



# Evaluation of the Entry/Exit scheme

**Elisa Roller**

Structural Support, Policy Development and Coordination

Maritime Affairs and Fisheries DG

European Commission

## The Entry-Exit scheme sets four safeguards :

- 1) Member States may not increase their fleets above capacity ceilings specified in legislation (currently Annex II of the CFP Regulation);
- 2) The capacity of any vessel entering the fishery must be balanced by the prior withdrawal of the equivalent capacity;
- 3) Capacity withdrawn with public aid must not be replaced. EU funding for decommissioning ceased on 31 December 2017;
- 4) The yearly national fleet reports need to include an action plan for the fleet segments with identified structural overcapacity.

# National rules implementing the EES

Two approaches concerning transfer of capacity between operators:

- capacity entitlements remain owned by operators after withdrawal of the vessels (with possibility to trade withdrawn capacity entirely or in tranches with other operators)
- capacity withdrawn cannot be transferred by the owner to other operators after withdrawal of the vessels without public aid.

# The evaluation

- *Required by Regulation 1380/2013 (Art. 23(3))*
- *Covers the period 2003 – 2017*
- *The data collection used:*
  - i) the EU fishing fleet register**
  - ii) stakeholder and open public consultations**
  - iii) review of available literature**
- *Based on external expertise (contractor)*

## Evolution of the EU fishing fleet since 2003

- -30% GT and -27% kW decrease in 15 years,  $\approx$  2% on average per year (EUR 15, mainland fleet)
- Comparable decreasing rates in North East Atlantic and in Mediterranean
- In the North East Atlantic and for the external fleet, a substantial proportion ( $\approx$  45%) of capacity reduction is attributable to operators (capacity withdrawn and not yet replaced) : capacity reductions driven by access conditions to available fishing opportunities
- In the Mediterranean and Black Sea, most capacity reductions have been driven by permanent cessation measures ( $\approx$  90% in GT and  $\approx$  75% in kW)

# EMFF Support permanent cessation 2014-2017

Member State	Number of vessels	Total eligible public cost committed	EMFF support committed
BG	8	€247,046.22	€123,523.88
CY	66	€2,955,480.70	€1,486,490.36
DE	6	€542,462.00	€271,231.00
EL	766	€46,029,264.00	€23,014,632.00
ES	25	€3,655,932.20	€2,612,733.65
FR	15	€1,655,080.70	€827,540.35
HR	85	€15,688,234.10	€7,844,117.04
IT	230	€62,022,503.81	€31,011,251.89
LV	5	€1,367,637.11	€683,818.54
PL	48	€12,854,547.87	€6,427,273.91
PT	6	€1,907,740.96	€953,870.49
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,260</b>	<b>€148,925,929.66</b>	<b>€75,256,483.12</b>

# Main findings – national implementation

- While respecting the 1:1 basic rule, Member States have implemented the EES in various ways, in most cases not establishing a clear link with the availability of fishing opportunities
- All Member States declare they remain below the (lowered\*) capacity ceilings
- Perceived lack of flexibility to increase GT for safety/modernisation due to national implementation measures

\* *Due to withdrawals with public aid*

# Overall conclusion

The Entry/Exit scheme is fit for purpose and effective in complementing the in-depth reforms of fishing fleet capacity management. But:

- direct relevance depends on whether conservation and management measures are effective enough to regulate the use of fishing capacity
- still high number of unbalanced fleet segments in all basins
- serious lack of compliance with declared engine power



**Thank you for your attention!**