

Code: SEG 0091

**Assessment against SEG Standard:** Component 1: Core requirements  
Component 2: Glass eel fishing

**Completed by**  
Nicolas Belhamiti

14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> of December 2020**Final Version**

Reviewed and Approved by Certification Body:  
David Bunt, Sustainable Eel Group, 8 January 2021

## 1) Introduction

This document represents the report carried out following the audit of 14 and December 2020 carried out within the framework of the SEG (Sustainable Eel Group) standard (version 6.0a, December 2019) with a group of fishermen operating on La Sèvre Niortaise and Le Lay. The fishermen concerned by this certification deliver their glass eels to various neighbouring trading sites but mainly to Charron, on a site in Gurruchaga marée, which requested this audit. The fishermen's group will therefore be called "Pêcheurs Sèvre Niortaise et Lay", but this does not commit the certified fishermen to deliver to the Charron site. This assessment was carried out in relation to components 1 and 2 of the standard.

Fishermen on La Sèvre Niortaise operate around the "Port du Corps de Garde", located in the commune of Charron (17230). These fishermen generally deliver their fish directly to the Charron fish trading site, which is located 100m from the port. Fishermen of Le Lay have their port at l'Aiguillon-sur-Mer (85460). These fishermen, on the other hand, store the elvers in fish tanks at home, generally for at least 48 hours before being sold to the fish wholesalers. These fish tanks are declared and legal, but make it difficult to monitor fishing mortality.

**21 fishermen** are concerned by the audit and therefore **5 boarding have been made.**

Devices are different on the Lay and the Sèvre Niortaise.

On Le Lay it has to be a square opening of 120cm by 120cm. Then the length of the pocket can vary but during the audits the length was 300cm. There are, in general, 3 degressive meshes with a reserve of 70-80cm in a mesh size less than or equal to 1mm.

On La Sèvre Niortaise, the shape of the opening is rectangular but dimensions are very variable. Thus the length of the opening noted during the audit ranged from 250cm to 200cm and the width from 150cm to 70cm. The total length of the pocket depends on the length of the boat. The lengths found ranged from 11m to 7.5m. Out of the three fishermen audited, all have a decreasing mesh size with a terminal sock with a mesh size less than or equal to 1mm. On La Sèvre, a significant part of the pocket is at the back of the boat.

**Code: SEG 0091**

The following fishermen are concerned for this assessment:

NAME	FIRST NAME	AREA
BURAUD	SAMUEL	SEVRE NIORTAISE
GLAJEAN	PASCAL	SEVRE NIORTAISE
MAULINI	JEAN-FRANÇOIS	SEVRE NIORTAISE
VAUCONSANT	GILLES	SEVRE NIORTAISE
CHAIGNE	PATRICE	SEVRE NIORTAISE
JUILLET	LOGAN	SEVRE NIORTAISE
LE-BIVIC	MARC	SEVRE NIORTAISE
LAURENT	JOHANN	SEVRE NIORTAISE
WOLF	FRANK	SEVRE NIORTAISE
THIECHART	PHILIPPE	SEVRE NIORTAISE
BERBUDEAU	SÉBASTIEN	SEVRE NIORTAISE
FRADET	PHILIPPE	SEVRE NIORTAISE
FORTUNA	BAPTISTE	SEVRE NIORTAISE
MORICEAU	JULIEN	SEVRE NIORTAISE
POTEVIN	GUILLAUME	SEVRE NIORTAISE
MORIN	FREDERIC	LAY
VIVIER	CYRIL	LAY
AUJARD	YANN	LAY
RABOTIN	GUILLAUME	LAY
TERRIER	JEAN MICHEL	LAY
BRARD	ALEXANDRE	LAY
JAULIN	SEBASTIEN	LAY

## 2) The assessment

The evaluator was Nicolas Belhamiti for Fish-Pass. The visit took place on the tides on the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> of December 2020.

