EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR MARITIME AFFAIRS AND FISHERIES

ATLANTIC, OUTERMOST REGIONS AND ARCTIC
The Director

Brussels, 18.12.2009 D 14520
C2/JL D(2009)

Sent by fax

To
1) The Fisheries Directors of Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Estonia, Spain, France, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, the United Kingdom
2) the Regional Advisory Councils for North Sea, Pelagic stocks, North-Western Waters, South-Western Waters and Long-Distance Fleet

Subject: Review of the deep-sea access regime

Dear Sir or Madame,

With the attached consultation document I would like to ask for your contribution and advice concerning the forth-coming review of the deep-sea access regime, by 19 February 2010.

Sincerely yours,

Reinhard Priebe
Director

Enclosure: Consultation and reflection document (15 pages)

c.c.: The Permanent representations of Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Estonia, Spain, France, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, the United Kingdom
Directors DG MARE A, B, E

Commission européenne/Europese Commissie, 1049 Bruxelles/Brussel, BELGIQUE/BELGIË - Tel. +32 22991111
Office: J-79 - Tel. direct line +32 229-+32 2 2987086 - Fax +32 229-+32 2 2955621

DG MARE/C2, December 2009

Consultation and reflection document:
Review of Council Regulation (EC) No 2347/2002 establishing specific access requirements and associated conditions applicable to fishing for deep-sea stocks

Note: This paper reflects discussion as of end 2009 and does not take into account policy impacts that might come from orientations in the context of the reform of the Common Fisheries Policy.

1. Introduction

The Regulation EC No 2347/2002 (in the following called the "access regime"), which concerns deep-sea fisheries in ICES[1] areas and in EC waters of the CECAF[2] area, relates back to a joint statement of the Council and the Commission of December 2000 that invited the Commission to establish catch restrictions for deep-sea species. This occurred at a time of increasing exploitation of some deep-sea species which was not accompanied by acceptable levels of scientific knowledge about the relevant stocks, nor by precautionary management measures. The only Community restrictions in place were maximum levels of effort that could be expended on deepwater species.[3] However, these rules only applied to fisheries along the Western slope, did not clearly define the regulated activity and contained effort ceilings which were not restricting.[4] An ICES report of 2001[5], endorsed by STECF, indicated that many of the deep-sea fish stocks were too heavily exploited and in a state which was actually or potentially outside safe biological limits. The report recommended an immediate reduction in these fisheries unless they can be shown to be sustainable. It advised that new deep-sea fisheries or the expansion of existing fisheries into new fishing areas should not be permitted unless the expansion is accompanied by programmes to collect sufficient data to determine sustainable exploitation levels. An STECF working group also recommended managing those fisheries by effort restriction rather than catch restrictions.[6] Since then, this basic message of scientific advice has not changed substantially.

As a first step, the Commission proposed, in December 2001, to set catch limitations in the form of Total Allowable Catches (TACs) for a number of deep-sea fish stocks, for each of the Member States that exploit these fisheries.[7] While this initial proposal did not find the support of the Council, since 2002 TACs are being decided in a by-annual rhythm, in parallel with biannual major updates of scientific advice. In parallel, the Commission advocated the policy of restricting the fishing for deep-sea species in the Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Commission

---

[1] International Council for Exploration of the Sea. Concerns the NEAFC Convention area.
[2] Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic Fisheries. These areas concern waters around the Azores, Madeira and the Canary Islands.
[3] Council Regulations (EC) No 685/95 and (EC) No 2027/95.
[4] Deep-water species mentioned in the regulation were (roundnose) grenadier, cutlassfish (black scabbardfish), emperor (orange roughy) and Portuguese dogfish.
[5] Report of the working group on biology and assessment of deep-sea fisheries resources, Advisory Committee on Fisheries Management ICES CM 2001/ACFM:23.
[6] Deep-sea fisheries. Report of SGFEN of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries of the European Commission. 123 pp.
[7] Proposal for a Council Regulation fixing for 2002 the fishing opportunities for deep-sea fish stocks, COM(2001)764 final of 10.12.2001.

