

INCEPTION IMPACT ASSESSMENT			
TITLE OF THE INITIATIVE	Proposals for Regulations of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing multi-annual plans for the management of demersal fisheries in western EU waters ¹		
LEAD DG – RESPONSIBLE UNIT – AP NUMBER	DG MARE-C2 (FISHERIES CONSERVATION AND CONTROL ATLANTIC AND OUTERMOST REGIONS)	DATE OF ROADMAP	10/06/2015
LIKELY TYPE OF INITIATIVE	Proposals for Regulations of the European Parliament and of the Council.		
INDICATIVE PLANNING	http://ec.europa.eu/atwork/key-documents/index_en.htm		
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION			
<p>This Inception Impact Assessment is provided for information purposes only and can be subject to change. It does not prejudice the final decision of the Commission on whether this initiative will be pursued or on its final content and structure.</p>			

A. Context, Subsidiarity Check and Objectives
<p>Context</p> <p>(1) The present initiative addresses certain problems related to the implementation of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) in respect of demersal fisheries in western EU waters².</p> <p>(2) The CFP falls under the exclusive EU competence. It seeks the integration of all fishing-related activities, including aquaculture, in the single EU market, ensuring that fishing and aquaculture activities are environmentally sustainable in the long-term and are managed in a way that is consistent with the objectives of achieving economic, social and employment benefits and of contributing to the availability of food supplies. The objective of the CFP also aims to ensure that exploitation of living marine biological resources restores and maintains populations of harvested species above levels which can produce the maximum sustainable yield (MSY)³.</p> <p>The reformed CFP foresees the adoption of conservation measures in the context of multi-annual fisheries management plans (hereinafter MAPs), which ensure transparency, predictability and stability within the process. While MAPs were an option already in the previous CFP, after the 2013 reform they became a priority⁴. The form and content of future MAPs was subject to work by an inter-institutional task force involving the Commission, the European Parliament and the Council in order to provide guidelines on the structure and content of these multi-annual plans and to solve delicate inter-institutional issues on the sharing of competences among the EU Institutions⁵.</p> <p>The CFP is a highly sensitive policy from the point of view of public opinion. In the context of the CLAMER research project⁶, researchers conducted a survey into public perceptions of the marine environment to help inform policy. Overfishing ranked second among the public concerns on the marine environment, only shadowed by marine pollution.</p> <p>(2) At present there are six multi-annual plans in force for fisheries in western EU waters, all of them adopted under the old CFP, prior to the 2013 CFP reform:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the cod recovery plan (Regulation (EU) No 1342/2008), covering cod fisheries in the Kattegat, the North Sea (including Skagerrak and the Eastern Channel), the West of Scotland and the Irish Sea The multi-annual plan for sole in the Western Channel (Regulation (EC) 509/2007) The multi-annual plan for sole in the Bay of Biscay (Regulation (EC) No 388/2006) The recovery plan for the northern stock of hake (Regulation (EC) No 811/2004) The recovery plan for hake and Nephrops in the Iberian peninsula (Regulation (EC) No 2166/2005) The Western Waters regime, covering fishing effort of all demersal fisheries in the area (Regulation (EC) No 1954/2003) <p>None of these plans is well adapted to the objectives and requirements of the new CFP, either for not</p>

addressing the specific objective of MSY or for not being compatible with the guidelines of the inter-institutional task force referred to under point 1) above (see the summary reviews shown under bullet point 3 below).

Recently, the Commission proposed a Regulation establishing a multi-annual plan for fisheries in the Baltic Sea⁷ that is fully compatible with the reformed CFP. The present new initiative intends to set up similar plans covering demersal fisheries⁸ in Western EU waters, and the Commission is undertaking preparatory work for similar initiatives covering demersal fisheries in the North Sea, pelagic fisheries in the Atlantic and certain other pelagic fisheries in the Mediterranean.