In order to have a good representativeness of the fishing areas, boarding was carried out as follows:

- 3 boardings on La Sèvre Niortaise with Mr. Glajean, Buraud and Vauconsant.
- 2 boardings on Le Lay with Mr. Vivier and Mr. Terrier.

## 3) Client Contact Details

Although it is a group of fishermen who are the subject of this audit, the contact person for this file was part of the Gurruchaga Marée group. This person looks after the site where the elvers are, in most cases, delivered by the fishermen.

<b>Name/Compagny</b>	PEROUX FREDERIC / Gurruchaga Marée CHARRON
<b>Postal address</b>	88 route de la corniche 64700 Hendaye
<b>email address</b>	frederic.peroux85@gmail.com
<b>Phone number</b>	06 82 95 04 37

#### 4) Results of the assessment

The outcome of this assessment is as follows:

<b>Component 1: General Requirements</b>	Auditor's findings	Weighting	Score
1.1 Commitment to Legality	Responsible	1	1
1.2 Contribution to eel conservation projects (bonus)	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.3 The organisation trades in certified responsibly sourced eels	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.4 Traceability:			
1.4.1 Incoming products, separation and segregation	Responsible	1	1
1.4.2 Outgoing products	Responsible	1	1
1.4.3 Record keeping and documentation	Responsible	1	1
1.5.1 Biosecurity & welfare – Biosecurity measures are adopted	Responsible	1	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Percentage Responsibility Score:</b>		<b>100%</b>	

**Finding:** The fishery meets the generic requirements and can be considered **responsible** for this component.

<b>Component 2: Glass eel fishing</b>	Auditor's findings	Weighting	Score
2.1 Eel fishing is in a catchment that is meeting its escapement targets	Aspiring	2	0
2.2 There is good progress with the applicant's responsibilities in the eel management plan for the river or district	Responsible	2	2
2.3 The fishery is well managed	Responsible	1	1
2.4 Mortality during fishing is minimised	Aspiring	2	0
2.5 The fishery has negligible impacts on by-catch species	Aspiring	1	0
2.6 The fishery has negligible impacts on rare or other protected species	Responsible	1	1
2.7 The fishery has negligible impacts on habitats	Responsible	1	1
2.8 Transport	Responsible	1	1
2.9 Bonus score: fishermen donate a proportion of their catch for a local positive contribution	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Percentage Responsibility Score:</b>		<b>55%</b>	

**Finding:** The fishery meets part of the criteria of the elver component (55%) and is considered **responsible** under the SEG standard.

#### Summary of assessment and scoring

<b>Component</b>	<b>Not Met</b>	<b>Aspiring</b>	<b>Responsible</b>
1	0	0	5
2	0	5	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Total Responsibility Score: =</b>			<b>69%</b>

**Summary finding:**

The "Sèvre Niortaise and Lay" fishery has achieved an overall **Responsibility Score of 69%**.

**5) Recommendations:**

Fish-Pass makes the following recommendations with regard to the "Sèvre Niortaise and Lay" fishery:

1. With an overall responsibility score of 69%, the fishery has reached the level required to be considered **responsible** and meets the criteria for **certification for the SEG standard**. However, we recommend that this certificate is only issued if the following pre-requisite is met:
  - a. Fishermen operating on La Sèvre Niortaise will have to sign a paper certifying that they are going to fully immerse the net for the entire duration of the fishing hauls;
2. The fishery should consider how to make a positive contribution to eel conservation projects (criteria 1.2 and 2.9) and implement them by the next evaluation.
3. Concerning criterion 2.4, several things need to be improved. Average fishing speeds are higher than what the SEG standard requires, but less than what is recommended in the France Good Practice Guide. Moreover, no monitoring of mortality in home tanks is carried out on Le Lay. However, practices observed on board appear to be consistent with responsible glass eel fishing, as the mortality observed on board is very low. The following recommendations are suggested and can be applied between now and the control audit:
  - a. Speeds should be reduced as much as possible, especially when the fisherman goes against the current.
  - b. Preferably, the fishing haul should be less than 15 minutes, especially when the speed is above 1.5 knots.
  - c. Fishermen audited on Le Lay have a home tank which they use to store elvers for a minimum of 48 hours. However, no mortality monitoring is carried out on these tanks. We recommend that from the 2020-2021 season onwards, fishermen keep a home mortality logbook that they can provide to the auditor during the control audit. It should be possible to link mortality to a period and a quantity of elvers caught (fishing log). For better readability, it is preferable that elvers' trips during sales are also indicated. An example of this would be:

