conservation measures, including technical measures, have been implemented in your region/Member State to support the implementation of the landing obligation?

L.O exemptions an Joint recommendation

5. Are you aware of any of the following landing obligation exemptions associated with the following? Please tick all that apply.

- prohibited species;
- high survivability;
- de minimis exemptions
- fish which show damage caused by predators

6. If you are responding on behalf of a non-governmental body, have you been consulted or involved in the development of a submitted a joint recommendation?

Choke species

8. For stocks managed through catch limits, the existence of choke species is often identified as one of the main impacts of the implementation of the landing obligation.

- a. Have you observed any choke issues?
- b. Have your fisheries been closed due to choke issues?
- c. What conservation measures or actions are taken to mitigate such issues?

Quota swaps and quota flexibility

9. Quota swaps can be a useful management measure to provide flexibility and reduce the risk of choke situations. Have any of the following been initiated in the quota system(s) most relevant to your interest(s):

- i. Swaps between Member States?
- ii. Swaps between vessels within Member State?
- iii. Swaps with (in) the producer organisation

10. Has the use of quota flexibility mechanisms changed since the introduction of the landing obligation?

- If yes, please provide details regarding the use of the following mechanisms and specify the species and fleet segments for which they have been applied.
 - i. Inter-species flexibility
 - ii. Inter-annual flexibility

Control and enforcement measures

What control and enforcement measures have been carried out to ensure compliance with the landing obligation, as well as accurate documentation of all catches?

- Port inspections
- At-sea inspections
- Last-haul inspections
- Remote electronic monitoring (REM) systems
- Aerial surveillance
- Increased observer coverage
- Monitoring/control at landing markets (e.g. detect illegal sales of fish below MCRS)
- Administrative controls (e.g. cross checks of data recorded in logbook against landing declarations)
- Other

Challenges experienced

Contribute
to a
MEDAC
answer:
frame the
QR code



12. What challenges have you experienced in the implementation and in the control and enforcement of the landing obligation?

a. Operational challenges

- Increased selectivity is hard to attain in specific fisheries (name the fisheries)
- Difficult to adapt vessels for handling unwanted catches at sea
- Insufficient hold capacity to accommodate additional unwanted catches
- Insufficient port infrastructure to handle additional landings of unwanted catches
- Difficulties with handling, storage and processing of unwanted catches at port
- Lack of national funding to support fishers to increase selectivity of fishing gear and methods or adapt vessels or port infrastructure
- Inexistence of economic outlet for unwanted catches brought to land
- Lack of incentives for compliance
- Others, please specify

Challenges experienced - 2

Contribute to
a MEDAC
answer:
frame the QR
code above

Challenges related to quota management

- Problems re-allocating quota to cover catches previously not landed
- Problems with the timing or availability of quota swaps
- Fisheries being forced to close early due to choke issues

Challenges related to control and enforcement

- Difficult to detect discards because of insufficient observers (on board?)
- Difficult to detect discards because of insufficient electronic monitoring tools
- Not possible to detect discards by small (under-12m) vessels
- Difficult to gather evidence for successful prosecution of discarding
- Appropriateness of fines to deter fishers from discarding
- Not enough resources (inspectors, ships or aircraft) to enforce this obligation of landing all catches
- Lack of fisher understanding of the details of implementation and where different rules or exemptions may apply Difficulties implementing and monitoring de minimis or high survivability exemptions;
- Inaccurate or lack of reporting on discards in logbooks
- Fish below MCRS are still being landed and marketed for purposes of direct human consumption

Section 2: Evaluation of Landing Obligation

Contribute to
a MEDAC
answer:
frame the QR
code above

- 1. For the region(s), fleet segment(s) and fisheries in which you have an interest, to what extent would you estimate the landing obligation has contributed to the achievement of Article 2(5)(a) *“gradually eliminate discards, on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the best available scientific advice, by avoiding and reducing, as far as possible, unwanted catches, and by gradually ensuring that catches are landed”*:
 - (a) gradually eliminate discards, on a case-by-case basis,;
 - (b) by avoiding and reducing, as far as possible, unwanted catches;
 - (c) gradually ensuring that all catches are landed

Compliance level

Contribute to
a MEDAC
answer:
frame the QR
code above

2. Please indicate what you believe are the levels of compliance with the following requirements of the landing obligation.

- That catches are brought and retained on board fishing vessels
- That catches are recorded
- That catches are landed
- That catches are counted against quota where applicable
- Are catches below the minimum conservation reference size restricted to purposes other than direct human consumption

4. To what extent do you consider the Western Mediterranean MAP for your fleet segments/fishery clearly sets out the details of the implementation of the landing obligation referred to in Article 15 (5), in accordance with Articles 9 and 10 of the CFP regulation?

- Specific provisions regarding fisheries or species covered by the landing obligation aimed at increasing gear selectivity or reducing or, as far as possible, eliminating unwanted catches
- The specification of exemptions to the landing obligation of species for which scientific evidence demonstrates high survival rates
- Provisions for de minimis exemptions of up to 5 % of total annual catches of all species subject to the landing obligation
- Provisions on documentation of catches
- Where appropriate, the fixing of minimum conservation reference sizes

Scientific advices

6. To what extent is scientific advice to stakeholders from fishing sector available to:

- i. eliminate discards?
- ii. increase selectivity?
- iii. avoid unwanted catches?

6(a) Which type of scientific bodies are providing this advice?

6(b) Which stakeholders are benefitting from this advice?

Measures or studies on L.O.

Since 2021, have you initiated, supported, participated in or implemented any measures and/or studies relating to the reduction and avoidance of unwanted catches (i.e. **below MCRS**) through improving selectivity or spatial or temporal changes to fishing behaviour (for example, studies/pilots on gear innovation or on real-time closures)?

