



FAME Support Unit

AT01.2

**EMFF and Natura 2000
Final report**

Final

September 2018

FAME SU: AT01.2 EMFF and Natura 2000, final report, September 2018

Prepared by: FAME SU geographic experts, Mojca HRABAR, AS Revised by: AS Linguistic Review: FW Date sent to DG MARE: 25.06.2018
DG MARE reviewer(s): JM, Katarzyna JANIAK, Fotios Papoulias (DG ENV), Vedran Nikolic (DG ENV) Date sent to FAME: 12.07.2018 (meeting)
FAME second reviewer(s): AS Date sent to DG MARE: 18.07.2018, <i>update with stories, 11.09.2018</i>
DG MARE second reviewer(s): Date sent to FAME:
FAME third reviewer(s): Linguistic Review: Date sent to DG MARE:
DG MARE third reviewer(s): Date sent to FAME:
Status: Final
To be published: no
Location in SharePoint: https://projects.gopa-group.com/unit/cofad/MARE-2014-02/_layouts/15/WopiFrame2.aspx?sourcedoc=/unit/cofad/MARE-2014-02/COM%20Working%20Space/AT01.2_Natura_2000_5_of_5_final_report_2018-06.docx&action=default
DG MARE final approval: JM Date of approval: 12.07.2018 See Ares(2018)3713645

Copyright notice:

© European Union, 2018

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries

Disclaimer:

The information and views set out in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Commission. The Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this report. Neither the Commission nor any person acting on the Commission's behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Recommended citation:

EUROPEAN COMMISSION - Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries – Unit D.3 (2018): FAME SU Report 'EMFF and Natura 2000', Brussels

Authors: FAME SU geographic experts, Mojca HRABAR, Angelos SANOPOULOS

Contact:

FAME Support Unit
Boulevard de la Woluwe 2
BE-1150 Brussels
T: +32 2 775 84 44
FAME@fame-emff.eu

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	5
1.1	Background.....	5
1.2	Purpose and target groups.....	5
1.3	Methodology.....	6
1.4	Report structure.....	6
1.5	Acknowledgments.....	7
2	The Natura 2000 network and biodiversity protection.....	8
2.1	Definition.....	8
2.2	'Fitness check' of the Habitats and Birds Directives.....	8
2.3	EMFF legal framework and Natura 2000.....	9
3	Natura 2000 implementation in EMFF operational programmes.....	15
3.1	Natura 2000 provisions in the EMFF operational programmes.....	15
3.2	Natura 2000 implementation in the EMFF operational programmes.....	17
3.3	Natura 2000 implementation and biodiversity protection, directly related measures.....	21
3.3.1	Article 40.1b-g and i.....	21
3.3.2	Article 40.1.h.....	24
3.3.3	Article 54.....	25
3.3.4	Article 80.1.b.....	27
3.4	Natura 2000 implementation and biodiversity protection, potentially related measures.....	28
3.5	Planned EMFF support for Natura 2000 implementation.....	30
3.6	Horizontal issues, climate change.....	31
3.7	Examples of Natura 2000 operations in EMFF.....	31
4	Operations funded under the EFF.....	37
5	Other funding relating to the Natura 2000 implementation in marine areas.....	39
5.1	Alternative EU support.....	39
5.2	National support.....	46
6	Conclusions and recommendations.....	48
7	Bibliography/sources provided by the Member States.....	52
8	Annex.....	58

Acronyms

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CFP	Common Fisheries Policy
CLLD	Community led local development
COFASP	Cooperation in Fisheries, Aquaculture and Seafood Processing
CSR	corporate social responsibility
DG ENV	Directorate-General for the Environment
DG MARE	Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries
EAFRD	European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development
EEA	European Environmental Agency
EFF	European Fisheries Fund
EIB	European Investment Bank
EMFF	European Maritime and Fisheries Fund
ERDF	European Regional Development Fund
ESIF	European Structural and Investment Fund
FLAG	Fisheries Local Action Group
FP7	Seventh Framework Programme
GE	Geographic Expert
GIS	Geographic Information System
IAS	invasive alien species
IMP	Integrated Maritime Policy
MA	Managing Authority
MPA	Marine Protected Area
MS	Member States
MSFD	Marine Strategy Framework Directive
NCFF	Natural Capital Financial Facility
NGO	non-governmental organisation
OI	Output Indicator
OP	Operational Programme
ORC	Organic Rankine Cycle
PAF	Prioritised Action Framework
PAL	Porpoise Alerting (device)
SWOT	strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats
TED	turtle excluder device
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WFD	Water Framework Directive

Country codes

AT	Austria
BE	Belgium
BG	Bulgaria
CY	Cyprus
CZ	Czech Republic
DE	Germany
DK	Denmark
EE	Estonia
EL	Greece
ES	Spain
FI	Finland
FR	France
HR	Croatia
HU	Hungary
IE	Ireland
IT	Italy
LT	Lithuania
LV	Latvia
MT	Malta
NL	Netherlands
PL	Poland
PT	Portugal
RO	Romania
SE	Sweden
SI	Slovenia
SK	Slovakia
UK	United Kingdom

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

In 2014 the Commission launched the **"fitness check" of the Habitats and Birds Directives**, which concluded that the directives are fit for purpose, however full achievement of their objectives will depend on substantial improvement in their implementation in close partnership with local authorities and different stakeholders in the Member States. As a response to the fitness check conclusions, in 2017 the Commission adopted the **Action plan for nature, people and the economy**.

One of its **priorities** is to **strengthen investment in Natura 2000 and to improve synergies with EU funding instruments**. Under Action 11 in particular, the Commission and Member States (MS) will **'facilitate full and effective use of the financial resources allocated under the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) for biodiversity protection and Natura 2000 sites** in the period 2014-2020 and, where feasible, will promote increased allocations and uptake'.

To that end, the following is needed:

- Information on how the MS are using the funds allocated in their EMFF operational programmes for biodiversity protection and in particular for Natura 2000 sites and other Marine Protected Areas (MPAs).
- Transfer of relevant information to the Commission that may be useful for promoting increased allocations and uptake of the current EMFF and for programming the future EMFF (e.g. look into support for MPAs under the EMFF and analyse effectiveness).

To this end, FAME has implemented a group of ancillary task packages comprised of a scoping report, field research in 25 Member States and a final report.

1.2 Purpose and target groups

The **purpose of this final report** is:

- to provide an **introduction to the Natura 2000 implementation framework** under the EMFF;
- to present the **findings** collected through the field research, and
- to extract **conclusions and recommendations** on the use of the EMFF resources for biodiversity protection and Natura 2000 sites in the MS.

This report is targeted at the Commission services, to the Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (DG MARE) and the Directorate-General for the Environment (DG ENV) in particular, and to MS Managing Authorities (MAs)¹.

¹ Dissemination modalities are to be decided by DG MARE Unit D3

1.3 Methodology

The methodology consisted of the following steps:

- Drafting a scoping report, identifying the points of interest and outlining the regulatory framework and field research (January to March 2018);
- Developing a questionnaire to be used during the field phase (March 2018, provided in the annex);
- Screening the MS Article 97.1.a reports (henceforth Infosys reports) for relevant operations (March 2018);
- Conducting interviews with the EMFF MAs (April-May 2018);
- Synthesising the findings in the present report (June 2018).

The methodology contains two fundamental conventions:

1. The main tool for identifying relevant operations is the EMFF measure that the operation is linked to; there might be other relevant operations but they could not be identified if they are linked to measures not considered to be part of those identified as relevant in the scoping phase.
2. The direct relevance of an operation to the Natura 2000 network is determined by the value inserted in the Infosys operation implementation datum on the 'Natura 2000 area concerned'. If a value is reported, it is assumed that the operation is within a Natura 2000 area and directly relevant to the network. If no value is reported the operation is considered to be outside the relevant areas and hence relevant to biodiversity protection in the broader sense.

1.4 Report structure

This report consists of eight chapters.

Chapter 1 provides the general introduction. **Chapter 2** provides an introduction to the Natura 2000 network and biodiversity protection, and its accommodation in the EMFF legal framework.

Chapter 3 discusses the Natura 2000 provisions in the EMFF operational programmes as well as the progress of implementation per measure as per 31 December 2017. The chapter closes with an overview of planned EMFF support for Natura 2000 implementation until the end of the programming period, a short review on the consideration of climate change and finally a number of operation examples.

Chapter 4 deals with implementation under the European Fisheries Fund (EFF) (2007-2013).

Chapter 5 presents findings on other funding relating to Natura 2000, protection of marine biodiversity and the implementation of marine protected areas.

Chapter 6 closes with a discussion and conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations, followed by the bibliography in **Chapter 7**. The questionnaire used in the field phase is contained in **Chapter 8**.

