



### Case Study Report, Task 7.3

# Synthesis and recommendations for Discard Mitigation Strategies by case study

Year 1: March 2015-February 2016

Case Study: Celtic Sea

Date: March 2016

**Main Authors**: Dave Reid (MI, Beneficiary 14), Mike FitzPatrick (MNRG, Beneficiary 27) & Marianne Robert (IFREMER, Beneficiary 2)

**Task Leader**: Clara Ulrich DTU, Beneficiary 1

**WP Leader**: Kåre Nolde Nielsen UIT, Beneficiary 26





### 1 What has been going on in this case study during the last 12 months?

The Celtic Sea case study in DiscardLess is focusing on demersal fisheries, these fisheries were not subject to Landing Obligation in 2015. The (EU) 2015/2438 commission delegated regulation defines the fisheries subject to the Landing Obligation in 2016. The main fisheries in the Celtic Sea are those targeting Nephrops and gadoids. Demersal fisheries using demersal trawls and seines that landed more than 25% of cod, haddock, whiting and saithe combined, the landing obligation shall apply to whiting. For the Nephrops fisheries, the LO applies to nephrops and whiting.

Based on this discard plan, several exemption have been asked by the member states and assessed by STECF in 2015

To date there is no reliable information from the fisheries on how the LO is operating or on the impact on fishing or fishermens behaviour

### 1.1 Important changes in stock development, discard data and ecosystem

No major changes have been noted in stock development, nor is this to be expected as the LO has only just started in 2016 and only for a small number of species in the Celtic Sea. The same applies to the ecosystem. No reports have been made on any major changes in the discarding by the fleets.

Th case study partners have reviewed the DiscardLess Atlas, several issues and mistakes have been identified and are being remedied. We are also defining a new description for the "area" in the Atlas, and to separate the pelagic data from the demersal data. We have also set out a series of filtered outputs looking at key demersal species (either in terms of tonnes or euros). We will also filter for outputs on non TAC species in terms of ecological impact

### **ICES stock assessment report:**

http://www.ices.dk/community/groups/Pages/WGCSE.aspx

STECF evaluation of national LO plans:

https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/43805/999871/2015-07 STECF+15-10+-+Landing+obligations+-+part+5 JRC96949.pdf

#### **NWWAC response on LO February 2016**

http://www.nwwac.org/ fileupload/Opinions%20and%20Advice/Year%2011/NWW%20MS%20LO %20docs/FINAL Advice MS-Group Landing%20Obligation.pdf

### EC Seminar on the LO February 2016:

http://ec.europa.eu/newsroom/mare/itemdetail.cfm?item\_id=29369





### 1.2 Important changes in terms of fisheries and stakeholders perception

Broad conclusions are that stakeholder perception is generally very negative. Fishers divide into two groups. The first mainly ignore LO, other group are looking for solutions and want to work with scientists. The first group are probably in the majority. Some interviews have been carried out and more will be conducted using a standard set of questions for semi-structured interviews – developed in WP4.1.

### 1.3 Important changes in management

New plans expected for next phase of LO (addional species) in June 2016. Basically 2016 plan focusing on the LO applying to whiting and nephrops only in the Celtic Sea remains in operation.

- What been going on in the regional groups and in the ACs
  - o . Member state group high level group no reports
  - o NWWAC paper on Landing Obligation advice to Member state Group

http://www.nwwac.org/ fileupload/Papers%20and%20Presentations/2016/02%20Paris/NWW MS Advice request Feb 2016 EN.pdf

Response to MS Group
 http://www.nwwac.org/ fileupload/Opinions%20and

 $\frac{http://www.nwwac.org/fileupload/Opinions\%20and\%20Advice/Year\%2011/NWW\%20MS\%20}{L0\%20docs/NWWAC\%20letter\%20to\%20MS\%20on\%20L0\%20phasing\%2018122015.pdf}$ 

- What has been going on in the member states (for those where we know something about?) No new developments
  - o Ireland Discard Implimentation group formed but currently not meeting. Proposed sub group on quota management changes to develop possible multi-month quota approaches (ref WP4.4. the Managers Story) has not met so far either.
- Main problems -
  - France Requests asking can we advise fishermen on next species for the LO based on science advice??
- In France logbooks are not set up to record discards. Discards can be recorded in Irish logbooks but not as detailed as needed by for reporting within the LO.

## 2 The Year behind us: What has DiscardLess produced in this case study during the last 12 months?

### 2.1 WP1 (ecosystem scale assessment)

*Task 1:* DiscardLess Deliverable - D1-1\_050ct2015 Celtic Sea factsheet completed for Irish and French fisheries

Task 3: Mappings discards: Nested grid of gadoids discard based on french observer at sea data in the Celtic sea (2010-2012). Irish Celtic Sea discards are being mapped currently





Planning for Task 3-4-5: a PhD on using EwE and ecospace in collaboration with Agrocampus Rennes: Including run of LO scenario is foreseen (funding: decision April 2016). New models from CEFAS EwE available

Impact assessment of increasing selectivity using existing FLBEIA model (from DAMARA project) and selectivity curve coming from local project (CelSelect) (In discussion with the DAMARA team)

Impact assessment of LO for COD assessment based on ICES WGCSE work

### 2.2 WP2 (Fishery scale assessment)

Interviews with fishermen on LO perceptions carried out.

### 2.3 WP3 (gear technology)

BIM/MI reports on gear tech measures will be provided to the gear manual under WP3. Several gear based measures deployed in Irish Challenge trials including selection grids.

Dissemination of results coming from CELselect project (FFP-LPDB-Ifremer): End 2016. Test of 3 selectivity devices over an entire year (1 trip observed per quarter). Catch comparison analysis (on going). Selectivity trials to characterize T90 and standard gear selectivity curves, analysis on going

### 2.4 WP4 (fishing strategies)

- *Task 1.* Some interviews have been carried out and more will be conducted using a standard set of questions for semi-structured interviews.
- *Task 2* Irish challenge trials completed and analysed report soon. Some evidence of gear based approaches working in the Nephrops vessel but behavioural tactics in whitefish vessel proved unsuccesfull.
- Task 3. French and Irish mapping and analysis using surveys, observer data and landings VMS
  are underway. Survey and observer data can be used together to predict low probability of
  whiting discards and being extended to other key species

### 2.5 WP7 (Framing and implementing the discard policy)

Initial semi structured interviews set up with fishermen. A draft of questions for semi-structured interviews is being prepared.

### 2.6 WP8 (Bringing results to users)

Approaches for the project have been presented to Stakeholders – e.g. Irish Fisheries Science Research Partnership. Similar presentations in France.

### 2.7 Summary:

- Main Discard Mitigation Strategies investigated
  - o Tactical changes time and place of fishing
  - o Technical changes use of grids and mesh changes





- Stakeholders Involvement challenge trial carried out with stakeholders. First interviews on tactics for discard mitigation
- Main outcomes
  - o Challenge completed and analysed
  - Selectivity analyses underway
  - o First interviews with stakeholders
  - o First analyses using survey, observer and landings data

### 3 The Year ahead of us: What do we expect for the next year?

- Continue with interviews with stakeholders on attitude to LO, mitigation approaches, and tactical and gear proposals development of standard interview subject list
- Continue with analyses of spatial probability mapping for discards from surveys, observers etc. Hold workshop with other Case studies in the autumn.
- Task 7.4 quota management and incentives in the Celtic Sea.