
North Western Waters Control Experts Group (NWW CEG)

Evaluation of Compliance with the Landing Obligation

North Western Waters 2016 - 2017

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY





Executive Summary

The MS Control Expert Group (CEG) for the NWW formally requested the assistance of EFCA in carrying out a compliance evaluation with the provisions of the LO in the NWW region. The framework EFCA methodology agreed for this evaluation is the same as that applied to similar evaluation exercises in other areas. This report presents the findings of an evaluation of compliance with the LO in the NWW region over the period 2016 and 2017 for selected species where applicable: hake (HKE), haddock (HAD), and whiting (WHG). This compliance evaluation is essentially addressing illegal discards as a proxy to compliance. Compliance with recording obligations of LO exemptions are not fully considered.

The overall evaluation is normally based on direct observations in the form of LH inspections to record detailed information on catch compositions, notably the quantity of BMS fish present in the catches (Method 1). Still, as it was the initial phase of the LH inspection scheme in this area, the number of LH inspections conducted in 2016 and 2017 does not correspond to an adequate numbers to derive a discard estimate when split by the different fleet segments. Therefore, some results of the analyses presented should be taken with caution and confirmed with similar LH data in following years. Nevertheless, Method 1 is supplemented to a certain extent with the findings of Method 2 – with both STECF and ICES discard data estimates.

Results indicate that for certain towed gears used in certain areas (mainly segments NWW01 and NWW02,), non-compliance with the LO appears to have been widespread during the evaluation period.

The infringement analysis (Method 3) yields few results for the evaluation period, not surprising given that in the absence of continuous monitoring, any discarding behaviour may take place unobserved at sea. The results of interviews with industry methods 4a, 4b and 5, are disappointing in terms of response rate measured against the effort and cost involved in the exercise, and few conclusions can be extracted.

This compliance evaluation was complicated by two elements: the lack of data and the complexities of the provisions under the discard plans exemptions. The collection of reliable reference data is essential for a valuable compliance evaluation exercise, and the traditional control tools have proven to be inefficient in enforcing the LO, thus effective monitoring and control methods are necessary. The introduction of REM systems should be considered in this respect, on one side as a monitoring tool instrumental for improving the reference data available and on the other side as a control tool for effective enforcing the LO. As an alternative for the collection of reference data, an increase of effort on LH inspections should be promoted.

Overview of compliance evaluation of NWW HAD, HKE and WHG in 2016 and 2017.

Segment Code	ICES areas	HAD		HKE		WHG	
		2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017
NWW01 Generic bottom trawl < 100mm	5b	!		✗		✓	
	6	✗		!		✗	
	7a	✗	✗	✗		✗	
	7d	✓		✓		✗	✗
	rest of 7	✗		✗		✗	
NWW02 Generic bottom trawl ≥ 100mm	5b	!		✗		✓	
	6	!	✓	!		✗	
	7a	✗		✗		✗	
	7d	✓		✓		✗	
	rest of 7	✗		✗	✗	✗	
NWW03 Deep water bottom trawl ≥ 100mm	5b						
	6						
NWW04 Beam trawl ≥ 80 - < 99 mm	7a						
	7d						
	rest of 7						
NWW05 Beam trawl ≥ 100mm	7a						
	7d						

Segment Code	ICES areas	HAD		HKE		WHG	
		2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017
	rest of 7						
NWW06 Generic gillnet	5b						
	6						
	7a						
	7d						
	rest of 7						
NWW07 Trammel nets	5b						
	6						
	7a						
	7d						
	rest of 7						
NWW08 Generic longline	5b						
	6						
	7a						
	7d						
	rest of 7						
NWW09 Pots and Traps	5b						
	6						
	7a						
	7d						
	rest of 7						

Compliance benchmarking criteria

Compliance Level	Estimates of illegal discards	Benchmark Icon
High	< 5%	
Medium	≥ 5% and < 15%	
Low	≥ 15%	