

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

The recommendations below are listed in order of descending importance. Some more technical comments have been transmitted directly to the author DG and are expected to be incorporated in the final version of the impact assessment report.

General recommendation: The impact assessment has been significantly improved on the basis of the Board's recommendations in its first opinion. It should nevertheless be clearer on the application of the subsidiarity principle and the definition of the level of implementation for issues falling under exclusive EU competence. Economic and social impacts, including on administrative burden, should as far as possible be quantified and the reasons for discarding the option of an overall TAC should be better explained.

(1) Clarify the application of the subsidiarity principle and the definition of the level of implementation under exclusive competence for the different sub-options. While additional information on the decision and implementation level (EU/MS) has been provided, the report should try to make clearer what measures fall under the exclusive competence of the EU and will thus become a binding part of the management plan. Those measures which leave the decision on the 'if and what is done' to the Member States, and for which the management plan will only provide a non-binding recommendation, should be clearly indicated.

(2) Analyse economic and social impacts more fully, including on administrative burden, and quantify them where possible. Further explain why an overall TAC is discarded. The report should attempt to further quantify expected key economic and social impacts (e.g. on the rearing industry, p. 27 and administrative burden) or explain why quantification is not possible or proportionate. If the impacts on administrative burden are significant the Standard Cost Model (SMC) should be used. In section 5.2 the report should explain better why an overall TAC is discarded while it is expected to be more effective than the *marine TAC* approach. The report should also further justify why in this regard the scientific advice of the STECF is not followed. The conclusion on the TAC approach in table 7 on page 39 should be aligned with the analysis presented.

(D) Procedure and presentation

The high-level policy change options presented in summary table 3 should be explicitly assessed against the baseline scenario/no EU management plan (thus no +/- qualifications for option 1). Also for the comparison table 7 the report should clarify that the assessment of impacts for the identified measures is made relative to the baseline scenario. The presentation of the report could be improved with a further editorial check. The report should be clearer about the relevance and probability of certain issues, by avoiding vague formulations such as 'some' and 'might'. The length of the main text should be brought closer to the recommended 30 pages maximum.

2) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2008/MARE/035 (catalogue)
Author DG	DG MARE
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	WP
Date of adoption of Opinion	23 NOV. 2009 The present opinion concerns a re-submitted draft IA report. The first opinion was issued on 17 July 2009.