



Ref.: 6/REL

Rome, 08 January 2014

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP WG5 ON THE EVALUATION OF THE SOCIO ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE REFORM TO THE CFP IN THE MEMBER STATES. PARIS 16<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2013

Participants: see attached list

Coordinator: Antonio Pucillo

Documents attached: Agenda, slides by Frangiskos Nikolian on the EMFF, slides by Elise Petre on the GEPETO project.

1. Working Group 5 (GL5) met in Paris on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2013 to continue discussion on the situation of the respective countries, basing the session on the document drafted and approved last year, and also to begin to study the issues of diversification and complimentary activities for the fishing enterprises in detail.

2. Before passing the floor to the Executive Secretary, the outgoing coordinator recalled that each working group has a coordinator who is in charge of organising the WG meetings, gathering the documents, and if necessary sub-working groups could be established in order to organize the work to be carried out in the most efficient way possible. The Executive Secretary took the floor to present item 2 of the Agenda relative to the nomination of the WG5 coordinator and informed the meeting that two candidates had been proposed: Pucillo of ETF and Iolanda Piedra of IVEAEMPA, and she asked the participants if there were any further candidatures.

The IVEAEMPA representative informed the meeting that the two candidates considered proposing dual coordination, so that ETF could cover the social aspects while IVEAEMPA dealt with the economic matters. The ETF candidate was asked to comment and stated that the two aspects – on one side the productive activities and the efficiency of the workers and on the other the maintenance of income levels – should develop in parallel.

3. The Executive Secretary asked the participants whether they agreed with the notion of joint candidature or if they preferred individual nominations. A vote was taken by raised hands: 5 participants voted for the joint candidature, 8 for the individual one and one participant abstained. The Secretary then requested votes to be cast in the same way for each single candidate and 14 voted for Pucillo (ETF) while 2 voted for Piedra (IVEAEMPA). As a result, Pucillo was nominated coordinator of the Working Group.

4. The new coordinator thanked the participants for the preference expressed and stressed that collaboration with IVEAEMPA is crucial, the economic element must be considered and cannot be regarded as independent from the social issues. He asked the meeting if agreement could be reached on the formation of this sub-group. On the basis of the subsequent discussion it was decided that the establishment of a sub-group on economic aspects was not appropriate.



5. The coordinator passed on to item 3 of the Agenda and this same Agenda was thus adopted without changes. Monique Pariat then took the floor to introduce the presentation by Frangiscos Nikolian on the EMFF; it was underlined that the role of the RAC/AC in the reformed CFP is strengthened through regionalization and that they will contribute to the definition of the multiannual management plans with the involvement of the Member States.

6. With the support of slides, Frangiscos Nikolian presented a general picture of the forthcoming period where the EMFF programming is concerned (focusing on the people and communities that depend on fisheries), prepared by the EC in order to provide a useful tool for the implementation of the CFP. The main aim of the new fund is based, to give an example, on the development of aquaculture, on the promotion of the transition towards sustainable fisheries, on the diversification of fishers' activities. The meeting was informed on the progress being made on these issues: in November and December the triologue will be held, so that in the coming spring the legal basis will be available. The EFMM will therefore not be adopted before the second half of 2014.

7. The coordinator thanked Mr Nikolian for the presentation of the EMFF and opened the floor to debate. Many of the interventions requested further information on the state of the Mediterranean stocks. Ms Pariat replied that the most exploited stocks are those of demersal and small pelagic species, there are numerous reasons for this (pollution, climate change), however this is a problem that must be dealt with by strengthening data collection and by allocating funds for diversification. On the matter of the difficulties faced by fishing enterprises to access and use complimentary aid, Ms Pariat informed the meeting that they are about to begin the programming phase and in the coming months they will deal with the operative programme of each single fund, moreover the EMFF will also support venture capital. Mr Nikolian added that, at present, the final budget is not known.