Date	Quantity added to the tank (g)	Mortality (g)	Quantity leaving the fish tank (g)
04/01/2021	1890	0	0
05/01/2021	910	10	0
06/01/2021	0	5	0
07/01/2021	500	20	0
08/01/2021	0	0	3260

The exit weight may not necessarily correspond to the weight fished + mortality. This may be due to weight loss and weighing accuracy.

- d. Each ship has a fish tank on board. However, the practices for collecting glass eels from them differ. Sometimes a very fine-mesh net (less than 1mm) is present in the tank and allows the fish to be retrieved with almost no handling. If there is no net, the elvers are collected after emptying the tank with a shovel and a plastic brush. This last technique subjects the glass eels to more handling. It would be preferable for all fishermen to place a very fine-meshed net (0.9mm or less) inside the fish tank.

4. We recommend testing with indigo carmine during the control audit. The lesions taken into account have yet to be defined but this system would make it possible to judge whether practices are in line with the SEG standard, despite speeds in excess of 1.5 knots recorded.
5. Concerning criterion 2.5, sometimes by-catches or elvers get stuck for several hauls in the nets, especially on La Sèvre. Fishermen must be careful to remove all fishes present when they empty the pockets between each haul.

## 6) Next Audit

Question	Performance of the Client at Audit	Yes	No
1	Has the client been part of any external investigation which may be of concern to SEG AND/OR been suspended from any other certification standard?	Enhanced Surveillance	Go to Q2
2	Has the client received a borderline pass for a Component in its previous audit?	Enhanced Surveillance	Go to Q3
3	Does the client only buy and sell product (does not physically handle it?)	Minimum Surveillance	Go to Q4
4	All other scenarios	Standard Surveillance	

	Certification Audit	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 Recertification Audit
Minimum Surveillance	On-Site Audit	No Audit	Remote Audit	No Audit	On-Site Audit
Standard Surveillance	On-Site Audit	No Audit	On-Site Audit	No Audit	On-Site Audit
Enhanced Surveillance	On-Site Audit	On-Site Audit	On-Site Audit	On-Site Audit	On-Site Audit

The next mid-term audit should therefore take place by December 2022.

## 7) The Assessment

The tables below give the standard and a rationale for the scores given above.

<b>Component 1 – Generic requirements (Weighting : 1 for each criterion)</b>	
<b>Criterion 1.1: Commitment to legality</b>	
<b>Responsible indicators</b>	For at least the past two years: the organisation has not been found guilty for any offences relating to eel fishing or trading.
<b>Aspiring indicators</b>	For at least the past 12 months: the organisation has not been found guilty for any offences relating to eel fishing or trading.
Discussion	The five fishermen audited have no recent prosecutions or legal proceedings pending, and all fishermen are signing an agreement to abide by the terms of the fishery and the SEG standard. The criterion is therefore met.
Score	Responsible

<b>Criterion 1.2: Contribution to Eel Conservation Projects. (Optional bonus score) (The intention is for this to be mandatory from summer 2020)</b>	
<b>Responsible indicators</b>	The organisation donates at least 2% of its profits or at least 20% of its corporate responsibility programme to projects that make a positive contribution to eel conservation or population enhancement, such as Eel Stewardship Funds, River Restoration projects, conservation and education projects.
<b>Aspiring indicators</b>	The organisation donates 1 – 1.99% of its profits or 10 - 20% of its corporate responsibility programme to projects that make a positive contribution to eel conservation or population enhancement, such as Eel Stewardship Funds, River Restoration projects, conservation and education projects.
Discussion	N/A
Score	N/A

