

Targeted consultation on the 2022 Report on the Functioning of the Common Fisheries Policy

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

This online questionnaire is part of a consultation to prepare a report on the functioning of the [common fisheries policy](#) (CFP), under Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013 (the CFP Regulation). The objective of this report is to address the functioning of the CFP and look at how we can strengthen its implementation. This questionnaire will provide the basis for more in-depth discussions at regional level starting in April 2022. The consultation process will end with an event before Summer 2022. The report will also build on the studies carried out in its support, and which are referred to in the corresponding chapters of the questionnaire.

The questions refer to each chapter of the CFP Regulation, ending with the topics raised in the [Mission letter](#) to Commissioner Sinkevičius as not sufficiently covered in the current policy framework and should be paid specific attention to (social dimension, climate adaptation and clean oceans). They are designed to identify what works well (or not), identify any evidence of shortcomings in how the CFP is implemented and highlight good practice or innovative tools or processes implemented by stakeholders or Member States. 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.

This questionnaire does not cover the [technical measures regulation](#) nor the protection of sensitive species and habitats. They are covered in a parallel [consultation on the action plan to conserve fisheries resources and protect marine ecosystems](#) (launched 25 October with deadline 10 January 2022).

All information collected through this survey will be stored and handled in a confidential manner and in compliance with the [General Data Protection Regulation](#) (GDPR).

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

To facilitate our assessment of the information, we encourage you to send any complementary information in English.

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

* First name

Teresa

* Surname

Morrissey

* Email (this won't be published)

teresamorrissey@ifa.ie

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

IFA Aquaculture

* Organisation size

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

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

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

* Country of origin

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

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti | <input type="radio"/> Libya | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Dominica | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> Samoa |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt | <input type="radio"/> Macau | <input type="radio"/> San Marino |

- Andorra
- Angola
- Anguilla
- Antarctica
- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- 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
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar/Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- 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
- Switzerland
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan

- 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
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- 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
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- 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
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela

- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena
Ascension and
Tristan da Cunha
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- 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. **For 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](#)

General aspects - overall functioning of the CFP (objectives)

Article 2 CFP Regulation – objectives

1. The CFP shall ensure that fishing and aquaculture activities are environmentally sustainable in the long-term and are managed in a way that is consistent with the objectives of achieving economic, social and employment benefits, and of contributing to the availability of food supplies.
2. The CFP shall apply the precautionary approach to fisheries management, and shall aim to ensure that exploitation of living marine biological resources restores and maintains populations of harvested species above levels which can produce the maximum sustainable yield.

In order to reach the objective of progressively restoring and maintaining populations of fish stocks above biomass levels capable of producing maximum sustainable yield, the maximum sustainable yield exploitation rate shall be achieved by 2015 where possible and, on a progressive, incremental basis at the latest by 2020 for all stocks.

3. The CFP shall implement the ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management so as to ensure that negative impacts of fishing activities on the marine ecosystem are minimised, and shall endeavour to ensure that aquaculture and fisheries activities avoid the degradation of the marine environment.
4. The CFP shall contribute to the collection of scientific data.
5. The CFP shall, in particular:
 - (a) gradually eliminate discards, on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the best available scientific advice, by avoiding and reducing, as far as possible, unwanted catches, and by gradually ensuring that catches are landed;
 - (b) where necessary, make the best use of unwanted catches, without creating a market for such of those catches that are below the minimum conservation reference size;
 - (c) provide conditions for economically viable and competitive fishing capture and processing industry and land-based fishing related activity;
 - (d) provide for measures to adjust the fishing capacity of the fleets to levels of fishing opportunities consistent with paragraph 2, with a view to having economically viable fleets without overexploiting marine biological resources;
 - (e) promote the development of sustainable Union aquaculture activities to contribute to food supplies and security and employment;
 - (f) contribute to a fair standard of living for those who depend on fishing activities, bearing in mind coastal fisheries and socio-economic aspects;
 - (g) contribute to an efficient and transparent internal market for fisheries and aquaculture products and contribute to ensuring a level-playing field for fisheries and aquaculture products marketed in the Union;
 - (h) take into account the interests of both consumers and producers;
 - (i) promote coastal fishing activities, taking into account socio-economic aspects;

(j) be coherent with the Union environmental legislation, in particular with the objective of achieving a good environmental status by 2020 as set out in Article 1(1) of Directive 2008/56/EC, as well as with other Union policies.

Q1. What are the specific fisheries conservation and management measures introduced by the CFP Regulation that work well and contributed to real change and/or progress in terms of sustainable EU fisheries?

3000 character(s) maximum

Q2. For the areas fished by vessels from your country, region or sea basin, do you believe that the objective has been achieved

	Fully	Partly	Not at all
1. The CFP shall ensure that fishing and aquaculture activities are environmentally sustainable in the long-term and are managed in a way that is consistent with the objectives of achieving economic, social and employment benefits, and of contributing to the availability of food supplies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. The CFP shall apply the precautionary approach to fisheries management, and shall aim to ensure that exploitation of living marine biological resources restores and maintains populations of harvested species above levels which can produce the maximum sustainable yield. In order to reach the objective of progressively restoring and maintaining populations of fish stocks above biomass levels capable of producing maximum sustainable yield, the maximum sustainable yield exploitation rate shall be achieved by 2015 where possible and, on a progressive, incremental basis at the latest by 2020 for all stocks.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. The CFP shall implement the ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management so as to ensure that negative impacts of fishing activities on the marine ecosystem are minimised, and shall endeavour to ensure that aquaculture and fisheries activities avoid the degradation of the marine environment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. The CFP shall contribute to the collection of scientific data.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. The CFP shall, in particular: (a) gradually eliminate discards, on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the best available scientific advice, by avoiding and reducing, as far as possible, unwanted catches, and by gradually ensuring that catches are landed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(b) where necessary, make the best use of unwanted catches, without creating a market for such of those catches that are below the minimum conservation reference size	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(c) provide conditions for economically viable and competitive fishing capture and processing industry and land-based fishing related activity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

(d) provide for measures to adjust the fishing capacity of the fleets to levels of fishing opportunities consistent with paragraph 2, with a view to having economically viable fleets without overexploiting marine biological resources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(e) promote the development of sustainable Union aquaculture activities to contribute to food supplies and security and employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(f) contribute to a fair standard of living for those who depend on fishing activities, bearing in mind coastal fisheries and socio-economic aspects	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(g) contribute to an efficient and transparent internal market for fisheries and aquaculture products and contribute to ensuring a level-playing field for fisheries and aquaculture products marketed in the Union	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(h) take into account the interests of both consumers and producers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(i) promote coastal fishing activities, taking into account socio-economic aspects	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(j) be coherent with the Union environmental legislation, in particular with the objective of achieving a good environmental status by 2020 as set out in Article 1(1) of Directive 2008/56/EC, as well as with other Union policies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q3. What are the specific measures introduced by the CFP Regulation that have worked well to keep or make aquaculture sustainable?

