Contribution ID: 9c971578-94a5-4bf8-a732-4fecf0f75d6c
Date: 03/04/2025 14:35:57

Public Consultation - CFP Regulation Evaluation

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

About this consultation
The purpose of this public consultation is to gather your input and views about the functioning of the common fisheries policy (CFP) Regulation (Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013) in order to support the evaluation of this Regulation.

This evaluation will consider how the existing CFP Regulation is performing to date and assess how the legal framework allows its current objectives to be met and address emerging challenges. It will cover all action within the EU and the external action of the CFP Regulation.

The evaluation will take stock of the CFP Regulation's impact in the conservation of marine biological resources and the management of fisheries and fleets exploiting such resources, the supply chain, consumers and public authorities in all EU Member States over the past 10 years of implementation (2014-2024), building on earlier consultations and input provided as preparation for the Commission Communication on the common fisheries policy today and tomorrow (COM/2023/103)

The questions are organised around four of the five standard evaluation criteria used by the European Commission in order to assess the extent to which the CFP Regulation:

- is effective in fulfilling expectations and meeting its objectives;
- is efficient in terms of cost-effectiveness and proportionality of actual costs to benefits;
- is relevant to current and emerging needs;
- is coherent (internally and externally with other EU interventions or international agreements)

These criteria are a set of principles used by the European Commission to assess the quality and impact of policies and regulations to ensure that EU policies are well-designed, and that they deliver real benefits to citizens and businesses across the EU.

Please comment on any or all topics (you can skip questions if you have nothing to say) and provide any other information you think relevant.

At the end of the survey, you can upload a document or position paper (maximum size 3 MB) or link if your contribution is in html format. You can also provide additional comments or information.

About you

* Language of my contribution

- ○ Bulgarian
- ○ Croatian
- ○ Czech
- ○ Danish
- ○ Dutch
- ◉ English
- ○ Estonian
- ○ Finnish
- ○ French
- ○ German
- ○ Greek
- ○ Hungarian
- ○ Irish
- ○ Italian
- ○ Latvian
- ○ Lithuanian
- ○ Maltese
- ○ Polish
- ○ Portuguese
- ○ Romanian
- ○ Slovak
- ○ Slovenian
- ○ Spanish
- ○ Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- ○ Academic/research institution
- ○ Business association
- ○ Company/business
- ○ Consumer organisation
- ○ EU citizen
- ○ Environmental organisation

- ( ) Non-EU citizen
- ( ) Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- ( ) Public authority
- ( ) Trade union
- (•) Other

* First name

Marzia

* Surname

Piron

* Email (this won't be published)

segreteria@med-ac.eu

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Mediterranean Advisory Council

* Organisation size

- (•) Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- ( ) Small (10 to 49 employees)
- ( ) Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- ( ) Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

Check if your organisation is on the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

283785319481-25

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

This list does not represent the official position of the European institutions with regard to the legal status or policy of the entities mentioned. It is a harmonisation of often divergent lists and practices.

- ( ) Afghanistan
- ( ) Djibouti
- ( ) Libya
- ( ) Saint Martin

- Åland Islands
- Albania
- Algeria
- American Samoa
- Andorra
- Angola
- Anguilla
- Antarctica
- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Dominica
- Dominican Republic
- Ecuador
- Egypt
- El Salvador
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Estonia
- Eswatini
- Ethiopia
- Falkland Islands
- Faroe Islands
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Liechtenstein
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Macau
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar/Burma
- Namibia
- Saint Pierre and Miquelon
- Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
- Samoa
- San Marino
- São Tomé and Príncipe
- Saudi Arabia
- Senegal
- Serbia
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Sint Maarten
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden

- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Switzerland
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Türkiye
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States

- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **Fo r the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association, 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.** Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

* Contribution publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

○ **Anonymous**
Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

◉ **Public**
Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

☑ I agree with the personal data protection provisions

Effectiveness of the CFP Regulation

1. What impact do you think the CFP Regulation has had to?

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion /No answer
The contribution to the environmental sustainability and conservation of marine resources	○	◉	○	○	○	○
The contribution to the economic sustainability of people active in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors and consumers	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Contributing to the social conditions (fair standard of living; training) of people active in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors and of consumers	○	○	○	◉	○	○