<b>Criterion 1.3: The organisation trades in certified responsibly sourced eel</b>	
<b>Responsible indicators</b>	The organisation trades in at least 50% (by number) of certified responsibly sourced eel and has the documentation to demonstrate that.
<b>Aspiring indicators</b>	The organisation trades in 10 – 49.9% (by number) of certified responsibly sourced eel and has the documentation to demonstrate that.
Discussion	The audit concerns only fishermen who have not yet been SEG certified so not yet trading in certified eel, so are not already covered by this criterion.
Score	N/A

<b>Criterion 1.4: Traceability</b>	
<b>1.4.1: Traceability - Incoming product, separation and segregation</b>	

<b>Responsible indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certified and uncertified eel products can be clearly and easily traced back to their source.</li> <li>• Where a fishery or buyer, an electronic tele-declaration system is used.</li> <li>• It operates a clear system which ensures that the product remains separated at all stages from arrival to dispatch from non-certified eel products.</li> <li>• The organisation ensures that any products wishing to make a claim as certified do not contain any non-certified eel-based ingredients.</li> <li>• If resolved through mass- or number- balance calculations, the margin of error does not exceed 2%.</li> </ul>
<b>Aspiring indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certified and uncertified eel products can be traced back to their source.</li> <li>• If segregation is not possible, there are clear and auditable records of the numbers of certified and uncertified eels entering the organisation at each facility.</li> <li>• It can demonstrate through auditable records that the number of certified eels exiting the organisation in a year did not exceed the number that entered.</li> <li>• If resolved through mass- or number- balance calculations, the margin of error does not exceed 5% or if a farm, the 2800 pieces per 1 kg of glass eels is applied.</li> </ul>
Discussion	<p>All fishermen audited use the electronic filing system "Télécapêche". This system allows computerised banking and direct access to COREPEM, which represents all the fishermen of the UGA Loire - Côtiers Vendéens - Sèvre Niortaise (LCVS). This makes it possible to monitor the fishermen's quota finely and to avoid exceeding the authorised quotas.</p> <p>The fishermen also fill in fishing forms (or fishing log) which are systematically sent to France Agrimer. Each fishing day is declared on paper with 3 copies: 1 for the administrative authorities, 1 for the wholesaler and the last one is kept by the fisherman.</p> <p>This criterion has therefore been met.</p>
Score	Responsible

#### 1.4.2: Traceability - Outgoing product

<b>Responsible indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where a fishery or buyer, an electronic tele-declaration system is used</li> <li>• Documentation is well maintained with a maximum of 2% error in the following:</li> <li>• The organisation correctly uses batch-coding for labelling certified product, which can be on the packaging for the product, or included in the documentation (e.g. invoice) with the assignment</li> <li>• All product to be sold as certified by an organisation is accompanied by an invoice which meets the following criteria:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Includes an appropriate batch code</li> <li>- Includes a record of the quantity (no. &amp; weight) of product and to whom it was sold</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
-------------------------------	--

Code: SEG 0091

<b>Aspiring indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation is well maintained. If resolved through mass- or number- balance calculations, the margin of error does not exceed 5% in the following (or if a farm, the 2800 pieces per 1 kg of glass eels is applied):</li> <li>• The organisation correctly uses batch-coding for labelling certified product, which can be on the packaging for the product, or included in the documentation (e.g. invoice) with the assignment.</li> <li>• All products to be sold as certified by an organisation are accompanied by an invoice which meets the following criteria:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Includes an appropriate batch code.</li> <li>- Includes a record of the quantity (no. &amp; weight) of product and to whom it was sold.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Discussion	As in the previous point, this audit concerns only fishermen and they use a system of electronic tele-declaration and fishing form. The criterion is therefore met.
Score	Responsible

**1.4.3: Traceability - Record keeping and documentation**

<b>Responsible indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The organisation operates a system that allows the tracking and tracing of all eel from purchase to sale and including any steps in between. In the case of live eels this should include the ability to track each batch delivered to a buyer to be connected back to a water, a time period (maximum duration one month) and specific fisherman/vessel.</li> <li>• If a fisherman or buyer, a tele-declaration system is used to report catches and trade.</li> <li>• The organisation operates a system that also allows for the completion of a batch reconciliation of eel product by weight over a given period.</li> <li>• The organisation maintains records for a minimum of three (3) years.</li> </ul>
<b>Aspiring indicators</b>	<p>The above requirements are met except that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records have been maintained for less than three (3) years</li> <li>• If a fisherman or trader, a tele-declaration system is planned to be used to report catches and trade in the next season</li> </ul>
Discussion	The fishermen all use an electronic tele-declaration system and fishing forms. These data are kept by the administrative authorities for more than 3 years. The criterion is therefore met.
Score	Responsible



Criterion 1.5: Biosecurity & welfare – Eel and eel products are provided with minimal risk of diseases, parasites and alien species	
1.5.1 Eel Fishing: Biosecurity measures are adopted	
Responsible indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The fishery conducts good biosecurity measures such as the disinfection and drying of nets and equipment between each fishing in different waters. <b>OR</b></li> <li>The fishermen only operate in the same river or estuary, with no risk of transferring diseases or alien species between catchments.</li> </ul>
Discussion	<p>All fishermen fish the whole fishing season only on La Sèvre Niortaise or La Lay, without changing their fishing location. It is then not possible to move any diseases or exotic species.</p> <p>The criterion is therefore met.</p>
Score	Responsible

Summary scores for Component 1	
Not applicable	2
Not met	0
Aspiring	0
Responsible	5
Total possible	5
<b>% Responsibility (Responsible / Total possible)</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>Component 2 - Glass eel fishing</b>	
<b>Criterion 2.1: Eel fishing is in a catchment that is meeting its escapement targets</b>	
<b>Weighting: 2</b>	
<b>Sustainable Indicator (worth 2 x Responsible Indicator Score)</b>	There are good data which show to the satisfaction of the fisheries authority that the EU silver eel 40% escapement target (40% B0) is being achieved for the river or in the eel management district.
<b>Responsible indicators</b>	There are good data which show to the satisfaction of the fisheries authority that at least 70% of the Bbest target for silver eel escapement is being met in the river or eel management district.
<b>Aspiring indicators</b>	Eel fishing is in a place accepted by the fishery authority as providing a positive contribution to the eel stock or, the river or RBD is meeting 40% - <70% of the Bbest target.
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>The information available on this subject (Report of the Eel Management Plan in France, 2018) shows that, for the moment, the objective of 40% of the B0 or 70% of the BBEST is not achieved, both in the relevant Management Unit (LCVS) and in the other French Management Units. Moreover, we do not have precise information by catchment area to make a more detailed assessment of this criterion.</p> <p>However, all the actions planned in France's Eel Management Plan (EMP) have been implemented and the rebuilding of the eel stock requires long-term action. The effects of the measures taken in recent years are not observable for the moment. The actions taken by the fisheries sector are detailed in the following criterion.</p> <p>Considering all this, the criterion is not met but significant efforts have been made since the establishment of the EMP, in particular by professional fishermen.</p>
<b>Score</b>	Aspiring

<b>Criterion 2.2: There is good progress with the applicant's responsibilities in the Eel Management Plan for the river or District</b>	
<b>Weighting: 2</b>	
<b>Responsible indicators</b>	There is credible progress with at least 75% of the actions relating to the fishery for the implementation of the Eel Management Plan for the river or eel management district.
<b>Aspiring indicators</b>	There is credible progress with at least 50% of the actions relating to the fishery for the implementation of the Eel Management Plan for the river or eel management district.
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>Professional fisheries stakeholders have implemented the majority of actions related to the EMP.</p> <p>So, the exploitation rate of glass eel stock has decreased significantly since the reference period. This rate has been relatively stable in recent years and fluctuates around the management target.</p> <p>The allocation of glass eel fishing licences has decreased by 57% between 2006 and 2018.</p>