(3) The old, pre-reform MAPs have been evaluated to be either obsolete or ineffective. Several scientific assessments have been done on the existing plans, mostly by the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)⁹ and the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)¹⁰. What follows summarises the current perceptions on the existing plans:

- a. On the cod plan, STECF made an evaluation in 2011¹¹ and concluded "*Overall STECF concludes that the plan is not delivering reduced F^{12} and additionally in many areas does not have stakeholder support.*" The review identified in detail failings of the plan and provided a number of recommendations, including the use of improved metrics to monitor its performance.
- b. On the plan for western Channel sole, STECF carried out an assessment¹³ and concluded among other things that, since the plan is not designed to achieve MSY or any other management reference point, it is not possible to analyse the consequences of different exploitation rates in terms of risk.
- c. The Bay of Biscay sole plan has the objective to rebuild the stock but no target has been set under the plan for reaching MSY.
- d. In the Northern hake plan, the objective is considered to be achieved when the size of the spawning stock is kept above safe biological limits for two consecutive years. It is therefore not specifically designed to achieve MSY. Besides, ICES reports that "*the current recovery plan (EC Reg. No. 811/2004) uses target values based on precautionary reference points that are no longer appropriate*"¹⁴.
- e. Similar comments apply to the Southern hake and Nephrops plan: not designed to achieve MSY and, according to ICES, "*precautionary reference points that are no longer appropriate*"¹⁵. STECF made an assessment of the plan in 2010¹⁶ and concluded that "*the expected F reduction according to the plan from 2006 has not been achieved*" and that "*the objectives of the common fisheries policy have not been reached and probably will not be reached by the intended date of 2015*",

In Commission Communication "Review of fishing effort management in western waters" ([COM\(2010\) 661 final](#)) it is stated that "*due to its static nature, the 2003 effort regime cannot be used for stock management or management of multi-species fisheries; it was not conceived for that purpose*".

Issue

The key objective of the CFP, which is to reach maximum sustainable yield as a benchmark for sustainable EU fishing, has not yet been reached and cannot be reached with the management tools currently in place.

The overall problem is that, despite recent improvements, most demersal fish stocks in the area are not yet at levels above those capable to produce MSY and a few ones are even clearly depleted. From about 50 demersal stocks for which fishing opportunities are allocated each year, scientists have carried out assessment on 28. Of these, 16 are overfished with regard to MSY and only 12 are found to be exploited at MSY-related rates. When regarding the most emblematic species, the 3 cod stocks, 3 out of 8 sole stocks, 2 out of 4 plaice stocks, 2 out of 4 haddock stocks, the two hake stocks and a number of Nephrops management units in the area are exploited beyond MSY rates¹⁷.

The analysis presented above (section "context", point 3), demonstrates that the existing framework does not guide fishery managers towards the main objective of the CFP to bring and maintain fish stocks at levels above those capable to produce MSY.

The advantages of keeping stocks above MSY levels are at the basis of the 2013 CFP reform. By not being at such levels, the fishing industry and related industries do not benefit from the environmental, economic and social advantages that otherwise would accrue to them. This means that, in addition to the CFP objectives not being met, the fishing sector as a whole does not contribute adequately to the overall EU objectives of economic wealth and food supply.

Fishing at excessive rates means not only that stocks cannot be rebuilt to MSY levels but also that the environmental damage associated to fishing (habitat disruption, by-catch of non-commercial species) is in

excess of what would occur in sustainable MSY-related conditions.

Managing fisheries requires, *inter alia*, fixing fishing opportunities, i.e. how much fish can be harvested in a given year. There is hence a need to provide stability and predictability to this process so the fishing industry can timely adapt to changes and plan their annual activities.

The second objective of the CFP reform, to eliminate wasteful discards, cannot either be reached with the existing management tools. The elimination of discards and the consequent obligation to land all catches, together with certain technical specifications, must be implemented in the form of discard plans which necessarily need to be formalised in the context of a multi-annual plan, in accordance with Article 15(5) of the CFP Basic Regulation. MAPs constitute nowadays the only possible instrument to consolidate the discard plans.

The regionalisation process (Article 18 of the Basic Regulation) is one of the novelties of the reformed CFP. In essence, regionalisation means involving Member States around sea basins in the conception and design of management rules to the interested parties, with a view to increasing ownership, enforcement and, ultimately efficiency. It specifies that Member States sharing a fishing area can make joint recommendations on management measures, and the Commission can adopt these as delegated acts when empowered to do so in the context of a multi-annual plan.

As a summary, the current problems are:

- Many demersal stocks are at levels below those capable to produce MSY, and the current multi-annual instruments are inadequate to reverse the situation;
- In these circumstances, the fishing industry cannot enjoy the benefits of fishing at MSY, environmental damage associated to fishing in excess of what would occur in MSY conditions and the lack of predictability in fishing opportunities prevents the industry to timely adapt to changes;
- There is need of clear and stable rules to implement the landing obligation, and these can only be adopted in the framework of MAPs;
- The regionalisation of the CFP requires MAPs to be implemented.

The Basic Regulation foresees the adoption of MAPs as the instrument to address these problems in that:

- They provide guidance on the path towards stock recovery and maintenance above MSY levels;
- In doing so, they provide better guarantee that MSY will be reached, with associated environmental, economic and social benefits, and become a transparent framework allowing predictability and stability in the fixing of fishing opportunities.

They offer the instrument for implementing the landing obligation and the regionalisation process.

According to the Annual Economic Report of 2014¹⁸ more than 31.000 fishers would be potentially affected by this initiative, broken down by Member State as follows¹⁹:

- Belgium (22 vessels, 19 231 kW, 6 082 GT, 122 fishers)
- Germany (4 vessels, 1 267 kW, 531 GT, 27 fishers)
- Spain (5 202 vessels, 245 483 kW, 92 975 GT, 12 297 fishers)
- France (2 240 vessels, 345 027 kW, 63 926 GT, 4 264 fishers)
- Ireland (740 vessels, 84 451 kW, 26 362 GT, 1 213 fishers)
- Portugal (3 812 vessels, 189 108 kW, 31 060 GT, 8 036 fishers)
- UK (2 487 vessels, 280 169 kW, 56 209 GT, 5 085 fishers)

The fleets operating in Western Waters (WW fleet) generated €1.8 billion in revenue (representing one fourth of the revenue of the total EU fleet) in 2012. Roughly half of the total revenue goes into salaries and profits for the fishing communities. According to the Annual Economic Report, the economic performance of the demersal fleets in Western EU Waters is generally low. It seems to have recently improved but less than in other EU maritime regions.

Poor performance in exploiting fish stocks affects primarily fishing fleets, who suffer the immediate consequences of low fishing yields, increased fishing costs and severe catch cuts following the required limits in fishing opportunities led by the need to rebuild stocks towards the adequate MSY-related levels. All this reduces the fleet's economic performance. Poor yields and poor economic performance would affect also all the downstream related industries: processors, retailers, etc. and, ultimately, consumers, who may find low supply at high prices. It must be stressed that the large majority of businesses engaged in demersal fisheries in Western EU Waters are small or medium-sized enterprises (SME) or even micro-enterprises.

Poor fishing performance and drastic management measures also require additional and costly efforts by enforcement authorities to guarantee abundance by the rules.