1.5 Acknowledgments

The FAME Support Unit would like to express their gratitude to the officials and experts of the EMFF Managing Authorities and other national agencies that contributed to this report, and generously shared their knowledge and experiences during the field phase in spring 2018. The FAME Support Unit would also like to thank Mrs Leticia Martinez Aguilar from DG MARE Unit D3 for her guidance, her liaison with DG ENV and her support throughout this task.

2 The Natura 2000 network and biodiversity protection

2.1 Definition

Biodiversity is defined by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) as 'the variability among living organisms from all sources including inter alia, terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part; this includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems'.

The Natura 2000 network is central to the European Union's (EU) response to the aim of biodiversity preservation in the form of protecting Europe's most valuable and threatened species and habitats, listed under the Birds Directive and the Habitats Directive². It is a key part of the EU contribution to the CBD and the Bern Convention on the protection of European wild animals, plants and their habitats.

It extends across all 28 Member States currently covering approximately 18 % of the EU's land area and more than 9 % of its marine territory³.

In relation to the marine environment, the EU has established a policy framework addressing the multiple challenges and providing an ecosystems-based approach regarding marine resources. The Marine Strategy Framework Directive, along with the Birds and Habitats Directives, are among the pillars of this framework.

In 2007, the Commission published guidelines for the establishment of the Natura 2000 network in the marine environment in order to apply the Habitats and Birds Directives.

2.2 'Fitness check' of the Habitats and Birds Directives

In 2014, as part of its commitment for Better Regulation, the Commission launched the '**Fitness Check**' of the **Habitats and Birds Directives**⁴. The fitness check found that the directives are fit for purpose, but that better implementation is needed in order to achieve their objectives.

The Commission therefore adopted the **Action Plan** for nature, people and the economy⁵ in 2017 to improve the implementation of the two directives, and undertook to report on the delivery of the actions before the end of its mandate in 2019.

² The European network of protected areas, Natura 2000, consists of Special Protection Areas classified under the EU Birds Directive (Directive 79/409/EEC codified in 2009 by 2009/147/EC) and Sites of Community Importance (SCI) (subsequently designated as Special Areas of Conservation) identified under the EU Habitats Directive (Directive 92/43/EEC).

³ 2017 data, as published in N2000 barometer on EEA website (release version 2018-05-17) <https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/dashboards/natura-2000-barometer>

⁴ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/legislation/fitness_check/index_en.htm

⁵ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/legislation/fitness_check/action_plan/communication_en.pdf

One of the priorities in the Action Plan is to strengthen investment in Natura 2000 and to improve synergies with EU funding instruments. In particular, under Action 11 the Commission and Member States will 'facilitate full and effective use of the financial resources allocated under EMFF for biodiversity protection and Natura 2000 sites in the period 2014-2020 and, where feasible, will promote increased allocations and uptake'. The current EMFF allows for such measures, under shared management, primarily in its Articles 40, 44, 54 and 80. Relevant actions can also be found under Articles 28, 38, 39 and 77.

The main aim of the EMFF is to support the implementation of the common fisheries policy (CFP). Natura 2000 is not mentioned in the CFP basic regulation 1380/2013 explicitly. However, Article 2.5j of the Regulation 1380/2013 requires the CFP to 'be coherent with the Union environmental legislation...', while the ecosystem approach lies at the core of the CFP. Moreover, the implementation of Natura 2000 is the responsibility of the environment administration in most MS, while the EMFF usually falls under the competencies of the fisheries and/or agriculture administration (however, marine Natura 2000 can be a joint responsibility).

In practice, the management of Natura 2000 or other MPAs may require regulating fisheries and aquaculture, usually involving a restriction or adaptation on fisheries and aquaculture activity. Accordingly, the main task of the EMFF (and the administrations managing it in the MS) is not to implement Natura 2000 or other MPAs as such, but to support measures to effectively manage the areas and ensure compatibility with fisheries and aquaculture.

2.3 EMFF legal framework and Natura 2000

The European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIFs) provide various Natura 2000 funding opportunities.

The EMFF contains, under shared management, a series of measures, directly related or potentially supporting the implementation of the Natura 2000 network. The table below gives an overview.

Table 1: EMFF regulation 508/2014, Natura 2000 relevant measures and indicative operations

Measures directly related to Natura 2000		
EMFF regulation measure	Lit.	Indicative operations supported by the EMFF
Art. 40 Protection and restoration of marine biodiversity and ecosystems and compensation regimes in the framework of sustainable fishing activities (including Art. 44.6 on 'the management, restoration and	1.(b-g and i)	(b) the construction, installation or modernisation of static or movable facilities intended to protect and enhance marine fauna and flora, including their scientific preparation and evaluation; (c) contributions to a better management or conservation of marine biological resources; (d) the preparation, including studies, drawing-up, monitoring and updating of protection and management plans for fishery-related activities relating to NATURA 2000 sites and spatial protected areas referred to in Directive 2008/56/EC and relating to other special habitats; (e) the management, restoration and monitoring of NATURA 2000 sites in accordance with Directives 92/43/EEC and 2009/147/EC, in accordance with prioritised action frameworks established pursuant to Directive 92/43/EEC; (f) the management, restoration and monitoring of marine protected areas with a view to the implementation of the spatial protection measures referred to in Article 13(4) of Directive 2008/56/EC; (g) increasing environmental awareness, involving fishermen, with regard to the protection and

monitoring of NATURA 2000 sites which are affected by fishing activities, and the rehabilitation of inland waters in accordance with Directive 2000/60/EC ⁶)		restoration of marine biodiversity; (i) the participation in other actions aimed at maintaining and enhancing biodiversity and ecosystem services, such as the restoration of specific marine and coastal habitats in support of sustainable fish stocks, including their scientific preparation and evaluation.
Art. 40, as above	1.h	(h) schemes for compensation for damage to catches caused by mammals and birds protected by Directives 92/43/EEC and 2009/147/EC.
Art.54, Aquaculture providing environmental services	-	(a) aquaculture methods compatible with specific environmental needs and subject to specific management requirements resulting from the designation of Natura 2000 areas ⁶ in accordance with Directives 92/43/EEC and 2009/147/EC; (b) participation, in terms of costs directly related thereto, in ex-situ conservation and reproduction of aquatic animals, within the framework of conservation and biodiversity restoration programmes developed by public authorities, or under their supervision; (c) aquaculture operations which include conservation and improvement of the environment and of biodiversity, and management of the landscape and traditional features of aquaculture zones.
Art.80 eligible operations (IMP measures financed under shared management)	1.b	protect the marine environment, in particular its biodiversity and marine protected areas such as Natura 2000 sites, in accordance with the obligations established in Directives 92/43/EEC and 2009/147/EC.
Measures potentially supportive to the implementation of Natura 2000		
EMFF regulation measure	Lit.	Indicative operations supported by the EMFF
Art.28 Partnerships between scientists and fishermen	-	(a) the creation of networks, partnership agreements or associations between one or more independent scientific bodies and fishermen, or one or more organisations of fishermen, in which technical bodies may participate; (b) the activities carried out in the framework of the networks, partnership agreements, or associations referred to in point (a). The activities referred to in point (b) of paragraph 1 may cover data collection and management activities, studies, pilot projects, dissemination of knowledge and research results, seminars and best practices.
Art.38 Limitation of the impact of fishing on the marine environment and adaptation of fishing to the protection of species	1.d	(d) in equipment that protects gear and catches from mammals and birds protected by Council Directive 92/43/EEC or Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (28), provided that it does not undermine the selectivity of the fishing gear and that all appropriate measures are introduced to avoid physical damage to the predators.
Art.39 Innovation	1	'to reduce the impact of fishing on the marine environment and the impact of protected predators, the

⁶ Operations under Art.54 can also take place outside of Natura 2000 areas. This information can be retrieved from Infosys.

linked to the conservation of marine biological resources		EMFF may support operations aimed at developing or introducing new technical or organisational knowledge that reduces the impact of fishing activities on the environment, including improved fishing techniques and gear selectivity, or aimed at achieving a more sustainable use of marine biological resources and coexistence with protected predators.'
Art. 40, as above	1.a	(a) collection of waste by fishermen from the sea such as the removal of lost fishing gear and marine litter.
Art.80, as above	1.c	improve the knowledge on the state of the marine environment, with a view to establishing the monitoring programmes and the programmes of measures provided for in Directive 2008/56/EC, in accordance with the obligations established in that Directive.