Code: SEG 0091

	<p>The ratio of the fishing quota 40% consumption and 60% restocking is unchanged since 2013. However, the target of 60% glass eels for restocking in Europe has never been reached, but the profession is getting closer to this target over the years. Reaching this objective is dependent on the European market, which is not the responsibility of professional fishermen.</p> <p>The overall catch quota has decreased for the 2020-2021 season by a total of 57.5 tonnes, a reduction of 11.5% compared to the previous season.</p> <p>Finally, France allocates between 5 and 10% of annual catches to French restocking operations, 5.8% in 2018.</p> <p>In view of all these elements, it can be considered that this criterion has been met.</p>
<b>Score</b>	Responsible

### Criterion 2.3: The fishery is well managed

**Weighting: 1**

<b>Responsible indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fishers are licensed and provide catch and effort data via a tele-declaration system.</li> <li>• Data on catch and effort are collected and analysed regularly by the fishery authority (at least annually at the end of the season).</li> <li>• There is a data set for at least the last 5 years that is considered by the fishery authority to be accurate, useful for statistical purposes and provide a comprehensive picture of the glass eel fishery under assessment.</li> <li>• Enforcement is in place throughout the fishing area and there is no evidence of systematic non-compliance.</li> </ul>
<b>Aspiring indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fishers are licensed and provide catch and effort data.</li> <li>• Data on catch and effort are collected and analysed regularly by the fishery authority (at least annually at the end of the season).</li> <li>• There is a data set for at least the last 3 years that is considered by the fishery authority to be accurate and provide enough information on the glass eel fishery under assessment for management and to track annual trends in glass eel arrival.</li> <li>• There is no evidence of systematic non-compliance.</li> </ul>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>All fishermen have a licence and carry out the electronic filing in addition to the declaration by the fishing form or the fishing logbook.</p> <p>Fishing figures are monitored throughout the season by COREPEM and the PO in order to know the exact consumption of the quota to avoid a preventive closure. These data are obtained thanks to "Télécapêche" which has been compulsory for 5 years. This data is a very efficient management tool.</p> <p>The official data come from the fishing sheets (or fishing log) sent by fishermen to the administrative authorities. Thus, the Directorate of Maritime Fisheries and Aquaculture (DPMA in french) collects and compiles these data. During the elver fishing season, the DPMA circulates a table every week to report on the consumption of quotas in the various UGAs. In May-June, when the season is over, the DPMA distributes a statistical compendium (quota consumption, market price, number of wholesalers, etc.) per UGA. There is a set of reliable data for more than 5 years.</p> <p>This criterion has therefore been met.</p>
<b>Score</b>	Responsible