(NEAFC), given that deep-sea fisheries expand into areas beyond EC waters and are not limited to EC vessels, but in particular comprise vessels from Norway, Iceland, Russia, the Faeroes and Greenland. Consequently, in 2002, NEAFC recommended freezing effort in the following two years. The access regime was developed in parallel, and from there on, global effort reductions were imposed as a measure transposing agreements found in NEAFC into EU legislation. During subsequent reviews of these effort limits, a significant reduction of the effort level could be agreed with respect to the reference level deployed in 2003.

Since these initial steps towards regulating deep-sea fisheries, several closed areas and protection areas have been established to reduce further depletion of orange roughy and blue ling, which are easily fished down when aggregating for feeding or spawning.

Moreover and in response to the UNGA resolution 61/105 on sustainable management of deep-sea fisheries, additional technical measures concentrated on the protection of deep-water corals, sponges and other sensitive habitats by prohibiting the use of certain gears that are likely to contact the seafloor (measures to protect Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems, VMEs).

In line with the obligation stipulated in Article 10 of the access regime, the Commission evaluated the regime in 2006 and presented a report.[8] Since then the discussion on management measures for deep-sea fisheries has further evolved. This paper provides background documentation and summarises main lines of the discussion in presenting policy options for future management of deep-sea species that evolve from the access regime. The Commission intends to present a legislative proposal, where appropriate, in 2010.

2. The sector concerned and the problem

Deep-sea fisheries as defined by the access regime are currently practiced by fleets from (in the order of effort deployed in 2008): France (79% of the Community effort spent), Spain (7.7%), United Kingdom (5.3%), Portugal - Azores (3.7%), Netherlands, Ireland, Germany, Lithuania and Denmark (see **annex 1**). **Annex 2** describes the main fisheries by eco-region or ICES area.

The landings of deep sea species have increased in recent years. For example, the three most landed species (black scabbarfish, blue ling and roundnose grenadier) have registered an increase of 38%, 28% and 61% from 2006 to 2008. The evolution of landings into European ports and the related values of species listed in annex 1 to the access regime is shown in **annex 3**, while **annex 4** records landings and related values of species listed in annex 2 to the access regime.

Annex 5 shows the extent to which quotas are used at EC level, comprising deep sea species listed in annexes 1 and 2 to the access regime. For instance, the quota utilisation of black scabbardfish in ICES zones V, VI, VII and XII has been stable around 90%. In CECAF zone 34.1.2 the utilisation of quota for black scabbardfish decreased by 11.5% from 2003 to 2008. The utilisation of quota for roundnose grenadier in Vb, VI and VII has decreased by about 50% since inception of the quota system.

[8] Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament, Review of the management of deep-sea fish socks, COM(2007)30 final dated 29.1.2007.

The number of vessels concerned can be identified on the basis of the special fishing permits granted (see **annex 6** for key countries). However, the Commission is currently not in a position to present related economic data of the fleets (income, costs, employees etc), due to an aggregation level of data that is not suitable for deep-sea fisheries.
The **need for management measures** that restrict fishing operations targeting deep-sea species is explained by their biological characteristics. Most deep-water species in ICES area are long-lived, slow growing and have a very low reproductive capacity. These species are, therefore, very vulnerable to exploitation and once depleted will recover very slowly. A further concern is that recruitment for some species, e.g. orange roughy, may be episodic with pulses of recruitment occurring infrequently. Some species, like blue ling, are an easier target when they aggregate in spawning season.

Given the vulnerability and fragility of these stocks, fisheries should be managed rigorously as they develop, and steps should be taken to ensure that extensive biological monitoring is in place to facilitate stock assessments and an understanding of the status of stocks. In contrast, exploitation of almost all deep-water species in the ICES area has developed without reglementation, with a "mining approach"[9] towards the exploitation of newly discovered populations: they are located and then fished out. The collection of biological information and data for use in assessments has lagged behind exploitation. Consequently, scientific assessments are highly imprecise.

The 2002 access regime, which was the regulatory answer to this challenge together with the introduction of TACs for important deep-sea species, basically consists in:

- improved information gathering on the activities of fishing vessels, flanked with an obligatory sampling of those vessels for monitoring by independent observers;
- limiting the size of the fleet that can fish directed on deep-sea species to the size of the fleet recently active in the fishery, accompanied with a system of special fishing permits;
- improved control of those vessels' activity in terms of VMS surveillance and obligatory landings in designated ports.

