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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3) Capacity withdrawn with public aid must not be replaced.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• capacity entitlements remain owned by operators after withdrawal of the vessels (with possibility to trade withdrawn capacity entirely or in tranches with other operators)

• capacity withdrawn cannot be transferred by the owner to other operators after withdrawal of the vessels without public aid.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, ≈ 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for the external fleet, a substantial proportion (≈ 45%) of capacity reduction is attributable to operators (capacity withdrawn and not yet replaced) : capacity reductions driven by access conditions to available fishing opportunities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 (≈ 90% in GT and ≈ 75% in kW)
## EMFF Support permanent cessation 2014-2017

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