Criterion 2.4: Mortality during fishing is minimised	
<b>Weighting: 2</b>	
<b>Responsible indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fishing is by hand-held nets and has effective nearby holding facilities <b>OR</b></li> <li>• Fishing from vessels meets the following criteria:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) fishing is at slow speed (no more than 1 knot relative to water);</li> <li>ii) haul duration is on average no longer than 20 minutes, with the maximum duration not more than 30 minutes;</li> <li>iii) mesh size of cod end no greater than 1mm;</li> <li>iv) rest of the net designed such that glass eels do not become trapped or abraded;</li> <li>v) vivier tank on board and in use;</li> <li>vi) fishermen maintain accurate daily records of mortality. <b>OR</b></li> </ol> </li> <li>• Fishermen can demonstrate that the mortality rate of the catch over the duration of holding in the storage facility is less than 4% for each batch captured. <b>OR</b></li> <li>• Fishing methods (in France) meet the criteria in Category 1 of the France Good Practice Guide. <b>OR</b></li> <li>• The Carmin Indigo or similar test indicates that mortality averages less than 4%.</li> </ul>
<b>Aspiring indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fishing from vessels meets the following criteria:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) fishing is at slow speed (no more than 1.5 knots relative to water);</li> <li>ii) maximum haul duration no longer than 30 minutes;</li> <li>iii) mesh size of cod end no greater than 1mm;</li> <li>iv) rest of the net designed such that glass eels do not become trapped or abraded;</li> <li>v) vivier tank on board and in use;</li> <li>vi) fishermen maintain accurate daily records of mortality. <b>OR</b></li> </ol> </li> <li>• Fishermen can demonstrate that the mortality rate of the catch over the duration of holding in the storage facility is between 4% and 8% for each batch captured. <b>OR</b></li> <li>• Fishing methods (in France) meet the criteria in Category 2 of the France Good Practice Guide. <b>OR</b></li> <li>• The Carmin Indigo or similar test indicates that mortality averages between 4% and 8%.</li> </ul>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>The practices observed on the vessels audited are similar by estuary (Sèvre Niortaise and Lay). Thus, the sieves used are rectangular in shape on La Sèvre (length from 200 to 250cm, width from 70 to 150cm) and square on Le Lay (120cm by 120cm). On La Sèvre the length of the net varies greatly, from 7.5m to 11m. The meshes are degressive with a mesh size less than or equal to 1mm on the terminal part (sock). On Le Lay, the pocket is more or less 300cm long with 3 degressive meshes ending with a 70-80cm section with a mesh size less or equal to 1mm.</p> <p>On La Sèvre, one of the fishermen did not have all of his net in the water during the entire haul, as it was observed during the audit carried out in 2019. This practice seems common and is carried out to avoid turbulence at the rear of the boat. However, when the entire net is not in the water, the "elbow" thus created is on a section where the mesh size is greater than 1mm, which is not in line with SEG standard requirements.</p> <p>All boats have a water tank on board. For most, there is no recirculation of water or bubbling in the fish tank during the tide, which can be harmful to glass eels. Above the fish tank, there is an overflow screen present to quickly release by-catch.</p> <p>The duration of each haul was between 7 and 10 minutes on La Sèvre and between 15 and 17 minutes on Le Lay during the audit.</p> <p>On la Sèvre, one of the fishermen had an average speed of 1 knot and the two others between 1.9 and 2.4 knots. On Le Lay, the fishermen's speed was more homogeneous,</p>

	<p>from 2.4 to 2.5 knots. In addition, one of the fishermen on Le Lay had speeds sometimes close to 3 knots against the current, which appears to be a limit not to be exceeded. Overall, speeds were higher than what is recommended by the SEG standard. However, these speeds are lower than what is recommended in the Guide des Bonnes Pratiques de France.</p> <p>A few dead elvers have been found on La Sèvre niortaise. This is probably due to the fact that the pocket is very long and difficult to empty. Some elvers thus remain stuck in the net for several strokes, which leads to mortality. On Le Lay, mortality has been observed too. It is possible that this is due to the fishing time (between 15 and 20 minutes), combined with a speed of between 2.5 and 3 knots.</p> <p>After the tide, fishermen of Le Lay take the elvers to their homes to place them in a fish tank for at least 48 hours in fresh water. Professionals estimate that mortality during this stage is low, but no real monitoring of mortality is carried out. On the river La Sèvre, the elvers are delivered directly to the fish wholesaler.</p> <p>Thus, many criteria are met, but fishermen on Le Lay do not keep mortality records and speeds are too high in relation to the SEG requirements. However, speeds observed remain relatively low. On the other hand, the same observation is made as in 2019 during another audit, some fishermen do not fully immerse the net during the entire fishing haul. The "elbow" thus created has a mesh size greater than 1mm.</p> <p>We recommend assigning an aspiring score with several recommendations (part 5, page 4 of the document) to be applied by the time of the control audit.</p>
<b>Score</b>	Aspiring

