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Variety in vessel types and sizes
It’s about fishermen and their families
Supplying proteins for a growing population
EAPO’s reply to the call for a discardsban

• Avoid occurrence of discards
  – Optimal distribution of fishing opportunities

• Minimise unwanted catches
  – Developing and use of most selective gear

• Incentivise fishermen
  – Stimulate technical and management innovations
We got a landing obligation instead
Two non performing disasters

• Some clippings:
  – Good idea
  – Theoretically designed
  – Gambled with non proven techniques
  – Unrealistic time schedule
  – Hundreds of millions €uros down the drain
  – Politics now full of hindsight wisdom
Main Questions

- Where are we coming from
- Where are we now
- Where are we going to
  - What are we heading for?
This is not issuing art 15 of the CFP
Good governance requirement

• Rules and regulations must be
  – Do-able
  – Compliable
  – Enforceable

• At present the LO rules are none of the above
  – Repression is definitely not the answer
  – Late 1980’s lessons in the Netherlands
Imares research on the process

• Policy Making in a Multi Governance setting
  – Kraan & Trapman Imares C 196/15

• Observations of meetings between Ministry officials (including Minister herself) and fishers during 2013, 2014 en 2015
Parallel monologues $180^\circ$ opposed

- **societal** pressure to ban discards (end to wasteful practice)

**Discards**

- **policy makers**
  - Many fish die

- **fishermen**
  - Many fish survive
    - Dead fish also contribute to ecosystem

**Discard ban**

- Fishermen increase selectivity
  - Fewer discards
  - Lower fishing pressure
  - Less waste of protein
  - Further fish stock recovery
  - Increased profits for fishermen

- ‘Land all discards’ (constraints to increasing selectivity)
  - Increased mortality
  - Undersized fish

- Less food in ecosystem

- Not necessarily fewer discards
  - Higher fishing pressure
  - Increased mortality of some species (e.g., birds)

- Detrimental to fish stock recovery
- Increased costs for fishermen
- Detrimental to ecosystem
Gap between Dutch Minister and Dutch Fishers

- Fleet
  1. ‘landing obligation is impossible’
  2. We want a principle discussion
  3. We mention impossibilities problems and dilemmas

- Ministerie
  1. ‘de landing obligation is a fact’
  2. No principle discussion
  3. Let us find room to manoeuvre at implementation

Pastoors et al 2014; Kraan en Verweij 2016
Imares process research results: 
*actual situation*

- Parallel monologues deepened fishers opposition
  - *Gap is deepening*

- Fisheries organisations between rock and hard stone
  - *Young skippers are now creating action groups*
    - *Steaming up to Rotterdam in protest on 3 September*
Two categories of discards

• Regulatory discards
  – Primary attention in EU, not in NL demersal
  – Choke species

• Technical discards
  – Prime attention in NL demersal, not in EU

• 2011 Economic damage estimated € 7.mio
  • Bandwidth -/- €13 mio t0 + €2 mio
Sole and Plaice: Rizla vs Cardboard
The Sole and Plaice dilemma

- To catch Sole mesh size < 80mm
- Escape juvenile Plaice cs mesh size > 120 mm
Dutch beamtrawl fleet development since 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>↓↓</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nr vessel</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>↓↓</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine power</td>
<td>586.000</td>
<td>↓↓</td>
<td>212.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kW days</td>
<td>&gt;40.000.000</td>
<td>↓↓</td>
<td>≈ 21.000.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target species (primary) Sole and Plaice (secondary)
EFF funded Projects 2014-2015

• CCTV - failed
• Net selectivity - good progress
• Survival - very hopeful
• Making most of discards - fishmeal only

• Best Practices
LO Pilot Fully implemented on 5 vessels

- Quantify labour
- Storage space
- Shore processing methods and costs
Discards trials behind the scenes
Cost of shore processing

- Average **305€ (219 – 572€)** per 1.000kg discards
Storage on board > 300 hp beamer

safe stacking height: 6 boxes...

Number of boxes

% undersize fish caught (and therefore landed)

max: 828 boxes

> 40%

current  25%  50%  75%
Carrying capacity $\leq 300$ hp Flatfish + Langoustine

- Capacity problems in abt 70% of all trips
Nett-result by Fleetsegment


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2019 Deeloon daalt</th>
<th>2019 Deeloon gelijk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 300 pk pulis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= 300 pk pulis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langoustines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Conclusions

- Costs can easily exceed 25 mln. euro per year
  - Fleet segments will have negative cash flow
  - Long term viability at stake, no money for vessel replacement

- Cost reductions are needed
  - Innovations and exemptions essential
    - Valorisation/random sampling
    - Exemptions on “high” survival
    - Results still fall by 50%
Disclaimer

• Results based on 2014 being a very “positive” year
• Capacity problems of >300hp vessels are not included
• Unanswered questions regarding additional crew:
  – (Re)distribution of crew share?
  – Facilities and safety on board?
• Effects of changing fishing behaviour?
• Effects of choke species not included
Lessons learnt so far

• Landing Obligation is here to stay
  – But in what form or shape?
  – 2016 Is showing just the tip of the Iceberg only

• Paradigm shift for all involved
  – Too much Too fast
  – It is essential to get fishers alongside

• Prevent disaster in 2019
  – Autopilot implementation will lead to collision
  – Simple choice: sensible mitigation or full stop
Dutch EMFF funded Projects 2016-2018

• Develop further increased net selectivity

• Develop multi species survival improvements

• Best Practices, reduce costs

• Basics for essential Mitigation
The Landing Obligation
Who dares to see the elephant(s) in the room?