STANDARD SUMMARY PROJECT FICHE

1. Basic Information

1.1. Désirée Number: 2002/000-579.06.01
Twinning EE02-IB-AG-05

1.2. Title: Successful implementation of Common Fisheries Policy

1.3. Sector: Agriculture

1.4. Location: Estonia, Tallinn

2. Objectives

2.1. Overall objective:
Estonian fisheries policy complies with EU Common Fisheries Policy.

2.2. Project purpose:
Establishing effective legislative, informational and structural framework for implementation of market policy of fisheries products and Financial Instrument of Fisheries Guidance.

2.3. Accession Partnership and NPAA priority

AP 2001

Fisheries
Complete the establishment of adequate administrative structures with sufficient institutional resources and equipment at central and regional level that ensure the implementation of the Common Fisheries Policy including management of resources, inspection and control of fishing activities, the market policy, structural programmes co-financed by the Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance, a fishing vessel register and a management plan for the fleet capacity in accordance with available resources.

NPAA 2002-2003

Objectives for 2002 – 2003

According to the Accession Partnership the development of administrative structures with adequate institutional resources and equipment at central and regional level will be completed to ensure the implementation of common fisheries policy of the EU. This consists of administration of resources, supervision and control of fish catches, market policy, structural policy co-financed from FIFG, fishing vessel register and fishing vessel development plan based on the existing fish resources.

The Fisheries Department of the Ministry of Environment will be responsible for the organisation of sustainable management of fish resources (including multi-annual
fishing vessels development plan) and implementation of necessary inspection system. The Department of Fishery Economics of the Ministry of Agriculture will be responsible for fish market policy and structural policy in the fisheries sector.

For the organisation of structural aid and strengthening of controls the fishing vessel register and fisheries information system will be developed as currently they do not contain all fisheries information required. In respect of structural policy the development of legislative framework will be continued to ensure proper planning and coordination of EU structural measures. The preparation of multi-annual fishing fleet development plan will be continued as well as the segmentation of fleet, to bring the catches into conformity with real fish resources that can be used.

The quality of controls in the sector will be improved. For that purpose the capacity of the Environmental Inspectorate will be strengthened by expansion of their supervision activity to the whole chain from catches to primary buying-in. The respective methodology and equipment of inspection and control will be upgraded.

The preliminary programming documents of fisheries sector drafted in the framework of the EU Phare twinning project will be further developed (action plan, additions and preliminary assessment of the action plan) to complement the implementation of requirements of the EU common fisheries policy in respect of structural aid after accession.

Estonia's Progress Report 2001:

“As regards structural policy, Estonia still needs to establish the legislative framework required for planning and coordinating the EC structural actions.”

“As far as market policy is concerned, further progress is still required. In particular, regulations on producer organizations and marketing standards (including size categories) corresponding to EC requirements do not yet exist. The creation of producer organizations will be a useful tool in order to ensure the implementation of market policy in Estonia.”

“In April 2001 the software for the Fisheries Information System (FIS), also based at the Environmental Inspectorate, was upgraded. However, the system’s proper functioning is not yet fully assured. The gaps in the system’s ability to comply with EC reporting requirements have been identified and a working group was established in April 2001 to elaborate a development plan for the system.”

2.4. Contribution to National Development Plan

Not Applicable

2.5. Cross Border Impact

Not Applicable

3. Description

3.1. Background and justification:
I. The Twinning Project **ES 98/IB/AGR/01-2** was implemented from January 2000 to October 2001 by the Estonian Ministry of Environment with the assistance of Sweden (leading partner) and Germany (Pre-Accession Adviser, PAA). The objective was to get the Estonian administrative and legal system in key areas of the Common Fisheries Policy sufficiently prepared for accession to the European Union, by:

- harmonizing all laws and legal acts under preparation in fisheries with the *acquis*;
- preparing both the administration and the sector for the Union's structural funds system in fisheries by:
  - training and advice,
  - carrying out a complete provisional programming of structural assistance,
  - developing a guidance programme for the Estonian fishing fleet,
- introducing the Common market organization to the administration and the industry,
- implementing the system of the Common marketing standards and training of inspectors with regard to the control aspect;
- quality checking of the computerized Fisheries Information System.

II. At the end of 2001 the following results have been achieved:

a) The Estonian Fishing Act has partly been harmonised with the *acquis*, in the following fields. The act has been amended but not yet completely harmonized:
   - Regulation of fishing capacity,
   - Fishing Vessel Register (FVR),
   - Vessel Monitoring System (VMS),
   - Some definitions.
   A large area of the secondary legislation still needs harmonization with the *acquis*.

b) The structural policy measures have been achieved to about 80%. A complete programming exercise has been carried out and all analytical planning and strategy papers have been elaborated, stepwise improved, assessed and discussed. However, the quality of the planning papers does not yet meet the Union's demands in every respect. A written evaluation of the provisional operational programme and the programme complement has been provided by the PAA as well as a manual on management, monitoring and control aspects. A strategy paper for the development of the Estonian fishing fleet has been developed as a basis for a future MAGP.

c) In the market area two introductory seminars as to market organisation and marketing standards have been successfully carried out. No legal and practical basis was laid to implement the system of marketing standards and accordingly no training of inspectors took place.

d) As to the Fisheries Information System and its capability to process and deliver the data and reports required by the CFP, the system has been checked and a first gap analysis has been prepared.

III. The current project will address the remaining gaps to full implementation of the *acquis* in the fisheries sector. It will provide further assistance to:
a) the harmonization of the remaining primary and secondary legislations including:

- Act for regulating fish marketing and structural aid (FIFG)
- Amendments to Fishing Act and Fishing Rules to guarantee the collection of all necessary data for the year 2004
- Secondary legislation on the recognition and control of first-hand buyers
- Secondary legislation on data collection

b) the implementation of Market Policy, marketing standards including training of inspectors and professional organizations

c) the implementation of Structural Policy including:

- assistance to the programming process (Fisheries chapter of SPD) and to FIFG implementation procedures (as CFP will be changed also structural policy will be changed, we need assistance for preparing necessary procedures according new CFP and prepare necessary national plans for introducing FIFG)
- assistance to funding regulations (prepare national funding regulations, plan national co-financing, inform sector about future measures)
- assistance to the administration of a FIFG based funding program (capacity building, training activities)

IV. Fisheries Information System

According to a first gap analysis by the 98 twinning project, the current FIS needs to be upgraded in the light of the management of Market Policy and in order to achieve compliance with COM 1639/2001. The ministries of Agriculture and Environment have created a working group in May 2002 to decide upon the conceptual design of the future FIS system. A feasibility study will advise the WG by October 2002.

3.2. Linked activities:

I. Under Phare twinning project “Support to European Integration Process in Estonia (N°ES 9620.01.01)”, there was also a sub-project on “99/EN/48 Local control of market organisation-Fishery” The objective was to prepare recommendations on the establishment of local control of marketing. These recommendations include an amended version of the proposed rules for Producer Organisations. In addition the current report will include notes on the functioning of the withdrawal price system in the EU and the system of quota management through POs in the UK.