8. The FNCCP representative took the floor and highlighted that, while the EMFF does foresee *ad hoc* measures for small-scale fisheries, the definition set at 12 m total length is not a sufficient parameter, and the risk is that many small-scale fishing vessels that are longer than 12 m will not be able to access these funds as foreseen in the new EMFF.

9. Mr Buonfiglio recalled that issues such as minimum landing sizes, mesh size and distance from the coast are internal matters relative to the Mediterranean Regulation, and took the opportunity to remind those present that the Secretary had requested contributions to be sent, in view of the forthcoming DG MARE meeting to be held on 13<sup>th</sup> November on the CFP and on the Mediterranean Regulation. Where the EMFF is concerned, it is only possible to intervene through Members of the European Parliament and with the Council of Ministers.

10. The coordinator passed on to item 5 of the Agenda and emphasized that the Secretariat had only received contributions from ETF IVEAEMPA and UNCIPESCA. He insisted on the importance of gathering as much data and information as possible in order to demonstrate that the EFF has failed on socio-economic issues. It would therefore be helpful if the participants could send further contributions by December in order to implement the document adopted last year, and in particular receive the data differentiated by fleet type. The coordinator then presented the data received from the Spanish unions, which are alarming as they indicated that from 2002 to 2011 there has been a decrease of 50% in the number fishery workers.



11. There were no further interventions and therefore the coordinator moved on to the next Agenda item, and therefore Elise Petre presented the GEPETO project that is managed by RAC SWW with the help of slides. The coordinator then thanked her for the presentation and opened the floor to discussion. WWF asked for information on the INTERREG funding schemes. Ms Petre replied that she was not informed on this aspect.
12. The coordinator moved on to item 9 of the Agenda, relative to diversification and complimentary activities for fishing enterprises.
13. KGZS requested further information on the legal definition of fisheries tourism and asked whether this activity is included among fisheries activities. These queries were made because next year Slovenia will modify national legislation on this activity.
14. CRPMEM CORSE informed the meeting that in France the definition of fisheries tourism is: an activity in which 80% of the income is from fisheries and the remaining 20% from diversification.
15. CRPMEM LR informed those present that in the Languedoc Roussillon region, fisheries tourism activities have been implemented and the National Committee (CNP MEM) is preparing a convention so that such activities can be extended to the rest of the county.
16. AGCI AGRITAL recalled that in Italy fisheries tourism activities have been going on for over 20 years and that several solutions had been found to allow the development of this form of income alongside fisheries activities. Fisheries tourism is authorized on professional fishing vessels and is not an activity that increases the number of fishing trips made by the fleet. Another form of fisheries-related tourism was also developed, in this case the fishers receive the tourists on the shore. Over time, numerous variables have come to light, such as whether fishers that also carry out these activities can make use of VAT subsidies or not, as is the case for the professional fisheries sector. These variables have all been worked into Italian legislation. At European level, there is no such legislation, RAC MED could therefore make a proposal to this effect to the EC, in order to regulate fisheries tourism in such a way that there is a common policy that all Member States should respect.
17. FBCP informed the meeting that in Spain there is no legislation on the diversification of fisheries activities.
18. FNCCP intervened to recall that in Spain a decree is in force on fisheries tourism in which there are no limits on the type of fishery, all fishers involved must be authorized, but the benefits are shared as with the fisheries product. Agreement was expressed with the proposal made by AGCI AGRITAL for a European regulation.
19. GKTS informed the meeting that in Malta there is no *ad hoc* legislation on fisheries tourism yet.
20. Legambiente agreed with the proposal made by Mr Buonfiglio. The procedure to be followed would ideally fix regulations that would “label” fisheries tourism activities, in order to receive recognition for them and to create a brand.
21. The coordinator took the floor and encouraged the participants to send the Secretariat all possible information in order to integrate and improve the available data on the negative effects of the reform to the CFP on the fisheries system in the Mediterranean. The participants were also requested to send in the necessary documentation to verify the legislation in force in each Member State on fisheries tourism activities. There were no further matters to discuss, therefore the participants were thanked for their presence and the interpreters for their work. The meeting concluded at 16.30.

