

# Public consultation on the Eel Regulation

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2007 of 18 September 2007 establishing measures for the recovery of the stock of European eel

## Introduction

---

### Background to the public consultation

The European eel stock (*Anguilla Anguilla*) is in critical condition. Recruitment is at an all-time low and exploitation of the stock is currently unsustainable. The decline in eel stock has numerous causes including human activities such as fisheries (commercial and recreational), hydropower turbines and pumps, pollution, habitat modification and the creation of obstacles to eel migration. A further deterioration of the status of the stock should be avoided. In 2007 a framework to ensure the protection and sustainable use of the European eel stock was established at EU level ([Regulation \(EC\) No 1100/2007](#) – the so called ‘Eel Regulation’).

### Purpose of the public consultation

This public consultation is part of the evaluation of the Eel Regulation. The evaluation aims to assess the measures for the recovery of the stock of the European eel under the Eel Regulation, and in particular the contribution of the Eel Management Plans established and implemented under this Regulation. These plans include measures to ensure the long-term escapement of at least 40% of adult eels and include:

- limiting professional and recreational fisheries,
- facilitating fish migration through rivers, and
- restocking inland waters with young fish.

The **answers you provide as part of the consultation will form an important part of the Commission’s evidence basis** for the evaluation. The results of this consultation and the evaluation study may be used to inform decisions on whether the Eel Regulation and/or the implementation measures need to be reviewed.

### Scope of the consultation

This Public Consultation aims to gather input from all the stakeholders to evaluate the measures for the recovery of the European eel stock under the Eel Regulation of 2007. It forms part of a wider consultation strategy for the evaluation that also includes targeted stakeholder consultations and several case studies that will gather more detailed evidence at a national level.

This questionnaire takes about 15 minutes to complete. You will also be able to provide any other relevant information or comments at the end.

## About you

---

\* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- Gaelic
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

\* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

\* First name

\* Surname

\* Email (this won't be published)

\* Organisation name

*255 character(s) maximum*

\* Scope

- International
- Local
- National
- Regional

\* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

*255 character(s) maximum*

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

\* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- |                                      |  |                                     |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan    | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti           | <input type="radio"/> Libya         | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon        |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands  | <input type="radio"/> Dominica           | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania        | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania     | <input type="radio"/> Samoa                            |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria        | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador            | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg    | <input type="radio"/> San Marino                       |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt              | <input type="radio"/> Macau         | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe            |

- Andorra
- Angola
- Anguilla
- Antarctica
- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- El Salvador
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Estonia
- Ethiopia
- Falkland Islands
- Faroe Islands
- Fiji
- Finland
- Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar /Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Saudi Arabia
- Senegal
- Serbia
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Sint Maarten
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Swaziland
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste

- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- North Korea
- Northern Mariana Islands
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Saint Martin
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

**\* Publication privacy settings**

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

**Anonymous**

Only your type, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

**Public**

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

\* I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

**\* What is the main field of activity of your company/organisation?**

- fishery
- aquaculture
- environment
- other

If other:

**\* How would you best describe the nature of your understanding and involvement in matters related to the Eel Regulation?**

- I work for a public administration responsible for developing, implementing and/or monitoring the Eel Regulation
- I am a fisher or farmer involved the production and/or sale of eels
- I represent an international organisation with an interest in the implementation of the Eel Regulation
- I work for an environmental body with an interest in the implementation of the Eel Regulation
- I work for a research body with an interest in the Eel Regulation
- I have a general interest in matters concerning fisheries in the European Union
- Other

If other:

**\* How familiar are you with the Eel Regulation provisions?**

- I have at least a basic knowledge of the Eel Regulation and its implementation
- I am not familiar with the Eel Regulation

# Questions on Eel Regulation

Relevance

1. The Eel Regulation has a number of objectives. To what extent do you consider that each of these remains relevant today?

	Strongly disagree	Rather disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Rather agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
* There remains a need for a European recovery plan for the European eel.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* There remains a need for Member States to implement Eel Management Plans.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* There remains a need to ensure that anthropogenic mortalities are reduced.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* There remains a need to ensure the escapement to the sea of at least 40% of the adult eel biomass.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* It remains appropriate to regulate the supply of glass eels for restocking operations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* There remains a need to regulate fishing effort and catches to ensure the recovery of the European eel.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* There remains a need to ensure the origin and						

traceability of all live eels imported to and exported from MS.	<input type="radio"/>					
* There remains a need to ensure that control and enforcement activities take place in EU waters and at all stages of the eel supply chain.	<input type="radio"/>					
* It remains appropriate to seek to reduce catching of eels to at least 50% of 2006 levels.	<input type="radio"/>					

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Rather disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Rather agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
*The target of 40% eel escapement is achievable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. Please provide a reason for your answer as to why you think the 40% escapement goal is achievable or not (optional).

