

Code: SEG0073

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

**Completed by**  
Nicolas Belhamiti

10<sup>th</sup> February 2022

**Final Version**

Reviewed and Approved by Certification Body:  
David Bunt, Sustainable Eel Group, 29 March 2022

## 1) Introduction

This document represents the report produced following the audit carried the 10<sup>th</sup> of February 2022 under the SEG (Sustainable Eel Group) standard (version 6.0a, December 2019) with a group of 8 fishermen operating on the Lay river. The fishermen concerned by this certification sell their glass eels directly to the fish merchants at the landing ports.

The fishermen concerned by this certification store their glass eels in fish tanks at home before delivering them to the traders.

The OP Estuaires, in collaboration with COREPEM, organised this audit and the group of fishermen will be called "Fishermen Lay". This evaluation was carried out only in relation to components 1 and 2 of the standard.

On the Lay, fishing gear must have a square opening of 120cm by 120cm. Then the length of the pocket can vary but during the audits the length was 290-300cm. In general, there are 3 degressive meshes with a reserve of 70-80cm.



*Figure 1: Example of a sieve used on the Lay river*

The tides are carried out both during the day and at night, with gear being set at depth if necessary.

The audit carried out in February 2022 was a control audit. It concerned 8 fishermen, including 2 new applications. Thus, 3 boardings were planned.

The following fishermen are concerned for this assessment:

NAME	FIRST NAME	AREA
CARRE	Christian	Already SEG
CHARNEAU	Didier	Already SEG
RABOTIN	Guillaume	Already SEG
ROBERGEAU	Philippe	Already SEG
TAUPIER	Pascal	Already SEG
BIOGET	Julien	Already SEG
VIVIER	Bruno	New application
RAFFIN	Dominique	New application

## 2) The assessment

The assessor was Nicolas Belhamiti from the consultancy firm Fish-Pass. The visit took place on 10 February 2022 during the daytime tide. VIVIER Bruno and RAFFIN Dominique were boarded. Unfortunately, the other fishermen had already finished their fishing quotas. In the absence of a third boarding, the installations of RABOTIN Guillaume's boat were checked.

## 3) Client Contact Details

The OP Estuaires, in association with the COREPEM, requested this audit.

<b>Name/Compagny</b>	OP ESTUAIRES / COLLIAS ALEXANDRA – DURAND LAURIE
<b>Postal address</b>	2, rue Colbert 85100 Les Sables d'Olonne
<b>email address</b>	<a href="mailto:op.estuaires@gmail.com">op.estuaires@gmail.com</a>

## 4) Results of the assessment

The outcome of this assessment is as follows:

Component 1: General Requirements	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	Responsible	1	1
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
Total		6	6
<b>Percentage Responsibility Score:</b>		<b>100%</b>	

**Finding:** The fishery with a score of 100% meets the generic requirements and can be considered **responsible** for this component.

Component 2: Glass eel fishing	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	Aspiring	2	0
2.3 The fishery is well managed	Responsible	1	1
2.4 Mortality during fishing is minimised	Not met	2	0
2.5 The fishery has negligible impacts on by-catch species	Responsible	1	1
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
Total		11	5
<b>Percentage Responsibility Score:</b>		<b>45%</b>	

**Finding:** With a score of 45% and one criterion not met (4.2), the fishery don't meet the requirements of component 2 for elver fishing and is considered **as aspiring** under the SEG standard.

#### Summary of assessment and scoring

Component	Not Met	Aspiring	Responsible
1	0	0	6
2	2	4	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Total Responsibility Score: = 11/17</b>			<b>65%</b>

#### Summary finding:

With a score on the responsibility criteria of **65%**, **but one criterion not met**, the fishery has not reached the level required to be considered **responsible** following the control audit. The continuation of the SEG certification is to be reviewed at the beginning of next season.