While the access regime did not curb the directed fishing effort as requested by scientific bodies, such steps where subsequently undertaken by transposing NEAFC resolutions on allowable directed fishing effort into Community law. The maximum allowable effort was reduced in yearly steps and arrived at 75% and 65% of the 2003 reference effort in the years 2008 and 2009, respectively.[10] This measure will remain in force in the NEAFC Regulatory area until 2012.

The Commission evaluated the access regime in place in 2006 and revealed certain shortcomings. In addition, the regular review of this regime provides the opportunity to update it in the light of recent policy developments, in particular review its functions in the context of other management measures, the control environment and data collection instruments.

---

[9] Commission staff working paper: STECF-SGFEN, Deep-sea fisheries, 2001, p. 44.
[10] Article 8 (4) of Council Regulation (EC) No 40/2008 and Article 8(4) of Council Regulation (EC) No 43/2009.

Concerning the development of the sector, important fisheries have dramatically declined and the fleets are struggling with earning the costs of long-distance journeys, especially when trawling. The harvesting sector's interest might have shifted from seeking a short-term profit towards keeping deep-sea fisheries as a developed business at smaller scale and turning them towards sustainable fishing practices.

3. The policy options

The access regime secures the implementation of legal obligations resulting from NEAFC-recommendations related to deepwater species and is thus an indispensable policy instrument. Therefore, the policy option of "no regulation at all" is not considered a valid option.

In view of it being an established and indispensable policy that has shown certain shortcomings, the policy options at hand can be structured according to their level of regulatory ambition:

Option 1 would consist in limiting regulatory changes to a minimum. The criterion for indispensable changes would be the need to align the access regime with the new framework regulation on control. This review would concern the rules contained in the access regime that specifically concern the control of landings and compliance with the capacity/effort regulation.

Pros: Re-establish policy consistency among CFP regulations. Abstain from regulatory changes that are not imposed by law, in order to minimise administrative adaptation costs.

Cons: Shortcomings identified during the ongoing evaluation process of the access regime could not be tackled by policy improvements. Opportunities to improve management efficiency would be foregone.

Option 2 would consist in reducing the regulatory content of the access regime to the minimum required to fulfil the obligations resulting from the NEAFC agreements. This would in the essence mean a monitoring scheme for expended fishing effort and transposition of specific obligations that result from the NEAFC's applicable control scheme.

Pros: International obligations could be honoured with minimum administrative costs. Shortcomings identified in the efficiency of the access regime would be addressed by removing the rules that have shown to be not efficient in practice.

Cons: Shortcomings identified during the ongoing evaluation process of the access regime could not be tackled by policy improvements. NEAFC has so far not estabilshed a comprehensive conservation policy towards deep-sea species. Opportunities to improve management efficiency would be foregone.

Option 3 would aim at improving the access regime in all its parts, based on an analysis of their functioning and relevance today. The objective would be to put the access regime into context of the overall policy development and improve its contribution to conservation objectives and to the gathering of scientific information. This analysis might also suggest that not all of the improvements might in procedural terms be addressed in the same legal instrument. According to the review process so far, the following conservation concerns are of prime importance:

- **Discard** practices constitute a particular problem in deep-sea fisheries as there is scarce information and need to be integrated into stock assessment for management purpose. More quantitative information would be needed and a more complete sampling coverage, in view of the heterogeneous nature of deep-sea fisheries with respect to depth. The operational side of this could consist of more thorough data collection protocols to be incorporated into national data collection programmes, which would assure a systematic compilation and utilization among expert groups.

- Another important issue related to discards is the high level of by-catch species occurring in deep-sea fisheries. The inclusion of certain species into the current annex I of the access regime could be envisaged. Other possible tools could be the setting of by-catch limits where fishing cannot be continued on the same fishing ground, after reaching a certain threshold level, and a move-on rule. Further possible measures could include the establishment of trawler-free zones, temporary closure areas to avoid catches of undersized fish and/or a mixture of unwanted species.

- Moreover, the issue of **ghost-fishing**[11] in deep waters needs to be addressed, particularly the deep-water gillnet fishery. Whenever a gillnet is lost, discarded or abandoned, they can have an adverse impact on the marine environment. These nets may continue to fish for periods of 2–3 years, and perhaps even longer. Reporting obligations could be established and net retrieval programmes put into place.

- A review of the **definition of the fleets** that are allowed to land deep-sea species with a fishing authorisation. This review would aim at better targeting the policy to relevant vessels and not restricting the activities which are less relevant, or addressing those with specific by-catch rules. It would also encompass an assessment of the interaction with the Western Waters regime and possible improvements in delimiting the two from each other. The following aspects would need in particular to be looked at: Reassessment of the landings' threshold for being subject to the access regime and update of the list of species according to scientific advice.

- **Control and monitoring**: This concerns the monitoring of maximum capacity, calculating and monitoring of fishing effort, vessel monitoring system, landing limitations to designated ports. The related review would aim at aligning the access regime with the new control regulation (see option 1) and improving control by specific rules where appropriate.

Pros: Shortcomings identified during the ongoing evaluation process of the access regime could be tackled by policy improvements. Opportunities to improve management efficiency would be used. Commission would stay consistent with its previous communication on the needs to act and keep its sustainability profile in international negotiations.

Cons: Pursuing the option might result in additional obligations of the harvest sector which the latter would not easily cope with and would have to adapt to. Administrative

[11] See the study IEEP/Poseidon, Ghost fishing by lost fishing gear, August 2005 (reference: DG FISH/2004/20).

obligations and costs might arise which are not commensurate with the economic importance of the fisheries.

4. The review process undertaken so far and further steps leading to a Commission proposal

The Commission's internal review process which started in 2006 resulted in the 2007 Communication to the Council and the European Parliament on the Review of the management of deep-sea fish stocks.[12] The European Parliament provided its opinion with a resolution in 2008.[13] In 2009, DG MARE sent a technical questionnaire to Member States and received contributions up to October 2008 from some of them. Also in 2009, the Commission asked the STECF to provide scientific advice on certain aspects of the access regime. The report of the working group SG-MS 09-05 is due to be finalised still in early 2010.

With this consultation and reflection document DG MARE **invites Member States and RACs** to provide their view on the discussed options and their information and suggestions to individual issues raised. Member States need not repeat their concerns which they have already brought to DG MARE upon the technical consultation.

Feedback should arrive at DG MARE, Unit C2, **by February 19, 2010**. The legislative planning foresees tabling of a Commission proposal in the first half of 2010.

Annexes

[12] COM(2007)30 final.

[13] P6_TA(2008)0196.

Annex I, Fishing effort deployed in deep sea fisheries by the relevant Member States

Fishing effort in kW-days[1]) deployed in deep sea fisheries				
Country	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2008%**
France	182760172	86908989	116951313	79%
Spain	13678234	12043781	11436011	7.7%
UK		10807634	7942019	5.3%
Portugal (Azores)	5884547	5490672	5529263	3.7%
Portugal (mainland)	4154648	2530445	2347940	1.6%
Ireland	55668	4360,42	1013128	0.7%
Netherlands		1262146	913333	0.6%
Germany	2362417	1173690,1	909943	0.6%
Portugal (Madeira)	798301	721677	722283	0.5%
Lithuania	93472	93472	20608	0.01%
Denmark	2854613	39327	4330	0.0029%
Sweden	11100	6451	3830	0.0025%
Estonia	31640	14506	0	0%
Total	**212.684.812**	**121.097.151**	**147.794.001**	**100%**

Source: Member States notifications to the Commission according to art. 9 of Council Regulation (EC) No 2347/2002

1) The high amount of effort results from the fact that effort is broken down to ICES statistical rectangle and to individual species.

Annex II, Deep sea fisheries by eco-region or ICES areas.

(Sources: ICES WGDEEP REPORT 2008, ICES CM 2008/ACOM:14; Commission staff working document: STECF, review of Scientific Advice for 2007 Part 1 Advice on Deepwater Resources and stocks in the Baltic Sea, SEC(2007) 471)

Barents Sea and Norwegian Sea (Divisions I and II)

In subareas I and II three species, ling (*Molva molva*), tusk (*Brosme brosme*) and Greater silver smelt (*Argentina silus*) make up almost 99 percent of the landed catches. Ling and tusk are mainly caught by long liners and a small proportion is caught in gillnets. Greater silver smelt are caught by bottom and midwater trawls in almost equal amounts. Minor catches of other species, which are mainly taken as by-catches, include roughhead grenadier (*Macrourus berglax*), greater forkbeard (*Phycis blennoides*), roundnose grenadier (*Coryphaenoides rupestris*), rabbitfish (Chimaerids) and blue ling (*Molva dypterigia*). Norway lands by far the largest amount of the three species. The Faroese, France, Germany, Russia, Scotland, Ireland and England and Wales report small by-catch landings of ling, blue ling and tusk. Occasional landings of these species in the direct fishery for greater silver smelt were reported by the Netherlands and as by-catches by Germany, Russia, Scotland and the Faroese.