Source: Regulation (EU) No 508/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

Further, **Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/531** identifies that '...costs eligible for support from the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund in order to ... protect and restore marine biodiversity and ecosystems...' and in Art.7-12 defines in detail which costs are eligible. The following table gives an overview

Table 2: EMFF regulation 508/2014 measures and 2015/531 provisions

EMFF regulation measure	Regulation 2015/531, eligible costs
Art. 40.1.a	(a) the removal of lost fishing gear from the sea, in particular in order to combat ghost fishing; (b) the purchase and, if applicable, the installation of equipment on board for the collection and storage of litter; (c) the creation of schemes of waste collection for participating fishermen, including financial incentives; (d) the purchase and, if applicable, the installation of equipment based in fishing port facilities for the storage and recycling of litter; (e) communication, information, awareness raising campaigns, to encourage fishermen and other stakeholders to participate in projects to remove lost fishing gear; (f) training for fishermen and port agents.
Article 40.1.b	(a) the purchase and, if applicable, the installation of facilities to protect marine areas from trawling; (b) the purchase and, if applicable, the installation of facilities to restore degraded marine ecosystems; (c) costs relating to preliminary work such as prospecting, scientific studies or evaluations; (d) costs, in the outermost regions, relating to the purchase and, if applicable, the installation of anchored fish aggregating devices which contribute to sustainable and selective fishing, in accordance with Article 38(2) of Regulation (EU) No 508/2014.
Article 40.1.c	(a) circular hooks; (b) acoustic deterrent devices on nets; (c) turtle excluder devices ('TEDs'); (d) streamer lines; (e) other tools or devices proven efficient in preventing accidental catches of protected species; (f) training for fishermen on better management or conservation of marine biological resources; (g) projects focusing on coastal habitats of importance for fish, birds and other organisms; (h) projects focusing on areas of importance for fish reproduction, such as coastal wetlands, may also be eligible For the replacement of existing fishing gear with low impact fishing gear, costs related to fish pots and traps, jigging and hand-lining may be eligible for support.
Article 40.1.d	(a) carrying out studies, in particular for the monitoring and surveillance of species and habitats including mapping, and risk management (b) mapping fishing activity and intensity and interactions with protected species and habitats;

EMFF regulation measure	Regulation 2015/531, eligible costs
	<p>(c) consulting stakeholders during the preparation of management plans;</p> <p>(d) developing and applying indicators for pressures and for impacts and performing conservation status assessments;</p> <p>(e) training for fishermen and other persons working for or on behalf of the bodies responsible for the management of marine protected areas (MPAs) relevant for the preparation of protection and management plans for fishery-related activities;</p> <p>(f) demarcation of MPAs;</p> <p>(g) surveillance including salaries of personnel involved in surveillance activities;</p> <p>(h) carrying out publicity and awareness raising measures in relation to MPAs;</p> <p>(i) assessing the impacts of the management plans on Natura 2000 areas and on the fisheries areas affected by the management plans.</p>
Article 40.1.e, f, g	<p>(a) consultation of stakeholders during the preparation of management plans;</p> <p>(b) development and application of indicators for pressures/impacts and conservation status assessments;</p> <p>(c) surveillance of Natura 2000 sites and MPAs;</p> <p>(d) training for persons working for or on behalf of the bodies responsible for the management of Natura 2000 sites and MPAs;</p> <p>(e) training of fishermen on conservation and restoration of marine ecosystems and related alternative activities such as eco-tourism in Natura 2000 sites and MPAs;</p> <p>(f) mapping fishing activity and monitoring its intensity and recording fishery interactions with protected species such as seals, sea turtles, dolphins, seabirds;</p> <p>(g) supporting the development of fisheries management measures in Natura 2000 sites and MPAs, such as IA studies and risk assessment, including actions fostering the improvement of their coherence;</p> <p>(h) support to measures increasing environmental awareness, involving fishermen, with regard to the protection and restoration of marine biodiversity;</p> <p>(i) cooperation and networking of managers of Natura 2000 sites and MPAs.</p>
Article 40.1.i	<p>(a) costs relating to schemes to test novel monitoring techniques, and in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) remote electronic monitoring systems, such as CCTV, for the monitoring and recording of incidental catches of protected species; (ii) the recording of oceanographic data such as temperature, salinity, plankton, algae blooms or turbidity; (iii) the mapping of invasive alien species (IAS); (iv) actions, including studies, to prevent and control the expansion of IAS; <p>(b) financial incentives for the installation on board of automatic recording devices for monitoring and recording oceanographic data such as temperature, salinity, plankton, algae blooms or turbidity;</p> <p>(c) costs for chartering of commercial fishing vessels for environmental observation at a rate proportional to the activity;</p> <p>(d) costs for other scientific actions related to the mapping and assessment of marine and coastal ecosystems and their services.</p> <p>2. For operations aiming at restoring specific marine and coastal habitats in support of sustainable fish stocks, as referred to in Article 40(1)(i) of Regulation (EU) No 508/2014, the following actions are eligible for support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) actions reducing physical and chemical pollution; (b) actions reducing other physical pressures, including anthropogenic underwater noise that negatively affect biodiversity; (c) positive conservation measures to protect and conserve flora and fauna, including the reintroduction of or stocking with native species, and applying Green Infrastructure principles referred to in the Commission Communication on Green Infrastructure;

EMFF regulation measure	Regulation 2015/531, eligible costs
	(d) actions to prevent, control or eliminate IAS.

Source: Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/531.

Additionally, Commission Implementing Regulations 1243/2014, 1242/2014 and 2017/788 (the Infosys regulations), define the operational information collected per measure and operation.

For some measures, Natura 2000 relevant actions can be identified directly; for others only assumptions can be made and then clarified during the field research exercise. The following table gives an overview.

Table 3: Infosys and Natura 2000 relevant data

EMFF regulation measure	Infosys implementation data	Infosys result indicators related to Natura 2000
Measures directly related to Natura 2000		
Art. 40.1.(b-g and i)	Indication as to whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both Type of operation: investment in facilities; management of resources; management plans for Natura 2000 and SPA; management of Natura 2000; management of MPAs; increasing awareness; other actions enhancing biodiversity Total area concerned by Natura 2000 (in km ²) (if relevant) Total area concerned by MPA (in km ²) (if relevant) Number of fishermen concerned	(a) Change in the coverage of Natura 2000 areas designated under the Birds and Habitats Directives (km ²) (b) Change in the coverage of other spatial protection measures under Article 13.4 of Directive 2008/56/EC (km ²)
Art. 40.1.h	Number of fishermen benefiting from the operation	n.a.
Art. 54	Type of operation: aquaculture in Natura 2000 areas; ex situ conservation and reproduction; aquaculture operations including conservation and improvement of environment and biodiversity Number of employees benefiting from the operation Total area concerned by Natura 2000 (in km ²) Total area concerned outside Natura 2000 (in km ²)	n.a.
Art.80.1.b	Type of operation: MPA; Natura 2000 Surface of MPA covered (km ²) (if relevant) Surface of Natura 2000 covered (km ²) (if relevant) Type of beneficiary	As for Art. 40.1.(b-g and i)
Measures potentially supportive to the implementation of Natura 2000		
Art.28	Indication as to whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both Type of activities: networks; partnership agreement or association; data collection and management; studies; pilot projects; dissemination; seminars; best practices Number of scientists involved in partnership Number of fishermen involved in partnership Number of other bodies benefiting from the operation	n.a.
Art.38	Indication as to whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both Type of investment: selectivity of gear; reduce discards or deal	n.a.

EMFF regulation measure	Infosys implementation data	Infosys result indicators related to Natura 2000
	with unwanted catches; eliminating impacts on ecosystem and sea bed; protecting gears and catches from mammals and birds; fish aggregating device in outermost regions Number of fishermen benefiting from the operation	
Art.39	Indication as to whether the operation relates to sea or inland fishing or both Type of operation: developing new technical or organisational knowledge reducing impacts; introducing new technical or organisational knowledge reducing impacts; developing new technical or organisational knowledge achieving sustainable use; introducing new technical or organisational knowledge achieving sustainable use Number of fishermen benefiting from the operation	n.a.
Art 40.1.a	Number of fishermen benefiting from the operation	n.a.
Art. 80.1.c	Type of operation: establishment of monitoring programme; establishment of measures for MSFD Type of beneficiary	n.a.

Source: FAME 2018

3 Natura 2000 implementation in EMFF operational programmes

3.1 Natura 2000 provisions in the EMFF operational programmes

The EMFF has committed itself in principle to the protection and restoration of marine biodiversity and ecosystems.

According to the FAME EMFF operational programme (OP) synthesis report (October 2016) MS intend to implement over 1 400 operations⁷ to protect and restore biodiversity in marine and inland waters under Article 40.1.b-g, and i. These operations will support inter alia the establishment of a coherent network of fish stock recovery areas as well as management, restoration and monitoring of Natura 2000 sites and implementation of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD).

One of the most important issues highlighted in the analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) of 13 OPs is the management of the Natura 2000 areas and data availability. Thirteen OPs refer to the management of Natura 2000. Six MS classify management as a weakness (CY, DE, HU, IT, PL, SE), but others consider it as an opportunity (EI, HR, NL, PT, UK). BG, FR and LV consider management as a strength.

Data availability is the most often quoted weakness, by 8 MS (BG, CY, DK, EL, FR, IE, MT, SI). This argument is closely related to available research infrastructure, which is considered as a weakness in IE, MT, SE and SI.

Five MS (AT, CZ, EE, LT, SK) stated that measures related to Natura 2000 are not part of the OP, as they are not sufficiently closely related to the national fisheries sector⁸.