II. The Twinning Project ES 98/IB/AGR/01/2 (Preparation of the Estonian Fisheries Sector for the Accession to the European Union) was implemented from January 2000 to October 2001 by the Estonian Ministry of Environment with the assistance of Sweden (leading partner) and Germany (PAA). The objective was to get the Estonian administrative and legal system in key areas of the Common Fisheries Policy sufficiently prepared for accession to the European Union. As many areas important for accession (e.g. market, structural, fishing-control issues) have not, or only to a minor degree been addressed legally by the fisheries
administration, the harmonization has been proceeding far less than originally anticipated.

3.3. Results:

1. Implementation of Market Policy for Fishery Products
   - Revision and implementation of legislative requirements (support schemes, intervention system, Common Marketing Standards, Recognition of Producers’ Organisations)
   - Training of administrative services, inspection services and PO’s- (described in point 3.4.E)

2. Implementation of FIFG in Estonia
   - Revision and implementation of legislative requirements (programming process and funding regulations)(MoA is drafting act for regulating fish marketing and structural aid (FIFG).)
   - Training of administrative services- this is responsibility of PAA for elaboration of training plans and program

3.4. Activities:

3.4.1 Twinning 18 man-months, 507,300 EUR

A. Pre-Accession Adviser (PAA) (€ 225 000)
   Input 18 months
   Responsibilities:
   1. Under result 1 “Market policy of fisheries products”
      a) Analysis of current administrative and legislative situation.
      b) Elaboration of action plan on implementing PO’s as part of resource management and possible (self) control in fishery sector
      c) Identification of information needs to implement market policy, elaboration of marketing data collection scheme on the basis of first sales notes.(legislative work only, not IT systems)
      d) Elaboration of training plans
      e) Training of the beneficiary institutions staff (see point E
      f) Elaboration of written procedures for recognizing PO’s and controlling PO-activities

   2. Under result 2 “Structural policy – FIFG”
      a) Analysis of current administrative and legislative situation.
      b) Elaboration of training plans
      c) Training of the beneficiary institutions staff
      d) Elaboration of written procedures

1 For the indicators please see ANNEX 1 – Logical Framework Matrix.
3. Overall co-ordination of activities and short term experts inputs;
4. Organizing training and study trips;
5. Preparation of Terms of References for short-term experts in cooperation with the working group
6. Reporting

Profile:
- Very good knowledge of European Union Common Fishery Policy, Fisheries Market Policy
- Good knowledge of European Union Structural Policy, specially in Fisheries field.
- Excellent English.
- Very good management and co-ordination skills.

B. PAA Assistant for 18 months, approx. 15.600 EUR

Tasks:
- Assists the PAA with the project management:
  - monitoring and guidance of the whole project;
  - provision of legal and technical advice and analysis;
  - overviews the development of all key project outputs and the corresponding procedural/operational manuals, plus the provision of related skills development activities.

C. Member States Project Leader for 18 months, approx. 22.000 EUR

Tasks:
- Assists the PAA with the project management:
  - monitoring and guidance of the whole project;
  - provision of legal and technical advice and analysis;
  - overviews the development of all key project outputs and the corresponding procedural/operational manuals, plus the provision of related skills development activities.

Profile:
- at least 10 year experience in Fishery Administration
- excellent English

D. Short-term experts (5 experts, 10 man-months, 160 000 EUR)

a) 2 ST experts for Fish market analysis (in co-operation with Estonian Fishermen’s Association and Estonian Fishery Association, parallel) (4 man-months, 64 000 EUR);

Tasks:
• Analysis of fish market overview and proposals made by the fishermen associations
• Analysis of the fish market regulations as to the compliance with EU regulations
• Training of Ministry of Agriculture in fish market issues.
Profile:
• 5 year experience in Fishery Market
• excellent English

b) 2 ST experts for Fishery structural fund analysis (4 man-months, 64 000 EUR):

Tasks
• Analysis of the necessary administrative changes for implementation of the FIFG
• Proposals for administrative development to ensure the readiness to implement FIFG
• Provision of procedures and manuals for the FIFG implementation.
• Training of the Paying Agency and Intermediate Body staff
Profile:
• 5 year experience with Structural funds specially in fishery
• excellent English

c) 1 expert for analyzing proposals of above experts with specific attention to guaranteeing coverage of fish tracing; (2 man-months, 32 000 EUR):
Tasks:
• analysis of whole sector, identifying gaps in the fish trading chain and making proposals for full coverage

Profile:
• 5 year experience in Fisheries Administration
• excellent

E. Training, Seminars and Study Trips (53,000 EUR)

• Training and Seminars of beneficiary institutions and PO staff in Estonia according to the training plans elaborated by the PAA (7000 EUR)
• Study Trip of the beneficiary institutions and PO staff (26,000 EUR)
• Translation / Interpretation (20,000 EUR)

The indicative duration of training is 3 days.
Indicative number of staff to be trained according to the training plan to be elaborated by the PAA:
### 3.5. Lessons learned:

The results achieved at the end of the 1998 twinning project are less, in some parts substantially less, than anticipated and could only be achieved with delay. The main reasons which lead to this situation were:

- massive staff cuts at all levels of the fisheries department of the Ministry of Environment in the starting phase of the project;
- a continuous reorganisation of the Estonian fisheries administration at the ministerial level, including a reassignment of responsibilities for market and structural policy from the Ministry of Environment to the Ministry of Agriculture in April 2001;
- staff fluctuations during the whole implementation phase (including the CC project leader and the PAA’s counterparts);
- lack of cooperation between the concerned ministries;
- usually a lower priority to EU accession work than to other responsibilities.

However, in addition to the objectives stated in the Covenant and which partly have been reached, the project has triggered a development process on the level of the Estonian Government which so far has lead to the mentioned reallocation of responsibilities between the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture. The staff in both fisheries departments has gradually been increased. In October 2001, the combined staff of the two ministries in terms of quantity is assessed to be sufficient for the EU accession preparations.

It was agreed to address the concern relating to insufficient cooperation between the two competent ministries by a modification of the implementation arrangements: Two working groups (Structural Policy, Market Policy) reporting to the Estonian project
The manager will assure the coordination between the different competent institutions. The implementation arrangements will be confirmed in writing by all competent institutions.

4. Institutional Framework

The Ministry of Agriculture will be the Estonian co-ordinator of the project. Further involved institutions include:

- Ministry of Environment who is responsible for handling fish resource as part of natural resource. MoEnv is also responsible for collecting and analyzing data which is collected according Fishing Law. MoEnv is also responsible for fishery control.
- ARIB keeps agricultural registers and has been designated as paying authority for FIFG.

5. Detailed Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phare</th>
<th>Total Phare (I+IIB)</th>
<th>National Co-financing</th>
<th>IFI*</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment Support</td>
<td>Institution Building</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>30 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract 1 Twinning</td>
<td>507 300</td>
<td>507 300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Twinning covenant preparation
  - 12 000
- PAA (18 months)
  - 210 000
- PAA assistant
  - 15 600
- MS project leader
  - 22 000
- Short term experts (7 experts, 8 man-months)
  - 160 000
- Training and study tours
  - 43 000
- External audit
  - 5 000
- Reserve
  - 14 700
- Total
  - 477 300

National co-financing
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAA (18 months)</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td>5 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and study tours</td>
<td>8 600</td>
<td>1 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External audit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>18 600</td>
<td>11 400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estonian national co-financing € 18 600 is foreseen in the 2003 and 11 400 in 2004 budget. The same eligibility rules will apply for Phare as for cofinancing part of the budget. The expenses not eligible for Phare will be covered by Estonian funds.