North Sea and Skagerrak (IV and IIIa)

The main fisheries currently targeting deep sea species in the IIIa and IV are:

- By-catches of ling and tusk are taken in the UK demersal trawl fisheries;
- Fisheries for deep-sea shrimp (*Pandalus borealis*) carried out by Denmark, Norway and Sweden in Skagerrak and in the Norwegian Deep in the eastern part of the northern North Sea. The gears (trawls) used in these fisheries are small meshed (mesh size 35-45 mm). By-catches of deep-sea fish species, such as Anglerfish, tusk and witch flounder, are also landed. Also by-catches of roundnose grenadier *(Coryphaenoides rupestris)* in this fishery have occasionally been landed for reduction, depending on the quantities. Introduction of sorting grids in recent years has probably reduced the amounts of some of this by-catch;
- Bottom trawl fisheries by Denmark, Norway and UK mainly in the northern and north-eastern North Sea directed at mixed demersal species including ling, tusk, anglerfish and *Nephrops*;
- Minor fisheries in Skagerrak (IIIa) targeting witch flounder by Denmark and Sweden. Mainly trawl fisheries, but also Danish seine has been used;
- A Danish directed trawl fishery for roundnose grenadier in the deeper parts of Skagerrak was carried out by very few vessels from the 1980s up to 2006;
- A directed midwater trawl fishery for greater silver smelt *(Argentina silus),* conducted mainly by Norway, in IVa.

Faroese Waters (Division Vb)

Vessels from other nations than Faroese are licensed to fish in Faroese waters through bilateral and multilateral agreements. Only Norway and EU have permission to fish deep water species. In the agreement with Norway it is stated that the maximum by-catch of roundnose grenadier/black scabbardfish in the blue ling/ling fishery is 25%. The TAC for blue ling/ling is then reduced correspondingly.

North-Western Waters (Divisions VI and VII)

Deepwater Trawl fisheries are conducted in areas VI and VII, principally by French, Irish, Spanish and Scottish vessels.

- French vessels operate a mixed deepwater fishery mainly targeting roundnose grenadier, black scabbardfish and siki sharks on the continental slope and offshore banks of sub-area VI and VII;
- The Irish deepwater fishery is based on the flat grounds and targets orange roughy, black scabbard, roundnose grenadier and siki sharks;
- A number of Scottish vessels target monkfish (*Lophius spp)* on the continental slope of subarea VIa and on the Rockall Bank. This fishery has a by-catch of deep-water species including ling, blue ling and siki sharks and a small number of these vessels occasionally fish in deeper water targeting roundnose grenadier, black scabbardfish and siki sharks;
- Spanish trawlers targeting Hake in area VII and VI have a by-catch of deepwater species including ling, blue ling, greater forkbeard and bluemouth. A fleet of 29 Spanish stern bottom freezer trawlers fish in international waters of the Hatton Bank area (ICES XIIb & VIb1). The presence of the majority of the vessels in this area is discontinuous. Vessels conduct fishing trips of variable duration. Fishing operations are conducted in a depth range of 800-1600m, mainly at depths >1000m or deeper. Roundnose grenadier and Baird's smoothhead are the most important species in the catches. Black scabbardfish (1000 t in 2002, then decreasing) and blue ling (600-1000 t/year) are also caught in significant amounts. In 2005, landings of roughhead grenadier comparable to those of roundnose grenadier were reported. A gill-netters' fleet registered in UK until recently operated in areas VI and VII targeting hake, monkfish and deep-water sharks; this fishery was stopped or seriously reduced due to regulation of deep-water gillnetting. UK registered longliners target hake with a by-catch of ling and blue ling. There is a UK trap fishery for Deepwater red crab (*Chaceon affinis)* in sub area VI and VII.

