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A major change

1- Coercive methods to ensure enforcement by creating an effective deterrence to illegal fishing activity
   ✓ Implement cost effective strategies for maximizing detection of offences

2- Non-coercive methods aiming at voluntary compliance:
   ✓ Aim at developing a sense of shared responsibility for the sustainability of marine resources

3- The LO is a challenge for fisheries control and inspection:
   – Traditional tools (sea, land, surveillance) and specific risk analysis developed
   – Tools tailored to the fisheries and the fishing vessel to be explored (CCTV, footage),
   – Need progress in cooperation with the industry
OBJECTIVE

• To ‘convince’ the fishing industry to comply with the landing obligation (deterrence, monitoring, awareness, voluntary approach…),

• The monitoring of the landing obligation focusses in ensuring:
  – No illegal discarding;
  – Recording of legal discards;
  – Recording of catches kept on board.
CONTROL OF LANDING OBLIGATION

• EFCA objective is to promote compliance with CFP rules and level playing field:
  – Coordination of MS control activities.
  – Assistance to Member States and Commission

• EFCA started its preparation of the implementation of the LO in January 2012 and considers the implementation of the landing obligation a priority for the next 5 years
• EFCA document with recommendations for implementation of the landing obligation: Objectives:
  ❖ Accurate recording of discards.
  ❖ Development of practical control and benefit of EFCA data monitoring systems (ERS, EIR, MARSURV, JADE)
  ❖ Controllability of specific discard plans
Presented to stakeholders (Dubrovnik Seminar) and endorsed by EFCA AB

• Ambition: to be ready by January 1st 2015;

• Assistance to Regional bodies in preparation of discard plans and development of practical tools:
  a) Scheveningen
  b) Baltfish
EFCA FISHNET
ADDITIONAL AREAS OF EFCA ACTIVITY IN LANDING OBLIGATION

- Participation to EU studies and projects
- Participation in AC meetings
- Participation in STECF meetings
- Landing obligation implementation
The accurate recording of discards will contribute to:

- Improve the accuracy of the scientific evaluation and catch advice
- Permit a sounder management of stocks by computing the otherwise missing discards data.
- Permit an analysis of the catch composition, an important element for promoting selectivity and identifying choke species for some fisheries.
A specific 2-year project is proposed and will be implemented in the different JDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDP</th>
<th>Date JDP adoption (possible)</th>
<th>Species concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltic Sea</td>
<td>20 April 2014</td>
<td>Herring, Sprat, Cod, salmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean Sea</td>
<td>1 May 2014</td>
<td>Anchovy, Sardine (Adriatic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Waters</td>
<td>15 May 2014</td>
<td>Mackerel, Horse mackerel, Anchovy, Herring, Blue whiting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Content of Project JDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>DELIVERABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of a discard frequency matrix, based on estimated and</td>
<td>A quarterly record of estimated discard rates and official recorded ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>official recorded level of discards</td>
<td>for the different fisheries concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection and statistical analysis of the “last haul” information</td>
<td>A matrix with the necessary data at regional level for the implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(catch composition / estimated discards)</td>
<td>of risk management approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toolbox for inspection bodies indicating the expected frequency of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discards per area, for a given fishery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness of industry regarding the mandatory record of</td>
<td>A communication / awareness raising strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discards in the logbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roadmap and milestones

2014
- EFCA Seminar, Dubrovnik
- Launch JDP projects: BS, WW, MED
- First report

2015
- Midterm report
- Launch JDP project NS
- Midterm report NS
- Midterm report
- Final report MED, WW, BS
1// Risk analysis as a key instrument for a successful implementation of the landing obligation:

- New risk analysis methodologies developed, able to identify likelihood and impact factors of discard behavior
- EFCA Regional Risk Analysis system adapted to the new threats
- But more data needed and learning curve for:
  - Identifying reasons for discards (gear, area, season, choke, quota, other)

2// Additional systems for identifying individual behaviors (outliers)

- ERS data analysis: catch rates and transitory reference “flotilla”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fisheries</th>
<th>Gear</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Area (GFCM)</th>
<th>Fishery issues</th>
<th>Discard 2011</th>
<th>Discard level 2011 and % catches</th>
<th>REPORTED DISCARD RANGE</th>
<th>REPORTED DISCARD AVERAGE</th>
<th>OBSERVED DISCARD AVERAGE</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>risk factor</th>
<th>Discard causes</th>
<th>Mitigation measures</th>
<th>Possible control tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Pelagic</td>
<td>ANE</td>
<td>(12 ≤ a ≤ 24)</td>
<td>GSA 17</td>
<td>Further targets: PIL MAC JAX</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Data available for 2011 - ITA + SLO</td>
<td>High &gt;15%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High &gt;15%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Gear inspections; air surveillance; observers; CCTV, reference fleet, statistical analysis, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reported catches in 2012: PIL MAC JAX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Pelagic</td>
<td>PIL</td>
<td>(12 ≤ a ≤ 24)</td>
<td>GSA 17</td>
<td>Further targets: ANE PIL MAC JAX</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Data available for 2011 - ITA + SLO</td>
<td>High &gt;15%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High &gt;15%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reported catches in 2012: PIL MAC JAX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Pelagic</td>
<td>PIL</td>
<td>(12 ≤ a ≤ 24)</td>
<td>GSA 17</td>
<td>Further targets: ANE PIL MAC JAX</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Data available for 2011 - ITA + SLO</td>
<td>High &gt;15%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High &gt;15%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reported catches in 2012: PIL MAC JAX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example of risk analysis matrix**

- **What definition?**
- **Outline issues to consider size of vessels (fleet segment), seasonal and temporal issues, quota**
- **STECF**
- **source:**
- **Discard level 2011 (High/Medium/Low)**
- **Economic factor?**
- **Absolute**
- **High >15% Medium >5% Low <5%**
- **Reported catches**
- **Fmsy**
- **Possible control tools**
- **Gear inspections; air surveillance; observers; CCTV, reference fleet, statistical analysis, etc.**
- **The main reasons for the discarding commercial species are because of MLS and market demand. No over-quota discarding occurs.**
- **The MLS of PIL in GFCM(37)2013/1 (11cm) as well as number per kg (55) is in line with Annex III in R. 1967/76. However, market R. 2404/96 allow 36 to 91 per kg.**
- **Further targets: PIL, MAC, JAX**
- **Reported catches in 2012: 17200 t by ITA (17200 t). Closure of fishery in April. No quotas**
- **Small pelagic fisheries for sardine and anchovies, active gears all vessels lengths**
- **GSA 17**
- **Area**
- **Fishery issues**
- **Impact (scale 1-5)**
- **Possible control tools**
- **discarding or not**
- **Risk factor**
- **Reported catches**
- **Discard causes**
- **Mitigation measures**
- **Possible control tools**
- **Small pelagic**
- **Active**
- **Further targets: ANE PIL MAC JAX**
- **Small pelagic fisheries for sardine and anchovies, active gears all vessels lengths**
Risk Analysis Focus

- Region (e.g. Baltic Basin)
- Fisheries of the Region
- Spatial and Temporal Considerations
- Gears and Target Species
- High Risk Métiers
- Local Intelligence
- Target Vessel

Narrowing of focus during risk analysis procedures
Risk Management Process

Risk Analysis

**Inputs**: a specific range of known information about the fishery of interest…

**Risk Factor**: May be colour coded or expressed in numerical terms (e.g. 0.1 – 1.0)…
How to identify the outlier(s)?

Same target factor levels but let's look at the catch rates...
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Example of possible narrowing of focus

1. Regional risk analysis provides high risk métiers (area, period, gear, target species) and thus a risk factor (numerical odr color coded);

2. MS ERS data processing identifies transitory fishing vessel groups and catch rates and thus possible outliers;

3. MS additional intelligence contributes to provide a target factor.
Dubrovnik conclusions:

“A general consensus emerged on a more proactive approach towards the industry involvement”

“Voluntary compliance approaches will also be explored”

Some initial ideas:

• Incentives linked to specific commitments of the industry on selectivity, control tools, risk management...can be an important tool to improve compliance

• **New CFP, including future Technical Measures** is based in management by results.

• A reverse burden of the proof approach should be explored
RAISING AWARENESS

- To ensure industry understand their rights and responsibilities
- To highlight the importance of properly recording discards
- To ensure industry feedback is received

*Strong industry commitment is crucial for a successful implementation of the landing obligation*
Limitations of the scope

- EFCA has JDPs in all UE waters regions, and will implement the landing obligation as an additional rule, but not all the fisheries/species in the region are covered by the JDPs.

- EFCA, for example, is cooperating with the Scheveningen Group regarding pelagic species in the North Sea, but this species are not in the JDP scope.

- This fact could jeopardise the fulfilment of the objectives of control and enforcement established by article 36 of the new CFP Regulation, namely the need for a global and common approach and the need for cooperation and coordination.
Solutions to the limitations of the scope

EFCA considers that the scope of the SCIP/JDPs should be enlarged to cover the different species to which the landing obligation applies on a gradual basis.

To have a full coordination by EFCA on all the implementation of the landing obligation, a legal basis can be created by:

- A Decision of the Commission enlarging the scope of the current SCIPs (article 95 of Council Control Regulation) or
- A Common Member States request to EFCA

It is also to be considered the impact of that decision in the EFCA limited resources
THANK YOU!

efca@efca.europa.eu
http://www.efca.europa.eu