1a. What impact do you think the CFP Regulation has had on the contribution to the environmental sustainability and conservation of marine resources

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very Negative	No opinion /no answer
Helping to keep fish stocks at healthy levels or bring them back to those levels	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Contributing to healthy marine ecosystems (protecting young fish, the seabed, sensitive species such as marine mammals and seabirds and Natura 2000 sites and other marine protected areas and)	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Contributing to international ocean governance in support of environmental sustainability	○	○	◉	○	○	○
Supporting animal health and welfare	○	◉	○	○	○	○

Please add any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking

The management measures adopted so far were mainly impacting on the fishing sector because only fishing mortality was considered, without a holistic view. The socio-economic sustainability of the CFP management measures has not been assessed considering updated information and data. MEDAC Ref. 148/2024.

1b. What impact do you think the CFP Regulation has had on the contribution to the economic sustainability of people active in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors (owners, workers, employers, operators) and consumers

specifically on contributing to profitable activities:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion /No answer
in the fisheries catching sector	○	○	○	○	◉	○
in the fisheries processing sector	○	○	○	◉	○	○
In the fisheries marketing sector	○	○	○	◉	○	○
in the aquaculture sector	○	○	○	○	○	◉

What impact do you think the CFP Regulation has had on supporting modernisation and innovation:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion /No answer
in the fisheries catching sector	○	○	◉	○	○	○
in the fisheries processing sector	○	◉	○	○	○	○
In the fisheries marketing sector	○	◉	○	○	○	○
in the aquaculture sector	○	○	○	○	○	◉

What impact do you think the CFP Regulation has had on the contribution to:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion /No answer
Ensuring availability of food supplies at reasonable prices for consumers	○	○	◉	○	○	○
Supplying aquatic food to processors and consumers with adequate level of information	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Improving stability of the fishery and aquaculture market	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Ensuring fair competition conditions, between stakeholders of the fishery and aquaculture sector on the EU market	○	○	○	◉	○	○

Please add any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking

The reported positive impact emerged mainly through the action of producer organisations and their production and marketing plans. Multi-annual plans, EU and GFCM (MEDAC Ref. 20/2025): considering the huge efforts made by the EU fleets in the framework of the current MAPs a special attention to the socioeconomic monitoring aimed to provide the most updates information on the EU coastal communities must be paid (MEDAC Ref. 182/2024).

1c. What impact do you think the CFP Regulation has had on contributing to the social conditions of people active in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors

Specifically, on ensuring a fair standard of living for the people active in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors (owners, workers, employers, employees,

operators), including through a fair and stable income and decent working conditions

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion /No answer
in the fisheries catching sector	○	○	○	○	◉	○
in the aquatic food processing sector	○	○	○	○	○	◉
In the aquatic food marketing sector	○	○	○	○	○	◉
in the aquaculture sector	○	○	○	○	○	◉

What impact do you think the CFP Regulation has had on the following social aspects?

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion /No answer
Ensuring a fair allocation of fishing opportunities to fishers	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Supporting small-scale fishers	○	○	◉	○	○	○
Supporting small-scale aquaculture farmers	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Supporting coastal communities dependent on fishing and aquaculture	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Taking into account the interests of consumers by ensuring the availability of food supplies at reasonable prices, enabling informed choices and promoting responsible consumption	○	◉	○	○	○	○

Please add any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking

The social impact of the CFP has been absolutely negative, as policies have always focused more on environmental protection than on social aspects. For example, prior to the implementation of measures in multi-annual plans, socio-economic impact studies were often not even presented and evaluated. Multi-annual plans, EU and GFCM (MEDAC Ref. 20/2025): considering the huge efforts made by the EU fleets in the framework of the current MAPs a special attention to the socioeconomic monitoring aimed to provide the most updated information on the EU coastal communities must be paid (MEDAC Ref. 182/2024).

Efficiency of the CFP Regulation

A reminder:
The CFP regulation's objectives

"Long-term environmental sustainability" includes the sustainable exploitation of marine biological resources (through the use of maximum sustainable yield) as well as preserving marine habitats and sensitive species.