<b>Criterion 2.5: The fishery has negligible impacts on by-catch species</b>	
<b>Weighting: 1</b>	
<b>Responsible indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fishery has a negligible impact on by-catch.</li> <li>• By-catch is returned to the water alive as gently and rapidly as possible.</li> </ul>
<b>Aspiring indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fishery has low-level impacts on by-catch.</li> <li>• By-catch is returned to the water alive as gently and rapidly as possible.</li> </ul>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>The by-catches encountered are as follows: Roach, Spotted goby, Thinlip grey mullet, Flounder, Stickleback. These species are caught in low numbers and quickly return to the water on both Le Lay and La Sèvre Niortaise rivers.</p> <p>On Le Lay, the by-catch is very quickly returned to the water.</p> <p>However, on La Sèvre, the sock (terminal part of the net) is very long and some fish can get stuck in it for several consecutive strokes. In this case, chances of survival of these fishes are greatly reduced.</p> <p>It therefore appears that practices on La Sèvre can have a low impact on by-catch. An improvement has to be made on this side, so this criterion only reaches the aspiring indicator.</p>
<b>Score</b>	Aspiring

Criterion 2.6: The fishery has negligible impacts on rare or other protected species	
<b>Weighting: 1</b>	
<b>Responsible indicators</b>	The fishery has no direct interactions resulting in mortality or injuries with other species that are considered vulnerable, threatened, endangered or are protected under national or international law.
<b>Aspiring indicators</b>	Interactions, resulting in mortality or injury, with other species that are considered vulnerable, threatened, endangered, or are protected under national or international law, are rare and have no overall measurable impact on the population.
<b>Discussion</b>	We did not observe the presence of vulnerable or protected species on board. The criterion has therefore been met.
<b>Score</b>	Responsible

Criterion 2.7: The fishery has negligible impacts on habitats	
<b>Weighting: 1</b>	
<b>Responsible indicators</b>	The fishing gear does not cause any damage to the benthos.
<b>Aspiring indicators</b>	Damage to the benthos by gear is limited or minimal.
<b>Discussion</b>	Glass eel fishing consists of filtering the water, without touching the benthos. If it happens that the sieve touches the benthos it will be accidental and will lead to an unwanted loss of time and fishing efficiency. This criterion is therefore met.
<b>Score</b>	Responsible

Criterion 2.8: Transport	
<b>Weighting: 1</b>	
<b>Responsible indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The operator holds the relevant transport authorisations.</li> <li>• There is a Transport Plan in place to minimise travel time – this meets the Transport requirements for vertebrates.</li> <li>• Packing is done in a way that minimises handling, time and stress.</li> <li>• Eels are kept cool and wet with an adequate supply of oxygen.</li> </ul>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>The fishing form filled in at the end of the tide serves as an authorisation for transport in France.</p> <p>At the end of the fishing, elvers are taken out of the fish tank (with the help of a pocket or with a brush and bucket) and placed in a plastic or polystyrene crate. Then they transport this crate from the boat to the truck or to the trading site where the catch is weighed, usually without transferring the container (the tare is known).</p> <p>On La Sèvre Niortaise, fishermen deliver directly to the trading site located 100m from the port. Transport is therefore very limited and most often takes place in</p>

**Code: SEG 0091**

	(plastic) tidal bins. On Le Lay, the elvers are transported to the fishermen's home in plastic or polystyrene bins. This transport time is generally short and during transport the eels are kept moist and fresh (air temperature in winter). This method of transport allows for little handling of the elvers and the fish seems to be able to cope with this way of working. The criterion is therefore met.
<b>Score</b>	Responsible

<b>Criterion 2.9: Bonus Score: Fishermen donate a proportion of their catch for a local positive contribution</b>	
<b>Weighting: 1</b>	
<b>Responsible indicators</b>	Fishermen have donated an average of at least 5% of their catch in the past 2 years to local stocking programmes, e.g. translocating over barriers to aid upstream migration and recruitment in the catchment, or have credible plans in place to do so next season (note that this is separate from any planned restocking to meet the 60% target).
<b>Discussion</b>	N/A
<b>Score</b>	N/A

<b>Summary scores for Component 2</b>	
Not applicable	1
Not met	0
Aspiring	5
Responsible	6
Total possible	11
<b>% Responsibility (Responsible / Total possible)</b>	<b>55%</b>