



**MINISTERUL AGRICULTURII ȘI DEZVOLTĂRII RURALE**  
**AGENȚIA NAȚIONALĂ PENTRU PEȘCUIT ȘI ACVACULTURĂ**

**Questionnaire to MS on the implementation of the landing obligation**

**Steps taken by Member States and producer organisations to comply with the landing obligation**

1. Have you initiated, supported, participated in or implemented any measures and/or studies relating to the avoidance of unwanted catches through spatial or temporal changes to fishing behaviour (for example, studies/pilots on real time closures)?

Please specify the measures taken or studies.

**No.**

2. Which fleet segments/fisheries do these measures and/or studies apply to? **N/A**

3. What has the uptake of these measures and/or studies been in the fleet segments/fisheries to which they are applicable? Please provide the number and proportion of vessels in the segment/fishery.

**In 2016, from the total of 130 boats licensed to commercial fishing "other species", except turbot, there were 57 boats licensed to fish sprat (44%) - 21 boats authorized to catch sprat with pelagic trawl, 36 were involved in sprat fishing with "talian" (stationary gear trap). The total catch of sprat from the Black Sea in 2016 was 49 275 kg . From which 35 436 kg was caught by the fishing vessel Flamingo 4 of Miadmar Fishing Ltd with pelagic trawl, represented 72% of the total catch. The difference in capture was carried out by "small coastal fisheries" with "talian" (stationary gear trap).**

4. Have you initiated any changes to your quota management system to implement the landing obligation?

**No. Given the fact that the quota was not fulfilled in the last years and the risk analysis for this species measures will be taken to insure the compliance with the landing obligation for all vessels fishing sprat. Also, during inspections there were not discovered failure to comply with this obligation throughout the last years, moreover, it is enforced by the MADR order no 807/2016.**

5. For stocks managed through catch limits, have you conducted a quantitative analysis to identify potential national choke issues? **Yes.**

6. Have you pursued any exemptions to the landing obligation (either for high survival or de minimis) in the development of regional joint recommendations ? **No.**

7. What studies or evidence have you collected or produced in order to support such a request. **N/A**

8. What steps have you taken to ensure the amount discarded under granted de minimis exemptions does not exceed the permitted volume in the delegated act ?

**N/A, we have no exceptions for sprat.**

9. What has been the utilisation of any granted de minimis exemptions in the fleet segment/fishery to which the exemption applies? Please provide the total weight and proportion of catch discarded under this exemption for each fleet segment/fishery to which an exemption applies.

**N/A, we have no exceptions on sprat.**



**MINISTERUL AGRICULTURII ȘI DEZVOLTĂRII RURALE**  
**AGENȚIA NAȚIONALĂ PENTRU PESCUIT ȘI ACVACULTURĂ**

10. Have any of your vessels utilised the provision to discard fish which shows damage caused by predators? **No**

11. For stocks managed by catch limits, did you make use of the provisions for interannual or inter-species flexibility? **No**

12. In the development of joint recommendations, has consultation with Advisory Councils and other relevant stakeholders taken place?

**Yes, we have periodical meetings with the Consulting Council of Black Sea.**

13. Following the adoption of the delegated act for a discard plan, have steps been taken to ensure adequate understanding among stakeholders of their obligations under the provisions of the act?

**Yes. The annual meetings with the fishermen is the occasion when the new legislative provisions are communicated. The last meeting was on 14th of February 2017 where all the new provisions from the legislation were presented to the fishermen and all the questions were answered.**

14. Are there any other steps not covered by the questions above that you have carried out to effect compliance with the provisions of the landing obligation? **No**

15. Which fleet segments/fisheries do these studies/pilots apply to? **N/A**

16. What has the uptake been of these measures in the fleet segments/fisheries to which they are applicable? Please provide the number and proportion of vessels in the segment/fishery.

**There were no recorded issues in 2016 regarding the landing obligation. From a total 57 boats licensed to commercial fishing of sprat, there were 21 boats licensed to use pelagic trawl, the others boats were involved in the fishing with stationary gear trap.**

**Steps taken by Member States regarding control of compliance with the landing obligation.**

17. Has information been provided by Member States administrations and control agencies to fishermen?

**Yes. The inspectors were trained in October 2016 and they had thereon the obligation to inform the fishermen about the new provisions and ask them to comply with the provisions of the ministerial Order in this respect, meaning to declare all landings for sprat. There will be another national training in March 2017 where all the new legislation provisions will be transmitted to the inspectors.**

**Initiatives directed to fishermen to improve compliance.**

18. Have guidelines been provided by Member States administrations and control agencies for inspectors? **Yes.**

19. Have new control and monitoring tools been used by Member States?

**Because this is mainly small coastal fishery, the used tools was: inspections on landing points, first sale centers, fish markets and sea missions;**

20. Have the Member state administrations and control authorities monitored below Minimum Conservation Reference Size (MCRS) catches at and after landing (traceability)?

**Yes**

**MINISTERUL AGRICULTURII ȘI DEZVOLTĂRII RURALE**  
**AGENȚIA NAȚIONALĂ PENTRU PESCUIT ȘI ACVACULTURĂ**

Please supply information on:

- Total number of discards (by fishery, fleet segment) from 2013 to 2016

**Black Sea, sprat:**

Year	Discharge on length segments - vessels (tons)				Total (tons)
	< 6m	6 - 12 m	12-18 m	24 - 40 m	
2013	1,256	0,84	-	36,744	38,84
2014	-	-	15,1	-	15,1
2015	-	3,356	-	-	3,35
2016	-	-	-	-	-

- Measures taken to monitor landings at fish markets/auctions adopted.

**Yes, the increasing of the inspections number, especially for the verification of the MCRS.**

21. Has control and monitoring been based on risk assessment?

**Yes. Through the Annual National Control Plan for Black Sea fishery under the coordination EFCA, control actions have been planned based on the risks identified. In 2016, there not identified any MCRS captures. During the missions conducted at sea DPIM inspectors did not find sprat or anchovy discards.**

22. Has the "last observed haul" approach elaborated by EFCA as a tool for monitoring the implementation of the landing obligation and to derive potential targets for inspection been used? Please give details of the fisheries covered and the extent of sampling.

**No**

**Information on the socioeconomic impact of the landing obligation**

23. Using the most appropriate indicators defined below, provide information on the socioeconomics impacts on:

**The catching sector - the operational expenses for fishermen are increasing.**

**Information on the effect of the landing obligation on safety on board fishing vessels**

24. Have there been any reported incidents of overloading of vessels causing stability problems?

**No**

25. Have there been any reported incidents of overloading of vessels forcing them to return to port early? **No**

26. Have there been any reported incidents or accidents on board vessels that can be attributable to excessive workload? **No**

27. Has any national legislation relating to safety on board fishing vessels arising from the landing obligation been amended or introduced? **No**

28. Have you provided or received any funding under Article 32 (Health and safety) of EMFF or Article 3 (Eligible operations on safety) and Article 6 (Eligible operations on working conditions) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/531 to mitigate against potential safety issues caused by the landing obligation? **No**



**MINISTERUL AGRICULTURII ȘI DEZVOLTĂRII RURALE  
AGENZIA NAȚIONALĂ PENTRU PEȘCUIȚ ȘI ACVACULTURĂ**

**Information on the use and outlets of catches below the minimum conservation reference size of a species subject to the landing obligation**

29. What have been the main reported uses and destinations for catches below MCRS? Can you quantify these catches by species in terms of volumes, price per tonne and associated costs for the different outlets such catches have been sent?

**No, we are trying to find solutions for catches below MCRS destination;**

30. Have you carried out any studies or pilot projects considering the potential uses for such catches? **No.**

**Information on port infrastructures and of vessels' fitting with regard to the landing obligation for each fishery concerned**

31. Have you provided funding under Article 38 of the EMFF for modifications on board vessels for the handling of catches on board? **No.**

32. Have you provide funding under Article 43 of the EMFF for investment in the infrastructure of fishing ports, auction halls and shelters for the handling of unwanted catches? **No.**

33. Have you provide funding under Articles 68 and 69 of the EMFF for investment in marketing measures and the processing of fishery and aquaculture products? **No**

**Information on the difficulties encountered in the implementation of the landing obligation and recommendations to address them.**

34. Please provide information on the following:

Operational difficulties:

- Handling, storage and processing of unwanted catches - fishermen encounter difficulties for all of these operations, because most of the ships are small vessels and do not have the means to add personnel in order to implement all the provisions, especially because Romania does not have the adequate infrastructure to process the unwanted catches.

Difficulties relating to monitoring, control and enforcement, such as:

- Implementation problems with regard to control/monitoring processes or infrastructure (e.g. adaptation of ERS systems)

The data sent by ERS system will be used after the database project will be functional, in 2017, but it will be applied only for the large vessels. The small vessels do not have this electronic device.

Difficulties in fully utilising fishing opportunities: the kw limit does not allow Romania to supplement its capacity with new vessels.