"Economic benefits" includes increased productivity, stable markets, availability of food supplies, reducing the Union market's dependence on food imports, reasonable prices for consumers, economic development in coastal areas and overall smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

"Social and employment benefits" includes a fair standard of living for the fisheries sector including small-scale fisheries, improvement of safety and working conditions for fishing operators, direct and indirect job creation, as well as preservation of traditional fishing activities in dependent coastal communities.

2. How you would rate the contribution of the following elements of the CFP Regulation to achieving its objectives?

Contribution of **Maximum sustainable yield** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Economic objectives	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Social objectives	○	○	○	○	◉	○

Contribution of the **landing obligation** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Economic objectives	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Social objectives	○	○	○	◉	○	○

Contribution of **Fleet capacity limits** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	○	◉	○	○	○	○

Economic objectives	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Social objectives	○	○	○	○	◉	○

Contribution of **the multiannual plans** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Economic objectives	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Social objectives	○	○	○	○	◉	○

Contribution of **regional cooperation on conservation measures via joint recommendations by the Member States** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	◉	○	○	○	○	○
Economic objectives	◉	○	○	○	○	○
Social objectives	◉	○	○	○	○	○

Contribution of **adopting conservation measures necessary for compliance with obligations under EU environmental legislation** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Economic objectives	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Social objectives	○	○	○	○	◉	○

Contribution of **adopting Commission (conservation) measures in case of a serious threat to marine biological resources** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Economic objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Social objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉

Contribution of **Member State emergency measures** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Economic objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Social objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉

Contribution of **professional organisations, incl. producer organisations** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Economic objectives	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Social objectives	○	◉	○	○	○	○

Contribution of **allocation of fishing opportunities** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Economic objectives	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Social objectives	○	◉	○	○	○	○

Contribution of **Sustainable Fisheries Partnership Agreements** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Economic objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Social objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉

Contribution of the **international and regional Fisheries management agreements** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer

Environmental objectives	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Economic objectives	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Social objectives	○	○	○	◉	○	○

Contribution of the **management of stocks shared with third countries** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Economic objectives	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Social objectives	○	○	○	○	◉	○

Contribution of the **Commission strategic guidelines and Member States' multi-annual national strategic plans on aquaculture** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Economic objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Social objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉

Contribution of the **open method of coordination of Member States on aquaculture** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Economic objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Social objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉

Contribution of the **marketing standards** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Economic objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉

Social objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉

Contribution of **consumer information/ labelling rules** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Economic objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉
Social objectives	○	○	○	○	○	◉

Please add any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking

LANDING OBLIGATION - The MEDAC raised up the same concerns about the implementation of the landing obligation and the socioeconomic impact since the beginning (MEDAC Ref. 129/2024): “A recent study “Synthesis of the landing obligation measures and discard rates” concluded there was no evidence of changes to the discarding practice in fisheries and that discarding was still taking place.
Stakeholders contributing to the study identified the main reasons for this: complex legislation, numerous exemptions in the various Commission delegated regulations and the substantial amount of work to be done on board due to the landing obligation.
Participation of the fishers in further development of these tools are essential to the stakeholders’ view.
Study “Synthesis of the landing obligation measures and discard rates for the Mediterranean and the Black Sea”: In the study, respondents evaluated positively the amount of information and the means employed to inform about the features of the landing obligation implementation by Member States’- and control authorities to fishing operators.
European Parliament Initiative report “Securing the objectives of the landing obligation under Article 15 of the Common Fisheries Policy”: emphasised the socioeconomic impact of the landing obligation on the industry, and the need for the Commission to evaluate the impact.
The CFP Regulation recognises the difficulty in implementing the landing obligation in mixed fisheries in which more than one species is present and where different species are likely to be caught in the same fishing operation. Stakeholders from the industry, trade unions and public authorities all mentioned in the stakeholder consultation carried out by DG MARE the complex difficulties with choke situations.
Management decisions relating to maximum sustainable yield in mixed fisheries should factor in the difficulty of fishing all stocks in a mixed fishery at maximum sustainable yield at the same time, in particular where scientific advice indicates that it is very difficult to avoid the phenomenon of choke species by increasing the selectivity of the fishing gear- and methods used.”