**Implementation Arrangements**

6.1. Implementing Agency

The Implementing Agency is the CFCU. The CFCU will be responsible for tendering, contracting and accounting. The responsibility for project preparation, implementation and control will remain in the recipient institution.

Ministry of Agriculture will be responsible for the overall co-ordination of this project.

A Steering Committee will be set up to oversee the project implementation. The Committee will meet quarterly and it will include the representatives of ARIB, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment, the EC Delegation in Tallinn and the Ministry of Finance Customs Agency and Veterinary and Food Board.

For the implementation of project activities within the current project 2 working groups will be created which will be assisted by the PAA and STEs.

a) Market policy working group
b) Structural Policy working group

The composition of these working groups will include representatives of the ministries of Agriculture, Environment, Veterinary and Food Board, ARIB, Customs Board as necessary.

Working groups will report on each steering committee meeting about progress. Quarterly will be presented CO-finance data flow.

PAO:
Renaldo Mändmets
Deputy Secretary General
Ministry of Finance
Suur-Ameerika 1, Tallinn
Tel: (+372) 6 113 545
Fax: (+372) 6 966 810
e-mail:
6.2. Twinning

One twinning contract will be signed (18 consecutive months, in total cost of 507,300 EUR – Phare 477,300 EUR, Estonian co-financing 30,000 EUR)

Contact for twinning expert in Ministry of Agriculture

Juhani Papp
Tel:+37256265
Fax:+3726256200
e-mail:juhani.papp@agri.ee

6.3. Non-standard aspects

The project will consist on one component: twinning. For twinning component Twinning Manual rules apply.

6.4 Contracts

Contract 1 Twinning € 507 300 (Phare € 477 300)
6. **Implementation Schedule**

7.1. Start of tendering/call for proposals  
*September 2002*

7.2. Start of project activity  
*January 2003*

7.3. Project Completion  
*June 2004*

7. **Equal Opportunity**

During the implementation of the project there will be no discrimination on the grounds of race, sex, sexual orientation, mother tongue, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, birth or other status. Equal opportunities for women, men and minorities will be ensured by the Steering Committee during the implementation of the project. The Estonian laws and regulations concerning the equal opportunities for women, men and minorities will strictly be followed. Equal opportunity for men and women to participate in the project will be measured by recording the experts and consultants employed.

8. **Environment**

Not Applicable

9. **Rates of return**

Not Applicable

10. **Investment criteria**

11.1. Catalytic effect:

Without PHARE support Estonia will not be able to manage intervention and structural aid of CFP for the time of accession.

11.2. Co-financing:

PHARE funds will be supplemented by Estonian state budget funds in the total amount of 30,000 EUR

11.3. Additionality:

Phare support within this project does not replace other financiers.

11.4. Project readiness and Size:
Project will be ready for implementation as soon as the funds are available. Total project size is 507,300 EUR of which twinning component covers 507,300 EUR.

11.5. Sustainability:

Project will be sustainable, as Estonia has declared its commitment to the accession process to the EU. Estonian Government will guarantee financial sustainability and will cover future maintenance and operation costs of future implementation.

11.6. Compliance with state aids provisions
State aids provisions of the Europe Agreement will be respected.

11. Conditionality and sequencing

- With regard to all FIFG related activities (e.g. training and preparations for structural policy for fisheries sector, procedures and manual for FIFG), the Ministry of Finance, as the managing authority for the SPD, must be consulted to avoid overlaps with activities organised under the two other Phare Twinning projects on structural funds (SPP+ and SPP++). Furthermore, the training must create special value added in the fisheries sector and procedures and manuals for FIFG must be in line with the overall guidelines submitted by the Ministry of Finance for the Structural Funds.

A memorandum of understanding has to be signed between MoA and MoE to avoid lack of co-operation.
The necessary staff will be available in MoA to administrate the project.
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**ANNEX 1**

**Phare log frame**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOGFRAME PLANNING MATRIX FOR</th>
<th>Programme name and number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Ensuring the successful implementation of Common Fisheries Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful implementation of Common Fisheries Policy</th>
<th>Contracting period expires 30 November 2004</th>
<th>Disbursement period expires 30 November 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total budget : 507 300</td>
<td>Phare budget : 477 300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective</th>
<th>Objectively verifiable indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estonian fisheries policy complies with EU Common Fisheries Policy.</td>
<td>Estonian fisheries policy coherent with CFP</td>
<td>Annual EU Commission reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project purpose</th>
<th>Objectively verifiable indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishing effective legislative, informational and structural framework for implementation of market policy of fisheries products and Financial Instrument of Fisheries Guidance</td>
<td>Legal approximation</td>
<td>Official journal (Riigi Teataja)</td>
<td>Necessary legislation approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective co-operation with other institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Necessary staff recruited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectively verifiable indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Implementation of Market Policy for Fishery Products

1. **Revision and implementation of legislative requirements**
   - Support schemes, intervention system, Common Marketing Standards, Recognition of Producers' Organisations

2. **Training of administrative services, inspection services and PO's**

### Implementation of FIFG in Estonia

2.1 **Revision and implementation of legislative requirements**
   - Programming process and funding regulations
   - MoA is drafting act for regulating fish marketing and structural aid (FIFG)

2.2 **Training of administrative services**
   - This is the responsibility of PAA for elaboration of training plans and program

| 1. | Quarterly reports for the steering committee and EC |
| 2. | Project monitoring and evaluation report at the end of the project |

- Necessary legislation approved

---

1. Detailed structure of responsible authorities, responsibilities and working plans designed and available for competent authorities.

2. Staff trained according to Annex 6

3. Written procedures for processing documentation and control elaborated and available for relevant institutions.

4. Seminars held, informative materials published and distributed.
### Activities -

#### Market policy of fisheries products
1.1.1 Analysis of current administrative and legislative situation.
1.1.2 Elaboration of action plan
1.2.1 Elaboration of marketing data collection scheme on the basis of first sales notes.
1.2.2 Equipping relevant institutions with IT equipment needed
1.3.1 Elaboration of training plans
1.3.2 Training of the beneficiary institutions staff
1.4.1 Elaboration of written procedures.
1.5.1 Seminars, publishing and distributing informative materials.

#### 2. Structural policy – FIGF
2.1.1 Analysis of current administrative and legislative situation.
2.1.2 Elaboration of action plan
2.2.1 Elaboration of training plans
2.2.2 Training of the beneficiary institutions staff
2.3.1 Elaboration of written procedures
2.4.1. Elaboration of Project Pipeline
2.5.1 Seminars, publishing and distributing informative materials.

### Cost Estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Phare (€)</th>
<th>Est (€)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract 1 Twinning PAA and assistant</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>30 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twinning covenant preparation</td>
<td>12 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAA (18 months)</td>
<td>210 000</td>
<td>15 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAA assistant</td>
<td>15 600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS project leader</td>
<td>22 000</td>
<td>5 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term experts (5 experts, 10 man-months)</td>
<td>160 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ST experts for Fish market analysis (4 man-months)</td>
<td>64 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ST experts for Fishery structural fund analysis</td>
<td>64 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 expert for analyzing proposals of above experts with specific attention to guaranteeing coverage of fish tracing; (2 man-months)</td>
<td>64 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and study tours</td>
<td>43 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>14 700</td>
<td>10 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External audit</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Effective co-operation with other institutions
- Necessary legislation approved
- Necessary staff recruited
Preconditions

- Enough CC staff available

ANNEX 2 TIME IMPLEMENTATION CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J F M A M J J A S O N D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract 1 Twinning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T – tendering; C – contracting; I – implementation; A - external audit and control
ANNEX 3  CONTRACTING AND DISBURSEMENT SCHEDULE

Project No:
Project Title: Successful implementation of Common Fisheries Policy

CUMULATIVE CONTRACTING SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract 1 Twinning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CUMULATIVE DISBURSEMENT SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract 1 Twinning</td>
<td></td>
<td>200 000</td>
<td>250 000</td>
<td>300 000</td>
<td>375 000</td>
<td>425 000</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>200 000</td>
<td>250 000</td>
<td>300 000</td>
<td>375 000</td>
<td>425 000</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
<td>477 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 4

List of relevant EU legislation

- Council Decision 81/608/EEC
- Council Decision 82/886/EEC
- Commission Regulation (EEC) n° 3510/1982
- Council Regulation (EEC) n° 31/1983
- Council Resolution (EEC) n° 203/1983
- Council Decision 83/414/EEC
- Commission Regulation (EEC) n° 2807/1983
- Commission Regulation (EEC) n° 671/1984
- Commission Regulation (EEC) n° 2108/1984
- Commission Regulation (EEC) n° 3440/1984
- Commission Decision 85/474/EEC
- Council Decision 86/238/EEC
- Council Regulation (EEC) n° 2930/1986
- Commission Regulation (EEC) n° 954/1987
- Commission Regulation (EEC) n° 955/1987
- Commission Regulation (EEC) n° 1382/1987
- Commission Regulation (EEC) n° 3940/1987
- Council Decision 89/631/EEC
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 2945/1995
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 3067/1995
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 3068/1995
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 3069/1995
- Council Decision 96/91/EC
- Commission Decision n° 96/286/EC
- Council Decision n° 96/428/EC
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 347/1996
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 376/1996
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 788/1996
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 1762/1996
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 2406/1996
- Commission Recommendation n° 97/03/27
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 323/1997
- Council Decision n° 97/413/EC
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 494/1997
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 779/1997
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 894/1997
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 1049/1997
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 1292/1997
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 1489/1997
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 2205/1997
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 2550/1997
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 2635/1997
- Council Decision n° 98/249/EC
- Council Decision n° 98/414/EC
- Commission Directive 1999/19/EC
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 308/1999
- Council Decision n° 99/337/EC
- Council Decision n° 99/386/EC
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 728/1999
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 831/1999
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 963/1999
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 1260/1999
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 1263/1999
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 1351/1999
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 1446/1999
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 1447/1999
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 1459/1999
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 1471/1999
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 1922/1999
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 2445/1999
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 2723/1999
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 2737/1999
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 2740/1999
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 2791/1999
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 2792/1999
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 2805/1999
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 104/2000
- Council Decision n° 439/00/EC
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 908/2000
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 1159/2000
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 1298/2000
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 1543/2000
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 1685/2000
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 2438/2000
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 2509/2000
- Council Regulation (EC) n° 2578/2000
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 2722/2000
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 2813/2000
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 2814/2000
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 80/2001
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 150/2001
- Commission Regulation (EC) n° 259/2001
Description The Twinning Project ES 98/IB/AGR/01-2

Background and justification:

The Twinning Project ES 98/IB/AGR/01-2 was implemented from January 2000 to October 2001 by the Estonian Ministry of Environment with the assistance of Sweden (leading partner) and Germany (Pre-Accession Adviser, PAA). The objective was to get the Estonian administrative and legal system in key areas of the Common Fisheries Policy sufficiently prepared for accession to the European Union, by:

- harmonising all laws and legal acts under preparation in fisheries with the *acquis*;
- preparing both the administration and the sector for the Union's structural funds system in fisheries by:
  - training and advice,
  - carrying out a complete provisional programming of structural assistance,
  - developing a guidance programme for the Estonian fishing fleet,
- introducing the Common market organisation to the administration and the industry,
- implementing the system of the Common marketing standards and training of inspectors with regard to the control aspect;
- quality checking of the computerised Fisheries Information System.

By the end of twinning project a number of important results has been achieved. The results can be summarised as follows:

- The Estonian Fishing Act has partly been harmonized with the *acquis*. However in the following fields the act has been amended but not yet completely harmonized:
  - Regulation of fishing capacity,
  - Fishing Vessel Register (FVR),
  - Vessel Monitoring System (VMS),
  - Some definitions.
- The main bulk of the secondary legislation is lacking or not to any substantial degree harmonized to the *acquis*. As many areas important for accession (e.g. market, structural, control issues) have not, or only to a minor degree been addressed legally by the fisheries administration, the harmonization was proceeding far less than originally anticipated.
- The structural policy measures were achieved to about 80%. A complete programming exercise has been carried out and all analytical planning and strategy papers was elaborated, stepwise improved, assessed and discussed in MoE Resource department. However, the quality of the planning papers do not yet meet the Union's demands in every respect. The PAA as well as a manual on management, monitoring and control aspects provided a written evaluation of the provisional operational programme and the programme complement. A strategy paper for the development of the Estonian fishing fleet was developed as a first basis for a future MAGP. The programming exercise, training sessions and frequent discussions have made an essential part of the Estonian...
fisheries administration and parts of the sector sufficiently aware of the requirements and possibilities of the Common structural policy in fisheries.

- In the market area two introductory seminars as to market organisation and marketing standards have been successfully carried out. No legal and practical basis was laid to implement the system of marketing standards and accordingly no training of inspectors took place.

- As to the Fisheries Information System and its capability to process and deliver the data and reports required by the CFP, the system has been checked and a gap analysis has been made available which will guide the necessary upgrading of the system to meet the demands of a MS.

In total the results achieved are less, in some parts substantially less, than anticipated when the Covenant was signed and could only be achieved with delay. The main reasons which lead to this situation were:

- massive staff cuts at all levels of the fisheries department of the Ministry of Environment in the starting phase of the project;
- a continuous reorganisation of the Estonian fisheries administration at the ministerial level, including a reassignment of responsibilities for market and structural policy from the Ministry of Environment to the Ministry of Agriculture in 2001;
- staff fluctuations during the whole implementation phase (including the CC project leader and the PAA’s counterparts);
- lack of cooperation between the concerned ministries;
- usually a lower priority to EU accession work than to other responsibilities.

However, in addition to the objectives stated in the Covenant and which partly have been reached, the project has triggered a development process on the level of the Estonian Government which so far has lead to the mentioned reallocation of responsibilities between the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture. The staff in both fisheries departments has gradually been increased. In October 2001, the combined staff of the two ministries in terms of quantity is assessed to be sufficient for the EU accession preparations. But still is present need for some extra staff in both Ministry.

General description of the project and the environment for its implementation

The objective has been to facilitate and make possible the future integration of Estonia into the European Union by raising the institutional and technical capacity of the institutions in the fisheries sector. The beneficiaries and target institutions have mainly been the public sector institutions responsible for the implementation of the Common Fishery Policy (CFP), but also the fishermen, the industry and their professional associations.

The project, which extended from January 11, 2000 to October 31, 2001 contained basically the following four elements with the enumeration used in the Covenant:

6.1 Legislation
6.2 Structural policy measures
6.3 Market policy
6.4 Fishery Information System (FIS)
The whole *acquis* of the secondary legislation as can be found in chapter 04 (fisheries) of the Directory of Community Legislation in Force has been relevant, with emphasis to 04.10.10 Structural Policy and 04.10.20 Market Organisation.

When the project started in January 2000, the Estonian Government simultaneously started to reorganize the fisheries administration and reduced the staff working with fisheries issues in the Ministry of Environment. Up to October 2001, when the project is to finish, this reorganization brought about a number of important changes, but might not yet be finalized. When the Covenant was drafted the whole responsibility for the fisheries sector with view to the EU fisheries *acquis* rested within the Ministry of Environment. The situation in October 2001 is that the responsibility is divided between the Ministry of Environment (MoE) and the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), with the MoE being responsible for resource policy and the MoA being responsible for structural and market policy. At the start and during the course of the project neither the number of staff nor the organisation has been what was originally foreseen in the Covenant, a situation which has been unfavorable both to the project and to the Estonian commitments in the Covenant. However, with view to the future, the decisions taken by the Estonian Government in December 2000 and April 2001 have considerably improved the staff situation and the clarification of responsibilities.

Due to the lack of human resources the project implementation was concentrated on the structural policy element of the project in order to fully utilize the expertise of the resident PAA. As to the other elements of the project, the ambition has nevertheless been to implement as much as was deemed possible under the given circumstances. As a result the Covenant was accommodated by two addendi, effecting an eight months prolongation of the PAA’s mission, an adaptation of the time scheme and a reduction of Swedish and German short term expertise to what could be absorbed by the Estonian fisheries administration.

Summary of the activities and delivered results compared to the Covenant of ES 98/IB/AGR/01-2

**Legislation**

In the Covenant the *benchmark* is described as follows: …”A preliminary draft of the Fishery act will be available at the end of 1999. The aim is that all legal acts will be completed in draft versions by the end of 2000. Following parliamentary reading, the practical implementation, including enforcement of the whole acquis, is planned to be achieved successively and at the latest by the end of 2002. …”

*The Estonian Parliament adopted in October 2000 a revised Fishery Act (law) on the proposal of the Minister of Environment. The aim of the changes was mainly to solve internal problems i.e. individual quota distribution and obligations in some international fishery organisations. However, in the following two respects the law established the legal basis for areas, which are vital to the accession preparations:

• *Fishing Vessel Register (FVR),*

• *Vessel Monitoring System (VMS).*

Furthermore the law gives the Minister of Environment the right to issue secondary regulations in some other specified areas. The Ministry of Environment drafted the
Fishery law with practically no input from the project, however assistance was offered. The law is not totally harmonized to the acquis. In summary the main differences are as follows:

- There is no coverage of the structural and market areas. The parts mainly dealt with in the law are resources and control.
- The law does not make it possible to regulate the fishing capacity.
- The definition of the Fishing Vessel Register (FVR) is not the same as in the acquis.
- The VMS (vessel monitoring system) is applicable only outside Estonian water.
- Many definitions, for example a fishing vessel is different from the acquis.

The secondary legislation of the EU harmonization is to a great extent not in force and the regulation in force is not totally harmonized to the acquis.

In the structural field international consultants have undertaken some basic analytic work. A Phare consultant (En Act International, London) has been contracted to support the European Integration Process in Estonia (No ES 9620.01.01). The consultant has at December 31, 1999 presented a report. The scope of the contract was to identify EU legislative requirements for controls to be applied to structural measures in the fisheries sector and to advise on the implementation of such legislation in Estonian law, by amending existing legislation, if necessary. In addition, advice was provided on how to establish a system of local controls. After delivery of the report no further work has been undertaken.

In the marketing sector, no harmonization of the Estonian legislation has taken place. The Control regulation (2847/93) has partly been integrated. In this field a Phare consultant, Caroline Blatch, EnAct International, London has in March 2000 produced a report (No ES 9620.01.01) describing the gaps in the Estonian legislation.

It is not possible at this stage to judge if the Estonian fishery legislation will be harmonized at the end of the year 2002. If no additional human resources are engaged in the legal field it is highly likely that this goal will be reached.

Structural policy measures

According to the original Covenant the benchmark stated i.a. ”... within the fisheries department (of the MoE) 4 employees will staff the new unit for structural measures by the end of 1999. The unit will bear the main responsibility for the programming and the implementation of the EU structural measures.” However, at the start of the project this unit did not exist and throughout the project period less than an average of 2 persons, including one person from the Marine Institute, could be made available permanently. As from July 2000 working contacts where established to the MoA, which assumed responsibility for matters of the fish processing industry as a part of the whole food industry and for a part of the aquaculture sector.

The work in this project part started with an analysis of the responsibilities, capacity and previous experience of the Estonian fisheries administration with regard to structural planning and policy implementation. Already existing planning papers like the Fisheries Development Plan (FDP) elaborated by the MoE in August 1999, the drafts of the Rural Development Plan (RDP) and the National Development Plan (pre-
NDP) have been examined. Among other information the results of this first analysis of the situation are contained in the PAA's Inception Report. As to planning structural assistance in the broader political sense, the project started in a situation where Estonia was already reviewing the first draft of the RDP and the pre-NDP, both of which form the basis for implementing the pre-accession funding instruments SAPARD, ISPA and Phare. Both drafts were containing a small fisheries chapter, which by that time presented an incomplete and rather distorted picture of the sector. In the frame of this twinning project a complete planning and programming exercise, though not aimed at pre-accession funds but aimed at the FIFG, should be accomplished. Therefore it was proposed by the PAA that this exercise could in parallel provide a welcome input into the revision process of the RDP/NDP. However, it turned out later that the timeframe of both processes did not match (the RDP/NDP were about to be finalised when the planning exercise for the FIFG was still in its starting phase) and this input, though existing to some extent, remained quite limited. At the end via the MoA some input even was provided the other way round.

The three day-seminars indicated as benchmarks in the Covenant, were successfully carried out by the PAA in the second quarter. Two of them were addressed to the public administration in fisheries, mainly on the ministry level, the third one was addressed to the professional associations and other representatives of the fisheries sector. The subjects dealt with in detail were the structural policy of the Union, its implementation through multi-annual assistance and guidance programmes and the programming of assistance. All seminar materials were copied and distributed to the participants after the seminars.

Throughout the first year of the project the PAA, as a partner for discussion or with own presentations on CFP issues, was in addition invited to take part in a number of meetings with fishermen or the industry in Estonia.

The major part of work in the structural policy part of the project was directed to two main tasks:

- to elaborate in a provisional form all planning papers as they would be required in fisheries for a MS objective-1-area and
- to elaborate a strategic paper for the development of the Estonian fishing fleet as a basis for a future Estonian MAGP.

The twinning partners agreed to apply the following principles to elaborating these papers:

1) The planning papers should embrace a provisional operational programme (ProvOP), a programme complement (ProvPC) and an Ex-ante evaluation. This, although Estonia will by the time of accession submit a Single Programming Document (SPD) and not a Community Support Framework, implemented via different operational programmes. The first idea behind this approach was that the fisheries administration would in this case already possess, for the best benefit of the sector, all the information needed to be integrated into the Estonian SPD by the time it will be elaborated and the Ministry of Finance will ask for the line ministries' contributions. The second idea was that this approach would allow to see the fisheries administration trained in all aspects of programming of structural assistance and well aware of its requirements.
2) Though guidance by the PAA would continuously be provided, the papers were to be elaborated by the Estonian fisheries administration alone, as this would ensure the best training effect.

3) According to the principle of partnership the social partners were to be consulted and involved into the planning process as close as possible. The benchmark for completing all afore mentioned planning and strategy papers according to the original Covenant was set for 1 November 2000, which was changed to 31 January 2001 with the first Addendum to the Covenant.

During the second quarter the fisheries department of the MoE contracted the Marine Institute to elaborate the ProvOP and ProvPC, whereas the fisheries department itself was to assume responsibility for supervision and for carrying out the ex-ante evaluation.

The first very incomplete draft of the ProvOP was ready at the end of October 2000 and received a written evaluation by the PAA. No substantive consultations with the social partners had taken place up to that stage.

Until the end of January 2001 the draft was revised, amended and sent for comments to the social partners (professional associations and public bodies like the Environmental Inspectorate and the MoA). In addition a two days meeting with the social partners took place in order to discuss the draft ProvOP. In this period, too, a questionnaire was sent to the fishermen and their association. February and March saw a series of working group meetings mainly targeted at improving the SWOT-analysis. The MoA was asked to contribute to the ProvOP with an analysis of the fish processing industry, as by that time the MoA had already completed most of the programming of SAPARD.

The Estonian versions of the ProvOP, ProvPC and Ex-ante evaluation were ready until May/June 2001, that is about four months later than stated in the Covenant. The English versions could in parallel be assessed by the PAA as from July and the PAA’s “Evaluation and Recommendations” to the ProvOP/PC were distributed and finally discussed with the MoE, MoA and Marine Institute in August/September 2001.

In order to facilitate future deliberations on an Estonian MAGP, to be decided upon at the time of accession (presupposed that MAGPs remain a key tool of the Common structural policy in fisheries), the fisheries department of the MoE set up a working group to elaborate a Strategic paper for the Estonian fishing fleet. Apart from the fisheries department of the MoE, the Environmental Inspectorate (fleet capacity questions) and the Marine Institute (resource questions) were engaged in this working group. In this way coordination was ensured with the process of completing a Fishing Vessel Register (FVR) under the responsibility of the Environmental Inspectorate, the technical setting up of which was supported by the Swedish National Board of Fisheries within a Phare project (No ZZ9719.01.01) that started in May 1999.

A first draft of this paper was ready for assessment by the PAA in November 2000. The draft was also made available to the Estonian fishermen’s Association, research institutes and the MoA. After discussion it was unanimously agreed to revise and supplement the draft with regard to the fleet’s capacity development and a review of the supporting legal and administrative framework. Emphasis was laid on checking the availability of capacity data, their reliability and their compliance with the EU requirements for vessel measurement, in particular to close the prevalent information gap with regard to the coastal fishing fleet. This work was taken up in January and continued up to May when the second draft was sent for comments to the Association.
and the MoA. The revised paper ("Strategy for the attainment of a stable balance between fish resources and the current fishing capacity") was again assessed by the PAA, discussed with the fisheries department of the MoE and slightly amended.

With regard to creating the administrative and organisational basis to implement an EU structural funds programme in fisheries, the respective objective in the Covenant reads: “… the administrative bodies responsible for implementation and execution of the structural policy will be determined … and capable of handling the structural assistance tools and to monitor the implementation according to EU requirements…”. The benchmark states: “… At this date (30 June 2001) also the pre-described handling and monitoring manual will be completed and training sessions will have taken place.”

A basic discussion on the respective administrative organisation requirements started during the fifth quarter of the project, involving the two fisheries departments of the MoE and the MoA. The Agricultural Registers and Information Board (ARIB), which already assumes responsibility as the accredited paying agency for SAPARD, and the Environmental Inspectorate were identified as possible administrative bodies to become involved in managing the FIFG. In cooperation with the MoA the RDP, the Rural Development and Agricultural Market Regulation Act (RDAMR) and the EU-EE Financing Agreement for SAPARD were reviewed in order to compare the managing, paying and monitoring procedures established to implement SAPARD in Estonia with the administrative procedures established to implement the operational programmes for fisheries in the MS.

In order to facilitate deliberations and for training purposes the PAA elaborated a FIFG-targeted “Manual on Management, Monitoring and Control” (Annex 9) which was distributed to the MoA, MoE, ARIB and Environmental Inspectorate in July. However, despite repeated attempts of the PAA to see meetings organised between the named institutions, no such meetings were arranged by the MoA/MoE. Upon the outcome of an internal meeting at the ARIB in July a "FIFG working group" was about to be established (with representatives of the MoA/MoE included), but this group did not meet up to September. Therefore no further input from the twinning project was possible.

With regard to the last benchmark in this part of the project the Covenant states: "... The drafting of provisional ministerial guidelines for financial assistance in the priority fields of operation (fishing fleet, fishery ports, processing industry) will be completed until June 30, 2001.”

A first draft of an act supposed to regulate structural assistance for the fishing fleet has been elaborated by the fisheries department of the MoE, taking into account the provisions of Regulation EC No 2792/1999. The draft was ready in June. After internal discussion it was sent to the MoA for comments in September and discussed with the PAA.

Within the frame of implementing SAPARD and based on the RDAMR Act the MoA has elaborated funding decrees with regard to the fish processing industry and aquaculture. However, though promised, a translation of the respective decrees has not been made available for the PAA’s assessment. Deliberations on how to administratively/legally regulate financial assistance for fishing port development in future have not yet started.
The 3-4 days study tour to Sweden and Germany, originally foreseen in the work schedule included in the Covenant, was cancelled. This was partly due to the unavailability of people (vacation, other missions), but mainly because the study tour was unanimously regarded as being less beneficial at a stage where the Estonian fisheries administration has seen recent reorganisations which might not yet be totally concluded.

Market policy

A one-day seminar on the new market regulation (104/2000) took place in December 2000 at the Ministry of Environment. The regulation and its implications was explained as well as the practical implementation in both Germany and Sweden. About 20 persons attended the seminar from both the administration and the industry. In May 2001 a one-day seminar on the marketing standards was carried out as well, with about the same number of participants. In this later seminar all concerned authorities participated; Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment, Environmental Inspectorate and the Veterinary Board. The emphasis of the presentation and in the discussions was the experience and the costs when introducing a system which was new both to the fishers and the first-hand buyers. One conclusion to be drawn is that it takes a very long time before all the actors of the market had such a good knowledge of the regulations that it was implemented in practice.

The benchmark of the Covenant states: .."The marketing standards will be implemented in Estonia by July 1, 2001. Within the Fisheries Department 4 employees will staff a new unit for market policy by the end of 1999..."

According to a government decision, taken in the second week of November 2000, a new unit was established in the Ministry of Agriculture to ensure Estonia’s preparations for implementing the Common market organisation in fisheries. This unit started to operate 11 December, 2000. The unit was in April 2001 transformed to the Department for Fishery Economics. Altogether 7 persons are in September 2001 working in this department.

