Public consultation on the Eel Regulation

Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2007 of 18 September 2007 establishing measures for the recovery of the stock of European eel

Introduction

Background to the public consultation

The European eel stock (*Anguilla Anguilla*) is in critical condition. Recruitment is at an all-time low and exploitation of the stock is currently unsustainable. The decline in eel stock has numerous causes including human activities such as fisheries (commercial and recreational), hydropower turbines and pumps, pollution, habitat modification and the creation of obstacles to eel migration. A further deterioration of the status of the stock should be avoided. In 2007 a framework to ensure the protection and sustainable use of the European eel stock was established at EU level (*Regulation (EC) No 1100/2007* – the so called ‘Eel Regulation’).

Purpose of the public consultation

This public consultation is part of the evaluation of the Eel Regulation. The evaluation aims to assess the measures for the recovery of the stock of the European eel under the Eel Regulation, and in particular the contribution of the Eel Management Plans established and implemented under this Regulation. These plans include measures to ensure the long-term escapement of at least 40% of adult eels and include:

- limiting professional and recreational fisheries,
- facilitating fish migration through rivers, and
- restocking inland waters with young fish.

The answers you provide as part of the consultation will form an important part of the Commission’s evidence basis for the evaluation. The results of this consultation and the evaluation study may be used to inform decisions on whether the Eel Regulation and/or the implementation measures need to be reviewed.

Scope of the consultation

This Public Consultation aims to gather input from all the stakeholders to evaluate the measures for the recovery of the European eel stock under the Eel Regulation of 2007. It forms part of a wider consultation...
strategy for the evaluation that also includes targeted stakeholder consultations and several case studies that will gather more detailed evidence at a national level.

This questionnaire takes about 15 minutes to complete. You will also be able to provide any other relevant information or comments at the end.

**About you**

* Language of my contribution
  - Bulgarian
  - Croatian
  - Czech
  - Danish
  - Dutch
  - English
  - Estonian
  - Finnish
  - French
  - Gaelic
  - German
  - Greek
  - Hungarian
  - Italian
  - Latvian
  - Lithuanian
  - Maltese
  - Polish
  - Portuguese
  - Romanian
  - Slovak
  - Slovenian
  - Spanish
  - Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as
  - Academic/research institution
  - Business association
  - Company/business organisation
  - Consumer organisation
  - EU citizen
  - Environmental organisation
  - Non-EU citizen
  - Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
  - Public authority
  - Trade union
Other

* First name

India

* Surname

Redrup

* Email (this won't be published)

INDIA.REDRUP@ENERGY-UK.ORG.UK

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Energy UK

* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

13457582538-68

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

Afghanistan
- Djibouti
- Libya
- Saint Pierre and Miquelon
- Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

Áland Islands
- Dominica
- Liechtenstein

Albania
- Dominican Republic
- Lithuania
- Samoa

Algeria
- Ecuador
- Luxembourg
- San Marino

American Samoa
- Egypt
- Macau
- São Tomé and Príncipe

Andorra
- El Salvador
- Madagascar
- Saudi Arabia

Angola
- Equatorial Guinea
- Malawi
- Senegal

Anguilla
- Eritrea
- Malaysia
- Serbia

Antarctica
- Estonia
- Maldives
- Seychelles
*Publication privacy settings*

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

- **Anonymous**
  Only your type, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

- **Public**
  Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

- I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

*What is the main field of activity of your company/organisation?*

- fishery
- aquaculture
- environment
- other

If other:

Energy - Electricity
* How would you best describe the nature of your understanding and involvement in matters related to the Eel Regulation?
  - I work for a public administration responsible for developing, implementing and/or monitoring the Eel Regulation
  - I am a fisher or farmer involved in the production and/or sale of eels
  - I represent an international organisation with an interest in the implementation of the Eel Regulation
  - I work for an environmental body with an interest in the implementation of the Eel Regulation
  - I work for a research body with an interest in the Eel Regulation
  - I have a general interest in matters concerning fisheries in the European Union
  - Other

If other:

- I work for a trade body whose members have an interest in the implementation of the Eel Regulation

* How familiar are you with the Eel Regulation provisions?
  - I have at least a basic knowledge of the Eel Regulation and its implementation
  - I am not familiar with the Eel Regulation

Questions on Eel Regulation

Relevance
1. The Eel Regulation has a number of objectives. To what extent do you consider that each of these remains relevant today?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Rather disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Rather agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* There remains a need for a European recovery plan for the European eel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* There remains a need for Member States to implement Eel Management Plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* There remains a need to ensure that anthropogenic mortalities are reduced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* There remains a need to ensure the escapement to the sea of at least 40% of the adult eel biomass.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* It remains appropriate to regulate the supply of glass eels for restocking operations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* There remains a need to regulate fishing effort and catches to ensure the recovery of the European eel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* There remains a need to ensure the origin and traceability of all live eels imported to and exported from MS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* There remains a need to ensure that control and enforcement activities take place in EU waters and at all stages of the eel supply chain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* It remains appropriate to seek to reduce catching of eels to at least 50% of 2006 levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Rather disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Rather agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The target of 40% eel escapement is achievable.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please provide a reason for your answer as to why you think the 40% escapement goal is achievable or not (optional).

4. Do you think that alternative targets are needed to ensure that the Eel Regulation delivers on its objective of securing the recovery of the European eel?

   - Yes
   - No
   - Don't know

5. Which indicators or targets do you think would be more suitable? (optional).

   Given the long-term nature of any potential recovery of eel populations measured by the 40% escapement target, more consideration is needed on the use of interim targets, milestones or indicators applying at appropriately defined time-scales. These are needed so resources and time are not wasted on measures that are ineffective. They could include assessing changes achieved in the various factors potentially influencing recruitment and escapement (such as mortality) as well as in the escapement achieved. Care needs to be taken to ensure that any interim activities used are themselves worthwhile (in terms of contribution to improvement in escapement for the resources deployed).

