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It is generally reported that the nature and extent of IUU fishing in the Mediterranean Sea is not clearly known at present, and yet.........
IUU FISHING IN THE MEDITERRANEAN
The EC Regulation 1224/2009 establishing a Community fisheries control system, requires that by January 2014:

“Member States shall set up and keep up to date an electronic database where they upload all inspection and surveillance reports drawn up by their officials “.
91% of Mediterranean assessed stock are overfished.

A fishing capacity, a management problem compounded by

IUU fishing hijacking conservation measures
THE COSTS OF IUU

Costs of IUU activity for Mediterranean tuna/billfishes, by country fishing (values in million euros)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Share (%)</th>
<th>Stock value lost</th>
<th>Catch value lost</th>
<th>Jobs lost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>1,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-EU</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>2,985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE COSTS OF IUU

A total cost to EU Member States of lost catches from 2008 to 2020 of **10.7 billion** – this is an average cost in lost catches of 825 million per year which equates to about 15% of total fishery value and more than 30% of the value of the fisheries considered.

**Over 27,800 lost job opportunities** in fishing and processing industries: around 13% of total fisheries employment.

Significant stock depletion across most of the fisheries assessed: the models suggest that **IUU fishing is preventing stock recovery and keeping fisheries locked in low-value states**. It is difficult to put a number on this, but valuing lost stocks at the same value per ton as landings suggests a **total cost of almost 9 billion**.

In the mid-1980s driftnets became very popular and were actively promoted by the Italian government.

The traditional harpoon swordfish fisheries was quickly replaced by the large-scale pelagic driftnet, the “spadara”
GFCM Resolution 97/1

+ No vessel flying the flag of a Contracting Party of GFCM may keep on board, or use for fishing, one or more driftnets whose individual or total length is more than 2.5 kilometres;

+ Throughout the fishing referred to in paragraph 1, the net must, if it is longer than one kilometre, remain attached to the vessel. However, within the 12 mile coastal band, a vessel may detach itself from the net, provided it keeps it under constant observation.
Between 1998 and 2002, following the EU ban on large scale driftnets, Italian driftnet fishers were compensated with €97 million and given an additional permit for the small coastal driftnet “ferrettara”.

Presently, Italy has 820 small scale driftnets authorizations, mostly concentrated in its Southern regions (Sicily, Calabria, Campania). This is the highest number in the EU.
FROM TRADITIONAL TO ILLEGAL FISHING

ILLEGAL, UNREPORTED AND UNREGULATED FISHING IN THE EUROPEAN UNION: THE CASE OF ITALIAN ILLEGAL DRIFTNETS

November 2010
2005-2014

679 reported infringements involving
320 fishing vessels of which
100 had received
10.5 million € from the Driftnets
Reconversion Plan.
The Case of Italian Driftnets

Porto di Ponza

- Sanzionati: 94%
- Non sanzionati: 6%

Map of Italy with cities marked.
THE PORT OF BAGNARA (ITALY)

Home port to 37 of the “black listed” vessels.

In 2010 returned to the authorities 300 km of large scale driftnets.

In 2013 local fishermen tried to export large scale driftnets to Albania.
Reti da posta vietate, per la marineria è giunto il giorno della consegna
In July 2011, a widespread Italian illegal trafficking ring was uncovered, along with evidence that bluefin tuna catch documents were regularly being falsified or withheld, allowing BFT to enter the market illegally and exported to France and Spain.

Violations worth 3.6 million € were identified, and 70 wholesale and retail operators were investigated.
CONCLUSIONS

Illegal driftnets fishing has become a highly organized activity with ramifications in other Mediterranean Countries (i.e. Algeria, Tunisia, Albania).

Monitoring and control measures should no longer be limited to target the single infringement but require wider coordination and integration efforts by different control authorities at regional and subregional level.

Black listing of vessels with a track record of illegal fishing should become a priority for the GFCM, particularly in view of the failure of the EU to enforce the IUU regulation on illegal driftnetters.

The GFCM resolution 97/1 should be revised and tighten in order to allow for a full ban with few strict derogations for specific small scale artisanal fisheries.
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