South-Western Waters (ICES areas VIII and IX) and Madeira

ICES Subarea VIII

There are two main Spanish fishing fleets defining the fisheries:

- The **trawl fishery** targets species such as hake, megrim, anglerfish, and Nephrops but also has variable by-catch of deepwater species. These include *Molva spp., Phycis phycis, Phycis blennoides, Conger conger, Helicolenus dactylopterus, Polyprion americanus, Beryx spp* and *Pagellus bogaraveo*. Longline fishery mainly targets deepwater species on conger, greater forkbeard, deepwater sharks and ling. The French trawler fishery mainly target demersal and pelagic species on the shelf with a small by-catch of deep-water species such as bluemouth and greater forkbeard.
- To the north of sub-area VIII, a small **handline fishery** targeting mainly bass and pollack *(Pollachius pollachius)* has a by-catch of red (blackspot) seabream. In recent years, some landings of orange roughy caught to the north or subarea VIII have occured, from artisanal trawlers targeting this species. This activity was stopped due to low quota.

In ICES **Subarea IX** on the contrary there is a main directed Portuguese longline fishery for black scabbardfish *(Aphanopus carbo)* with a by-catch of deepwater sharks, and also a Spanish longline *(Voracera)* fishery for *Pagellus bogaraveo*. There has been a small expansion of UK (England and Wales) gillnet fisheries into subareas VIII and IX.

In **Madeira** exists a traditional longline fishery on black scabbardfish. There is also a bottom trawl fishery at the southern part of the Portuguese continental waters, targeting crustaceans some on deeper grounds such as *Nephrops norvegicus* and *Aristeus antennatus*. Typical by-catch species of this fishery are: bluemouth *(Helicolenus dactylopterus),* greater forkbeard *(Phycis blennoides),* conger eel *(Conger conger),* blackmouth dogfish *(Galeus melastomus),* kitefin shark *(Dalatias licha),* and gulper shark *(Centrophorus squamosus).*

Azores and North Azores

The Azores deep-water fishery is a multispecies and multigear fishery. The ecosystem is a seamount type with fishing operations occurring in all available areas, from the islands coasts to the seamounts within the Azorean EEZ. The fishery takes place at deeps until 1000 m, catching species from different assemblages, with a mode on the 200-600 m strata, the intermediate strata where the most commercially important species occur. The dynamic of the fishery seems to be dominated by the main target species *Pagellus bogaraveo*. However, others commercially important species are also caught and the target species change seasonally according abundance, species vulnerability and market. The fishery is clearly a typical small scale one, where the small vessels (<12m; 90% of the total fleet) predominate, using mainly traditional bottom longline and several types of hand lines.

In ICES sub-area X the main fisheries are by handline and longline near the Azores, and the main species landed are red (blackspot) seabream (*Pagellus bogaraveo*), wreckfish (*Polyprion americanus*), conger eel *(Conger conger)*, bluemouth *(Helicolenus dactylopterus)*, golden eye perch (*Beryx splendens*) and alfonsino (*Beryx decadactylus*). At present the catches of kitefin shark *(Dalatias licha)* are made by the longline and handline deepwater vessels and can be considered as accidental. There are no vessels at present catching this species using gillnets.

Outside the Azorean EEZ there are trawl fisheries for golden eye perch (Beryx spp), orange roughy (*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) , cardinal fish (*Epigonus telescopus*), black scabbard fish (*Aphanopus carbo*) , and wreckfish (*Polyprion americanus*).

In ICES Sub-area XII there are trawls fisheries on the mid-Atlantic Ridge for orange roughy, roundnose grenadier, and black scabbardfish. There is a multispecies trawl and longline fishery on Hatton Bank, and some of this occurs in this sub-area, some in Sub-area VI. There is considerable fishing on the slopes of the Hatton Bank, and effort may be increasing. Smoothheads (*Alepocephalus* species.) were previously usually discarded but now feature to a greater extent in the landings statistics.

Greenland

In ICES Sub-area XIV there are trawl and longline fisheries for Greenland halibut (*Rheinhardtius hippoglossoides*) and redfish that have by-catches of roundnose grenadier, roughhead grenadier (*Macrourus berglax*) and tusk.

