

# 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

India

\* Surname

Redrup

\* Email (this won't be published)

INDIA.REDRUP@ENERGY-UK.ORG.UK

\* Organisation name

*255 character(s) maximum*

Energy UK

\* 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.

13457582538-68

\* 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            |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra        | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador        | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar    | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola         | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea  | <input type="radio"/> Malawi        | <input type="radio"/> Senegal                          |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla       | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea            | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia      | <input type="radio"/> Serbia                           |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica     | <input type="radio"/> Estonia            | <input type="radio"/> Maldives      | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles                       |

- 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
- Bulgaria
  
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cambodia
  
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- 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
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- 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
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- North Korea
- Northern Mariana Islands
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- 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
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands

- |  |                                   |   |  |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Central African Republic         | <input type="radio"/> Iraq        | <input type="radio"/> Palestine   | <input type="radio"/> Tuvalu                               |
| <input type="radio"/> Chad                             | <input type="radio"/> Ireland     | <input type="radio"/> Panama  | <input type="radio"/> Uganda                               |
| <input type="radio"/> Chile                            | <input type="radio"/> Isle of Man | <input type="radio"/> Papua New Guinea                                  | <input type="radio"/> Ukraine                              |
| <input type="radio"/> China                            | <input type="radio"/> Israel      | <input type="radio"/> Paraguay  | <input type="radio"/> United Arab Emirates                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Christmas Island                 | <input type="radio"/> Italy       | <input type="radio"/> Peru  | <input checked="" type="radio"/> United Kingdom            |
| <input type="radio"/> Clipperton                       | <input type="radio"/> Jamaica     | <input type="radio"/> Philippines                                       | <input type="radio"/> United States                        |
| <input type="radio"/> Cocos (Keeling) Islands          | <input type="radio"/> Japan       | <input type="radio"/> Pitcairn Islands                                  | <input type="radio"/> United States Minor Outlying Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Colombia                         | <input type="radio"/> Jersey      | <input type="radio"/> Poland  | <input type="radio"/> Uruguay                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Comoros                          | <input type="radio"/> Jordan      | <input type="radio"/> Portugal  | <input type="radio"/> US Virgin Islands                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Congo                            | <input type="radio"/> Kazakhstan  | <input type="radio"/> Puerto Rico                                       | <input type="radio"/> Uzbekistan                           |
| <input type="radio"/> Cook Islands                     | <input type="radio"/> Kenya       | <input type="radio"/> Qatar   | <input type="radio"/> Vanuatu                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Costa Rica                       | <input type="radio"/> Kiribati    | <input type="radio"/> Réunion   | <input type="radio"/> Vatican City                         |
| <input type="radio"/> Côte d'Ivoire                    | <input type="radio"/> Kosovo      | <input type="radio"/> Romania   | <input type="radio"/> Venezuela                            |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia                          | <input type="radio"/> Kuwait      | <input type="radio"/> Russia  | <input type="radio"/> Vietnam                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Cuba                             | <input type="radio"/> Kyrgyzstan  | <input type="radio"/> Rwanda  | <input type="radio"/> Wallis and Futuna                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Curaçao                          | <input type="radio"/> Laos        | <input type="radio"/> Saint Barthélemy                                  | <input type="radio"/> Western Sahara                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus                           | <input type="radio"/> Latvia      | <input type="radio"/> Saint Helena<br>Ascension and<br>Tristan da Cunha | <input type="radio"/> Yemen                                |
| <input type="radio"/> Czech Republic                   | <input type="radio"/> Lebanon     | <input type="radio"/> Saint Kitts and Nevis                             | <input type="radio"/> Zambia                               |
| <input type="radio"/> Democratic Republic of the Congo | <input type="radio"/> Lesotho     | <input type="radio"/> Saint Lucia                                       | <input type="radio"/> Zimbabwe                             |
| <input type="radio"/> Denmark                          | <input type="radio"/> Liberia     | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin                                      |  |

**\* 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:

Energy - Electricity

\* 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:

I work for a trade body whose members have an interest in the implementation of the Eel Regulation

\* 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<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"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* It remains appropriate to seek to reduce catching of eels to at least 50% of 2006 levels.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<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 checked="" 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).

Given the long-term nature of any potential recovery of eel populations measured by the 40% escapement target, more consideration is needed on the use of interim targets, milestones or indicators applying at appropriately defined time-scales. These are needed so resources and time are not wasted on measures that are ineffective. They could include assessing changes achieved in the various factors potentially influencing recruitment and escapement (such as mortality) as well as in the escapement achieved. Care needs to be taken to ensure that any interim activities used are themselves worthwhile (in terms of contribution to improvement in escapement for the resources deployed).

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>

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

The objectives are too complex to evaluate (it is too hard to evaluate parameters that determine the objectives)

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

The general awareness for the European eel and related issues has increased.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Limiting professional eel fisheries in freshwater	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Limiting recreational eel fishing in freshwater	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Facilitating fish migration through rivers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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:

Partial fishing bans will be necessary to ensure the sustainability of the eel stock.

\*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)?

Since Eel Regulations were established in 2007, research in this area has progressed. However, there still remain key questions regarding the lifecycle of eel which lead to holes in understanding all the pressures on the population. There is a need to continue to investigate the decline in the eel stock, for instance via the provision of effective funding for research as well as for monitoring efforts. This should be coordinated by the EU.

There should be confidence that a given measure would be effective in closing the gap to the escapement target within an Eel Management Plan. More dialogue between MS with regards to the implementation of Eel Regulations and the effectiveness of measures should be promoted through the regulatory framework to facilitate identification of most effective measures. The cost-efficiency and benefits of implementation measures under the Eel Regulation should be evaluated and also taken into account in the estimated overall costs in the Programme of Measures (PoM) under the Water Framework Directive. This shall also include the ongoing generation losses and maintenance costs of measures set including the value of lost generation during unavoidable plant closure for installation of measures.

## 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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:

The Eel regulation is tightly linked with the Water Framework Directive, as in particular, Eel Management Plans should cover river basins defined in accordance with Directive 2000/60/EC. Due to this link, the purpose of the eel regulation should be the same as for the WFD, i.e. to strike a balance between environmental, climate and socio-economic goals. This means that it should not unduly hamper the operation of existing thermal power plants, or create obstacles to upgrading or developing of new power plant.

## 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 checked="" 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)?

Risk of a decline in the eel stock

## 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>
* It is possible to simplify the Eel Regulation and still achieve the same results.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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

### Sustainability

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

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

## 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

**e65807dc-62a9-46f5-9e2c-1e42770b7997/EnvC28-19\_Response\_to\_EU\_Eel\_Regulation\_Consultation\_-\_final.pdf**

## Contact

MARE-D3@ec.europa.eu

---