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Rather disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Rather agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Eel Regulation requires amendment or simplification.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please provide a reason for your answer, and, if appropriate, identify which aspects of the Eel Regulation you think need to be amended or simplified (optional).

Effectiveness
8. To what extent have the current measures for the recovery of European eel stock under the Eel Regulation achieved the following objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Rather disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Rather agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Implementing Eel Management Plans</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Achieving the targets set out in Eel Management Plans</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ensuring a reduction in anthropogenic eel mortalities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Increasing the escapement to the sea of adult eels towards the 40% target</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ensuring that there is enough supply of glass eels for restocking operations</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ensuring reduction of fishing effort and catches towards the 50% targets</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ensuring the origin and traceability of all live eels imported to and exported from MS</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ensuring control and enforcement activities at all stages of the eel supply chain</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Reflecting your answers above, what do you consider to be the barriers to achieving the objectives of the Eel Regulation?

The objectives are too complex to evaluate (it is too hard to evaluate parameters that determine the objectives)

10. What do you consider to have been the successes of the Eel Regulation and its implementation to date?

The general awareness for the European eel and related issues has increased.

11. Do you support the following measures to recover the population of eel in Europe?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Rather disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Rather agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limiting professional eel fisheries in the sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting professional eel fisheries in freshwater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting recreational eel fishing in the sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting recreational eel fishing in freshwater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating fish migration through rivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restocking waters with young fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Do you support the implementation of total or partial bans on eel fishing to aid recovery of the European eel stock?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't know

12a. Please provide a reason for your answer to explain why you support or do not support bans on eel fishing in the EU:

Partial fishing bans will be necessary to ensure the sustainability of the eel stock.

13. What other actions should the European Union or Member States undertake to recover the eel population in Europe? Who should undertake these actions (EU or MSs)?
Since Eel Regulations were established in 2007, research in this area has progressed. However, there still remain key questions regarding the lifecycle of eel which lead to holes in understanding all the pressures on the population. There is a need to continue to investigate the decline in the eel stock, for instance via the provision of effective funding for research as well as for monitoring efforts. This should be coordinated by the EU.

There should be confidence that a given measure would be effective in closing the gap to the escapement target within an Eel Management Plan. More dialogue between MS with regards to the implementation of Eel Regulations and the effectiveness of measures should be promoted through the regulatory framework to facilitate identification of most effective measures. The cost-efficiency and benefits of implementation measures under the Eel Regulation should be evaluated and also taken into account in the estimated overall costs in the Programme of Measures (PoM) under the Water Framework Directive. This shall also include the ongoing generation losses and maintenance costs of measures set including the value of lost generation during unavoidable plant closure for installation of measures.

### Coherence

14. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Rather disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Rather agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The Eel Regulation is coherent with other EU instruments to regulate fisheries (such as the Common Fisheries Policy, Fisheries Control Regulation, the Water Framework Directive and the Marine Strategy Framework Directive)</em></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Strongly disagree" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rather disagree" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Neither agree or disagree" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rather agree" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Strongly agree" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Don't know" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Eel Regulation is coherent with international instruments to regulate fisheries (such as the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora - CITES, and the Convention on the Migratory Species - CMS)</em></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Strongly disagree" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rather disagree" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Neither agree or disagree" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rather agree" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Strongly agree" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Don't know" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*14a. Please provide a reason for your answer to explain what factors lead to coherence or to identify those aspects that are inconsistent or a duplication of efforts under other measures:*
The Eel regulation is tightly linked with the Water Framework Directive, as in particular, Eel Management Plans should cover river basins defined in accordance with Directive 2000/60/EC. Due to this link, the purpose of the eel regulation should be the same as for the WFD, i.e. to strike a balance between environmental, climate and socio-economic goals. This means that it should not unduly hamper the operation of existing thermal power plants, or create obstacles to upgrading or developing of new power plant.

**EU added value**

15. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Rather disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Rather agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *The Eel Regulation provided additional value compared to what could be achieved by Member States at national or regional level.* | | | | | | ☐

15a. Please provide any comments below to explain your answer (optional):

*16. What would be the most likely consequences of stopping the application of the measures contained within the Eel Regulation (both positive and negative)?

Risk of a decline in the eel stock

**Efficiency**
17. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Rather disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Rather agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Administering and implementing the Eel Regulation has been carried out at the lowest possible cost.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The costs of administering and implementing the Eel Regulation are proportionate to the environmental and socio-economic benefits achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is possible to simplify the Eel Regulation and still achieve the same results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The same or better results in terms of eel stock recovery could have been achieved at lower cost.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Do you think that other policy instruments or mechanisms have provided better cost-effectiveness than has been achieved under the current Eel Regulation and associated Eel Management Plans?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

Sustainability

20. Are the effects likely to last after the intervention ends?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

Document upload and final comments

Should you wish to provide additional information (e.g. a position paper, report) or raise specific points not covered by the questionnaire, you can upload your document here. In preparing your response if you have specific recommendations we would ask that you make it clear who you believe should action these. Please note that the uploaded document will be published alongside your response to the questionnaire which is the essential input to this open public consultation. The document is an optional complement and serves as additional background reading to better understand your position. If you wish to add further information - within the scope of this questionnaire - please feel free to do so here.

2000 character(s) maximum

Please upload your file

The maximum file size is 1 MB

Only files of the type .pdf,.txt,.doc,.docx,.odt,.rtf are allowed

Contact

MARE-D3@ec.europa.eu