\* 4. Do you think that alternative targets are needed to ensure that the Eel Regulation delivers on its objective of securing the recovery of the European eel?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

5. Which indicators or targets do you think would be more suitable? (optional).

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Rather disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Rather agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
*The Eel Regulation requires amendment or simplification.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. Please provide a reason for your answer, and, if appropriate, identify which aspects of the Eel Regulation you think need to be amended or simplified (optional).

**Effectiveness**

8. To what extent have the current measures for the recovery of European eel stock under the Eel Regulation achieved the following objectives?

	Strongly disagree	Rather disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Rather agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
* Implementing Eel Management Plans	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Achieving the targets set out in Eel Management Plans	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Ensuring a reduction in anthropogenic eel mortalities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Increasing the escapement to the sea of adult eels towards the 40% target	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Ensuring that there is enough supply of glass eels for restocking operations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Ensuring reduction of fishing effort and catches towards the 50% targets	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Ensuring the origin and traceability of all live eels imported to and exported from MS	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Ensuring control and enforcement activities at all stages of the eel supply chain	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

\*9. Reflecting your answers above, what do you consider to be the barriers to achieving the objectives of the Eel Regulation?

\*10. What do you consider to have been the successes of the Eel Regulation and its implementation to date?

11. Do you support the following measures to recover the population of eel in Europe?

	Strongly disagree	Rather disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Rather agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
* Limiting professional eel fisheries in the sea	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Limiting professional eel fisheries in freshwater	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Limiting recreational eel fishing in the sea	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Limiting recreational eel fishing in freshwater	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Facilitating fish migration through rivers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Restocking waters with young fish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

\*12. Do you support the implementation of total or partial bans on eel fishing to aid recovery of the European eel stock?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

12a. Please provide a reason for your answer to explain why you support or do not support bans on eel fishing in the EU:

\*13. What other actions should the European Union or Member States undertake to recover the eel population in Europe? Who should undertake these actions (EU or MSs)?

**Coherence**

14. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Rather disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Rather agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
*The Eel Regulation is coherent with other EU instruments to regulate fisheries (such as the Common Fisheries Policy, Fisheries Control Regulation, the Water Framework Directive and the Marine Strategy Framework Directive)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*The Eel Regulation is coherent with international instruments to regulate fisheries (such as the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora - CITES, and the Convention on the Migratory Species - CMS)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

\* 14a. Please provide a reason for your answer to explain what factors lead to coherence or to identify those aspects that are inconsistent or a duplication of efforts under other measures:

**EU added value**

15. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Rather disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Rather agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
*The Eel Regulation provided additional value compared to what could be achieved by Member States at national or regional level.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15a. Please provide any comments below to explain your answer (optional):

\_\_\_\_\_

\* 16. What would be the most likely consequences of stopping the application of the measures contained within the Eel Regulation (both positive and negative)?

\_\_\_\_\_

**Efficiency**

17. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Rather disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Rather agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
* Administering and implementing the Eel Regulation has been carried out at the lowest possible cost.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* The costs of administering and implementing the Eel Regulation are proportionate to the environmental and socio-economic benefits achieved.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* It is possible to simplify the Eel Regulation and still achieve the same results.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* The same or better results in terms of eel stock recovery could have been achieved at lower cost.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

\* 18. Do you think that other policy instruments or mechanisms have provided better cost-effectiveness than has been achieved under the current Eel Regulation and associated Eel Management Plans?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

19. If yes, what other policy instruments or mechanisms do you think would have been more cost effective?

**Sustainability**

\* 20. Are the effects likely to last after the intervention ends?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

**Questions on eel conservation**

\* 21. Before starting this consultation, had you ever heard about the problem of decreasing population of the European eel?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

\* 22. Do you support action by the European Union to regulate eel fishing to ensure the recovery of the species?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

23. Do you support the following measures to recover the population of eel in Europe?

	Strongly disagree	Rather disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Rather agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
* Limiting professional eel fisheries in the sea	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Limiting professional eel fisheries in freshwater	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Limiting recreational eel fishing in the sea	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* Limiting recreational eel fishing in freshwater	<input type="radio"/>					
* Facilitating fish migration through rivers	<input type="radio"/>					
* Restocking waters with young fish	<input type="radio"/>					

\* 24. What other actions should the European Union or Member States undertake to recover the eel population in Europe? Who should undertake these actions (EU or MSs)?

### Document upload and final comments

Should you wish to provide additional information (e.g. a position paper, report) or raise specific points not covered by the questionnaire, you can upload your document here. In preparing your response if you have specific recommendations we would ask that you make it clear who you believe should action these. Please note that the uploaded document will be published alongside your response to the questionnaire which is the essential input to this open public consultation. The document is an optional complement and serves as additional background reading to better understand your position. If you wish to add further information - within the scope of this questionnaire - please feel free to do so here.

*2000 character(s) maximum*

### Please upload your file

The maximum file size is 1 MB

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed