



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
Impact Assessment Board

Brussels,
D(2011)

Opinion

Title **DG MARE - Impact Assessment on Future Financial Instrument for Fisheries and Maritime Policies**

(draft version of 28 July 2011)

(A) Context

The Commission adopted an over-arching proposal for the next multiannual financial framework (MFF) for EU spending on 29 June 2011, fixing the overall budget, allocations across high-level headings and key implementation choices. A series of follow-up proposals to provide a legal basis for sectoral spending programmes and to establish their specific budgetary arrangements are currently being finalised. This Impact Assessment report will accompany the proposals within the MFF as regards the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) and the Integrated Maritime Policy (IMP) for the years 2014-20. Its scope includes the following financial instruments currently in use: European Fisheries Fund, Second Financial Instrument, Integrated Maritime Policy, and the European Agriculture Guarantee Fund related to the Common Market Organization (CMO) for fisheries and aquaculture products. The IA builds on the conclusions of the IAs on the CFP reform and the CMO and closely corresponds to the June MFF communication. It serves as an ex-ante evaluation.

The IAB has focused on the policy choices not yet fixed in the MFF June package.

(B) Overall assessment

While a substantial amount of analysis has been carried out to support the revision of the policy, further work is needed on several points. Firstly, the report should strengthen the analysis of the current problems, and should clearly identify the policy choices remaining after the adoption of the 'A budget for Europe 2020 Communication'. Secondly, the discussion on the value-added of the individual components of the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund should be further elaborated. Thirdly, greater clarity is needed on the practical arrangements ensuring better co-ordination with other EU funding. Finally, the report should more thoroughly assess the monitoring aspects and their costs.

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

(1) Strengthen the analysis of implementation problems. The report should provide further information in particular with regard to the reasons for slow uptake of funding, the limited impact of the current spending on preventing unemployment, and the policy effects in outermost regions. The report should provide, where applicable, illustrative examples of economic indicators which can help to provide a clearer picture of the problems. In this context, the report should clarify what problems are expected to be addressed by changes to the regulatory framework (e.g. banning discards) and what would require financing at the EU level. In addition, the report should be clearer about the remaining policy choices, which have not yet been decided in the reform of the Common Fisheries Policy or in the Communication on the budget for Europe 2020.

(2) Strengthen the analysis of value-added of individual components of the new instruments. The report should provide greater clarity on the need for and value-added of EU funding in the aquaculture sector. It should also provide further analysis on the rationale for applying different levels of co-funding rate as envisaged under some policy options. More generally, it should provide more quantitative data in the assessment of the impacts. Finally, the contribution to the objectives of Europe 2020 should be made more visible.

(3) Improve the analysis of co-ordination with other funds. Given the wide spectrum of intervention of the EMFF, the report should strengthen the analysis of potential risk of overlaps with other funds (both with shared management, such as regional funds, and centrally managed such as LIFE), and provide more practical examples of how better co-ordination will be achieved (e.g. with operational programmes or partnership contracts).

(4) Clarify further the monitoring and evaluation arrangements. Given the weaknesses of the current monitoring and evaluation system, the report should provide greater clarity about the new indicators to be included in the EMFF Regulation, the costs of this new monitoring and the actors concerned. The report should also include an assessment of potential simplification benefits, resulting from consolidation of the programming and expenditure structures. The report should also indicate how the proposed framework would relate to the other existing monitoring systems (e.g. under regional and cohesion policy).

Some more technical comments have been transmitted directly to the author DG and are expected to be incorporated in the final version of the impact assessment report

(D) Procedure and presentation

Whenever relevant (and possible) the report should present the views of the stakeholders on the proposed options. The executive summary should include a clearer overview of expected impacts.

(E) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2011/MARE/005
External expertise used	No
Date of IAB meeting	Written procedure