Governance

A reminder: Governance

The CFP regulation states that the management of fisheries should be guided by principles of good governance, including principles such as:

- Decision-making based on best available scientific advice;
- Broad stakeholder involvement, in particular advisory councils*, in all stages of the decision-making process;
- Taking into account regional specificities through a regional approach;

- Transparency and coherence between the internal and external dimension of the CFP.
- The clear definition of responsibilities at the Union, regional, national and local levels;

*Advisory Councils are stakeholder-led organisations that provide the Commission and EU countries with recommendations on fisheries management matters.

3. How effective is the governance system of the CFP Regulation towards reaching environmental, social or economic sustainability?

	Very effective	somewhat effective	Neutral	Somewhat ineffective	Not effective at all	No opinion /No answer
Environmental sustainability	○	◉	○	○	○	○
social sustainability	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Economic sustainability	○	○	○	◉	○	○

Please add any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking

From a governance point of view, a strong involvement of fishers in decision-making and ownership of the measures adopted are also a prerequisite for success (MEDAC Ref. 129/2024 and 148/2024). The regionalisation approach taken by the CFP, the empowerment of producer organisations under the Common Market Organisation Regulation and the role given to Advisory Councils are ways to achieve this involvement and ownership.
In particular, the regionalisation approach in the CFP provides the basis for all stakeholders to work together to define and agree on the fisheries measures adapted to the local or regional context. Regionalisation has shown to be a good tool to adopt region-specific measures. With the regional groups set up and cooperation underway in the regional sea basins, it has proven to be the most effective way to ensure the bottom-up transition from the political ambition to real implementation on the ground. The study on regionalisation concluded that regionalisation helps achieve the objective set out in Article 2(5)(j) of the CFP Regulation: to be coherent with other EU policies.
The CFP Regulation has recognised the importance of regionalisation, however the implementation of regionalisation is carried out based on the laws unified for the whole of the EU, instead of adopting a regional approach. The only way of managing fisheries at the EU level is through quotas allocated by species, and it is not the correct way to manage fisheries for all seas.
The MEDAC reiterates the content of the letter on MSP (MEDAC Ref. 113/2024) on the importance of the involvement of the stakeholders in the process of the MSP.

4. How effective is the CFP Regulation's governance system in achieving the following:

	Very effective	somewhat effective	Neutral	Somewhat ineffective	Not effective at all	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
In collecting scientific advice	○	○	○	◉	○	○
In using scientific advice to inform its policy decisions	○	○	○	◉	○	○
In involving stakeholders at all stages of the policy-making process	○	○	○	◉	○	○
In empowering stakeholders through professional organisations, in particular producer organisations, to implement the CFP	○	◉	○	○	○	○
In managing EU fish stocks in a sustainable way	○	◉	○	○	○	○
In managing shared fish stocks in a sustainable way	○	◉	○	○	○	○
In managing fish stocks at international level in a sustainable way contributing to international ocean governance	○	○	◉	○	○	○
In managing aquaculture in a sustainable way	○	○	○	○	○	◉
In contributing to healthy marine ecosystems (protecting young fish, the seabed, Natura 2000 sites and other marine protected areas, sensitive species such as marine mammals and seabirds)	○	◉	○	○	○	○
In providing sufficient flexibility to adapt to regional differences: in the European sea basins (Baltic Sea, North Sea, North Western Waters, South Western Waters, Mediterranean Sea, Black Sea)	○	○	○	○	◉	○
In providing sufficient flexibility to adapt to regional differences: in the outermost regions	○	○	○	○	○	◉
In ensuring transparency in decision making?	○	○	○	○	◉	○

Please add any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking

MEDAC Ref. 148/2024

5. To what extent has legal enforcement action at EU level (EU Pilots and infringements) contributed to ensuring compliance with the CFP Regulation?

- ○ Very effective
- ○ Effective
- ○ Neutral
- ○ not very effective
- ○ ineffective
- ◉ No opinion/ unfamiliar with the topic

Please add any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking

Effectiveness and Efficiency

6. How would you rate the following elements that could challenge the successfulness of the CFP Regulation (i.e. achieving objectives)?

