



EVALUATION of the FISHERIES CONTROL REGULATION

**Fisheries Control Policy
DG MARE - European Commission**

Need

Implement a sufficiently specified and **uniform policy for the control** system of Member States fishing activities in order to **ensure the effective implementation of the CFP** rules, for assuring **sustainable exploitation** of living aquatic resources, and **reduction of overcapacity**

Why an evaluation?

Control
Regulation
(art. 118(1) &
art. 118(2))

5 years **report from the Member States** to the
Commission on the application of the Regulation

Report from the Commission to the European
Parliament and the Council **on implementation**

Control
Regulation
(art. 118(3))

Evaluation of the impact of the Regulation on
the common fisheries policy 5 years after the entry
into force

REFIT
(SWD(2015)110
p. 124

Assessment of whether the Regulation is fit for
purpose by focusing **on simplification and
regulatory burden reduction** aspects

Stakeholders consultation

- **5 Year Reports from Member States**
- **National visits to Member States**
- **External study (consultant)**
- **Public consultation December 2015-March 2016**
- **Workshop with Advisory Councils, NGOs and industry associations**
- **Workshop with the European Parliament**
- **Commission's appreciations (results from Commission audits, verification missions, inspections)**

Results of the evaluation

Implementation: rather (but not fully) positive

MSs have generally implemented the main provisions

Impacts: positive

- Improvement of behaviours and compliance with CFP rules
- Increase level playing field among operators
- Increase quality of catch data
- More collaboration among Mss
- Simplification of the legislative framework
- Decrease in administrative burden
- Appreciation of the EFCA

Results of the evaluation

- ❖ **Relevant** to promote culture of compliance with the CFP
- ❖ **Add EU value** in increasing level playing field among operators and Member States
- ❖ **Coherent** with other fisheries legislation and other policies, but synergies should be increased (e.g. CFP-LO, MSF)
- ❖ **Effective and efficient:** positive role of VMS, ERS, Risk analysis, SCiPs/JDPs, inspection standards, training. Deficiencies in sanctions and point system, control and reporting of small vessels, traceability
- ❖ **Administrative burden** decreased











European
Commission







DISCUSSION

PROMOTION OF THE LEVEL PLAYING FIELD

Assessment









	Appropriateness of provisions in CR	Implementation
VMS		
ERS		 Inter-operability issues (data exchange between MSs)
Vessels 12-15m	 Derogations undermine level playing field	 Difficulties in data exchange between MSs
Vessels <10m	 Exemptions undermine level playing field	 Difficult control Uncertainties on catch data

Assessment

	Appropriateness of provisions in CR	Implementation
Catch Data and Fishing Efforts		 Discrepancies between reported data
Traceability		 Difficulties of interoperability among MSs Difficulties in data verifications
Recreational Fisheries	 Lack of provisions	 No catch data





***DEVELOPMENT OF A CULTURE OF
COMPLIANCE AND RESPECT OF THE
COMMON FISHERIES POLICY RULES***

Assessment

	Appropriateness of provisions in CR	Implementation
Risk management		 Not uniform application at EU level Differences in criteria applied
SCIPs/JDPs		
Sanctions		
Serious infringements	 national criteria undermine level playing field	

SIMPLIFICATION AND REDUCTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN

Assessment

	Appropriateness of provisions in CR	Implementation
Simplification of the regulatory framework respect to previous system		 un-clarity of some provisions
Reduction administrative burden respect to previous system		 too many derogations provided

Conclusions

(+) MS have generally implemented the main provisions of the CR

(+) The CR has helped stepping up a culture of compliance with the CFP

(-) However there are a number of **shortcomings**:

1) Incomplete implementation of certain (key) rules (*e.g.* sanctioning system). This would require **additional effort from the MS**

2) The Regulation is not entirely fit for purpose

This would require a **revision of the legislative framework**, which was beyond the scope of this evaluation

Next steps: address shortcomings

- **Implementation: D4 work programme**
- **Legislative framework: launch of the revision**
 - Lack of alignment CFP**
 - Sanctions and point system**
 - Follow up of infringements**
 - Control and reporting catch data small vessels**
 - Data exchange and data sharing**
 - Rigidity of some provisions**

Next steps: stakeholders consultation

- **Council Working Party 26 April 2017**
Comments received from DE and ES
- **Expert Group on Fisheries Control 7 June 2017**
- **EP PECHE committee 22 June 2017**
- **Advisory Councils**
- **Public consultation on proposed options**

Take into account

ECA Report EU fisheries controls: more efforts needed

EP Report how to make fisheries uniform

EFCA Recommendations stemming from its 5years evaluation

Thank you for your attention