Yes/No

a. If Yes, please specify the measures taken or studies carried out and the status of the initiative (i.e. implemented in a Regulation or voluntary uptake).

Successful measures on L.O.

8. Which management measures or initiatives were successful and/or have been adopted by the fishing fleet?

- Closed/Temporary closed areas
- Selective gears
- High survivability exemptions
- Total allowable catch removal
- Quota management

Incentives

9. Have you implemented any incentives or/been incentivised to enhance the uptake of selective gear technology or selective fishing methods?

- *With incentives we mean, including those of an economic nature such as fishing opportunities that promote fishing methods which contribute to more selective fishing, the avoidance and reduction (as far as possible) of unwanted catches and fishing with low impact on the marine ecosystem and fishery resources.*

Handling of unwanted catches

Contribute to
a MEDAC
answer:
frame the QR
code above

10. What do you perceive to be the barriers and challenges encountered regarding the handling of unwanted MCRS catches onboard vessels?

(a) Difficulty in adapting vessels to manage the handling of unwanted catches at sea

(b) Additional time and increased costs associated with the handling and processing of unwanted MCRS catches

(c) Insufficient hold capacity to accommodate additional unwanted MCRS catches

11. Since the implementation of the landing obligation, has there been an increase in port infrastructure to facilitate landings for the non-human consumption market (i.e., unwanted catches) in your region(s) and or Member State(s) of interest?

a. If Yes, please specify these changes.

b. If No, what do you perceive to be the main barriers and challenges for updating/reconstructing port infrastructure to accommodate the additional landings of unwanted MCRS catches?

- i. Lack of funding to build or maintain additional infrastructure
- ii. Limited space to build specific facilities for handling additional unwanted MCRS catches
- iii. Lack of a market to sell unwanted MCRS catches for purposes other than direct human consumption

Market for unwanted catches/control

12. Have you been able to generate a market outlet for unwanted catches restricted to purposes other than direct human consumption?

13. Has your region(s) and or Member State(s) of interest implemented any additional initiatives associated with control and enforcement to prevent unwanted catches from reaching the human consumption market? (e.g. pre-notification of landings of under MCRS catches or monitoring of landings at fish markets/auctions etc.).

Training Programme

14. Are there training programmes related to discarding reduction and/or sustainable fishing practices that influenced increases in selectivity within your region(s) and or Member State(s) of interest?

15. To what extent have these training programs on discarding reduction been adopted and implemented across various fishing segments within your jurisdiction?

16. In your view, how has the implementation of relevant training programs contributed to the reduction of discarding and unwanted catches in your region/Member State?

New tools / Technologies

- 17. Have new tools/techniques been adopted by operators of fishing vessels since 2014?
- 18. Were there any additional costs associated with the adoption of such new tools/techniques?
- 19. Was there financial and/or legal support available towards the additional costs associated with the adoption of new tools/techniques?
- 20. Have any other policies at Member State level been put in place to help in providing better cost-effectiveness of the implementation of the landing obligation?

Advisory Councils

21. Could you provide examples where **Member States jointly worked with the Advisory councils** to provide recommendations on improving cost-effectiveness of:

- (a) Landing all catches
- (b) Handling unwanted catches
- (c) Implementation of the landing obligation in general
- (d) Increasing selectivity
- (e) Reducing administrative costs
- (f) Reducing administrative procedure
- (g) Reducing financial costs in general towards fishers

Share your opinion

Contribute
to a
MEDAC
answer:
frame the
QR code



- the landing obligation is relevant to the needs of your respective group as identified in the impact assessment of 2011 accompanying the Commission proposal
- The landing obligation has improved the sustainable exploitation of marine resources
- The landing obligation has a positive impact on the financial viability of fisheries
- The landing obligation provides appropriate and proportionate exemptions in fishing quotas
- The landing obligation has reduced overall discard
- The landing obligation has increased the selectivity of fishing gear
- The landing obligation has incentivised fishers to land all the catches
- Discards should continue to be eliminated

Share your opinion

Contribute to a
MEDAC answer:
frame the QR
code above

- the objectives of the landing obligation help in protecting the marine environment (Marine Strategy Framework Directive),
- The objectives of the landing obligation help in recovery of Biodiversity in the oceans (Biodiversity Strategy),
- The objectives of the landing obligation help in maintaining and restoring the marine habitats to a favourable conservation status within the EU (Habitats Directive),
- The objectives of the landing obligation help support fishers and improve productivity (Common Agricultural Policy)
- The objectives of the landing obligation help tackle climate change and the sustainable management of natural resources (Common Agricultural Policy)

Share your opinion

Contribute to a
MEDAC answer:
frame the QR
code above

- a) the landing obligation resulted in additional value, compared to what could be achieved by Member States at national and regional levels?
- (b) the landing obligation helped in the achieving results
- (c) the landing obligation provided additional results compared to the national and regional output and results in Member States
- (d) the landing obligation responded to cope with crises:
 - i. Climate emergencies, ii. COVID-19,
 - iii. Russian aggression in Ukraine

Share your opinion

Contribute to a
MEDAC answer:
frame the QR
code above

- **The EU** landing obligation to gradually eliminate all discards supported the national policies and initiatives that you listed above
- (b) The EU landing obligation to reduce unwanted catches supported the national policies and initiatives that you listed above
- (c) The EU landing obligation to ensure all catches are landed supported the national policies and initiatives that you listed above

And the last.....



25. Could you provide other policies and initiatives similar to the EU landing obligation that are relevant in your respective member state to

- Gradually eliminating discards Reduce unwanted catches
- Gradually ensuring all the catches are landed

thanks for coming so far....!!!