The marketing standards have not been implemented and the result promised in the Covenant has consequently not been delivered in this respect.

A first draft of the Market regulation and Marketing standards has been drafted by the MoA. A conference on marketing standards was held on 31 July 2001 in Pärnu in co-operation with the Estonian Fishermen Association and other NGOs. This work has been undertaken without assistance from the project.

Fishery Information System

The Environmental Inspectorate has since 1999 worked with a local company in order to create a data-base system for the log-books, landing declarations and sales-notes (Estonian Fishery Information System). The new system has been in operation since January 1, 2000. A seminar has been held on the statistical reporting requirements of a
Union MS. Staff from the Inspectorate and the Fishery Department of the Ministry of Environment participated as well as the consultant, hired for the development.

The seminar revealed that the main elements lacking in the present system are the exclusion of the coastal and the high-sea catches. Most of the reports demanded by the Commission are not yet ready, however much data is available in the system. In order to have the system EU compatible much work still needs to be performed. The Ministry of Environment has formed a working group with all the concerned parties involved and a project plan is under composition. Financial resources are available for further development of the system.

Recommendations

The major part of results which were guaranteed in the Covenant have been achieved, though with delay. However, in some areas the results achieved are substantially less than anticipated when the Covenant was signed.

In the legislation harmonisation a substantial input of manpower is needed if the harmonisation will be reached at the end of 2002. In the future work, the reports and the recommendations made by this project and other PHARE projects should be analysed and taken into consideration if appropriate.

In the Structural Policy part about 80% of the anticipated results could be achieved. The maybe most important result is that a complete provisional programming exercise could be carried out. The papers elaborated can be regarded as the first comprehensive planning documents for fisheries in Estonia which take account of the whole sector and which is structured according to the principles of a Community structural fund programme. However, as explained in No. 5.2.1.1/2 there are still some marked deficiencies. As programming of structural assistance is nothing static but a continuous process, they can be overcome in future if their cause is analysed and steps for improvement are taken. The main deficiencies are the insufficient SWOT-analysis and the lack of translating established needs into an operable and consistent political strategy. These are due to three reasons:

- lack of (in particular: quantified) information with regard to a proper description of the sector’s situation and to important development aspects;
- within the MoE and the Marine Institute no tradition and more or less no experience in properly addressing socio-economic and market questions;
- the unavailability of pre-accession funding possibilities for large parts of the sector, which lead to a downgrading of efforts taken in the programming exercise. This becomes particular obvious when the SWOT-analysis of the fish processing sub-sector is compared with the other sub-sector analyses: a much clearer picture is presented here because the processing industry can receive pre-accession assistance within SAPARD and much more efforts were taken by the MoA to properly analyse this sub-sector. Naturally, which comes in addition, the MoA per se has a more socio-economic and market orientated approach.

In order to improve the planning and programming process and finally lead it to a success, the following recommendations should be considered:
- a closer review of the data collection system for the official statistics;
- continuing to further develop the fisheries information system and its technical basis in order to link different data sources;
- continuing to adapt the supporting legislation;
- a closer cooperation of all administrative bodies and institutions involved in fisheries;
- continuing to further rise the sector's awareness of information needs and to further integrate the sector's representatives into the programming process.

The need for a much closer cooperation between all persons and institutions to be involved is found to be of over-riding importance in a situation where the responsibility for structural policy in fisheries is factually divided between two ministries and the expertise in fisheries questions is scattered between a whole number of different institutions, not to speak of persons. To solve this will be the main key to success.

With regard to the fleet strategy paper which should be a precursor of a MAGP, Estonia is on a fairly good track. This paper will soon be developed into a political guidance programme for the Estonian fishing fleet. It will be the first paper which has ever existed in this respect. With a continuous updating of the Fishing Vessel Register (which has to be speeded up for the coastal fishing fleet) and the ongoing development and improvement of the legal basis for regulating access to resources and for limiting fleet capacity/fishing effort, Estonia will be in a position to successfully negotiate a MAGP with the Commission by the time of accession.

An area where further foreign assistance will be needed in future is the elaboration of detailed governmental or ministerial funding regulations for the different sub-sectors which shall receive financial assistance from the FIFG in future. Apart from the fish processing industry (which is being considered in the frame of SAPARD) this is an area where Estonia will not be able to build upon own experiences. As to this and the practical application of funding regulations, study tours to the MS and training periods in the MS can be an appropriate tool of assistance in future.

The question of how to administer a FIFG-based funding programme in Estonia (that is to manage, monitor and control), could not be answered in all aspects during the course of this project. However, sufficient grounds are laid to successfully address this question in future and without any doubts the MoA will be able to make the required experiences by implementing the pre-accession funding programme in agriculture (SAPARD).

The project participation in the Market Policy part has during the whole period been rather limited and the project can therefore not make any specific recommendations but to stress that the harmonization work must be intensified in order to compensate the time lost during the last two years.

The development of the Fisheries Information System must continue and this work has already started.

Notwithstanding the results achieved, the project has in every sub-element constantly been hampered by lack of sufficient Estonian counterparts. The reason is a general lack of qualified staff compared to the tasks allotted to the fisheries administration at the ministry level. As a consequence the downgrading of the EU accession work in the
face of various other urgent tasks was prevalent throughout the course of the project. Fishery issues of national/regional concern, but also preparations for and participation in various meetings of international fishery organisations most often were assigned a higher priority. As a result, the input from the Swedish National Board of Fisheries has been far less than stated in the Covenant. Accordingly this has implied that with regard to legal harmonization and market policy far less experience in the EU accession work has been transferred to the Estonian fisheries administration than was anticipated.

If the administrative organisation in a CC is still a matter of basic discussion and subject to fundamental governmental decisions it can be difficult to run a twinning project simultaneously. This is due to a general uneasiness within the organisation itself and a political resistance to be engaged in something that can be moved to another ministry. A reorganisation is also time-consuming for the staff, especially the head of the organisation.

The lack of a steady Estonian engagement in the project has been stated in the quarterly reports and also discussed in the Steering Committee. Apart from some considerable improvements in the Structural Policy part during the 2nd, 4th and 5th quarter, only minor improvements have occurred with regard to the other parts of the project. However, it has to be honoured that both, the staff situation and the clarification of responsibilities improved during the course of the project, if compared with the situation at the start of the project. This applies equally to the MoE and to the MoA. The reason why this could only have a minor effect on the implementation of the Twinning Project is that all newly employed persons predominantly had not yet acquired enough experience in fisheries and/or public administration. When recruiting new staff, experience and education in fisheries should be a main decisive factor. In terms of quantity the overall human resources of the two fisheries departments is assessed to be sufficient for the EU accession preparations.

The EU Commission and the EC-Delegations should more strongly stress in the dialogue with the Candidate Countries (CC) that the Common Fisheries Policy is a common policy with far ranging obligations and responsibilities for the future Member States. It must be pointed out that even if the sector or the country is small, all the administrative routines established through the CFP, for example the different reporting requirements, must still be implemented.

After all and despite the difficulties in implementing the Twinning Project, there is no doubt, that the project contributed considerably to rising the awareness of the CFP, both within the administration and within the sector. Both the MoE and the MoA are thoroughly convinced that without the Twinning Project Estonia's accession preparations would have proceeded with a much slower pace. Apart from the results achieved in the various parts of the project, the project's effect on the reorganisation of the Estonian fisheries administration at the ministry level is, within the ministries concerned, unanimously being regarded as an achievement which is assessed vital for Estonia's further accession preparations.

Conclusion and Recommendations
The major part of results which were guaranteed in the Covenant have been achieved, though with delay. However, in some areas the results achieved are substantially less than anticipated when the Covenant was signed.

In the legislation harmonisation a substantial input of manpower is needed if the harmonisation will be reached at the end of 2002. In the future work, the reports and the recommendations made by this project and other PHARE projects should be analysed and taken into consideration if appropriate.

In the Structural Policy part about 80% of the anticipated results could be achieved. The maybe most important result is that a complete provisional programming exercise could be carried out. The papers elaborated can be regarded as the first comprehensive planning documents for fisheries in Estonia which take account of the whole sector and which is structured according to the principles of a Community structural fund programme. However, as explained in No. 5.2.1.1/2 there are still some marked deficiencies. As programming of structural assistance is nothing static but a continuous process, they can be overcome in future if their cause is analysed and steps for improvement are taken. The main deficiencies are the insufficient SWOT-analysis and the lack of translating established needs into an operable and consistent political strategy. These are due to three reasons:

- lack of (in particular: quantified) information with regard to a proper description of the sector's situation and to important development aspects;
- within the MoE and the Marine Institute no tradition and more or less no experience in properly addressing socio-economic and market questions;
- the unavailability of pre-accession funding possibilities for large parts of the sector, which lead to a downgrading of efforts taken in the programming exercise. This becomes particular obvious when the SWOT-analysis of the fish processing sub-sector is compared with the other sub-sector analyses: a much clearer picture is presented here because the processing industry can receive pre-accession assistance within SAPARD and much more efforts were taken by the MoA to properly analyse this sub-sector. Naturally, which comes in addition, the MoA per se has a more socio-economic and market orientated approach.

In order to improve the planning and programming process and finally lead it to a success, the following recommendations should be considered:

- a closer review of the data collection system for the official statistics;
- continuing to further develop the fisheries information system and its technical basis in order to link different data sources;
- continuing to adapt the supporting legislation;
- a closer cooperation of all administrative bodies and institutions involved in fisheries;
- continuing to further rise the sector's awareness of information needs and to further integrate the sector's representatives into the programming process.

The need for a much closer cooperation between all persons and institutions to be involved is found to be of over-riding importance in a situation where the responsibility for structural policy in fisheries is factually divided between two ministries and the expertise in fisheries questions is scattered between a whole number of different institutions, not to speak of persons. To solve this will be the main key to success.
With regard to the **fleet strategy paper** which should be a precursor of a MAGP, Estonia is on a fairly good track. This paper will soon be developed into a political guidance programme for the Estonian fishing fleet. It will be the first paper which has ever existed in this respect. With a continuous updating of the Fishing Vessel Register (which has to be speeded up for the coastal fishing fleet) and the ongoing development and improvement of the legal basis for regulating access to resources and for limiting fleet capacity/fishing effort, Estonia will be in a position to successfully negotiate a MAGP with the Commission by the time of accession.

An area where further foreign assistance will be needed in future is the elaboration of detailed governmental or ministerial funding regulations for the different sub-sectors which shall receive financial assistance from the FIFG in future. Apart from the fish processing industry (which is being considered in the frame of SAPARD) this is an area where Estonia will not be able to build upon own experiences. As to this and the practical application of funding regulations, study tours to the MS and training periods in the MS can be an appropriate tool of assistance in future.

The question of how to **administer a FIFG-based funding programme** in Estonia (that is to manage, monitor and control), could not be answered in all aspects during the course of this project. However, sufficient grounds are laid to successfully address this question in future and without any doubts the MoA will be able to make the required experiences by implementing the pre-accession funding programme in agriculture (SAPARD).

6.1.3 The project participation in the Market Policy part has during the whole period been rather limited and the project can therefore not make any specific recommendations but to stress that the harmonisation work must be intensified in order to compensate the time lost during the last two years.

6.1.4 The development of the Fisheries Information System must continue and this work has already started.

6.2 Notwithstanding the results achieved, the project has in every sub-element constantly been hampered by lack of sufficient Estonian counterparts. The reason is a general lack of qualified staff compared to the tasks allotted to the fisheries administration at the ministry level. As a consequence the downgrading of the EU accession work in the face of various other urgent tasks was prevalent throughout the course of the project. Fishery issues of national/regional concern, but also preparations for and participation in various meetings of international fishery organisations most often were assigned a higher priority. As a result, the input from the Swedish National Board of Fisheries has been far less than stated in the Covenant. Accordingly this has implied that with regard to legal harmonisation and market policy far less experience in the EU accession work has been transferred to the Estonian fisheries administration than was anticipated.

If the administrative organisation in a CC is still a matter of basic discussion and subject to fundamental governmental decisions it can be difficult to run a twinning project simultaneously. This is due to a general uneasiness within the organisation itself and a political resistance to be engaged in something that can be moved to
another ministry. A reorganisation is also time-consuming for the staff, especially the head of the organisation.

The lack of a steady Estonian engagement in the project has been stated in the quarterly reports and also discussed in the Steering Committee. Apart from some considerable improvements in the Structural Policy part during the 2nd, 4th and 5th quarter, only minor improvements have occurred with regard to the other parts of the project. However, it has to be honoured that both, the staff situation and the clarification of responsibilities improved during the course of the project, if compared with the situation at the start of the project. This applies equally to the MoE and to the MoA. The reason why this could only have a minor effect on the implementation of the Twinning Project is that all newly employed persons predominantly had not yet acquired enough experience in fisheries and/or public administration. When recruiting new staff, experience and education in fisheries should be a main decisive factor. In terms of quantity the overall human resources of the two fisheries departments is assessed to be sufficient for the EU accession preparations.

6.3 The EU Commission and the EC-Delegations should more strongly stress in the dialogue with the Candidate Countries (CC) that the Common Fisheries Policy is a common policy with far ranging obligations and responsibilities for the future Member States. It must be pointed out that even if the sector or the country is small, all the administrative routines established through the CFP, for example the different reporting requirements, must still be implemented.

6.4 After all and despite the difficulties in implementing the Twinning Project, there is no doubt, that the project contributed considerably to rising the awareness of the CFP, both within the administration and within the sector. Both the MoE and the MoA are thoroughly convinced that without the Twinning Project Estonia's accession preparations would have proceeded with a much slower pace. Apart from the results achieved in the various parts of the project, the project's effect on the reorganisation of the Estonian fisheries administration at the ministry level is, within the ministries concerned, unanimously being regarded as an achievement which is assessed vital for Estonia's further accession preparations.

Annex 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training/persons</th>
<th>MoA</th>
<th>ARIB</th>
<th>Veterinary and Food Board</th>
<th>Ministry of Environment</th>
<th>Producer Organisations</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIFG control and planning measures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of marketing standards and quality of fish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>February 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ressource control measures linked to Market policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of POs` reporting responsibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>March 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study tour on FIFG aspects (7days)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>September 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The indicative duration of training is 3 days.
Indicative number of staff to be trained according to the training plan to be elaborated by the PAA: