



BALTFISH Control Experts Group (CEG)

Evaluation of Compliance with the Landing Obligation

Baltic Sea 2017 - 2018

Executive summary



Executive summary

The current report presents the results of an evaluation of compliance with the provisions of the Landing Obligation (LO) in the Baltic Sea region during 2017 and 2018. This evaluation was carried out following the request for assistance of the Member State Control Expert Group for the Baltic Sea Fisheries Forum. This evaluation follows the methodology adopted by EFCA and used in previous evaluation of compliance carried out for the Baltic Sea fisheries for the period 2015 – 2016, with the exceptions of the methods related with polling of control and industry information and market study. The current evaluation includes PLE in addition to the species already included in the previous evaluation (COD, SAL, HER and SPR). The methodology described in the present document has been streamlined to provide results on (i) estimates of discard rates based on the comparison of logbook and inspection information (Method 1), (ii) discard estimates provided by scientific bodies (STECF and ICES) (Method 2) and (iii) trends in the number of suspected infringements related to non-compliance with the LO (Method 3). The analysis followed the segmentation of the fleet currently used by EFCA which considered minor changes compared to the one used in the previous evaluation. The description of the results, in relation to trends in compliance over time, takes these changes into account.

Results indicate that overall, in most pelagic fleet segments targeting HER and SPR there was high compliance with the LO over the study period (2017 – 2018) and lower compliance levels estimated for fixed and towed gears catching PLE and for towed gears targeting COD. Lack of reference data makes evaluation of compliance with the LO for SAL not possible with method 1. Method 3 did not provide enough information to assess compliance levels, therefore an overall compliance level by species and fleet segment is estimated based on the information provided by methods 1 and 2. When results are compared with those of the previous evaluation (2015-2016), the overall compliance with the provisions of the LO appears to have improved, especially when considering those fleet segments (towed gears) for which more data are available. Some fleet segments show the opposite trend but, in these cases, the most recent estimates are derived from a small number of Last Haul (LH) inspections and the estimated trends may not be representative.

The LH programme has provided the means to estimate the levels of discards and to derive indicators of compliance with the LO which, together with the estimates obtained from scientific bodies, has served as the basis for this assessment. The continuation of the LH programme is recommended, and its expansion encouraged, particularly for those species and fleet segments combinations for which only few last hauls are available. Alternative monitoring methods such as control observers or Remote Electronic Monitoring (REM) could also help to monitor compliance with the LO, would act as deterrent of illegal practices, and would enhance the reference data available for monitoring and evaluating compliance.

Comparison of the compliance levels by species per fleet segment in 2017 and 2018 derived from the discard ratios obtained by the 3 sources of information (Last Haul programme – method 1, STECF and ICES – method 2). The table also provides an overall evaluation by species and for each fleet segment (FS) [using the current, 2020, fleet segment denomination]. High compliance level (based on estimates that <5% of the total catch is discarded illegally) is indicated with a green circle; medium compliance level (estimates of illegal discards between \geq 5% and < 15% of the total catch) is indicated with a red circle.

		2017					2018				
FS	Species	1 - LH	2a - STECF	2b - ICES	Overall	FS Evaluation	1 – LH	2a - STECF	2b - ICES	Overall	FS Evaluation
BS01	COD			\bigcirc		• • •					
	PLE		\mathbf{i}	8			0		\mathbf{s}		
BS02	COD	1	-	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	8	-	-	\bigotimes	\bigcirc	8
	PLE	-1	-	8	8		8	-	8	8	
BS03	COD					. 🛞 .		8	\otimes		• 😢
	PLE	8	$\overline{\mathbf{S}}$	8	8		8	8	8	8	
BS04	HER	\bigcirc	\bigcirc		\bigcirc	 Ø 	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigotimes	\bigcirc	
	SPR	\bigcirc	\bigotimes	\bigotimes	\bigcirc		\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigotimes	\bigcirc	
BS05	HER		\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc		\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigotimes	\bigcirc	
	SPR		\bigcirc		\bigotimes		\bigcirc	\bigotimes	\bigotimes	\bigcirc	
BS06	HER	-	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigotimes		-	\bigcirc	\bigotimes	\bigcirc	
	SPR	-	\bigcirc		\bigcirc		-	\bigotimes	Ø		
BS07	SAL	-	-		\bigcirc		-	-	\bigotimes	\bigcirc	
BS08	SAL	-	\bigcirc		\bigcirc		12	-	>	\bigcirc	
BS09	SAL	-	\bigcirc	Ø	\bigotimes		-	\bigcirc	>	\bigcirc	
BS10	COD	\bigcirc	\bigotimes	\bigcirc	\bigotimes	8	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigotimes	\bigotimes	3
	PLE	\otimes		\mathbf{S}	8		8		8	8	
BS11	COD					3		\bigcirc	$\mathbf{\overline{c}}$		
	PLE	-	\mathbf{s}				-				
BS12	HER	-	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc		-	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigotimes	