

Code: SEG0081

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

**Completed by**  
Nicolas Belhamiti

9<sup>th</sup> and 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 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> of February 2022 under the SEG (Sustainable Eel Group) standard (version 6.0a, December 2019) with a group of 21 fishermen operating on the Sèvre Niortaise River. The fishermen concerned by this certification deliver the glass eels directly after the tide (the fish traders are present at the port).

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

On the Sèvre Niortaise, the shape of the net opening is rectangular, but the dimensions are very variable. The length of the opening observed during the audit ranged from 250 cm to 200 cm and the width from 150 cm to 70 cm. The regulations allow an opening of up to 2 m<sup>2</sup> of surface area. The total length of the pocket is dependent on the length of the vessel. The lengths found ranged from 11 m to 7.5 m. Of the 5 fishermen audited, all have degressive mesh sizes with a terminal sock with a mesh size of 1 mm or less. On the Sèvre, a significant part of the pocket is located at the rear of the boat.



*Figure 1: Example of a sieve used on the Sèvre River*

Fishing is mainly at night and rarely during the day. Gear can be set at depth if required.

The audit carried out in February 2022 was a control audit. It concerned 21 fishermen, including 4 new applications. Thus, there were 5 planned boardings.

The following fishermen are concerned for this assessment:

NAME	FIRST NAME	STATUS OF THE APPLICATION
BARON	Yannis	Already SEG
BERNARD	Vincent	Already SEG
BITARD	Christophe	Already SEG
BURAUD	Samuel	Already SEG
CHARLEUX	Stéphane	Already SEG
COUTANCEAU	Romuald	Already SEG
GALERA	Jean-Marie	Already SEG
GIRAULT	Teddy	Already SEG
GROLIER	Hervé	Already SEG
GROLIER	Thomas	Already SEG
GROLIER	Daniel	Already SEG
GUYARD	Stany	Already SEG
NICOLEAU	Freddy	Already SEG
NICOLEAU	Cyril	Already SEG
PINEAU	Sébastien	Already SEG
POTEVIN	Guillaume	Already SEG
EVENO	Frédéric	Already SEG
BERNARD	Claude	New application
DAVID	Jérémy	New application
GUYARD	Dany	New application
DAVID	Alain	New application

## 2) The assessment

The evaluator was Nicolas Belhamiti from the consultancy firm Fish-Pass. The visit took place on 9 and 10 February 2022 during the night tides. A boarding was carried out with the following fishermen: BERNARD Vincent / GROLIER Thomas / BARON Yannis / GROLIER Daniel / DAVID Alain.

## 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:

Code: SEG0081

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	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
Total		11	4
<b>Percentage Responsibility Score:</b>		<b>36%</b>	

**Finding:** With a score of 36% 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	5	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Total Responsibility Score: = 10/17</b>			<b>59%</b>

**Summary finding:**

With a score on the responsibility criteria of **59%**, **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 Sèvre fishery:

1. With an overall responsibility score of **59%**, **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:
  - Given the continued practice of not fully spinning the net by some fishermen, it will be appropriate for the organiser of this list to identify these fishermen so that control can be carried out on these fishermen. When this is done, an audit in December 2022 will be organised to carry out an indigo carmine test on a sample of elvers from all or some of these fishermen 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.
5. In relation to criterion 2.5: By-catches or glass eels may be trapped in the nets for several hauls. Fishermen should take care to remove all fish present when emptying the bags 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	<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 for fishermen not spinning the whole net during the fishing action.**

## 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	
<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 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)	
<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	Of the 21 fishermen concerned by the audit, 4 were already SEG. This means that 81% 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

**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>
<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**

<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>
<b>Discussion</b>	The audited fishermen only fishes on the Sèvre Niortaise River. The criterion is therefore met.
<b>Score</b>	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>

	Considering all this, the criterion is not met, but significant efforts have been made since the establishment of the EMP, particularly by professional fishermen.
<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.</p> <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 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> </ul>
-------------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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

<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>fishing is at slow speed (no more than 1 knot relative to water);</li> <li>haul duration is on average no longer than 20 minutes, with the maximum duration not more than 30 minutes;</li> <li>mesh size of cod end no greater than 1mm;</li> <li>rest of the net designed such that glass eels do not become trapped or abraded;</li> <li>vivier tank on board and in use;</li> <li>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>
-------------------------------	---

<p><b>Aspiring indicators</b></p>	<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. OR</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. OR</li> <li>• Fishing methods (in France) meet the criteria in Category 2 of the France Good Practice Guide. OR</li> <li>• The Carmin Indigo or similar test indicates that mortality averages between 4% and 8%.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Discussion</b></p>	<p>The practices observed on the Sèvre Niortaise are fairly similar between fishermen. The gear used has a rectangular opening with a maximum surface area of 2 m<sup>2</sup>. The length of the net varies greatly, from 7.5 m to 11 m. The mesh size is degressive with a mesh size of 1 mm or less on the terminal part (sock).</p> <p>The long length of the pockets leads to two different practices on the Sèvre, namely fishing with or without spinning the whole net. This practice seems common and is done to avoid turbulence at the back of the boat. However, when the whole net is not in the water, the "bend" thus created is on a section where the mesh size is greater than 1 mm, which is not in conformity with the requirements of the SEG standard. Thus, all SEG-certified fishermen have signed a paper attesting that they immerse the entire net when fishing. However, one fisherman audited and one boat on the list did not fully immerse the bags during the audit. It is very likely that many boats will do the same. The fishermen each have an opinion on the question, some indicating that the elvers are of better quality when the bag is not spun, while other fishermen affirm the opposite. But if the bag is not spun, it does not meet the SEG standard.</p> <p>The fishing is done facing the current and in the direction of the current, mainly at night. The speeds observed during boarding ranged on average from 2.2 to 2.6 knots depending on the fishermen. These speeds are higher than what is required in the standard, but lower than what is recommended in the CNPMM's Guide des Bonnes Pratiques de France.</p> <p>The duration of the hauls varies according to the fishermen and the sector fished. The duration of the hauls on board was between 7 and 15 minutes.</p> <p>Some dead or moribund elvers were observed during the hauls. This is probably due to the fact that the bag is very long and difficult to empty. Some glass eels remain stuck in the net for several hauls, which leads to mortality.</p> <p>The catches are all passed through one or more sieves, depending on the fisherman, in order to separate the glass eels from the by-catch. 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 deliver the glass eels to the wholesalers in the port.</p> <p>The fishermen do not keep a logbook on board in order to estimate fishing mortality.</p> <p>Thus, most of the criteria are met. However, despite having signed a paper stating the contrary, some fishermen do not spin the whole net when fishing.</p> <p>Therefore, this criterion is not met.</p>
<p><b>Score</b></p>	<p>Not met</p>

Criterion 2.5: The fishery has negligible impacts on by-catch species	
<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>Several by-catch species were caught on the boats: Thinlip grey mullet, eel, bream, pike-perch, spotted goby, sand goby, stickleback, stone moroko.</p> <p>On the Sèvre Niortaise, the sock (the end of the net) is very long and some fish can get stuck in it for several consecutive hauls. In this case the chances of survival of these fish are greatly reduced.</p> <p>It therefore appears that the practices on the Sèvre may have a low impact on by-catches. An improvement must be made on this side, and this criterion therefore only affects 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>	<p>During the 5 boardings, one yellow eel (critically endangered) was caught. However, these catches are rare and do not result in mortality at this stage of the eel. Therefore, professional fishing for this species is authorised in France at all stages of development. When fishing for glass eels, the yellow eels are released alive.</p> <p>The criterion is therefore met.</p>
<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>	The practices observed are mainly carried out in open water and therefore far from the bottom. However, the sieve can sometimes be placed at depth. In this case, the fishermen keep a

	reasonable height in relation to the benthos so as not to touch it. If this sometimes happens, it is never deliberate. 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>	The fishing form is filled in at the end of the trip, before getting off the boat. All fishermen transport the glass eels directly to the fish trader. All fishermen use a plastic or polystyrene box to transport the glass eels. This criterion has therefore been 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 met	2
Not applicable	1
Aspiring	5
Responsible	4
Total possible	11
<b>% Responsibility (Responsible / Total possible)</b>	<b>36%</b>