3000 character(s) maximum

- Establishment of an Advisory Council for Aquaculture (AAC) and an Advisory Council for Markets (MAC).
- Contribution to the improvement of work safety conditions.
- Helped the collection of data that allows an economic evaluation of aquaculture companies and data on employment.
- Research and innovation in aquaculture and the cooperation between industry and scientists.
- Establishment of financial support mechanisms (FEMP) to achieve the objectives of the CFP priorities.
- Encouraged Member States to publish Multi-Year Plans.
- Accomplishing sustainability. During the 2014-2020 period, EU aquaculture has reached a remarkable performance on 'environmental sustainability. This can be recognized, in part, as a merit of the CFP, though other drivers underlie (production efficiency, market forces, etc). However, the CFP has certainly missed the opportunity of taking advantage of the significant environmental performance of aquaculture to achieve more in the social and economic targets of the CFP.

Q4. What are the key challenges in implementing the CFP?

3000 character(s) maximum

- The definition of 'Sustainable aquaculture' continues to be undefined.
- Strengthen the achievement of sustained growth in aquaculture to meet the growing demand for safe, healthy and quality aquatic food.
- Establish mechanisms among Member States to exchange good practices.
- Administrative simplification of the licensing process. Unification of criteria of environmental evaluation and surveillance at the regional-national-international level.
- Digitalisation of aquaculture.
- Promotion of aquaculture as an environmentally sustainable activity with an ecosystem approach: low carbon footprint food production system and supplier of ecosystem services.

- Ensuring the clear definition of the competencies and responsibilities of the administrations at the regional, national and local levels. Ensuring that political decisions are fair, transparent and consistent with the objectives of the CFP.
- Ensure compliance with the objectives of the Multi-Year Plans of the Member States - plans are currently non-binding on Member States to implement them.
- Facilitate access to up-to-date, reliable and unified aquaculture production, economic and social data from the EU and per Member State.
- Better support Producer Organisations and Associations of Producer Organisations. These are crucial to achieving the objectives of the CFP and the CMO.
- Scope of the term 'fisheries'. The CFP regulation is unclear on when the term 'fisheries' refers to both 'fishing' and 'aquaculture' together, or when it refers exclusively to 'fishing' (capture fisheries). The meaning of the terms 'fisheries/fishing' throughout the CFP regulation might be apparent for lawmakers, but they are certainly not clear for implementers and operators leaving aquaculture in a limbo. This sets an unclear legal framework from the starting box that creates confusion and uncertainty to economic operators, national public administrations and other stakeholders. For example, the new EMFAF separates 'Fisheries' from 'Aquaculture'.
- Sustainability criteria. Several of the objectives set for aquaculture in the CFP require the definition of environmental/social sustainability criteria for benchmarking.
- Considering that 65% of aquatic products placed on the Single market are imported from Third countries, the existence on fair competition between EU-produced ones and those imported to the EU should be sought. This levelling effort should also be tackled through improving aquatic food labelling and the revision of international trade agreements.
- Aquatic products sold in the EU (unpacked and packed) continue to be subject to mislabelling and fraud due to insufficient implementation of consumer information laws and loopholes in them. In specific cases the legal framework on information to consumers should be revised.

Article 3 CFP Regulation - Principles of good governance

The CFP shall be guided by the following principles of good governance:

- (a) the clear definition of responsibilities at the Union, regional, national and local levels;
- (b) the taking into account of regional specificities, through a regionalised approach;
- (c) the establishment of measures in accordance with the best available scientific advice;
- (d) a long-term perspective;
- (e) administrative cost efficiency;
- (f) appropriate involvement of stakeholders, in particular Advisory Councils, at all stages - from conception to implementation of the measures;
- (g) the primary responsibility of the flag State;
- (h) consistency with other Union policies;
- (i) the use of impact assessments as appropriate;
- (j) coherence between the internal and external dimension of the CFP;
- (k) transparency of data handling in accordance with existing legal requirements, with due respect for private life, the protection of personal data and confidentiality rules; availability of data to the appropriate scientific bodies, other bodies with a scientific or management interest, and other defined end-users.

Q5. Are the principles of good governance, described in Article 3 of the CFP Regulation, sufficiently implemented in fisheries management under the CFP?

	Yes	Partly	No

(a) the clear definition of responsibilities at the Union, regional, national and local levels;	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
(b) the taking into account of regional specificities, through a regionalised approach;	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
(c) the establishment of measures in accordance with the best available scientific advice;	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
(d) a long-term perspective;	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
(e) administrative cost efficiency;	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
(f) appropriate involvement of stakeholders, in particular Advisory Councils, at all stages - from conception to implementation of the measures;	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(g) the primary responsibility of the flag State;	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(h) consistency with other Union policies;	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
(i) the use of impact assessments as appropriate;	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(j) coherence between the internal and external dimension of the CFP;	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
(k) transparency of data handling in accordance with existing legal requirements, with due respect for private life, the protection of personal data and confidentiality rules; availability of data to the appropriate scientific bodies, other bodies with a scientific or management interest, and other defined end-users.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Fisheries management measures for conserving and sustainably exploiting marine biological resources

Multiannual plans

The CFP Regulation highlights the importance of establishing multiannual plans reflecting the specific features of the different regions and fisheries, recognising that the objective of sustainable exploitation of marine biological resources is more effectively achieved through a multiannual approach to fisheries management.

Stocks and fisheries are managed by means of such plans, which contain goals for managing fish stocks in line with the CFP objectives (maximum sustainable yield) and measures such as fishing effort restrictions, rules for setting total allowable catches, specific control rules and technical measures (such as specific rules for implementing the landing obligation) and review clauses and safeguards to trigger remedial action.

Articles 9 and 10 of the CFP Regulation establish the principles, objectives and content of such plans. Currently four multiannual plans have been adopted under the CFP:

- [Baltic plan](#) (see also the [first implementation report](#));
- [North Sea plan](#);
- [Western Waters plan](#);
- [Western Mediterranean Sea plan](#).

Q6. Specifying which plan you work with, are the multiannual plans effective tools for ensuring the sustainable exploitation of fish stocks? Are the plans sufficiently flexible, too flexible, or too rigid in operation?

3000 character(s) maximum

Q7a. Do the multiannual plans cater sufficiently for the regional characteristics of fisheries?

- Yes
- No

Q7b. Are the plans used to their full potential?

- Yes
- No

Landing obligation

This new element in the CFP Regulation contributes to the CFP objective of eliminating discards by encouraging fishers to fish in a more selective manner and avoid and reduce, as far as possible, unwanted catches in the first place, by obliging them to land everything they catch.

Discarding is a term specifically used for catches of species that are not kept, but returned to the sea. It constitutes a substantial waste of resources and negatively affects the sustainable exploitation of marine biological resources and marine ecosystems, as well as the financial viability of fisheries.

There has been increasing collaboration between stakeholders and scientists to improve knowledge about this issue, e.g. the Horizon 2020 projects [DiscardLess](#), [MINOUW](#) and [choke mitigation tool](#).

Significant efforts by all stakeholders have been made to facilitate implementation of the landing obligation, notably to avoid choke species (*a species for which the available quota is exhausted before the quotas of (some of) the other species that are caught together in a (mixed) fishery are exhausted*), and to improve control and enforcement, for example by providing [technical guidelines and specifications](#) for implementing remote electronic monitoring (REM) in fisheries.