Annex III, European port landings in weight and related values for the deep sea species listed in Annex I of Council Regulation (EC) No 2347/2002 (Source: Eurostat)

SPECIES Annex I	2006		2007		2008	
	quantities (t)	EUR	quantities (t)	EUR	quantities (t)	EUR
Black scabbardfish	5.103	12.107.862	7.513	21.064.603	8.232	20.325.497
Blue ling	1.688	1.932.148	4.988	8.297.773	6.037	6.551.325
Roundnose grenadier	2.423	16.776	4.988	2.177.609	3.945	2.587.851
Portuguese dogfish	702	440.075	750	2.126.992	976	893.284
Forkbeards	682	156.286	863	67.118	488	85.765
Leafscale gulper shark	565	892.014	580	1.072.803	451	663.884
Kitefin shark	25	6.411	11	9.181	287	10.145
Blackmouth dogfish	272	20.586	228	14.319	209	11.376
Knifetooth dogfish	56	ND	164	94.760	187	175.226
Alfonsinos	229	616.166	288	760.357	178	871.646
Orange rougphy	3,1	4.341	162	942.737	121	723.946
Gulper shark	130	170.545	111	286.892	113	148.250
Black dogfish	2,1	0	83	70.562	113	119.212
Birdbeak dogfish	91	64.849	56	42.298	64	80.060
Longnose velvet dogfish	5,8	2.496	22	25.618	27	32.309
Greenland shark	12	2.970	2,2	1.358	22	4.522
Velvet belly	6,5	1.967	197	216.952	7,7	4.108
Six-gilled shark	9,5	5.881	7,3	3.397	2,8	1.821
Mouse catshark	4,8	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Sailfin roughshark	ND	ND	1,1	ND	ND	ND

Annex IV, European port landings in weight and related values for the deep sea species listed in Annex II of Council Regulation (EC) No 2347/2002 (Source: Eurostat)

SPECIES	2006		2007		2008	
	quantities (t)	EUR	quantities (t)	EUR	quantities (t)	EUR
Conger eel	5.521	3.577.565	13.616	14.574.465	13.326	14.170.284
Silver scabbard fish (Cutlass fish)	729	45.118	3.145	8.369.760	3.253	7.499.577
Blue mouth redfish	2.002	1.215.517	3.128	1.876.854	2.176	1.736.639
Red (blackspot) seabream	1.380	11.034.894	1.641	12.672.273	1.538	11.406.817
Baird's Smoothhead	487	18.658	108	ND	869	377
Wreckfish	190	7.613.469	532	10.735.260	539	9.362.574
Roughhead grenadier (Rough rattail)	286	47.456	556	36.285	391	42.940
Rabbit fish (Rattail)	31	17.560	320	325.996	280	228.142
Deep water red crab	2,6	ND	266	ND	273	350
Common mora	92	296.849	144	354.304	102	207.682
Black (Deep water) cardinal fish	39	23.320	67	42.352	59	46.348
Norwegian skate	ND	ND	ND	ND	28	43.717
Large-eyed rabbit fish (Ratfish)	ND	ND	ND	ND	9,8	ND
Spiny (Deep-sea) scorpion fish	ND	ND	11,6	58.441	6	35.100
Blue Antimora (Blue hake)	ND	ND	6,9	ND	1,9	ND
Silver roughy (Pink)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