Parallel to the SWOT analysis, the following needs are most often quoted:

- Management of the Natura 2000 areas (AT, BG, CY, DE, EL, ES, FI, FR, HR, HU, IE, IT, LV, MT, NL, PL, SE, UK);
- Maritime spatial planning (BE, BG, DK, EL, ES, FI, IE, IT, LV, MT, RO, SI);
- Research and data (BG, CY, DK, EL, ES, FI, FR, HR, IE, IT, LV, PL, SI, UK);
- Cooperation with stakeholders (BG, DE, EL, ES, FR, HR, HU, IE, MT, NL, PL, SE).

⁷ The EMFF has 28 common output indicators (OIs), which are listed in Reg. (EU) No 1014/2014 corresponding to EMFF measures. The measurement unit is in most cases 'number of operations' (25 out of the 28 OIs). It is the discretion of the MAs to decide what constitutes an operation. An operation can be a project, contract, action or group of projects selected by the MAs of the programme (Reg. (EU) No 1303/2013, Article 2). Hence, the comparability of the absolute number between MS is limited.

⁸ AT and SK were not included in the field phase, since they had no operations planned under the two measures groups; CZ, EE and LT were included since they have been implementing operations related to biodiversity protection in the broader sense.

Various other issues are mentioned by the MS in relation to Natura 2000: support to farmers to comply with the Natura 2000 restrictions (HU, RO), target programme for wetland protection (HU) and development of selective gear (DE).

Seven MS (CY, EL, HR, MT, SE, SI, UK) refer explicitly to the creation of a network of fish stock recovery areas. UK intends to apply, specifically, Articles 38-40 of EMFF in support of this aim. Other MS do not refer explicitly to measures and articles with regards to how the network will be created.

Attention given to the management of Natura 2000 area in the EMFF OPs is relatively limited. This is at least partly due to the responsibility for CFP and Natura 2000 being borne by different ministries, as well as to the fact that the establishment of Natura 2000 in the marine is still underway and at an early stage.

In the interviews in the frame of this ancillary task, 10 MS have stated that the institutional set-up of overall implementation of the Natura 2000 is advanced or practically completed; 7 are at intermediate or starting stage while 8 provided no answer. The table below gives an overview of the MS replies on the specific topics:

Table 4: Overall implementation of the Natura 2000, as perceived by the EMFF MAs

	No reply	Starting	Intermediate	Advanced	Completed
Progress in site designation	8	1	2	5	8
Progress in definition of sites' conservation objectives	8	2	3	6	4
Progress in management plans and schemes	7	6	6	4	1

Source: MA interviews, FAME 2018.

It becomes obvious that a certain gradient exists between site designation (which is to a high extent complete or advanced) on the one hand and detail questions like the development of management plans and schemes on the other.

The legal framework, as far as the MAs management tasks and the related secondary legislation elements are concerned, is considered in most MS as advanced or completed (exceptions are BG, HU and UK). Complementary components are also well developed as seen in the table below.

Table 5: Legal framework of Natura 2000, as perceived by the EMFF MAs

	No reply	Starting	Intermediate	Advanced	Completed
Legal framework	3	1	2	6	10
Capacity and resources of competent authorities/ bodies	4	1	6	6	5
Procedures for public participation	4	3	3	6	6
Data collection and monitoring	3	3	5	8	3

Source: MA interviews, FAME 2018.

Indeed, the EMFF MAs do not consider the EMFF to be the main carrier of Natura 2000 implementation. Thirteen MS consider the significance of EMFF to be marginal, whereas 6

consider it to be significant and only 3 (BG, CY, ES) decisive. In those MS where EMFF is considered to be decisive, one of the aspects was the carrying out of studies, mapping and data collection for the designation of marine Natura 2000 sites and the conservation of species and habitats of community importance. Even in those MS where EMFF is considered marginal, there are multiple examples of measures that indirectly relate to Natura 2000 and fisheries; for example, the protection of reefs through sustainable fishing equipment and regulated fisheries. Regarding **stakeholders**, the most important groups are ministries as decision-makers, environmental agencies as implementers and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) as implementers or followers (depending on the institutional set-up of the MS). Also important is the role of producer organisations and private operator/fishers, mainly as implementers and followers. This is a specific characteristic of the EMFF, where OPs sometimes have a fisher advocate role.

Table 6: Role of EMFF stakeholders in Natura 2000

Stakeholders	Decision-maker	Implementer	Follower	Total
Environmental agencies	3	7	1	11
General public	0	0	1	1
Ministries	9	1	0	10
NGOs	0	5	5	10
Producer organisations	1	4	2	7
Other professional associations	0	3	1	4
Private operator/fisher	0	2	2	4
Private operator/other	1	1	0	2
Regional/local authorities	1	2	0	3

Source: MA interviews, FAME 2018.

Regarding the consistency of measures in the 2014-2020 OP with the priorities identified in the **Prioritised Action Framework (PAF)**, most MAs replied that the PAF was significant or decisive in defining the actions. Only six of nineteen considered the influence of the PAF to be marginal. It has been mentioned for example that the PAF also included information on the impact of EMFF measures (BG), that it acknowledged the importance of EMFF for the marine component of Natura 2000 (CY), that the PAF was used for the EMFF OP needs assessment (SE) or that the EMFF measures objectives and actions are closely aligned with the PAF contents (GR, ES, HU, NL, PL, SI, UK).

3.2 Natura 2000 implementation in the EMFF operational programmes

EMFF OPs have set a target of implementing 8 609 operations either directly or potentially related to Natura 2000 and biodiversity protection. Out of them, 5 259 fall under the category 'directly related measures' and the rest (3 350) under 'potentially related measures'.

The total EMFF contribution is EUR 647 372 577.20 (from EUR 635 500 550.12 in 2016), with EUR 376 030 420.08 and EUR 271 342 157.12 for the two categories respectively. The overall commitment rate is 22.35 % and the expenditure rate is 5.74 %. The category 'directly related measures' has higher rates overall. Taking in account the late start of the EMFF (most OPs were approved in late 2015) the performance can be considered satisfactory.

Table 7: Output indicators targets (number of operations) per MS and measure for relevant EMFF measures

EMFF Article	MS																								Grand Total	
	BE	BG	CY	CZ	DE	DK	EE	EL	ES	FI	FR	HR	HU	IE	IT	LT	LV	MT	NL	PL	PT	RO	SE	SI		UK
Article 40.1.b-g, i	18	8	28		110	690	5	14	42	5	160	5	40	50	150	2				5	10		21	10	51	1 424
Article 40.1.h			600							800		80			500	28				1	6					2 015
Article 54	3	50		22	376			1	8			40	90		100	19	90			600	6	271		3	7	1 686
Article 80.1.b	3	2	6		2		5			10	32	6		4					6	30			14	2	12	134
Total directly related	24	60	634	22	488	690	10	15	50	815	192	131	130	54	750	49	90		6	636	22	271	35	15	70	5 259
Article 28			10		16	4	1	20	3	1	50	100		50	20	2			6		32		2		42	359
Article 38	40	30	40		116	35	65	4	160	50	830	80		126	200	9	40		40	130	32	55	126		85	2 293
Article 39	5	14			40	14		5	20	1	100			20	20			2	80	5			30		38	394
Article 40.1.a	5	7	4		16				10	3		15		2	20					3	12	11	19		5	132
Article 80.1.c	5	1	6		8	3	2		2	25	42	2		1	1	3	2	2	12	30	4		4	3	14	172
Total potentially related	55	52	60		196	56	68	29	195	80	1022	197		199	261	14	42	4	138	168	80	66	181	3	184	3 350
Grand total	79	112	694	22	684	746	78	44	245	895	1 214	328	130	253	1 011	63	132	4	144	804	102	337	216	18	254	8 609

Source: EMFF OPs 2017, FAME compilation 2018.

Due to the EMFF specificity of the output indicator “number of operations” the comparability of the numbers above is limited. Most comparable are usually the number of operations under Article 54 where one operation usually refers to a single aquaculture farm.

Under other measures, the number can only be interpreted within the context of the OP. For example DK is implementing under Article 40.1.b-g, I 690 operations, in many cases small river fish movement obstacle removals, whereas Spain is targeting 42 operations, for example related to the status quo of targeted species in larger coastal areas.

