

Landing obligation?

CCB-Baltic network of 19 NGOs, organising over 800 000 members in grass root organisations

 *Coalition Clean Baltic*
FOR PROTECTION OF THE BALTIC SEA ENVIRONMENT

State of play for the Landing Obligation , LO

Three important points, 2 questions and one exclamation mark:

- LO has strong public support!
- Is implementation on track?
- The data situation, where are we today?

Landing obligation with political and public support

One of few high profile issues in CFP - Massive support for stopping wasteful and unselective fishing :

- Land what you catch and be accountable for it
- Part of "package" to improve and give profit to the best performers
- Not designed to accomodate, but to change how we fish!
- No room for gears not fit for purpose
- To measure and manage - get the data right

Implementation so far – Baltic example

Painfully clear that:

- Industry and Member states act as if we just came up with this idea – from May 2013..
- Deliberate stalling, yet in 2012 fishermen blamed "EU" for forcing them to discard?
- Fishing pattern has not changed, high discard still
- In the Baltic, cod discards are still high
- Plaice? Last year ranges up to 100% discard...

Implementation so far – the numbers.. (ICES)

Discards of cod: Fishing pattern not changed..

ICES 2015:

- 8% in area 22-24
- 14.5% in area 25-32 (+1.6% actually landed..)

That means in real numbers: 449t + 6328t= 6 777 000 kg.
Today average weight of 34 cm cod is 340 gr.

-This means that 20 million cods were discarded under the landing obligation!

Discard of plaice area 21-23

-ICES 2016, calculate a 25% discard rate = 2 134t

Implementation so far – the numbers.. (EFCA)

Discards of cod: what does the control agency say?

- High discrepancy between catches and landings
- Logbooks show one thing, control another..

Segment /species	Last haul inspection			Follow-up inspection			Log-book or landing declaration		
	Min.	Max.	Ave.	Min.	Max.	Ave.	Min.	Max.	Ave.
BS01 COD	0	20.8	3.7	0	3.7	2.0	0	6.9	1.5
BS03 COD	0.7	45.0	10.9	0.2	45.0	2.3	0.2	45.0	2.4

Table shows % of fish below MCRS 22-24;25-32

Data questions and tools available to Member States

- The LO is full of exemptions creating difficulties
- Scientists state that data situation has not improved but actually is worse
- Quotas will need to be reconsidered in the light of unknown mortality
- MS are not using the tool at hand, swaps etc
- MS have also legal tools to propose changes technical rules but..

Errors made and corrections needed:

- The trawl is obviously not fit for purpose, but rules in place inhibit innovation
 - Trials and tests should have started long ago, very weak interest from industry
 - Data situation may even be worse than before, exemptions make it worse..
 - Exemptions are questionable if they really help?
 - Wrong focus: now break the law on LO, no gear changes
- it could be: break the law on gear rules and improve selectivity and live up to LO

In summary..

- The LO has strong public support for a good reason
- Implementation and enforcement must step up!
 - Industry needs to show how to improve, not demand exemptions
 - Member States must speed up work under regionalisation (or step aside...?)
 - Tools of swaps and flexibility that exists must be used to facilitate the LO
- Reporting of discards and correct landings must be in order, if not quotas must be lowered to account for unknown mortality

Thank you



***Nils Höglund, Marine Policy Officer, CCB
nils@ccb.se***