Subsidiarity check
<p>Under the Article 3(1.d) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)²⁰ the EU has exclusive competence for the conservation of the marine biological resources under the CFP, managed directly through EU regulations. For this reason, the subsidiarity principle does not apply. Furthermore, both the fish stocks and the fishing vessels concerned move freely across international boundaries so action at Member State level alone is unlikely to be effective in achieving the objectives. For measures to be effective, these should be taken in a coordinated manner and made applicable to the whole area of distribution of the stock and of the fleets concerned. Under the new CFP, collaboration to make this possible and effective can only take place in the framework of MAPs such as the present one.</p>
Main policy objectives
<p>The current initiative is intended to contribute to the achievement of the broad objectives of the reformed CFP, in particular the long term sustainability of the stocks and the implementation of an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management, through the achievement of the following specific objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide a transparent framework to achieve Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY) by 2015 where possible and by 2020 at the latest. • To ensure that the relevant stocks are maintained within safe biological limits and those stocks outside of biological limits are brought within those limits as rapidly as possible. • To provide with a framework facilitating stability and predictability in the fixing and allocation of fishing opportunities. • To ensure that the fishing opportunities on each of the stocks are set taking into account the nature of the mixed fisheries. • To facilitate the consolidation of the rules on the landing obligations introduced in the reformed CFP. • To establish the framework that is necessary for the implementation of regionalisation. <p>The initiative shall be coherent with the Union environmental legislation, in particular with the objective of achieving a good environmental status by 2020 as set out in Article 1(1) of Directive 2008/56/EC (the Marine Strategy Framework Directive).</p>
B. Option Mapping
<p>(1) Option 1. Baseline scenario: Continue to use the current relevant multi-annual (single and/or two-stock) plan together with all other relevant rules of the CFP.</p> <p>Option 2. Repeal the management plans and use only CFP basic regulation. This could be also considered as alternative baseline scenario since the existing plans are outdated concerning particularly the Fmsy objective.</p> <p>Option 3. Amend the existing plans. Aspects that need to be considered are: develop and introduce amendments on the current scope (in terms of stocks, fisheries, area), introduction of MSY target, time-frame to reach MSY, objectives for conservation and technical measures to be taken, safeguards and their timeframe. Delegation of powers to the Commission should also be introduced in order to implement discard plans and regionalisation.</p> <p>Alternative or (sub-option) under option 3: network of (existing/future; single-/two-/multiple-stock) multi-annual plans that manage in co-operation a mixed fishery. Each multi-annual plan would address a "cluster" of fisheries sharing certain characteristics. Examples of clusters could be the fisheries for roundfish (cod, haddock, whiting, saithe, hake) with important by-catch of megrim and monks, Nephrops fisheries (with by-catch of roundfish and also megrim and monk), and fisheries targeting flatfish (sole and plaice mainly), also with considerable finfish by-catch. But ultimately clusters should be chosen following consultation and on the basis of scientific advice.</p> <p>Option 4: Replace the existing plans with mixed-fisheries multi-annual plans covering wide areas. This option would include sub-options following choices that can be made on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The dates at which MSY should be achieved (given that it were possible to do that before 2020) and the dates at which stocks should be rebuilt to precautionary levels, whenever these are below such levels. - The number of MAPs and the specific areas and the fisheries to be covered. For bio-geographic and

practical reasons the areas could correspond to those covered by the North Western Waters Advisory Council (essentially, ICES areas VI, VII) and the South Western Waters Advisory Council (ICES areas VIII and IX). The fisheries covered are to be determined after consultation, as in option 3.

- The species for which precise MSY-related targets should be set. While ideally all species should reach MSY status, it may be possible to manage the fisheries only by a group of main target species if by doing so the status of the by-catch species is consequently kept above precautionary levels.
- The kind of measures that could be envisaged by the MAPs as a priority under a regionalised approach.

The legislative instrument that shall be used for MAPs is set-out in the CFP Basic Regulation²¹. It will be a regulation co-decided by the Council and the Parliament through the ordinary legislative procedure. Among other elements, the co-decided regulation will include a dedicated mechanism to adopt measures by Commission's delegated acts in line with the regionalised approach envisaged in Article 18 of the CFP Basic Regulation. It will establish the deadlines by when the Member States with a management interest may submit a joint recommendation on the conservation measures to be used to support the achievement of the plan's objectives. The intended MAPs will also be specific on the kind of measures that will be subject to regionalisation.

Baseline scenario – no EU policy change

As said above, the baseline scenario is to continue to use the current relevant multi-annual (single and/or two-stock) plan together with all other relevant rules of the CFP. The baseline scenario is not a real option in that it does not address the problems described: stocks exploited beyond MSY and absence of framework to implement discard plans and regionalization. It is mentioned uniquely as a reference to gauge the likely effects of the other options.

Options of improving implementation and enforcement of existing legislation or doing less/simplifying existing legislation

As shown in the description of the problem, the issue is not lack of implementation or enforcement but just inadequacy and insufficiency of the existing multi-annual plans and other existing CFP rules to cope with the objectives of the reformed CFP. Equally, and although there is ample room to simplify the existing legislation, and there are ongoing initiatives in that respect, this will not be enough to deal with the new challenges of the reformed CFP. Improved implementation and enforcement or "doing less" are therefore no solution to the problems envisaged.

Alternative policy approaches

There is no alternative approach to the introduction of a legal framework to implement discard plans and a regionalised management system. To bring stocks to the ideal MSY state, one could think of influencing the main driver of the problem, which is a high market demand. However, even if a reduced demand would automatically result in a reduction of fishing pressure and a consequent increase in fish stocks above their MSY levels, it would likely take generations to change food consumption patterns replacing fish with other foods having similar nutritional values.

Alternative policy instruments

In addition to the above-mentioned legislative instrument, "soft law" could also be considered. A number of actions can be undertaken such as improving awareness and ownership of fishing operators, giving guidance on fishing techniques, improving consumer awareness in order to guide market demand, etc. However, these elements of "soft law", while they can contribute substantially to achieving the objectives, are by themselves insufficient to guarantee the ambitious objectives of the Basic Regulation explained above, especially in the current situation of blatant overall over-capacity of the fishing sector.

Alternative/differentiated scope

From about 41 000 fishing firms in the EU²², 90.7% have just one vessel, 8.4% have between two and five vessels and only 0.9% have six or more vessels. In other terms, 95.1% of the firms would be micro-enterprises, and virtually the totality of the firms would be SMEs. The CFP, at least when referring to the catching sector – which would be the sector primarily affected by a MAP – is a policy specifically geared to deal with micro-enterprises, so there is no room to exclude from the scope of the CFP firms on the basis of their size.

Options that take account of new technological developments
All management measures proposed under the above-mentioned options must be based on the best available science. Science bases itself on the most recent technological developments in terms of computing facilities, mathematical modelling, data gathering, etc. Monitoring of compliance with the management measures is also heavily dependent on technological innovation, from satellite-based observation to internet-based catch reporting. Technical specifications on fishing operations conducted by the fishing industry in order to avoid undesired catch or to improve their ecological footprint (which might result in fuel savings) will also be a logical consequence resulting from this initiative.
Preliminary proportionality check
MAPs as they are conceived under the reformed CFP can contain a number of provisions. The Impact Assessment that will underpin this initiative will help ensuring that the measures chosen among those specified in Article 10 of the Regulation implementing the reformed CFP are only those necessary to achieve the desired objectives. It will also help ensuring that the measures will be cost-effective in terms of administrative burden and adaptation costs for the fishing industry. A preliminary assessment suggests that options 1 and 2 will not be effective and would have an impact on administrative burden for public authorities: the absence of a transparent framework guiding towards the CFP objectives would imply long and difficult processes to design and adopt management rules. Options 3 and 4 would have a positive impact on administrative burden. The reason is that MAPs are transparent and therefore the management measures that need to be taken are clear for everybody. They have the further advantage that measures would be taken after consultation of the stakeholders, which means their input on avoiding heavy procedures can be taken into account. Furthermore once MAPs are in place for the various fisheries there will be less administrative burden on both the Member States as well as Commission services since the setting of fishing opportunities will follow those MAPs. Finally, "regionalised" design of management measures will be less burdensome for fishing operators and closer to citizens than the traditional, detailed and prescriptive EU management measures.
C. Data Collection and Better Regulation Instruments
Data collection
Historically, the CFP has been a science-based policy. All management decisions are taken on the basis of the best available science, and the scientific processes, from data collection to the generation of scientific advice, and including basic scientific research, have been constantly improving. Data collection is conducted by Member States' scientific bodies in the framework of the Data Collection Framework (Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 and subsidiary legislation). These data is then feed to the scientific bodies that carry out stock assessments and produce scientific advice. These mainly are the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) and the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), already referred to above in section A (endnotes 8 and 9). Besides, the Commission regularly requests, by public procurement, <i>ad hoc</i> studies on particular subjects and very often these studies are a source of additional data and information. These can be consulted at http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/index_en.htm .
Consultation approach
A preliminary consultation (scoping exercise) was done with representatives of the co-legislators, through an issues paper that was discussed during a meeting on 29 January 2015. This consultation allowed to have a preliminary opinion on the scope of the MAPs (geographical and by stock), their objectives and the type of measures to include. A consultation strategy was discussed at the meeting of 15 April 2015 of the Inter-Service Steering Group. The main elements of the strategy are: <u>Consultation objectives:</u> to seek stakeholders' views on i) their perception of the main problems, ii) the adequacy of the existing regulatory and governance framework, iii) the adequacy (possible impacts) of MAPs to address the problems and iv) the scope and content of the MAPs <u>Population consulted:</u> i) by an Internet consultation, the wide public, and ii) by a targeted, more technical questionnaire, specific stakeholders such as Member States' authorities, members of the EP PECH Committee, Advisory Councils and members of the social dialogue (Unions and employers' organisations). Technical

assessment of the likely effects of the options was made by consultation to STECF. The populations more directly affected, i.e. the (capture) fishing industry, are well represented in the Advisory Councils, where they occupy 60% of the seats of their executive committees and their general assemblies.

Methods: Consultation documents: a general one for the wide public, in English, French, Spanish, Portuguese and Dutch and a more technical one, just in English, for the consultation targeted to stakeholders. They would have a combination of closed questions, allowing statistical analysis, and open questions, allowing precision on opinions.

Timing: Deadlines originally foreseen by the beginning of August, but later on postponed to add buffer time to compensate for the summer break. Consultations were launched 22 May and had a deadline of 11 September and 15 September for, respectively, the public and the targeted consultations.

The public consultation has been advertised in the Fisheries website: http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/index_en.htm and the consultation document can be downloaded from the same website, following the hyperlink of the advertisement:

http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/maritimeaffairs_fisheries/consultations/western-waters-multiannual/index_en.htm

Will an Implementation plan be established?

Yes No

An implementation plan will not be required because the implementation of the MAPs will be very straightforward, either specified in the Treaty (sharing of competences) or defined in the MAPs itself (e.g. measures adopted by delegated acts by the Commission).

D. Information on the Impact Assessment Process

- An inter-service steering group was created on 19 January 2015 by extending the competences of the existing steering group for the impact assessment of the multi-annual plan for demersal fisheries in the North Sea. The group is chaired by a representative of the Directorate General Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (DG MARE) and its members are appointed representatives of the following Directorates General:
 - DG ECFIN Economic and Financial Affairs
 - DG EMPL Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion
 - DG ENV Environment
 - DG GROW Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs
 - DG REGIO Regional and Urban Policy
 - SG Secretariat General
 - SJ Legal Service
- A roadmap was completed, following exchanges with the Secretariat General, by 4 June 2015; the roadmap was subsequently adapted to become the present inception impact assessment report.
- Consultation is going on at the time of drafting this inception impact assessment report.
- Evidence gathering has already started by requesting the advice from STECF on the possible environmental, economic and social consequences in the medium and long terms of certain idealised scenarios that correspond to the main options described under section B above.
- As soon as consultation is completed, and on the basis of STECF assessments and advice, expected by mid-July, drafting of the impact assessment report can be expected to be finalised in time for its presentation to the Regulatory Scrutiny Board by the end of November.

E. Preliminary Assessment of Expected Impacts

Under **Option 1** (essentially, not doing new MAPs), EU institutions and Member States would be in any case bound by the obligations set out in the Basic Regulation. In other words, the Council would be bound to adopt limits on fishing opportunities consistent with the MSY objective and avoiding stock collapse or similar situations.

However, in the absence of a legal instrument guiding on the precise parameters that determine when MSY has

been reached or on which safeguards should be set to avoid stock decline, there is a risk that, in deciding conservation measures, short-term considerations will prevail over purely conservation and economic ones until a point where it would be too late to achieve timely the main objectives of the CFP. Moreover, stability and predictability in the fixing and allocation of fishing opportunities will not be guaranteed and the fishing industry may suffer from unexpected changes in income and employment.

While superficially Option 1 looks as contributing to simplification, in reality this is not the case. The Basic Regulation introduced MAPs as the instrument to implement the landing obligation²³ and the regionalised management by technical conservation measures²⁴. Where no MAPs have been adopted, those policies cannot be implemented as efficiently or not at all.

Option 2 is not intrinsically appropriate, for reasons similar to those expressed above and because the establishment of MAPs is conceived as the main management instrument to achieve the objectives of the CFP. For this and for political reasons (expectations from EU Institutions, Member States' authorities and stakeholders) it is not conceivable not to adopt MAPs.

Option 3 (single fisheries MAPs) is conceptually very similar to **Option 4** (mixed fisheries MAPs), but different in that under this option there will be several MAPs (one by main fishery), whilst under Option 4 these would be grouped in wide areas.

Option 3 and Option 4 offer many advantages: MAPs are not only an obligation under the new CFP: MAPs will solve most of the problems described under section A of this Roadmap. The advantage of MAPs is that they provide with a framework for actions that increases transparency and predictability of future obligations for the managers (Council in fixing fishing opportunities Member States authorities in matters under their competence and the Commission in its delegated and implementing acts) and for fishing operators. Involvement of stakeholders in their conception will also increase their ownership, knowledge and, ultimately, abidance by the final rules adopted. They are also the instrument conceived to grant powers to the Commission to adopt delegated acts implementing the measures governing the landing obligation and other technical measures in the context of regionalisation.

It is also important to note that, during the process of adoption of the reformed CFP, both the European Parliament and the Council and stakeholders (including NGOs and the fishing industry) have put a great emphasis in the establishment of MAPs. Failing now to produce these will frustrate all actors of the CFP reform and create a climate of deception and lack of confidence in the capacity of EU institutions to implement the CFP. This will risk deteriorating the conditions for the operators to abide by the rules and for fishing authorities to enforce them.

Likely impacts on simplification and/or administrative burden

(i) Options 1 and 2 would have little impact on simplification since, as they do not resolve the need of rules implementing the landing obligation and the regionalised approach, specific co-decided acts should be set to cover those needs.

Option 3 and option 4 offer the advantage to, in addition to replace obsolete or inefficient legislation, cover the needs of the CFP as stipulated in the Basic Regulation. In terms of simplification, Option 4 looks more advantageous in that it will cover all or most important fisheries in a reduced number of regulations, possibly only two.

(ii) Options 1 and 2 would have an impact on administrative burden: the absence of a transparent framework guiding towards the CFP objectives would imply long and difficult processes to design and adopt management rules.

Options 3 and 4 would have a positive impact on administrative burden. The reason is that MAPs are transparent and therefore the management measures that need to be taken are clear for everybody. They have the further advantage that measures would be taken after consultation of the stakeholders, which means their input on avoiding heavy procedures can be taken into account. Furthermore once MAPs are in place for the various fisheries there will be less administrative burden on both the Member States as well as Commission services since the setting of fishing opportunities will follow those MAPs. Finally, "regionalised" design of management measures will be less burdensome and closer to citizens than the traditional, detailed and prescriptive EU management measures.

Likely impacts on SMEs

All the above is valid for SMEs (virtually all fishing firms and a wide majority companies in the downstream supply chain are micro-enterprises or SMEs).

Likely impacts on competitiveness and innovation

None expected directly from this initiative.

<p>Likely impacts on public administrations</p> <p>All options result in the need for public administrations to continue implementing and enforcing the CFP rules. As said above, administrative burden is expected to be lower under options 3 and 4.</p>
<p>Likely impacts on third countries, international trade or investment</p> <p>Neither of the options would have an impact on relations with other countries. Impact on trade may be expected as a consequence of reaching MSY, which will happen more likely under options 3 and 4, especially the latter: more EU-produced fish will become available in the EU market and the need to import will be reduced.</p>

ⁱ This roadmap covers in principle two proposals applicable to western waters north and south of the 48°N parallel (north-western waters and south-western waters). Depending on the results of the consultation process and of the impact assessment foreseen, the geographical division and the number of proposals can be different.

² By demersal fisheries it is meant those fisheries that use fishing gear appropriate for the capture of demersal fish stocks, i.e. those occurring close to the sea bed. By contrast, pelagic fisheries are those geared to catch pelagic fish, i.e. that swim close to the surface or quite apart from the sea bed. Examples of demersal fish are cod, haddock, hake, megrim, Norway lobster, shrimps, etc. Mackerel, sardine, anchovy, tuna, etc., are pelagic fish. By western EU waters it is meant waters west of 4° W and including the British Channel south of 51°N and the Bay of Biscay, but excluding waters around the Azores, Madeira and Canary Islands.

³ Article 2 of [Regulation \(EU\) No 1380/2013](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 on the Common Fisheries Policy, amending Council Regulations (EC) No 1954/2003 and (EC) No 1224/2009 and repealing Council Regulations (EC) No 2371/2002 and (EC) No 639/2004 and Council Decision 2004/585/EC. This is the Basic Regulation of the recently reformed CFP, which sets out the main principles, objectives and procedures to manage aquatic living resources.

⁴ Article 9 of the [Regulation \(EU\) No 1380/2013](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council ([CFP Basic Regulation](#))

⁵ Council Document No 8529-14 PECH/E 117 CODEC 1004, also published by the European Parliament: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/pech/dv/taskfor/taskforce.pdf

⁶ CLAMER (Climate Change and European Marine Ecosystem Research) was supported by the European Commission under the Seventh Framework Programme. See: www.clamer.eu

⁷ [COM\(2014\)614](#) final Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL establishing a multiannual plan for the stocks of cod, herring and sprat in the Baltic Sea and the fisheries exploiting those stocks, amending Council Regulation (EC) No 2187/2005 and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1098/2007

⁸ Demersal fisheries are those that operate on the sea bed or close to it. Fisheries that harvest fish swimming in the water column or in the surface (pelagic fish) are termed pelagic fisheries

⁹ <https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>

¹⁰ <http://ices.dk/>

¹¹ http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/43805/133326/2011-07_STECF+11-07+-+Evaluation+of+NSKTWoSIS+cod_JRC66051.pdf

¹² F stands for fishing mortality, an expression of the rate at which fish is being removed by fishing.

¹³ http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/43805/44893/10-10_SG-MOS+10-06+-+Impact+wc+sole_JRC61948.pdf

¹⁴ <http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2014/2014/hke-nrth.pdf>

¹⁵ <http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2014/2014/hke-soth.pdf>

¹⁶ http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/43805/44893/10-10_SG-MOS+10-06b+-+Hake+and+Nephrops+in+areas+VIIIc+and+Ixa_JRC61946.pdf

¹⁷ Extract from Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and to the Council concerning a consultation on fishing opportunities for 2016 under the Common Fisheries Policy (draft in course)

¹⁸ The [2014 Annual Economic Report on the EU Fishing Fleet](#) (STECF 14-16), STECF, Publications Office of the EU, Luxembourg.

¹⁹ Data shown corresponds to the whole demersal segments of the fleet of each Member State weighted by the proportion of the catch (expressed in value) that is taken in Western EU Waters. Fishers employed are expressed in FTE (full-time equivalents)

²⁰ Consolidated version of the [Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#)

²¹ Article 9 of [Regulation \(EU\) No 1380/2013](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council

²² These data are extracted from the 2011 Annual Economic Report. They exclude Greece and Lithuania, from which no data were available when drafting such report.

²³ Article 15(5) of [Regulation \(EU\) No 1380/2013](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council

²⁴ Article 18(1) of [Regulation \(EU\) No 1380/2013](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council