#### 5) Recommendations:

Fish-Pass makes the following recommendations in relation to Lay fishery:

1. With an overall responsibility score of **65%**, **but one criterion not met**, the fishery has not reached the level required to be considered **responsible**. We recommend awarding a provisional certificate so as not to penalise fishermen. However, **a control will have to be carried out during December 2022 to verify that criterion 2.4 is compliant**. The following will be done:

- In order to verify compliance or not of the fishing mortality criterion, a control audit will have to be carried out in December 2022, at the beginning of the next fishing season. This will have to verify either
  - That all fishermen have changed their pockets in order to comply (terminal mesh size of 1 mm or less) **OR**
  - Carry out an indigo carmine test on a sample of glass eels from at least 3 fishermen on the list in order to check the rate of lethal lesions (rate must be less than or equal to 8%)

In addition, FISH PASS makes the following recommendations:

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. Criterion 2.2: In view of the current context, the fragility of this resource and the recent ICES advice to close all eel fisheries, the representative bodies of professional glass eel fishermen should not request an increase in the annual quota. Fishermen wishing to engage in a sustainable exploitation of this resource must ensure that their representatives do not make such a request and follow the advice of scientists (most often recommending a reduction in the quota).
4. With regard to criterion 2.4, several things can be improved in order to obtain the criterion of responsibility:
  - a. Reduce fishing speed to stay below 1 knot.
  - b. Keep a mortality logbook on board the boat. This logbook can be filled out at the end of the tide to indicate the number of dead or dying glass eels that have left the tank.
  - c. All fishermen have a fish tank at home which they use to store glass eels for at least 48 hours. However, for the majority, no mortality monitoring is carried out on these tanks. We recommend that, starting this year, fishermen keep a logbook of home mortalities that they can provide to the auditor during the control audit. Mortality should be linked to a period and a quantity of glass eels caught (fishing log). For greater legibility, it is preferable that the elver releases during sales are also indicated. An exemple :

Date	Quantity added to the tank (g)	Mortality (g) or Number of individuals (N)	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.

## 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	<b>Go to Q2</b>
2	Has the client received a borderline pass for a Component in its previous audit?	Enhanced Surveillance	<b>Go to Q3</b>
3	Does the client only buy and sell product (does not physically handle it?)	Minimum Surveillance	<b>Go to Q4</b>
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

Enhanced surveillance is recommended. The next audit should be carried out in December 2022 to verify compliance with criterion 4.2.

## 7) The Assessment

The tables below give the outcomes of the assessment against each of the criteria of Components 1 and 2 of the standard, providing a rationale for the scores given above.

Component 1 – Generic requirements (Weighting : 1 for each criterion)	
Criterion 1.1: Commitment to legality	
Responsible indicators	For at least the past two years: the organisation has not been found guilty for any offences relating to eel fishing or trading.
Aspiring indicators	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 audited fishermen have not had any infringements in the last 24 months. The criterion is therefore met.
Score	Responsible

Criterion 1.2: Contribution to Eel Conservation Projects. (Optional bonus score) (The intention is for this to be mandatory from summer 2020)	
Responsible indicators	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.
Aspiring indicators	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

**Code: SEG0073**

<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	Of the 8 fishermen concerned by the audit, 6 were already SEG. This means that 75% of the fishermen on the list are already marketing SEG-certified eels. This criterion is therefore met.
Score	Responsible

<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	All the fishermen audited use the electronic declaration system. This system enables them to declare their catches via sms directly to the departmental fisheries committee. A computerised database makes it possible to track the fishermen's quota finely and to avoid exceeding the authorised quotas. Each day's fishing is also declared on paper via fishing forms in 3 copies: 1 for the administration (France Agrimer), 1 for the wholesaler and the last one is kept by the fisherman. This criterion has therefore been met
Score	Responsible



<b>1.4.2: Traceability - Outgoing product</b>	
<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>
<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>
<b>Discussion</b>	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.
<b>Score</b>	Responsible

<b>1.4.3: Traceability - Record keeping and documentation</b>	
<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>
<b>Discussion</b>	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.
<b>Score</b>	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	
<b>Responsible indicators</b>	<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	The audited fishermen only fishes on the Lay River. The criterion is therefore met.
Score	Responsible

Summary scores for Component 1	
Not met	0
Not applicable	1
Aspiring	0
Responsible	6
Total possible	6
<b>% Responsibility (Responsible / Total possible)</b>	<b>100%</b>



Component 2 - Glass eel fishing	
Criterion 2.1: Eel fishing is in a catchment that is meeting its escapement targets	
Weighting: 2	
<b>Sustainable Indicator</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 (GDC) and in the other French Management Units. Moreover, we do not have precise information by watershed 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, particularly by professional fishermen.</p>
<b>Score</b>	Aspiring

Criterion 2.2: There is good progress with the applicant's responsibilities in the Eel Management Plan for the river or District	
Weighting: 2	
<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. 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 for France has been increased for the 2021-2022 season to a total of 65 tonnes, an increase of +13% compared to the previous season. Given the current context and the recent ICES advice to close all eel fisheries. The increase in quotas is a bad signal for the sustainability of the fishery.</p> <p>Finally, France allocates between 5 and 10% of annual catches to French restocking operations, 5.8% in 2018.</p> <p>The latest EMP report (2018) indicates that all planned actions have been completed. This indicated that the exploitation rate remained below 50% and close to the management target. However, with the increase in quotas this year it is possible that the exploitation rate is above the management target. Unfortunately, we do not know if this is the case, but the ministerial decision to increase quotas goes against the advice of scientists (decrease). It is therefore presumed that the management target is exceeded with this quota.</p> <p>Despite the efforts made over many years, the quota increase for the 2021-2022 season does not meet the responsibility criterion.</p>
<b>Score</b>	Aspiring

### 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.</p> <p>Fishing figures are monitored throughout the season by the Fisheries Committee to know the exact consumption of the quota to avoid a preventive closure.</p> <p>The official data come from the fishing sheets 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 distributes 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. This criterion has therefore been met.</p>
<b>Score</b>	Responsible

Criterion 2.4: Mortality during fishing is minimised	
Weighting: 2	
Responsible indicators	<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:               <ul 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> </ul> </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>
Aspiring indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fishing from vessels meets the following criteria:               <ul 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> </ul> </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>
Discussion	<p>The practices observed on the Lay are similar among fishermen. The gear used is standardised, i.e. a frame of 1.2 m by 1.2 m. However, the length of the net bag can vary, but it is generally around 3 m long. There are 3 degressive meshes to end with the smallest at the bottom of the sieve.</p> <p>Fishing is done facing the current and in the direction of the current, day and night. The speeds observed on board ranged from 2.4 to 2.9 knots depending on the hauls. These speeds are higher than what is required by the standard, but lower than what is recommended in the CNPMEM Guide to Good Practice in France.</p> <p>The duration of the hauls varies according to the fishermen and the "dirtiness of the water". The dirtier the water, the shorter the hauls. The duration of the hauls on board was between 9 and 15 minutes.</p> <p>The mesh size of the terminal part of the gears for the 3 fishermen concerned by the audit was 1.3 mm. This does not correspond to the standard. One of the fishermen is on the initial list and has therefore been fishing with non-compliant bags for 2 years.</p> <p>No glass eels were observed trapped in any part other than the bottom of the sieve.</p> <p>The catches are all passed through one or more sieves depending on the fishermen, in order to separate the glass eels from the by-catches. All by-catches are returned to the water.</p> <p>All the fishermen audited use a livewell on board with water recirculation or bubbling.</p>

	<p>At the end of the tide, the fishermen take the glass eels home to store them for several days in livewells.</p> <p>Fishermen do not keep a logbook on board or in the livewell to estimate fishing mortality. Thus, most of the criteria are met. However, the mesh size used does not correspond to what is required in the standard.</p> <p>As a result, this criterion is not met.</p>
<b>Score</b>	Not met

#### Criterion 2.5: The fishery has negligible impacts on by-catch species

**Weighting: 1**

<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>During the boarding, only Thinlip grey mullet were caught as by-catch. These were quickly released and the impact on these fish was therefore negligible. This criterion is therefore met.</p>
<b>Score</b>	Responsible

#### Criterion 2.6: The fishery has negligible impacts on rare or other protected species

**Weighting: 1**

<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>	Among the species captured, no vulnerable or protected species were contacted. The criterion has therefore been met.
<b>Score</b>	Responsible

#### Criterion 2.7: The fishery has negligible impacts on habitats

**Weighting: 1**

<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>	The practices observed are mainly carried out in open water and therefore far from the bottom. However, when the tide is in the daytime, the screen can be placed at depth. In this case, the

Code: SEG0073

	fishermen keep a reasonable height in relation to the benthos so as not to touch it. If this happens sometimes, it is never intentional. This criterion has therefore been met.
<b>Score</b>	Responsible

<b>Criterion 2.8: Transport</b>	
<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 is filled in at the end of the trip, before getting off the boat. All fishermen transport the glass eels to their home tanks and then deliver them to the fish trader a few days later.</p> <p>All fishermen use a plastic or polystyrene box to transport the glass eels.</p> <p>This criterion has therefore been met.</p>
<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 met	2
Not applicable	1
Aspiring	4
Responsible	5
Total possible	11
<b>% Responsibility (Responsible / Total possible)</b>	<b>45%</b>