Species Annex I & II of 2347/2002	Zone	TAC 2003 (reference TAC)	TAC 2004	TAC 2005	TAC 2006	TAC 2007	TAC 2008	Catches 2003	Catches 2004	Catches 2005	Catches 2006	Catches 2007	Catches 2008	Utilisation 2003 (%)	Utilisation 2004 (%)	Utilisation 2005 (%)	Utilisation 2006 (%)	Utilisation 2007 (%)	Utilisation 2008 (%)
Alfonsinos	III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XII, XIV			328	328	328	332			302	323,7	322	305,8			92,2	98,7	98,1	92,1
Black scabbardfish	I, II, III, IV	30	30	30	30	15	18	0,6	0,6	3	1,1	1,6	0	2	2	10	3,7	10,7	0
Black scabbardfish	V, VI, VII, XII	3110	3353	3042	2905	3051	3316	2806	2909	2977	2425	2683	2951	90,3	86,8	97,9	83,5	87,9	89
Black scabbardfish	IX, X	4000	4000		4000		4400	2720	3073		2816		3656	68	76,8		70,4	87,3	83,1
Black scabbardfish	VIII, IX, X			4000	4000	4000				3389	2816	3492				84,7	70,4	87,3	
Black scabbardfish	CECAF 34,1,2			4285	4285	4285	4714			3194	2650	3087	3109			74,6	61,9	72	66
Blue ling	II, IV, V	138	138	119	119	96	87	121	93,2	26,5	56	47,4	49,4	88	67,5	22,3	47,1	49,4	56,8
Blue ling	III	25	25	25	25	21	17	14,1	2,6	1,3	5,2	0,4	0,1	56,4	10,4	5,2	20,8	1,9	0,6
Blue ling	VI, VII	3678	3687	3137	3082	2511	2211	3296	3490	3066	2816	2348	1816	89,6	94,7	97,7	91,4	93,5	82,1
Deep Sea Sharks	V, VI, VII, VIII, IX			6763	6763	2517	1848			3294	2845	1730	1329			48,7	42,1	68,7	71,9
Deep Sea Sharks	X			120	120	20	22			15,5	13,7	10,5	12,3			12,9	11,4	52,5	55,9
Deep Sea Sharks	XII			243	243	100	57			148	4,8	4,5	0			60,9	2	4,5	0
Forkbeards	I, II, III, IV			36	36	36	40			4,9	5	3,3	1,8			13,6	13,9	9,2	4,5
Forkbeards	V, VI, VII			2028	2028	2044	2167			1545	1509	1601	1598			76,2	74,4	78,3	73,7
Forkbeards	VIII, IX			267	263	267	275			269	247,8	254	264,4			100,6	94,2	95,1	96,1
Forkbeards	X, XII			63	63	63	69			36,2	15	16,9	18,3			57,5	23,8	26,8	26,5
Greater argentine	III, IV	1566	1566					285	335					18,2	21,4				
Greater argentine	V, VI, VII	6247	6247					2229	5456					35,7	87,3				

Orange roughy	VI	88	88	88	88	52	40	74,7	55,5	66,9	34,2	11	5,1	84,9	63,1	76	38,9	21,2	12,8
Orange roughy	VII	1349	1349	1148	1148	218	140	516	474	260	490,8	337	84,7	38,3	35,1	22,6	42,8	154,4	60,5
Orange roughy	I, II, III, IV, V, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIV			102	102	44	34			60,4	60,4	24,4	14,5			59,2	59,2	55,5	42,6
Red seabream	VI, VII, VIII	350	350	298	298	299	303	182	188	223	209,5	329	277,8	52	53,7	74,9	70,3	109,9	91,7
Red seabream	IX	1271	1271	1080	1080	1080	1188	177	228	430	307,1	272	230,5	13,9	17,9	39,8	28,4	25,2	19,4
Red seabream	X	1136	1136	1136	1136	1136	1138	1068	1091	1118	859,5	1018	1045	94	96	98,5	75,7	89,6	91,8
Roundnose grenadier	I, II, IV, Va	20	20	20	20	20	21	4	1,1	1,5	2,4	4,6	0,5	20	5,5	7,5	12	23	2,4
Roundnose grenadier	III	1870	1870	1590	2761			1365	816	881	2506			73	43,6	55,4	90,8		
Roundnose grenadier	IIIA/BCD					1241	1006					0,1	0,2					0	0
Roundnose grenadier	Vb, VI, VII	5106	5336	5253	5253	4624	5034	3235	3628	3388	2468	2023	1826	63,4	68	64,5	47	43,8	36,3
Roundnose grenadier	VIII, IX, X, XII, XIV			7190	7190	6115	6160			5683	5286	5784	3510			79	73,5	94,6	57

Annex V, Quotas for deep-sea species in tonnes and their utilisation rates 2003-2008
Source: FIDES

Annex VI, Number of vessels and their capacity (holders of a deep sea fishing permit in 2008)

Fleet by Member State holding a deep sea fishing permit in 2008		
Country	Number of vessels	Sum of fleet capacity (GT)
ESP	200	5790295
FRA	42	1753001
IRL	17	521700
LTU	2	55400
NLD	8	4295800
PRT	50	402012
DEU	34	2423
UK	unavailable	unavailable

Source: Member States notifications to the Commission; permits according to art. 3 of Council Regulation (EC) No 2347/2002