	Very important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Not important at all	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
Complexity of CFP legal requirements	◉	○	○	○	○	○
Inconsistent or lack of control and enforcement	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Lack of flexibility of the legal framework at EU level	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Lack of flexibility of the legal framework at regional sea-basin level	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Lack of flexibility of the legal framework at national level	◉	○	○	○	○	○
Difficulties in implementing new technology and innovation to meet CFP objectives	○	○	◉	○	○	○
Deviation from scientific advice when adopting fisheries conservation measures	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Challenges in implementing regionalisation for fisheries measures to contribute to environmental obligations	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Exemptions to the landing obligation	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Lack of attractiveness of the sector: for workers	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Lack of attractiveness of the sectorfor fishers and aquaculture producers	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Lack of attractiveness of the sector: for investors	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Unfair competition	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Regional disparities within the EU	○	◉	○	○	○	○

Contribution to food security	◉	○	○	○	○	○
Lack of predictability for: Availability of fishing opportunities	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Lack of predictability for: Climate change and weather conditions	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Lack of predictability for: Market conditions	○	◉	○	○	○	○

7a. To what extent do you consider the compliance costs generated by the CFP Regulation, including administrative burden, as:

Compliance cost (all direct cost):	High	Somewhat high	Acceptable	Somewhat low	Low	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
in the catching sector	◉	○	○	○	○	○
in the processing sector	○	○	○	○	○	◉
in the aquaculture sect	○	○	○	○	○	◉
for national public authorities	○	◉	○	○	○	○
For EU public authorities	○	◉	○	○	○	○

Administrative burden (reporting, registration, labelling etc.)

Administrative burden (reporting obligations, registration, labelling etc.)	High	Somewhat high	Acceptable	Somewhat low	Low	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
in the catching sector	◉	○	○	○	○	○
in the processing sector	○	○	○	○	○	◉
in the aquaculture sect	○	○	○	○	○	◉
for national public authorities	○	◉	○	○	○	○
For EU public authorities	○	◉	○	○	○	○

Please justify your answer, in particular if you considered these costs high (or unreasonably) by specifying them.

7b. According to your view, which areas of the CFP Regulation have potential for simplification and cost reduction?

- ☑ Measures for the conservation and sustainable exploitation of marine biological resources
- ☐ Common market organisation
- ☐ Aquaculture
- ☑ Control and enforcement

- [x] Governance
- [ ] External policy
- [ ] No such area

To specify: Measures for the conservation and sustainable exploitation of marine biological resources, simplification and cost reduction potential areas

- [ ] Rules on access to waters
- [x] Adoption of Conservation measures, including technical measures
- [x] Fishing capacity management
- [ ] Scientific base for fisheries management/data collection

To specify Governance simplificaiton and cost reduction potential areas

- [x] the taking into account of regional specificities, through a regionalised approach
- [ ] the establishment of measures in accordance with the best available scientific advice
- [ ] coherence between the internal and external dimension of the CFP Regulation
- [x] appropriate involvement of stakeholders, in particular Advisory Councils, at all stages - from conception to implementation of the measures;

Could you please briefly elaborate on your selection?

The MEDAC hihglights that the size of the EU fleet has been decreasing since 1996 due to progressing management policy, including subsidies for scrapping. Moreover, in this section for the Mediterranean fleet the lack of generational turnover and the obsolescence of the fishing fleet has to be considered when the fishing capacity is assessed.
So, the management decisions related to the fishing capacity should consider the socioeconomic aspects (MEDAC Ref. 148/2024).

Relevance of the CFP Regulation

9. To what extent do you agree that the objectives of the CFP Regulation have remained relevant over the past 10 years / implementation period?

	Fully relevant	Somewhat relevant	Neutral	Somewhat irrelevant	Fully irrelevant	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic

Fostering “Long-term environmental sustainability of fishing and aquaculture activities”	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Ensuring “Economic benefits”	◉	○	○	○	○	○
Ensuring “Social and employment benefits”	◉	○	○	○	○	○
Contributing to the availability of food supplies	◉	○	○	○	○	○
Pursue the objectives at international level	◉	○	○	○	○	○

Please add any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking

The general objectives of the CFP are still the same. The results so far are not satisfactory, especially in social and economic terms. And very often the environmental ones have not been achieved either. This is why the causes of the theorised environmental damage of fishing should consider also other areas not investigated by the CFP.