However, control and enforcement of the landing obligation remain challenging and, overall, Member States have not adopted the necessary measures in this respect. Moreover, significant undocumented discarding of catches by operators still occurs. REM tools seem to be the most effective and cost-efficient way to monitor the landing obligation. The Commission has supported the use of such modern control tools in its [proposal for a revised fisheries control system](#) and will continue working with the the European Parliament and the Council to reach an agreement. As indicated by the Commission's audits and the [initiatives by the EFCA](#), compliance remains weak.

The necessary increase in selectivity is also addressed in the recently published [report on the technical measures regulation](#), as well as in the ongoing [consultation on the action plan to conserve fisheries resources and protect marine ecosystems](#).

The implementation of the landing obligation, and its challenges, was also recently addressed in a [European Parliament Initiative report](#) and a recently published [study](#) contracted by DG MARE and the European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency (CINEA).

Q8. To what extent (scale 1 to 5) is the objective of eliminating discards met?

	1. Not at all	2. Poorly	3. Moderately	4. Incompletely	5. Fully	I don't know
1.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q9. What challenges do you experience in implementation and control of the landing obligation? You may select more than one

- None
- Difficult to detect discards because of insufficient observers or electronic monitoring tools
- Not possible to detect discards by small (under-12m) vessels
- Difficult to gather legally adequate evidence of discarding needed to make a successful prosecution
- Level of fines too low to deter fishers from discarding
- Not enough resources (inspectors, ships or aircraft) to enforce this obligation
- Obstruction by fishers, preventing observation of discards
- Implementation rules are unclear
- Not possible to detect where exemptions apply
- Not possible to detect where permissible discard limits are exceeded (for de minimis exemptions)
- Logbook records of discards are inaccurate or cannot be checked for verification
- Undersized fish are still being landed and marketed for purposes for direct human consumption
- Increased selectivity is hard to attain in specific fisheries (name the fisheries)
- Other - please specify in the text box below

Q9a. Which good practice or innovative tools could address these challenges in implementation and control?

3000 character(s) maximum

Q9b. What further pilot projects (if any) should be conducted to explore methods for avoiding, minimising or eliminating unwanted catches?

3000 character(s) maximum

Q9c. Which incentives in the CFP Regulation are the most relevant and successful?

With incentives we mean, including those of economic nature such as fishing opportunities) that promote fishing methods which contribute to more selective fishing, the avoidance and reduction (as far as possible) of unwanted catches and fishing with low impact on the marine ecosystem and fishery resources.

3000 character(s) maximum

Q9d. How do you see your role and the role of other stakeholders in implementing and monitoring the landing obligation?

3000 character(s) maximum

Scientific Advice

As highlighted in the CFP Regulation, fisheries management and conservation measures must be adopted that take into account the best available scientific, technical and economic advice. Sound advice requires harmonised, reliable and accurate data sets.

As outlined in recital 49 of the Regulation, policy-oriented fisheries science should be strengthened by means of:

- nationally-adopted, regionally-coordinated scientific data collection
- research and innovation programmes implemented in coordination with other Member States and within EU research and innovation frameworks.

When proposing new fisheries rules and regulations or reviewing those existing ones, the European Commission seeks the best available scientific advice from several scientific bodies. Data collected by EU countries under the [data collection framework](#) form the basis for the work of these **scientific advisory bodies**. This framework outlines the EU countries' obligations to collect, manage and make available a wide range of fisheries and aquaculture data needed for scientific advice.

Short-term needs for additional knowledge can be addressed through Commission-funded scientific advice studies (through calls for tenders and calls for proposals). Long-term research projects related to fisheries management receive support under EU research framework programmes. The new funding programme [Horizon Europe](#) includes a new approach – a mission on healthy oceans, seas, coastal and inland waters. The scientific advisory bodies consist of:

- the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries ([STECF](#))
- the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea ([ICES](#))
- the Regional fisheries management organisations ([RFMOs](#))
- regional fisheries bodies, e.g. the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean ([GFCM](#)).

The advisory councils may help, in close cooperation with scientists, to collect, supply and analyse the data necessary for developing conservation measures. Better cooperation between stakeholders and scientists is important to foster. Moreover, the Commission processes and manages data to support knowledge-based decision making ([EMODNET](#) and [Atlas of the Seas](#)).

Q10. Do you see a need to further strengthen the scientific basis for fisheries management? (you may tick more than one)

- No, the current level of science advice is adequate
- No, we already spend too much on science advice and give it too much importance
- We should widen and simplify access to fisheries data
- Yes, we need more precise measurement of fish stocks
- Yes, we need better knowledge of collateral impacts of fishing
- Yes, we need better measurement of mixed fisheries questions
- Yes, we need more coverage of science advice (more fleets, more areas, more species)
- Yes, we need a better survey of fishers' opinions.
- Other – please explain in the text box below.

Q11. Do you see any opportunity to use new technologies or know any good practices (e.g. in governance) or innovations that could help improve data collection and help deliver best available scientific advice?

- Yes
- No

Fishing opportunities

Articles 16 and 17 of the Regulation describe **how fishing opportunities are allocated**. In particular, Article 16(6) sets out that each Member State must decide how the fishing opportunities that are available to it, that are not subject to a system of transferable fishing concessions, may in turn be allocated to vessels flying its flag.

Furthermore, Article 17 stipulates that when allocating the fishing opportunities available to them, Member States must use transparent and objective criteria including those of an environmental, social and economic nature.

Q12. Do you consider that Member States implement the requirements set out in Articles 16 and 17 in a satisfactory manner? Please explain.

- Yes
- No

Management of fishing capacity

This aspect is included in the list of conservation measures (Article 7 of the CFP Regulation). Under Article 22 of the Regulation, Member States must adjust their fleet's fishing capacity to their fishing opportunities over time to achieve a stable and long-term balance between them. For this, Member States assess the capacity of the national fleet and all its segments. This assessment is made in line with [Commission guidelines](#) and is presented in an annual report sent to the Commission by 31 May each year.

Where the assessment clearly demonstrates an imbalance, the Member State prepares an action plan for the fleet segments with identified structural overcapacity. This plan sets out the adjustment targets and tools to achieve a balance and a clear time frame for its implementation.

Annually, as part of the Communication launching the consultation on fishing opportunities, the Commission presents a report on the balance between the fishing capacity of the Member States' fleets and their fishing opportunities

Capacity ceilings

Furthermore, Article 22(7) of the CFP Regulation stipulates that the capacity ceilings (in overall gross tonnage and kilowatt) set out in Annex II of the Regulation must not be exceeded. An important instrument to prevent fishing capacity from increasing is the entry/exit scheme (Article 23) which sets out that the entry into the fleet of new capacity without public aid is compensated for by the prior withdrawal of capacity without public aid of at least the same amount.

The Commission [evaluated](#) the scheme in 2019. Moreover, fishing capacity corresponding to the fishing vessels withdrawn with public aid must not be replaced (Article 22(6)). For more information on the EU fishing fleet, see the [EU fishing fleet register](#).

Q13. Is the current annual assessment and reporting provided for by Article 22 of the CFP Regulation effective in achieving a stable and long-term balance between the capacity of national fleet segments and the fishing opportunities available to them?

- Yes
- No

Q14. How do you consider current fishing capacity compared to the available fishing opportunities in each of these areas?

Enter 1= far too low, 2 = too low, 3 = about right, 4 = too high, 5 =far too high; or 'I do not know'

	Pelagic fisheries	Demersal fisheries
Baltic Sea and Kattegat		
North Sea, Skagerrak and Channel		
Celtic Seas		
Bay of Biscay		
Macaronesia (Canaries)		
Macaronesia (Azores)		
Western Mediterranean		
Central Mediterranean		
Eastern Mediterranean		
Black Sea		

Q15. Member States can decide themselves on how to design the entry/exit scheme at national level. Please indicate whether:

- The situation should remain unchanged
- More guidance is needed from the Commission on the best ways to implement the scheme

Aquaculture

Aquaculture, unlike fisheries, is not an exclusive EU competence. However, the EU is still involved, applying rules to aquaculture activities such as those ensuring environmental protection or human and animal health.

In addition, in 2013, the Commission adopted non-binding strategic guidelines for the sustainable development of EU aquaculture. These served as the basis for EU countries to develop specific national strategic plans for aquaculture. The Commission works with EU countries through the 'open method of coordination' to promote the exchange of good practice among EU countries, including through technical seminars.

In 2021, the Commission adopted new [strategic guidelines](#) and EU countries reviewed their national strategies in light of the new guidelines. The [European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund](#) (2021-2027) will continue to make funding available for EU aquaculture.

Q16. Has the system of strategic coordination established in Article 34 of the CFP Regulation, and in particular the [strategic guidelines for a more sustainable and competitive EU aquaculture](#) and the multi-annual strategic plans, contributed to the sustainable growth of EU aquaculture as set out in Article 34 of the CFP Regulation?

- Yes
- No

Please explain

3000 character(s) maximum

The system of strategic coordination is helpful considering the regionalisation of aquaculture governance. But reality is that EU aquaculture is far from achieving its potential. The CFP has highlighted the potential of aquaculture to provide food security and food safety to the EU, but unfortunately, the aquaculture sector of the EU has been pushed back and has hardly progressed during 2014-2020. The 'Strategic guidelines for sustainable EU Aquaculture' and multi-annual National strategic plans prepared by Member States are non-binding and there is no incentive for Member State authorities to implement these plans.

Q17. How can the [strategic guidelines for a more sustainable and competitive EU aquaculture](#) adopted in 2021 be effective in further pursuing

the sustainable growth of EU aquaculture in line with the objectives of the European Green Deal?

3000 character(s) maximum

- The system of strategic coordination, including the Strategic guidelines have been positive for EU aquaculture but not enough to contribute to the sustainable growth of EU aquaculture that remains basically at the year 2000 level.
- The IFA considers the Commission's Strategic guidelines comprehensive, sound and fit for purpose to promote a sustainable and competitive EU aquaculture. Unfortunately, the publication of these communications has not been enough incentive as they are non-binding guidelines. However, that route should be followed with a long-term focus on the sustainability of the aquaculture and highlight its contribution to the European Green Deal and Farm 2 Fork strategy.
- Value of the Open Method of Coordination. IFA appreciates the contributions of the Open Method of Coordination. This governance tool should be further implemented to effectively reach out to national (and regional) public administrations that have a say on aquaculture development but are different to the fisheries /aquaculture ministries. This extended coordination is an absolute necessity for streamlining national legislation and providing guidance on the regulatory framework applicable to the sector.
- Aquaculture is a national competence but with EU level objectives. Differently to fishing, aquaculture is a national competence and not a direct EU one. The sharing of EU water bodies and the transboundary influences of aquaculture (in both production and markets) make cooperation in aquaculture governance between countries a necessity. Furthermore, aquaculture has a relevant role to play in food supply and food security to the EU making its sustainable development of prime importance for the Union. These reasons should be enough to justify reinforcing the Commission's efforts on aquaculture. To be more effective, the Strategic Guidelines should:
 - Focus more on small scale aquaculture, paying more attention to how EU policies impact on aquaculture's micro and small enterprises, and specifically supporting their development.
 - EU level communication on aquaculture. The value of information campaigns about the EU aquaculture sector and production explained in the Strategic guidelines is important but should not stop in the Commission providing communication tools. The Commission should conduct, with funds under direct management, EU-wide communication campaigns alongside what the Member States could do under shared management.
 - Making full use of knowledge. IFA stresses the importance of addressing new knowledge fields like the relevance of microbiome, the scientific monitoring of aquaculture environmental services, while at the same time finding ways for making better use of present scientific knowledge. Furthermore, there is a need for a common methodology to measure carbon footprint at aquaculture farm level. Furthermore, besides scientific and academic research knowledge the vast hands-on competence capital held by the aquaculture workforce.

Regional cooperation on conservation measures – Regionalisation

The CFP recognises that dialogue with stakeholders has proven to be essential for achieving the CFP objectives. The 2013 CFP reform introduced a regionalised approach for the CFP. This entails a bottom-up approach to governance enabling:

- consultations with stakeholders via the advisory councils;
- enabling stakeholders to become involved in and take ownership of the CFP implementation process via the Member States (regional and expert groups), and the regional coordination groups under the [data collection framework](#).

In addition, the CFP Regulation aims to ensure more control at regional and national level. Regionalisation allows EU countries with a management interest to propose detailed measures, which the Commission can then adopt as delegated or implementing act and transpose them into EU law (Article 18 of the CFP Regulation).

In 2018, the Commission published [guidance on Article 11](#) of the Regulation on adopting conservation measures for Natura 2000 sites and for the purposes of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, providing for good practices already to be considered in this process.

Technical Measures Regulation

This topic has already been extensively discussed with you as a stakeholder in the context of the recently published Commission [report on the implementation of the Technical Measures Regulation](#). This report specifies that the Technical Measures Regulation introduced results-based approaches supported by 'regionalisation', setting out the general rules that apply to all EU waters, and provided for the adoption of technical measures that respond to the regional characteristics of fisheries.

This results-based regionalisation approach was conceived under the CFP in order to bring decision-making closer to the fishers. It also encourages Member States and the fishing sector to play an active role in making and implementing decisions. The variety of joint recommendations already put forward demonstrates that regionalisation can be effective and suitable for providing targeted and tailor-made technical measures.

Member States have demonstrated that regional cooperation can be swift and efficient. However, improvements are needed in terms of speed and ambition when it comes to developing and agreeing joint recommendations on measures aimed at improving selectivity or restricting fisheries in order to contribute to EU environmental legislation.

Overview of regionalisation

Another initiative in which the advisory councils and the Member States regional groups have been consulted is a study currently being carried out by DG MARE and CINEA to provide a comprehensive overview of how the regionalisation process works under the CFP. This initiative also covers the joint recommendations put forward by Member States specifying the details of how the landing obligation is being implemented, as well as the conservation measures necessary for compliance with obligations under EU environmental legislation.

Specifically raised in Article 3 of the CFP Regulation on principles of good governance was:

- the appropriate involvement of stakeholders, in particular advisory councils, at all stages – from conceiving to implementing the measures;
- the importance of taking into account the regional characteristics, through a regionalised approach.

While the regionalisation approach under the CFP has been applied to shaping and refining regional measures within the EU, it does not include third countries (e.g. Norway, United Kingdom, southern Mediterranean countries such as Morocco and Algeria) in this decision-making process. This can pose particular challenges for the Commission who represents the EU in international consultations and negotiations for fisheries both in terms of timing and content.

Q18. To what extent (1 to 5) have the changes to a more regionalised approach to EU decision and policy making improved the CFP's implementation?

	1. Not at all	2. Poorly	3. Moderately	4. Incompletely	5. Fully	I don't know
On collecting data on commercial fish stocks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
On monitoring incidental catches of sensitive species and impacts on habitats	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
On implementing the landing obligation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
On implementing the technical measures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
On implementing Natura 2000 areas and other measures under the Habitats Directive	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
On implementing measures under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other - please explain	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q19. Would you see the need for further improving the decision-making process?

- Yes
- No

Please specify examples of good practice, and possible governance improvements within the existing legislative framework.

3000 character(s) maximum

- Coherence with other Regulations. Alignment and coherence of the CFP objectives on aquaculture with other regulations and directives is a key challenge, mainly when considering environmental conservation matters. The European Commission should assess the level of coherence between different EU policies when approached under a sector-by-sector basis.
- Implementation at national/regional level. The main challenges for implementing good governance, as described in Article 3 of the CFP Regulation, lie in the complications that national and regional public administrations face to apply different, but overlapping, EU regulations. Public administrations that are not themselves responsible for governing aquaculture, but that have a saying on the administrative procedures that aquaculture must adhere to, have been proven to cause the main bottlenecks for the development of aquaculture.
- Cherry picking of legislative targets by national/regional public administrations. When implementing the

CFP and related regulations, national and regional public administrations tend to dedicate full efforts to reach European environmental targets while leaving aside other CFP objectives like those related to attaining primary producers' fair standards of living or employment.

How would you see your role in the frame of the Member States regional groups?
Would you see a need for stepping up the involvement of the various stakeholders in the frame of the Member States regional groups?

3000 character(s) maximum

Q20. How can regionalisation feed into consultations with neighbouring third countries where necessary to take effective measures for stocks of common interest? Please give examples of good practice that you have encountered.

3000 character(s) maximum

External dimension

International ocean governance agenda

In 2016, the European Commission and the EU's High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy presented a joint communication on international ocean governance. This is an agenda for the future of our oceans, specifying 50 actions for safe, secure, clean and sustainably managed oceans in Europe and around the world under 3 policy pillars. The communication is an integral part of the EU's response to the United Nations' 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, in particular Sustainable Development Goal 14: 'to conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources' (SDG14). It also contributes to the European Green Deal. We will revamp the 2016 International Ocean Governance Agenda by tabling a Joint Communication setting out an action plan on international ocean governance, addressing key threats such as pollution, climate change impacts and biodiversity loss. It will send a strong message that the EU is leading on the implementation of global commitments, as set out in the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development Goals.

In 2020, the EU launched the International Ocean Governance (IOG) Forum and a targeted consultation, to assess development needs and options for action in light of today's challenges and opportunities in international ocean governance. The Commission recently published a [summary of this consultation](#). There are no questions in this questionnaire regarding international ocean governance. However, the EU has continued to implement its agenda on international ocean governance for the conservation and sustainable use of oceans and seas. Some of its central components are the promotion of sustainable fisheries beyond EU jurisdiction in international fora and bodies and through bilateral relations, and the fight against illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing. It is based on international rules and obligations, and CFP principles and objectives, together with some specific objectives, such as policy coherence and promoting a level playing field.

Preventing harmful fishing practices

The international dimension of the CFP focuses on three areas:

- to **prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (IUU Regulation)**. By doing this, it actively supports the reforms of fisheries controls by partner countries to effectively fight against IUU fishing in line with their international obligations to ensure compliance with conservation and management measures.
- Through **sustainable fisheries partnership agreements (SFPAs)**, the EU gives support to fisheries management and control in partner countries in exchange for fishing rights. As a member of the World Trade Organization, the EU remains strongly committed to reaching an agreement to prohibit harmful fisheries subsidies.
- The EU, represented by the Commission, plays an active role in the **regional fisheries management organisations (RFMOs)**. These organisations regulate regional fishing activities in the high seas.

In 2021, a public and targeted stakeholder [consultation](#) was conducted for the SFPAs and therefore they are not covered by this questionnaire.

Beyond its involvement in RFMOs and SFPAs, the EU is also bound by Article 33 of the CFP Regulation to engage with third countries on stocks of common interest in order to ensure that those stocks are managed in a sustainable manner. In particular, the EU will endeavor to establish bilateral or multilateral agreements with third countries on joint management of stocks, including:

- the establishment, where appropriate, of access to waters and resources and conditions for such access
- the harmonisation of conservation measures
- the exchange of fishing opportunities.

Each year, the Commission, on behalf of the EU, engages in such bilateral or multilateral negotiations, e.g. with Norway, the United Kingdom, the Faroe Islands and other coastal countries.

Q21. How could the EU further improve the performance of the RFMOs in sustainably managing fisheries resources?

3000 character(s) maximum

Q22. To what extent (1 to 5) are RFMOs well equipped to face the challenges of climate change and protection of ecosystems, pollution, alien species, etc.? All these new factors are influencing the management of fisheries.

	1. Not at all	2. Poorly	3. Moderately	4. Incompletely	5. Fully	I do not know
Q22.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q23. Do the SFPA’s ensure that the CFP objectives are achieved?

- Yes

- No
- Partly

Q24. To what extent (1 to 5) is the EU position in its negotiations with third countries like Norway or the UK aligned with the CFP principles?

	1. Not at all	2. Poorly	3. Moderately	4. Incompletely	5. Fully	I do not know
Q24.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Market and trade (common market organisation)

The common organisation of the EU’s fisheries market strengthens the role of the actors on the ground: consumers receive information on the products sold on the EU market, and operators apply the same rules, regardless of the product’s origin. The [Common Market Organisation Regulation](#) covers five main areas:

- 1) organisation of the sector
- 2) marketing standards
- 3) consumer information
- 4) competition rules
- 5) market intelligence.

As regards market intelligence, the Commission set up the [European Market Observatory for Fishery and Aquaculture](#) products to contribute to market transparency and provide market intelligence to all actors across the sector including policy makers.

The Commission must provide a report on the results of the application of the Common Market Organisation Regulation by 31 December 2022, and will be covered separately from the 2022 CFP report. There is also a [separate consultation](#) on this subject.

Structural policy and support: EU funding

By 2024, the Commission will have evaluated the 2014-2020 [European Maritime and Fisheries Fund](#). Therefore, no specific questions on this fund are included in this questionnaire.

The 2021-2027 [European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund](#) (EMFAF) is a key instrument for implementing the CFP and achieving its objectives. The EMFAF has 4 priorities:

- 1) fostering sustainable fisheries and restoring and conserving aquatic biological resources
- 2) fostering sustainable aquaculture activities, as well as processing and marketing fishery and aquaculture products, therefore contributing to food security in the EU
- 3) enabling a sustainable blue economy in coastal, island and inland areas, and fostering the development of fishing and aquaculture communities
- 4) strengthening international ocean governance and ensuring seas and oceans are safe, secure, clean and sustainably managed.

The EMFAF is currently in its programming phase, with Member States finalising their national programmes. This phase has been accompanied by the [regional sea basin analysis](#). This document aims to provide Member States with a sea basin perspective of the key CFP challenges that need addressing through EMFAF funding.

Q25. Can you share examples of good practices or projects supported by the EMFF or that could be supported by the EMFAF to help achieve the objectives of the [European Green Deal – ‘fit for 55 delivering EU’s 2030 climate targets’](#)?

3000 character(s) maximum

- Aquaculture has the lowest carbon footprint. The farming of aquatic species through aquaculture has been proven to be the livestock production with the lowest carbon footprint, besides requiring the least natural resources per kilo of food produced. Encouraging the development of aquaculture will move the EU closer to the EU’s 2030 climate targets. However, there is a need for a common methodology specific tool to measure carbon footprint at aquaculture farm level.
- The value of aquaculture’s environmental and ecosystem services. The IFA supports pursuing actions on aquaculture research and innovation but stresses the importance of addressing the scientific assessment and monitoring of aquaculture environmental and ecosystem services.
- Compensation for losses in exceptional circumstances.

Q26. How do you see the role of public investment encouraging innovation and strengthening resilience in fisheries and aquaculture, in particular at local level?

3000 character(s) maximum

- The Taxonomy regulation should embrace aquaculture. Given the exceptionally positive contribution of aquaculture to build a carbon net zero, resilient and environmentally sustainable EU economy, the IFA and our EU counterparts do not understand why the European Commission has omitted aquaculture from the EU classification system for environmentally sustainable economic activities (the Taxonomy and its Technical screening criteria). This should be immediately corrected to encourage informed public and private investment in aquaculture as a high sustainability investment.
- Consider the limitations of micro and small aquaculture undertakings. Given the structure of the aquaculture sector, that is mainly comprised of micro and small undertakings with limited capacity to carry out innovation, public investment has a key role to play in it. Supporting Producer Organisations can also help on this.
 - Aquaculture production will be key to meeting global demands for seafood produce in the coming years. As such, EU Aquaculture production needs to be part of the global move towards meeting these demands. Innovation, technology and efficient aquaculture farming practices will drive the adaptation needed to fulfil ‘EU Green Deal’ goals of developing sustainable food production systems and ensuring food security. Smarter, more efficient food production systems are what is needed in order to increase production sustainably and ensure secure food sources into the future. Research and innovation are key drivers in accelerating the transition to sustainable, healthy, and inclusive food systems from primary production to consumption.
 - Investment in adaptive technology that allows for the use of renewable energy sources and greater energy efficiency in aquaculture farming practice should also be explored. . Aquaculture can contribute to meeting Climate action targets through carbon sequestration value, carbon efficient food production, use of

renewable energy sources and creating smart jobs with investment in adaptive technology for a more efficient EU Aquaculture industry.

Q27. Can you suggest projects that the EMFAF could support to facilitate generational renewal in the fishing and aquaculture sector?

3000 character(s) maximum

Profitable sectors attract younger generations. Facilitate generation renewal in order to make aquaculture farms an attractive working place regarding income, quality and personal development perspectives.

Skills & capacity building of these initiatives aim to develop smart, efficient jobs in new adaptive technologies for aquaculture production. Training and upskilling will be required to achieve these objectives, as well as capitalising on the existing skills of the aquaculture sector.

There is real need for an incentivised basic/entry level training to attract new entrants into the aquaculture sector; provide the essential knowledge and skills in developing an aquaculture career, shows how to progress careers in aquaculture production and be an incentive similar to the 'Green Cert' system for agriculture.

Blue Economy

The European Green Deal and the Recovery Plan for Europe will define the EU economy for many years, or even decades to come; and the EU's blue economy is fundamental to the efforts of both.

The blue economy, like every other sector, adheres to the European Green Deal, and is also indispensable in order to meet the EU's environmental and climate objectives. After all, the ocean is the main climate regulator we have. It offers clean energy and sustains us with oxygen, food, and many critical resources. To fully embed the blue economy into the Green Deal and the recovery strategy, the Commission has adopted [a new approach for a sustainable blue economy in the EU](#).

Many activities take place in Europe's seas. At any given time, fishing, aquaculture, shipping, renewable energy, nature conservation, touristic activities and other uses compete for maritime space. Various initiatives under the European Green Deal and the biodiversity strategy affect the (future) use of the sea, for example:

- the [EU strategy on offshore renewable energy](#)
- the [strategic guidelines for a more sustainable and competitive EU aquaculture](#)
- the extension and effective management of [marine protected areas](#).

That is why the EU has a [Directive on Maritime Spatial Planning](#) which provides transparency and stability, and encourages investment and cross-border cooperation, including in relation to offshore wind energy developments. It lays down minimum requirements for the planning process and the maritime spatial plans, including stakeholder and transboundary consultation requirements.

The [European Maritime Spatial Planning Platform](#), financed by the EMFAF, provides information on existing practices, processes and projects, carries out technical studies, and has a question and answer service.

Synergies between different human activities at sea come together in initiatives such as a European Blue Forum, as announced in the new approach for a sustainable blue economy.

Q28a. In what way do you see the synergies between the different human activities at sea, specifically between those activities falling under the CFP Regulation and the Maritime Spatial Planning Directive?

3000 character(s) maximum

- Synergies at sea between compatible sectors are a must. IFA considers that identifying and making use of synergies between activities is central for achieving the EU Green Deal objectives in maritime areas. These synergies should be viewed with a forward-looking approach.
- Development of combined activities of offshore electricity production and aquaculture. Reaching the carbon neutrality emissions goals will require the establishment of sea-based renewal energy plants. Combining these infrastructures with aquaculture farms will provide benefits to both sectors.

28b. Does the current EU legislation framework encourages such synergies to take place?

- Yes
- No

Is there anything missing?

3000 character(s) maximum

- Valuable synergies need to overcome reluctances set by older activities. Rear-looking governance prevents the unlocking of the full potential of synergies between activities that are new-comers, like aquaculture or renewal energy, with older activities like fishing or tourism. As an example, a more suitable approach to visual impact as part of the environmental impact assessments should be included in the legislation.
- At National level the legislative framework does not encourage synergies to take place. For example, in Ireland the National Marine Planning Framework is underpinned by legislation introduced in the form of the Maritime Area Planning Bill which aims to establish a new regulatory body in the Maritime Area Regulatory Authority (MARA) - this will not include aquaculture and fisheries, as it is not legislated for as part of the Bill. Aquaculture and fisheries must be included in associated National marine spatial planning legislation as it is essential for the fair and correct development management of the Marine space.

Q29. Is the current legislative framework sufficient to ensure that maritime space is used in such a way that helps achieve the objectives of the European Green Deal (e.g. sustainable seafood, sustainable energy, nature conservation and restoration)?

3000 character(s) maximum

See previous answer to question 28

Q30. What kind of impact have you experienced as a result of spatial planning initiatives or other human activities?

- Positive

- Negative
- I do not know

Please explain

3000 character(s) maximum

- Better planning is needed. Put in place coordinated spatial planning for waters and land/secure adequate allocation of space for aquaculture providing ecosystem services and simplify bureaucratic procedures both in access to space and licensing to ensure long term existence of this kind of aquaculture;

- Legislative framework must reflect the policies and principles of marine spatial planning. Ireland the National Marine Planning Framework is underpinned by legislation introduced in the form of the Maritime Area Planning Bill which aims to establish a new regulatory body in the Maritime Area Regulatory Authority (MARA) - this will not include aquaculture and fisheries, as it is not legislated for as part of the Bill. Aquaculture and fisheries must be included in associated National marine spatial planning legislation as it is essential for the fair and correct development management of the Marine space.

Clean (& healthy) oceans

This matter is linked to the [targeted consultation on the action plan to conserve fisheries resources and protect marine ecosystems](#) requesting the involvement in shaping the plan. The above-mentioned consultation will gather information and evidence on the current state of the conservation of sensitive species and habitats, and the availability and potential of innovative, more selective fishing gears and techniques. In addition, respondents are asked for input and suggestions on actions that could improve the way the relevant fisheries and environmental legislation are managed, implemented and governed.

Clean oceans are oceans free from any type of pollution. Main types of pollution are:

- eutrophication (excess of nutrients pollution/ agricultural runoffs)
- contaminants (pesticides, heavy metals, toxins) underwater noise (oil drilling, shipping)
- ocean acidification (atmosphere CO2 dissolving in ocean)
- marine litter (plastic, wood, metal etc.).

To restore ocean health, the EU aims to regenerate and recover European marine ecosystems through actions to achieve cleaner marine waters, restore their rich biodiversity and make our blue economy climate friendly. The 2030 biodiversity strategy under the European Green Deal and the upcoming EU nature restoration instrument play a key role in triggering these actions on the ground.

To help our oceans become clean and healthy, the CFP helps protect the marine environment, sustainably manage all commercially exploited species, and in particular achieve good environmental status for EU waters in line with the Marine Strategy Framework Directive's requirements. Clean oceans also mean more healthy and nutritious fish for people's plates.

More specifically on management measures under the CFP, the EU's efforts focus on, e.g.:

1. regulating fisheries to ensure fishing takes place at a sustainable level and to minimise negative impacts of fishing and aquaculture activities on marine ecosystems
2. [banning certain single-use plastic items and reducing the use of plastic in fishing gears](#)
3. encouraging ship operators to [deliver all waste to ports](#)
4. [improving the rules on reporting of lost fishing gear](#)

5. ensuring that the development of aquaculture in the EU does not significantly harm ecosystems and biodiversity.

Synergies between different human activities at sea come together in initiatives such as a European Blue Forum, as announced in the new approach for a sustainable blue economy.

Clean oceans at international level

The Commission is also stepping up its commitment to the fight against marine litter at international level, including in the UN, G7, G20 and other international fora. It promotes regional cooperation with Regional Sea Conventions.

The Commission drives research to create innovative and impactful solutions for clean and healthy oceans. The [European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund](#) (EMFAF) also includes as a priority, helping to strengthen international ocean governance and enabling seas and oceans to be safe, secure, clean and sustainably managed. The EMFAF provides support to develop solutions for restoring and maintaining ocean health and tackling marine litter. The fund compensates fishermen for bringing ashore waste caught in their nets rather than dumping it back into the sea.

Questions related to how the CFP contributes to environmental legislation, and to implementing the [Technical Measures Regulation](#) and protecting sensitive species and habitats are not covered in this questionnaire. They are covered in the [consultation on the action plan to conserve fisheries resources and protect marine ecosystems](#) running in parallel.

Q31. What is the impact of pollution on the fishing- and aquaculture community?

Please select first which sector you want to answer for (both possible)

- Fishing community
- Aquaculture community

Please answer Q31 for aquaculture community

3000 character(s) maximum

All aquaculture farms in Europe operate under strict ad hoc license terms. Any aquaculture undertaking in the EU must apply for an official permit to be able to be set up and operate. These licenses require, inter alia, a comprehensive environmental impact assessment and strict environmental monitoring. The pollution of aquaculture is thus fully controlled by public authorities. Any departure from those limits can result in the company losing its license.

- Aquaculture also contributes to the control of nitrogen/phosphorous removal as shellfish are filter feeders which aids to reduce and mitigate eutrophication effects of Irish coastal waters. Shellfish, as filter feeders, actually increase water quality and habitat quality in Irish coastal waters. Shellfish provide a nutrient removal service through feeding which enhances bacterial denitrification, sedimentation rates, reduces turbidity as well as contributing to nutrient sequestration.

- In relation to finfish aquaculture, current WFD classification of coastal waters classifies all coastal water bodies as being of 'High' status for water quality parameters - this includes water bodies which contain salmon farms and indeed all marine aquaculture activities. As part of finfish farming, excess nutrients are artificially introduced into the water column through salmon excretion, in the form of carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus. It is acknowledged that additional nutrients can disturb the natural ratios of nutrient elements in seawater and can increase the availability of nutrients for macro-algal and phytoplankton uptake, which, in

turn, can lead to eutrophication. However, the loading rate of dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN) from salmon farms generally is relatively low when compared to the natural loading rate (Wang et al., 2012).

- Almost all salmon farms in Ireland are of organic status and the location of farms, which are located in exposed, will flushed offshore environments – fish farming sites located in these environments are considered to have reduced nutrient enrichment when compared to natural levels and thus mitigates the risk of eutrophication (SAMS & Napier University, 2002 ; Wilding & Hughes, 2010).

Q32. How do the fishing community and/or the aquaculture producers work on to protect oceans (from pollution)?

Please select first which sector you want to answer for (both possible)

- Fishing community
- Aquaculture producers

Please answer Q32 for aquaculture community

3000 character(s) maximum

- By fulfilling the environmental requirements set in aquaculture licenses.
- By applying voluntary environmental certification schemes and organic certification schemes.
- By voluntarily adhering to National regulations and protocols.
- Clean Oceans – Reduction of waste and collection of waste at sea is part of the current EMFF programme Clean Oceans initiative. What existing areas could be focused on and what additional supports should be considered. The re-use of aquaculture equipment such as oyster bags, 3 for the sea initiative, shore clean ups, water bins in harbours – are all areas where the next EMFF could support through funding.
- Aquaculture sector already complies with obligations outlined in a number of environmental laws i.e. Habitats Directive, Birds Directive, Consolidated Environmental Impact Assessment Directive. Under the current aquaculture licensing system, the aquaculture sector is required to comply with more environmental legislation than any other sector in the marine space, thereby ensuring the healthy and sustainable use of seas.

Q33. What further initiatives and actions could be taken, within the CFP's current legal framework, to support the objectives of ensuring clean oceans within fisheries and aquaculture management? Do you have any examples of good practice that you would like to share?

3000 character(s) maximum

Social dimension

Under its objectives, the CFP Regulation sets out that ‘... *fishing and aquaculture activities....are managed in a way that is consistent with the objectives of achieving economic, social and employment benefits (...)*’, and that the ‘...*CFP shall, in particular, ... contribute to a fair standard of living for those who depend on fishing activities, ... taking into account socio-economic aspects*’.

The collection of specific social data began in 2019. This resulted in a [first report](#) by the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries on social data in the EU fisheries sector. The report

covered, in particular, the profiles of the EU fleet's workforce in terms of age, nationality, education and gender. The next report will be published in 2022 and should pave the way for a more refined analysis of the social dimension of EU fisheries. It should also provide the tools to better take into account social aspects when proposing measures on fisheries management.

The social dimension in fisheries also comes to the forefront in initiatives taken by the [EU social partners](#) such as the agreement which led to the International Labour Organization's 'Work in Fishing Convention' being introduced into EU law (Directive 2017/159). Other aspects concern:

- the training of fishers
- safety of vessels
- the attractiveness of the sector for young fishers
- the international dimension.

Q34. What key social aspects should be taken into consideration when proposing/adopting fisheries management measures?

3000 character(s) maximum

Q35. What initiatives should be taken to further strengthen the CFP's social dimension within its current legal framework?

3000 character(s) maximum

- The contribution of aquaculture to the CFP's social dimension have been overlooked. The CFP should be more forward looking and expand the scope of its social dimension to also cover aquaculture workers. Even though the CFP Regulation sets out that "... fishing and aquaculture activities....are managed in a way that is consistent with the objectives of achieving economic, social and employment benefits (...)", reality is that the socio-economic contribution of aquaculture is seldom taken into. This impact is specially relevant in rural areas.

Both aquaculture and fisheries sectors are essential in providing employment and sustaining rural coastal economies, sustaining these industries will be vital to ensure the development and survival of these communities. Aquaculture indirectly supports employment in ancillary marine sectors such as marine engineering and seafood processing.

Climate change

The ocean-climate nexus is essential for the EU and forms an integral part of our policies, particularly the European Green Deal and the EU Agenda on International Ocean Governance. Both aspects i.e. mitigation and adaptation are crucial.

Strongly reduced greenhouse gas emissions need to be coupled with sustained and robust adaptation actions. The Commission proposed the EU's first ever Climate Law which enshrines our commitment to reaching climate neutrality by 2050. The EU also agreed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 55% by 2030. With regards to adaptation, the ocean is an integral part of our new [adaptation strategy](#), including fisheries and aquaculture.

From a fisheries and aquaculture perspective, climate change should then be looked at having in mind the two following objectives:

1. adapting the fisheries and aquaculture sector, as well as the overarching regulatory framework, to changes in climatic and environmental conditions
2. reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the fisheries and aquaculture sector, to mitigate the scope of climate change.

DG MARE and CINEA contracted two studies on this topic to be delivered in 2022. The purpose of the first study is to:

- assess the resilience of the fisheries system to climate driven stress and investigate whether the current management regime under the CFP is robust
- evaluate to what extent fishing strategies for rebuilding stocks can help improve energy use and efficiency
- assess the potential for reducing fisheries GHG emissions by technical means.

The purpose of the second study is to:

- explore, via a case study approach, whether the value chain (post-harvest) can be made more resilient to impacts of climate change
- identify how operators in the value chain can improve their resource efficiency and reduce their emissions of GHG.

Another study DG MARE is launching will assess the potential of shellfish and algae to recycle nutrients and to estimate the greenhouse gas emissions generated by their production. With increasing changes in climate, there is still little understanding of the short and long term impacts on (commercial) fish stocks. However, any guidance must take into account potential changes in geographical distribution, change in biomass reference points, change in species relationships, changes in the abundance and diversity of non-indigenous species, as well as changes in productivity of a fish stock.

Q36. What challenge(s) do you face or are you aware of in relation to climate change in EU fisheries and EU aquaculture?

Please select first which sector you want to answer for (both possible)

- EU fisheries
- EU aquaculture

Please answer Q36 for EU aquaculture

3000 character(s) maximum

- Aquaculture provides for one of the most carbon efficient sources of protein, when there is an increasing demand globally for sustainable sources of protein. Consideration must be given to the role of the aquaculture industry as a carbon efficient source of sustainable protein. Aquaculture also contributes to the control of nitrogen/phosphorous removal shellfish are filter feeders which aids to reduce eutrophication of waters. Encouraging the development of aquaculture, and its replacing of land-based animal production, will move

the EU closer to the EU's 2030 climate targets. Some types of aquaculture have lower carbon footprint than some vegetable productions like rice. However, there is a need for a common methodology specific tool to measure carbon footprint at aquaculture farm level.

- Adaptation to temperature changes. Most of the fish species farmed in Europe are suitable for a certain temperature range. The increase in temperatures has the effect of making the production of certain species difficult in some countries where the rise in water temperature generates increasingly marked seasonal mortalities, as in the case of trout farming, for example. Similarly, the reproduction of certain species can only take place under certain conditions, such as lower temperatures in winters. Climate change is disrupting these phenomena and we can see fertility problems in these areas.

- Prioritise public funding for energy, climate action and sustainability, as well as support for the transition to a low carbon economy and society (just transition). Aquaculture can benefit from projects that seek to quantify the carbon sequestration value of aquaculture production and the value of aquaculture as a carbon efficient source of protein.

- The issue of increased risk of damage to wastewater infrastructure due to climate change i.e. increased flooding, is not addressed as a potential impact and should be included in the context of the potential effect on the shellfish industry. The shellfish industry depends on an effective wastewater treatment system to prevent loading of wastewater into shellfish production areas, subsequently contaminating their shellfish produce making unfit for market and unsafe for human consumption.

Q37. What are the possible solutions for fisheries and aquaculture to adapt to the changing environment, including in terms diversifying activities? Are there any good practices/ innovations that could help you overcome the challenges you mentioned above?

Please select first which sector you want to answer for (both possible)

- Fisheries
- Aquaculture

Please answer Q37 for aquaculture

3000 character(s) maximum

- Research on the biology of the farmed species, like hybridisation, genetic selection, and diversification of the farmed species.
- Adaptation of production systems, like RAS, aquaponics or offshore farms.
- Aquaculture can contribute to meeting Climate action targets through carbon sequestration value, carbon efficient food production, use of renewable energy sources and creating smart jobs with investment in adaptive technology for a more efficient Irish Aquaculture industry.

Q38. How can the fisheries sector and the aquaculture sector further reduce their emissions? Are there any good practices/innovations that could help you overcome the challenges you mentioned above?

Please select first which sector you want to answer for (both possible)

- Fisheries sector
- Aquaculture sector

Please answer Q38 for aquaculture

3000 character(s) maximum

Aquaculture provides for one of the most carbon efficient sources of protein, when there is an increasing demand globally for sustainable sources of protein. Food production has never been more important and the current Covid-19 crisis has shown the added value of sustainable food production systems. There is now a significant opportunity for aquaculture in light of the increasing global demand for seafood, more sustainable food sources, and carbon efficient food production.

In line the EU Strategic Guidelines for sustainable aquaculture, the European Green Deal and the Farm to Fork Strategy which underline the potential of farmed seafood as a source of protein for food and feed with a low-carbon footprint which has an important role to play in helping to build a sustainable food system.

Aquaculture can contribute to meeting Climate action targets through carbon sequestration value, carbon efficient food production, use if renewable energy sources and creating smart jobs with investment in adaptive technology for a more efficient Irish Aquaculture industry.

Q39. What initiatives should be taken to further strengthen the CFP's climate dimension within its current legal framework?

3000 character(s) maximum

Any further comment?

Is there any further comment / information that you would like to share with us?

- Yes
- No

Contact

MARE-D3-CFP@ec.europa.eu