Are there specific needs missing in your opinion, that are not sufficiently addressed in the current CFP Regulation and its objectives, if so, which?

Yes, factors other than fishing that impact on living aquatic resources are not addressed. A holistic approach has not been implemented.

10. To what extent do you consider that the following challenges, raised in different stakeholder fora or recommendations, are sufficiently addressed today by the CFP Regulation

	Sufficiently addressed	Somewhat addressed	Neutral	Somewhat not addressed	Not addressed at all	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
Brexit and its effect on the implementation	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Governance of commonly shared or managed stocks	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Impact of climate change / mitigation and adaptation (e.g. stock migration, natural disasters, invasive species, acidification, heatwaves)	◉	○	○	○	○	○
Impact of biodiversity loss including loss of ecosystem services	◉	○	○	○	○	○
Pollution, including eutrophication of waters leading to oxygen-deprived marine areas ('dead zones')	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Unstable geopolitical context	○	○	○	○	◉	○
International competition (eg. economic, market, technological, access to resources)	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Inflation and rising operational costs including energy costs	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Investment capacity, including for the energy transition and modernisation of vessels and equipment	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Unstable markets and price volatility	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Digital transition	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Behavioural changes and shift in consumption patterns	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Labour shortage	○	○	○	○	◉	○

Recreational fisheries	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Competition for space	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Management of inland waters	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Challenges of small-scale coastal fishing	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Prevention of food loss and food waste	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Animal welfare	○	◉	○	○	○	○

Please add any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking

11. To what extent are the objectives of the current CFP Regulation coherent with the following policies?

A. In relation to other EU fisheries law:

	Very coherent	Coherent	Neutral	Rather incoherent	Incoherent	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
Control and monitoring	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Fight against Illegal unreported and unregulated fishing	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Rules on the external fleet	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Scientific data collection	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Common market organisation	○	◉	○	○	○	○

B. In relation to other EU policies and laws:

	Very coherent	Coherent	Neutral	Rather incoherent	Incoherent	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
Habitats and Birds Directives	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Nature restoration law	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Water Framework Directive	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Marine Strategy Framework Directive	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Marine and inland waters	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Maritime spatial planning	○	◉	○	○	○	○
EU biodiversity strategy	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Food loss and waste prevention	○	○	◉	○	○	○
Food safety and Health	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Common Agricultural Policy	○	○	◉	○	○	○
Working conditions and labour standards	○	◉	○	○	○	○

C. In relation to international action:

	Very coherent	Coherent	Neutral	Rather incoherent	Incoherent	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
Synergy with development policy and recognition of developing countries' needs	○	○	◉	○	○	○
Sustainable and fair trade	○	○	◉	○	○	○
Protection of biodiversity	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Promoting international ocean governance	○	◉	○	○	○	○
On climate change	○	◉	○	○	○	○
UN Agreement on Marine Biodiversity of Areas beyond national jurisdiction	○	◉	○	○	○	○
UN Sustainable Development Goals	○	◉	○	○	○	○
FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries	○	◉	○	○	○	○
FAO Guidelines for Sustainable Aquaculture	○	○	○	○	○	◉

Please add any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking, or add any missing policies or themes you want to raise.

Any further comments?

12. Would you like to be contacted for a more in-depth interview if certain elements are not covered by this consultation – if so, please elaborate on which topic(s) and why.

No, thank you. DG MARE is already attending the MEDAC meetings and the AC has continuous relationships with the relevant fonctionnaires of DG MARE.

If you are open for a possible interview with DG MARE please leave you email address in the textbox below:

Have you any further comments on these questions? Or was there a topic regarding the CFP not yet covered?

No, thank you. DG MARE is already attending the MEDAC meetings and the AC has continuous relationships with the relevant fonctionnaires of DG MARE.

Please upload your file(s) you want to share

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

6af80400-4c4d-47e9-b1e5-2c485bf574af/148_2024_MEDAC_Advice_CFP_consultation_2024.pdf

Thank you for taking the time to fill in this questionnaire. Your input is much appreciated.

Contact

MARE-D3@ec.europa.eu