Table 8: EMFF contribution relevant EMFF measures (amounts planned, amounts committed and amounts spent)

EMFF Article	(a) EMFF contribution planned (EUR)	(b) EMFF committed (i.e. EMFF of the eligible expenditure of the operations selected for support (EUR))	(c) EMFF spent (i.e. EMFF of the eligible expenditure declared by the beneficiaries to the Managing Authority (EUR))	(b)/(a), in %	(c)/(a), in %
Article 40.1.b-g and i	213 565 184.91	55 239 780.84	17 468 445.86	14.69	4.65
Article 40.1.h	11 320 229.31	2 765 740.98	1 297 325.01	0.74	0.35
Article 54	133 068 840.64	26 677 270.73	7 489 919.52	7.09	1.99
Article 80.1.b	18 076 165.22	2 378 750.23	-	0.63	0.00
Total directly related	376 030 420.08	87 061 542.78	26 255 690.39	23.15	6.98
Article 28	56 222 481.65	15 656 457.07	554 656.05	4.16	0.15
Article 38	73 490 510.02	12 509 908.95	6 609 936.20	3.33	1.76
Article 39	87 381 510.62	8 975 495.30	950 917.77	2.39	0.25
Article 40.1.a	22 947 399.76	5 267 517.28	599 299.55	1.40	0.16
Article 80.1.c	31 300 255.07	15 184 560.47	2 190 642.07	4.04	0.58
Total potentially related	271 342 157.12	57 593 939.07	10 905 451.64	21.23	4.02
Grand total	647 372 577.20	144 655 481.85	37 161 142.03	22.35	5.74

Source: EMFF AIR 2017, Infosys 2017, FAME compilation 2018

Table 9: Number of selected operations per MS and measure for relevant EMFF measures

EMFF Article	BE	CY	CZ	DE	DK	EE	EL	ES	FI	FR	IE	IT	LT	LV	MT	NL	PL	PT	RO	SE	SI	UK	Grand Total	
Article 40.1b-g and i	8	7		8	646	15	2	235	3	6	128		1					1		13		28	1 101	
Article 40.1.h		339							486				63											888
Article 54			9	275									18	32					21					355
Article 80.1.b									3							2				1	1	5		12
Total directly related	8	346	9	283	646	15	2	235	492	6	128		82	32		2		1	21	14	1	33		2 356
Article 28					3	1		15	1	8						6		9				1		44
Article 38					318	52		34	21		2		7							37		175		646
Article 39				2	8			18	1	2	3				1	5				3		5		48
Article 40.1.a				1				70			1	1					5			14		2		94
Article 80.1.c		2		1	5	8		8	4		1			1	1	5				1	1			38
Total potentially related		2		4	334	61		145	27	10	7	1	7	1	2	16	5	9		55	1	183		870
Grand total	8	348	9	287	980	76	2	380	519		135	1	89	33	2	18	5	10	21	69	2	216		3 226

Source: Infosys 2017, FAME compilation 2018.

3.3 Natura 2000 implementation and biodiversity protection, directly related measures

3.3.1 Article 40.1b-g and i

One of the most significant measures in the EMFF is the Article 40.1b-g and i. It has been programmed by 20 MS and 14 have already selected and implemented operations. The table below gives an overview of the number of operations:

Table 10: Article 40.1b-g and i: Number of selected operations per MS and type of operation, inside and outside a Natura 2000 area

Type of operation (CIR 1242/2014) ⁹	BE	CY	DE	DK	EE	EL	ES	FI	FR	IE	LT	PT	SE	UK	Grand Total
Increasing awareness			1				3		1						5
Management of MPAs							6								6
Management of Natura 2000				3			2						1	1	7
Management of resources				2			73								75
Management plans for Natura 2000 and SPA				1			2								3
Other actions enhancing biodiversity			1				4								5
In a Natura 2000 area¹⁰			2	6			90		1				1	1	101
<i>Increasing awareness</i>							2		1	1					4
<i>Investment in facilities</i>	3						1					1	5		10
<i>Management of MPAs</i>							5							1	6
<i>Management of Natura 2000</i>				1			1			8				1	11
<i>Management of resources</i>	2		2	16			127	1		117			1	1	267
<i>Management plans for Natura 2000 and SPA</i>				2											2
<i>Other actions enhancing biodiversity</i>	3	7	4	621	15	2	9	2	4	2	1		6	24	700

⁹ MAs have to choose one type of operation per project, as defined in the CIR 1242/2014. MAs have a certain liberty in selecting the type; complex operations cannot be fully represented since the MA may choose only a single type.

¹⁰ The distinction if an operation is within or outside a Natura 2000 area is based on an Infosys convention. If the MA provides a number for operation implementation field 21 “Total area concerned by Natura 2000 (in km2) (if relevant)”, then the operation is considered to be directly related to an area.

Type of operation (CIR 1242/2014) ⁹	BE	CY	DE	DK	EE	EL	ES	FI	FR	IE	LT	PT	SE	UK	Grand Total
Outside Natura 2000 areas	8	7	6	640	15	2	145	3	5	128	1	1	12	27	1 000
Grand total	8	7	8	646	15	2	235	3	6	128	1	1	13	28	1 101

Source: Infosys 2017, FAME compilation 2018.

Out of the 1 101 operations under Article 40.1b-g and I, 395 are completed, 635 only selected and the rest are under various stages of implementation. The most commonly mentioned focus of operations under this measure was 'studies, data collection and monitoring/evaluation', followed by 'management measures and plans and 'conservation, restoration and reproduction activities'. The topics addressed range from overall monitoring and planning (UK) and support to the implementation of the Water Framework Directive (BE) to specific actions like mapping and assessment of marine habitats and actions to combat the expansion and presence of marine invasive alien species (CY, SI), mapping and evaluation of the Posidonia meadows and other important marine habitats under the European Habitats Directive (92/43 / EEC) in the coastal waters (CY), use of PAL pingers in gillnet fisheries and research on bird by-catch in inland fisheries (DE), stream restoration for fish passage, (BE, DE, DK), eel restoration (BE), bird by-catch research (DE), artificial reefs construction (EL), improvement of fish spawning conditions in different water bodies (EE), risks assessment and risk mitigation plans and pressure and impact plans (IE), monitoring of recreational fishing in marine protected areas and other sensitive marine areas (PT).

Beneficiaries included environmental agencies, ministries, private operators/fishers, producer organisations, other professional associations, port authorities and regional/local authorities.

Table 11: Article 40.1b-g and I: EMFF committed and EMFF spent per type of operation, inside and outside a Natura 2000 area

Type of operation (CIR 1242/2014)	EMFF committed	EMFF spent
Increasing awareness	380 200.62	12 607.20
Management of MPAs	3 067 986.61	2 666 769.68
Management of Natura 2000	1 424 077.23	901 906.00
Management of resources	3 309 711.30	2 602 250.82
Management plans for Natura 2000 and SPA	279 846.14	-
Other actions enhancing biodiversity	1 289 156.28	787 441.09
In a Natura 2000 area	9 750 978.17	6 970 974.79
Increasing awareness	140 957.34	26 344.37
Investment in facilities	2 304 328.00	293 950.19
Management of MPAs	8 068 661.32	6 049 815.22
Management of Natura 2000	522 763.88	86 206.71
Management of resources	13 698 206.33	2 197 720.53
Management plans for Natura 2000 and SPA	421 063.60	53 443.92
Other actions enhancing biodiversity	20 332 822.19	1 789 990.13
Outside Natura 2000 areas	45 488 802.66	10 497 471.07
Grand total	55 239 780.84	17 468 445.86

Source: Infosys 2017, FAME compilation 2018.

3.3.2 Article 40.1.h

Article 40.1.h deals with schemes for compensation for damage to catches caused by mammals and birds protected by Directives 92/43/EEC and 2009/147/EC. It has been programmed in 7 MS but only 3 have so far selected and implemented operations. The table below gives an overview of the number of operations, the EMFF share of the eligible expenditure of the operations selected for support and the amount already spent.

Table 12: Article 40.1h, number of selected operations per MS, EMFF committed and EMFF spent and number of fishermen benefiting

Values	CY	FI	LT	Grand Total
Number of selected operations	339	486	63	888
EMFF of the eligible expenditure of the operations selected for support (EUR)	1 939 600.05	661 175.43	164 965.50	2 765 740.98
EMFF of the eligible expenditure declared by the beneficiaries to the Managing Authority (EUR)	523 828.35	608 53116	164 965.50	1 297 325.01
Number of fishermen benefiting	339	484	219	1 042

Source: Infosys 2017, FAME compilation 2018.

Out of the 888 operations under Article 40.1.h, 491 are completed and the rest are in various stages of implementation. The main operations under this measure related to the provision of monetary compensations to fishermen holding specific professional licences (for example in CY for coastal and polyvalent fisheries) that suffer economic loss due to damages to their catches caused by marine mammals and for protecting biodiversity in general. In LT, pond aquaculture enterprises are compensated for implementing nature management plans and waterbird protection measures. Three pond aquaculture enterprises are situated into Natura 2000 areas. The beneficiaries were private operator/fishers.

3.3.3 Article 54

Article 54 focuses on aquaculture providing environmental services. Among these, on making aquaculture methods compatible with specific environmental needs and subject to specific management requirements resulting from the designation of Natura 2000. It has been programmed in 16 MS and 5 have so far selected and implemented operations. The table below gives an overview of the number of operations:

Table 13: Article 54, number of selected operations per MS and type of operation, inside and outside a Natura 2000 area

Type of operation (CIR 1242/2014)	CZ	DE	LT	LV	RO	Grand Total
Aquaculture in Natura 2000 areas		118	2		21	141
Aquaculture operations including conservation and improvement of environment and biodiversity		57		3		60
In a Natura 2000 area		175	2	3	21	201
<i>Aquaculture operations including conservation and improvement of environment and biodiversity</i>		100	16	29		145
<i>Ex-situ conservation and reproduction</i>	9					9
Outside Natura 2000 areas	9	100	16	29		154
Grand total	9	275	18	32	21	355

Source: Infosys 2017, FAME compilation 2018.

Out of the 355 operations under Article 54, 162 are completed, 115 are selected, 1 is interrupted and the rest are in various stages of implementation. The most commonly mentioned focus of operations under this measure was 'compensation schemes' and 'conservation, restoration and reproduction activities'. The approach usually entails financial compensation for the additional pond farming and pond management costs caused by conservation measures (e.g. in RO). When an aquaculture holding is located within an (inland) Natura 2000, specific conservation measures and management practices apply; for example, in DE there are detailed EMFF funding guidelines for the relative *Land*. In other countries, where the operations are not directly related to Natura 2000 sites, management provisions aim at the protection of biodiversity in the broader sense, for example in CZ they aim to restock eels. Other examples are measures for the preservation of traditional carp ponds, extensive aquaculture and biotope protection measures (DE), the implementation of nature management plans, protection of habitats and animal health and welfare and public health and safety measures (LT),

Beneficiaries were private operators (fishers or others).

The table below gives an overview of the EMFF share of the eligible expenditure of the operations selected for support, and the amount already spent for those operations that have reported an affected Natura 2000 area and for those who have not (and thus are assumed to be outside sites).

Table 14: Article 54, EMFF committed and EMFF spent per type of operation, inside and outside a Natura 2000 area

Type of operation (CIR 1242/2014)	EMFF committed	EMFF spent
Aquaculture in Natura 2000 areas	16 246 659.46	2 219 626.55
Aquaculture operations, including conservation and improvement of environment and biodiversity	3 136 379.66	1 986 895.19
In a Natura 2000 area	19 383 039.12	4 206 521.74
<i>Aquaculture operations, including conservation and improvement of environment and biodiversity</i>	<i>6 965 209.74</i>	<i>3 030 447.78</i>
<i>Ex-situ conservation and reproduction</i>	<i>329 021.87</i>	<i>252 950.00</i>
Outside Natura 2000 areas	7 294 231.61	3 283 397.78
Grand total	26 677 270.73	7 489 919.52

Source: Infosys 2017, FAME compilation 2018.

3.3.4 Article 80.1.b

Article 80.1.b deals with IMP measures financed under EMFF shared management to protect the marine environment, in particular its biodiversity and marine protected areas such as Natura 2000 sites. It has been programmed in 14 MS and 5 have so far selected operations. The table below gives an overview of the number of operations:

Table 15: Article 80.1.b, number of selected operations per MS and type of operation, inside and outside a Natura 2000 area

Type of operation (CIR 1242/2014)	FI	NL	SE	SI	UK	Grand Total
MPA					1	1
In a Natura 2000 area					1	1
<i>MPA</i>	3	2	1		1	7
<i>Natura 2000</i>				1		1
<i>Operations without type</i>					3	3
Outside Natura 2000 areas	3	2	1	1	4	11
Grand total	3	2	1	1	5	12

Source: Infosys 2017, FAME compilation 2018.

All 12 operations under Article 80.1.b are at the phase of being selected and about to start implementation. The most commonly mentioned focus of operations under this measure was 'studies, data collection and monitoring/evaluation' with occasional mentioning of 'management measures and plans', 'awareness' and 'collection of waste' (in NL and FI). The topics range from surveying the influence of underwater noise (FI), marine wildlife inventories creation (SE), research on the distribution of micro-plastic and other human intruding activities, removal of debris and litter (FI), education and awareness in school education (NL), mapping (SI), dolphin monitoring, and supporting implementation and stakeholder engagement in marine plans (UK). Beneficiaries were environmental agencies, ministries and local authorities.

The majority of operations are of a broader scope and do not refer to a Natura 2000 site; only one operation reports an affected Natura 2000 area. The table below gives an overview of the EMFF share of the eligible expenditure of the operations selected for support and the amount already spent.

Table 16: Article 80.1.b, EMFF committed and EMFF spent per type of operation, inside and outside a Natura 2000 area

Type of operation (CIR 1242/2014)	EMFF committed	EMFF spent
MPA	352 145.58	-
In a Natura 2000 area	352 145.58	-
<i>MPA</i>	1 737 539.45	-
<i>Natura 2000</i>	63 615.38	
<i>Operations without type</i>	225 449.82	
Outside Natura 2000 area	2 026 604.65	-
Grand total	2 378 750.23	-

Source: Infosys 2017, FAME compilation 2018.

3.4 Natura 2000 implementation and biodiversity protection, potentially related measures

In the context of this report, operations under Articles 28, 38, 39, 40.1.a and 80.1.c are considered to be potentially related to Natura 2000 and biodiversity protection in the broader sense. The majority of the MS has programmed them and 21 have so far selected and implemented operations. The table below gives an overview of the number of operations:

Table 17: Articles 28, 38, 39, 40.1.a and 80.1.c, number of operations, EMFF committed and EMFF spent per type of operation

Article and type of operation (CIR 1242/2014)	Nr.	EMFF committed	EMFF spent
Article 28	61	19 785 879.76	554 656.05
Best practices	2	662 403.10	-
Data collection and management	13	2 969 967.94	12 194.29
Dissemination	6	1 574 481.61	-
Networks	20	7 708 653.01	436 741.26
Partnership agreement or association	8	1 531 805.62	83 220.50
Pilot projects	1	166 989.93	-
Seminars	3	1 095 314.13	-
Studies	8	4 076 264.42	22 500.00
Article 38	646	12 509 908.95	6 609 936.20
Eliminating impacts on ecosystem and seabed	74	1 117 981.17	460 862.70
Investments on board that improve the quality of the fishery products	2	12 092.30	6 832.73
Protecting gears and catches from mammals and birds	71	831 878.18	134 037.02
Reduce discards or deal with unwanted catches	177	4 223 882.55	2 919 167.88
Selectivity of gear	322	6 324 074.75	3 089 035.87
Article 39	48	8 975 495.30	950 917.77
Developing new technical or organisational knowledge achieving sustainable use	9	2 488 174.04	129 295.67
Developing new technical or organisational knowledge reducing impacts	24	4 412 919.70	497 235.39
Introducing new technical or organisational knowledge achieving sustainable use	7	1 053 581.65	324 386.71
Introducing new technical or organisational knowledge reducing impacts	7	788 073.06	-
Process and techniques	1	232 746.84	-

Article and type of operation (CIR 1242/2014)	Nr.	EMFF committed	EMFF spent
Article 40.1.a¹¹	94	5 267 517.28	599 299.55
Article 80.1.c	38	15 184 560.47	2 190 642.07
Establishment of measures for MSFD	26	11 749 322.29	1 622 513.39
Establishment of monitoring programme	7	2 325 531.95	240 573.75
No information provided	5	1 109 706.23	327 554.93
Grand total	887	61 723 361.76	10 905 451.64

Source: Infosys 2017, FAME compilation 2018.

Out of the 887 operations under potentially related measures 366 are completed, 453 are selected and the rest are in various stages of implementation.

Under **Article 28**, 'Partnerships between scientists and fishermen', the most commonly mentioned focus of operations was 'cooperation/networking and partnership agreements', 'studies, data collection and monitoring/evaluation' and 'research on fishing equipment and techniques'. Most MS do not consider their operations to be directly related to Natura 2000. ES is an exception, reporting that 3 projects are actually directly related to marine Natura 2000 sites. Operations were selected in 16 MS. Beneficiaries were mainly research institutes but also ministries, NGOs and producer organisations.

Under **Article 38**, 'Limitation of the impact of fishing on the marine environment and adaptation of fishing to the protection of species', the most commonly mentioned focus of operations was the 'deployment of fishing equipment and techniques' and the 'protection of birds and mammals'. Most operations deal with gear selectivity, reduction of by-catch, improving the coexistence of fishermen and marine mammals and birds, and the implementation of the Landing Obligation. The operations are not directly related to Natura 2000 implementation, but may support protection of biodiversity in broader sense. Operations were selected in 21 MS. Beneficiaries were private operators (fishers and others).

¹¹ No type breakdown for operations under this measure.

Under **Article 39**, 'Innovation linked to the conservation of marine biological resources', the most commonly mentioned focus of operations was 'cooperation/networking and partnership agreements', 'studies, data collection and monitoring/evaluation' and 'development of fishing equipment and techniques'. Most operations deal with voluntary agreements by fishers to protect certain species (DE), protection of fisheries, nature and environment in general (DK), and studies for gear selectivity for specific fisheries (MT, UK). Most MS do not consider their operations to be directly related to Natura 2000. ES is an exception reporting that one operation is actually directly related to a Natura 2000 site. Operations were selected in 15 MS. Beneficiaries included ministries, producer organisations, other professional associations and private operators (fishers and others).

Article 40.1.a focuses on the 'collection of waste by fishermen from the sea such as the removal of lost fishing gear and marine litter'. The most commonly mentioned focus of operations was, as expected, 'collection of waste'; however also 'awareness', 'conservation, restoration and reproduction' and 'fishing equipment and techniques' were mentioned. MS do not consider their operations to be directly related to Natura 2000. In PL, the operations are coordinated by the WWF and are a continuation of the actions carried out in the previous programming period under the EFF. Operations were selected in 14 MS. Beneficiaries were mainly environmental agencies, producer organisations and private operators/fishers.

Article 80.1.c focuses on 'improving the knowledge on the state of the marine environment, with a view to establishing the monitoring programmes and the programmes of measures provided for in Directive 2008/56/EC'. The most commonly mentioned foci of operations were 'studies, data collection and monitoring/evaluation' and 'management measures and plans'. Actions include data collection, for example, for alien invasive marine species and cetaceans (CY), mapping and describing benthic habitat types (SI), and broader environmental monitoring in marine waters with the aim of achieving a Good Environmental Status in marine waters (MT). Operations were selected in 21 MS. Beneficiaries were environmental agencies, ministries, private operators/others and regional/local authorities.

3.5 Planned EMFF support for Natura 2000 implementation

MS who have not yet selected operations have mentioned the need to wait for the completion of strategic actions that will determine what the EMFF can offer (for example in BG a project started in October 2017 on mapping of marine natural habitats and species subject to protection). Others already have very clear ideas of operations to be targeted (CY, DE, IE, HR, SI).

Most of the MS, however, pointed out that the operations' selection is application-driven and depending on the interests and needs of potential applicants and their response to the OP calls. So a precise forecast is only possible in exceptional cases (for example in HR). The MAs expect a progress similar to that experienced so far.

Most MS would not specify the amounts to be spent for the relevant measures, apart from the EMFF contribution already indicated in the EMFF AIR (see also Table 8). These amounts are indicative and subject to change, especially within the same UP (for example EMFF contribution can easily be shifted between Article 40.1.b-g and i and Article 40.1.h since they are under the same UP).

3.6 Horizontal issues, climate change

The majority of the MS have responded saying that the consideration of climate change in the measure design has been marginal in most cases. The table below gives an overview.

Table 18: Consideration of climate change in EMFF measures

	Marginal	Significant	Decisive
Art. 40.1.(b-g and i)	15	0	0
Art. 40.1.h	9	0	0
Art. 54	7	0	0
Art.80.1.b	12	0	0
Art.28	10	0	0
Art.38	7	1 (UK)	1 (BE)
Art.39	10	1 (BE)	0
Art.40.1.a	8	2 (BE, PL)	0
Art.80.1.c	12	1 (LV)	0

Source: MA interviews, FAME 2018.

The MS have not considered their operations relevant to climate change aspects. The replies reveal that their first consideration is the climate change mitigation, where indeed the examined measures are of limited relevance and secondary effects. However awareness is rising with regard to the links between biodiversity protection, climate change adaptation and EMFF opportunities.

3.7 Examples of Natura 2000 operations in EMFF

Table 19: Natura 2000 at Sea, France

Title	Natura2000 at Sea - EMFF supports Involvement of French fishermen in managing Natura2000 at sea / Focus on Region Bretagne
Member State	France
Measure	Article 40.1b-g and i
Lead beneficiary/coordinator	Comité Régional des Pêches et Elevages Marins (CRPMEM) - Agence Française pour la Biodiversité (AFB)
Description	<p>Across France, the EMFF supports a coordinated series of project led by the French Biodiversity Agency (AFB) and supporting the design and co-management of Natura2000 areas at sea with the fisheries sector.</p> <p>The main actions include socio-economic analysis of fishing activities taking place within the classified areas, analysis of impact of these activities on the ecosystems and co-development of management and mitigation measures whenever impacts are identified. In Région Bretagne, the project HARPEGE benefits from an important involvement of the fisheries sector and is led by the Regional Fisheries committee, with AFB as institutional partner.</p>
Duration	01 March 2016 – ongoing
Total public cost	EUR 402 137,71
Total EMFF	EUR 241 282,60

Table 20: BioPradaRia, Portugal

Title	BioPradaRia - Restoration, management and conservation of biodiversity and biological resources associated with Ria de Aveiro seagrass ecosystems
Member State	Portugal
Measure	Article 40.1b-g and i
Lead beneficiary/coordinator	Universidade de Aveiro
Description	<p>The BioPradaRia project contributes to the protection and restoration of aquatic biodiversity and aquatic ecosystems within the framework of sustainable fishing activities within the Natura200 area of Ria de Aveiro.</p> <p>The approach is centered on stakeholder involvement, combining local and scientific knowledge, and compiling mutual lessons learned into a road map for restoration, management and conservation of the Ria de Aveiro seagrass ecosystems.</p> <p>Amongst various activities, the BioPradaRia project investigates the replacement of bivalve fishing gear with less impacting gear, but also tests fixed devices protecting seagrasses to revitalize the associated fauna, preserving its role as a nursery for fish species of economic importance for the local fishing activity.</p>
Duration	01 June 2018 - ongoing
Total public cost	EUR 366 920
Total EMFF	EUR 275 190

Table 21: RESTAURA2020, Portugal

Title	RESTAURA2020 – Improving environmental quality and developing mitigation measures against invasive species in Natura2000 Atlantic estuarine marshes
Member State	Portugal
Measure	Article 40.1b-g and i
Lead beneficiary/coordinator	Faculdade de Ciências de Lisboa
Description	<p>The project focuses on restoring ecosystem services and capacity of estuarine and tidal ecosystems to sustain reproduction and protection of marine species' juveniles in the context of Natura 2000 management policies.</p> <p>The project focuses on protection of endemic biodiversity and sustainable management of fisheries depending on fish populations inhabiting these ecosystems.</p> <p>The project also includes design and analysis of mitigation measures against invasive species, such as removal of aggressive and proliferating species.</p>
Duration	01 January 2018 - ongoing
Total public cost	EUR 609 822
Total EMFF	EUR 457 367

Table 22: Reef habitats, Denmark

Title	Significance of reefs for fish, porpoise and fisheries management
Member State	Denmark
Measure	Article 40.1b-g and i
Lead beneficiary/coordinator	DTU AQUA (Nykøbing Mors)
Description	<p>The project under the grant scheme “fisheries, nature and environment” deals with the documentation of the significance of reef-habitats for fish in Denmark. The project contributes to improving maritime planning, strengthening commercial fish species in coastal waters, and thus increasing both fishing yields and feeding resources for porpoise.</p> <p>NATURA 2000 sites are designated for the protection of the harbour porpoise and Denmark is obligated to secure a favorable conservation status for the species through implementation of appropriate conservation measures to reach the site’s conservation objectives. The project is expected to produce important tools for evaluating the effects of protection and restoration of reefs in relation to the density and occurrence of commercial fish species such as cod, herring and eel.</p> <p>Specifically, it is expected to document the establishing of a new reef consisting of pebbles near Als to restore reefs that are included as habitat types under Nature 2000.</p>
Duration	13 December 2016 - ongoing
Total public cost	EUR 581 730
Total EMFF	EUR 436 297

Table 23: Reef habitats, Denmark

Title	Effects on the ecosystem component benthic fauna in Natura 2000 areas from fishery with scraping tools
Member State	Denmark
Measure	Article 40.1b-g and i
Lead beneficiary/coordinator	Dtu Aqua (Charlottenlund Slot)
Description	<p>The purpose of the project under the grant scheme “fisheries, nature and environment” is to produce the technical basis for managing mussel and oyster fishery in Natura 200 areas in relation to the ecosystem component benthic fauna.</p> <p>In addition to fishery management the project is working to detect potential effects from fishery with mussel and oyster scrapers on the benthic fauna.</p> <p>Current activities are contributing to a planned unified data analysis to determine the impact of the fishery on the benthic fauna within the context of the actual area impact. The project has been initiated with seabed samples from five planned Natura 2000 areas.</p>
Duration	22 December 2016 - ongoing
Total public cost	EUR 388 709
Total EMFF	EUR 291 532

Table 24: Reef habitats, Ireland

Title	Marine Biodiversity Scheme
Member State	Ireland
Measure	Article 40.1b-g and i and 80.1c
Lead beneficiary/coordinator	Marine Institute
Description	<p>In 2017, eleven new projects were set up under the Marine Biodiversity Scheme. The Scheme, funded under Ireland’s EMFF Operational Programme supports actions with the specific objectives to promote good fisheries and aquaculture management and protect biodiversity in marine habitats.</p> <p>In 2017, eleven new projects were implemented under the two EMFF’s Union Priority 1 Sustainable Development of Fisheries and Union Priority 6 - Integrated Maritime Policy.</p> <p>The projects covered the areas of species restoration, fisheries and aquaculture interactions with Natura and support for MSFD. Projects included enhanced bycatch sampling programme for set net fisheries, an offshore reef mapping survey, species restoration for cray fish, rays and skates, and IT to support ecosystem based fisheries management.</p> <p>Two projects commenced on species restoration and included habitat characterisation and estimation of population size and distribution for crayfish and endangered skate and ray stocks and three projects related to mapping of fishing pressure and interaction of fisheries with protected biodiversity in Natura 2000 sites were also undertaken.</p> <p>A three-week offshore survey mapped and sampled reef habitats along Ireland’s continental slope in 50 locations with the aim of evaluating the status and reviewing the requirements for conservation and management measures consistent with the Habitats Directive.</p> <p>To monitor the bycatch interaction of endangered and protected species in Irish fisheries, an enhanced bycatch programme was launched to supplement the at sea data collection programme. The pilot study focused on fisheries that have been identified as a potential risk to the conservation objectives of Natura 2000 sites. Biopsies were conducted on stranded cetaceans to evaluate mortality through fisheries’ bycatch. The work is being carried out in partnership with the National Parks and Wildlife Service of the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht.</p> <p>Three projects focused on the assessment and mitigation of aquaculture impacts on Natura 2000 sites. Appropriate assessment reports evaluating the impact of aquaculture activities from five sites (Tralee, Ballymacoda, Mulroy, Blacksod/Broadhaven, and the Shannon Estuary) were completed and submitted to the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine. This represents 11 Natura 2000 sites (seven SACs and four SPAs).</p> <p>Revisions were carried out on two previously submitted reports to account for changes in proposed licensing activities (Waterford Harbour and Kenmare River). The implementation of shorebird monitoring to measure the effects of management actions (mitigation measures) was overseen in two locations (Dungarvan</p>

	<p>Harbour and Bannow Bay).</p> <p>Two projects were initiated in 2017 to support the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) and biodiversity. Monitoring for marine mammal distribution and abundance was carried out on nine weeks of the fisheries acoustic survey programme covering the Irish shelf and the Celtic Sea. Research has begun to derive Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY) reference points on fish species vulnerable to fishing pressure and of ecological significance to improve data availability for MSFD Good Environmental Status (GES) assessment and CFP MSY targets. The projects fostered close collaboration between the Marine Institute, National Parks and Wildlife Service and Geological Survey Ireland.</p>
Duration	2017- ongoing
Total public cost	EUR 729 000
Total EMFF	EUR 364 500

Table 25: INTERMARES, Spain

Title	Integrated, innovative and participatory management of the N2000 network in the Spanish marine environment
Member State	Spain
Measure	Articles 37, 38, 39, 40.1.a, 40.1b-g and I, 40.1.h, 47, 51, 77, 62, 80.1.b, 80.1.c
Lead beneficiary/coordinator	Biodiversity Foundation (BF), from the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Food and Environment Directorate General for Sustainability of the Coast and the Sea from the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Food and Environment
Description	<p>In 2016 the Biodiversity Foundation was designated as an Intermediate Managing Body of the EMFF for the 2014-2020 period. Within this context, it was decided that conservation related topics were complementary to the actions being funded by the LIFE programme.</p> <p>With the integration of various European Funds, marine conservation actions (such as for reduced human impacts, habitats restoration, and public awareness), in collaboration with the fishing and aquaculture industry, were assigned a larger financial contribution.</p> <p>The projects that fall within the scope of the EMFF, whose operating areas are included in the Natura 2000 Network and are carried out in collaboration with fishermen and fish farmers, are of special interest. These initiatives will be linked to the LIFE IP-PAF INTERMARES project where different funds, namely the LIFE Programme, the ESF and the EMFF work together with a common objective.</p> <p>The main objective is to implement the Prioritised Action Framework (PAF) for Natura 2000 in the Spanish marine Natura 2000 network and ensure that, upon completion, Spain has an effectively managed consolidated network of Natura 2000 marine areas, with active participation of stakeholders and research in the decision-making process. The PAF defines conservation actions and priority needs for the Natura 2000 network for the period 2014-</p>

	<p>2020, as well as the financial sources.</p> <p>The project brings together several policies and directives, such as the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP), the Integrated Maritime Policy (IMP), the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD), and the Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP), the Habitats Directive (HD) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).</p> <p>The initiative wants to develop a new management model based on innovation, participation and integration. Innovation relates to both governance structures and monitoring and control technologies.</p> <p>With a budget of EUR 49.8 million, an extensive programme of actions linked to research, monitoring and surveillance, conservation, governance and participation, as well as communication, awareness and environmental education, is being carried out. The EMFF contributes to actions related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information and capacity building for stakeholders; • Reduction of the impact of fishing activities; • Promotion of sustainable products; • Habitats and species conservation; and • Income diversification.
Duration	2017-2014
Total public cost	<p>EUR 49 778 552</p> <p>(EMFF = EUR 11.000.000; ESF= EUR 10 300 000; LIFE= EUR 27 278 552 ; National=EUR 1.200.000)</p>
Total EMFF	EUR 11 000 000

4 Operations funded under the EFF

Approximately half the MS replied that the consideration of the PAF when drafting the OP EFF 2007-2013 was significant. The rest considered the PAF to be marginally considered or did not reply. The EFF ex-post evaluation also corroborates this; with the exception of a few MS such as DE and SE, biodiversity protection under EFF was ad hoc rather than strategically implemented. This situation is understandable as:

- (i) the economic crisis caused EFF programmes to focus on efficiency improvements and emergency support;
- (ii) clearer biodiversity objectives emerged during the programme and were not reflected in the OPs; and
- (iii) the development of the Natura 2000 network, one of the main tools for protecting EU biodiversity, has been more limited in the marine environment.

Relevant measures in EFF were:

- **Article 30: Aqua-environmental measures**, focusing on actions like the compensation of aquaculture providing environmental services (BG, DE), promotion of organic aquaculture (DK), converting to organic aquaculture production (HU), aquaculture enterprises implementing nature management plans and waterbird protection measures (LT), etc. The most commonly mentioned focus of the operations was 'compensation schemes' with occasional reference to 'management measures and plans', 'construction or modernisation of facilities' and 'conservation, restoration and reproduction activities'. The MS reported a total EFF contribution of EUR 10.28 million (this number might be an underestimation since not all MS provided a number).
- **Article 38: Measures intended to protect and develop aquatic fauna and flora**, focusing on actions like protection of aquatic fauna and flora through the construction of artificial reefs and establishment of marine protected areas (CY), stream restoration and eel restoration (DK), scientific monitoring of two existing artificial reefs and construction of new ones (EL), restoration and conservation of spawning areas (FI), direct restocking (LV). The most commonly mentioned foci of the operations were 'conservation, restoration and reproduction activities' and to a lesser extent 'construction or modernisation of facilities' with occasional reference to 'studies, data collection and monitoring/evaluation' and 'fishing equipment and techniques'. The MS reported a total EFF contribution of EUR 16 92 million (this figure might be an underestimation since not all MS provided an amount).
- **Article 37 Collective actions**, focusing on actions like awareness raising (BG), IAS combating actions (CY), voluntary fishers' agreements on reporting and landing by-catches and avoiding areas of mammals and actions leading to a reduced by-catch in brown shrimp fishery and a reduced impact on the seabed (DE), grants for actions concerning energy audits (DK), schemes to encourage better environmental practices, especially in the catch sector, and an Inshore Management Scheme to support improved management of the inshore sector, especially with shellfish (IE). Foci of the operations varied a great deal, including aspects like 'cooperation/networking and partnership agreements', 'stakeholder involvement', 'studies, data collection and

monitoring/evaluation', 'management measures and plans', 'conservation, restoration and reproduction activities', fishing equipment and techniques' and 'collection of waste'. The MS reported a total EFF contribution of EUR 22.64 million (this figure might be an underestimation since not all MS provided an amount).

5 Other funding relating to the Natura 2000 implementation in marine areas

5.1 Alternative EU support

Most MS also rely on other funding for the implementation of Natura 2000 and its related actions. The most usual sources are the LIFE programme, and ESIF, European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) programmes. Only FR has explicitly stated that all of Natura 2000's relevant actions in marine areas will be financed exclusively by the EMFF. The table below summarises the information collected during fieldwork and is followed by information on the use of other EU support for Natura 2000 implementation in marine areas obtained by literature review, mainly by reviewing Prioritised Action Framework 2014-2020 of several countries and regions (DK, FI, GR, PT, SE, SI, Flanders, Lombardy).

Table 26: Other funding relating to the Natura 2000 implementation in marine areas

MS	Source	Content
BG	LIFE+, OP Environment, Rural Development Programme/actions for inland areas/wet zones	Mostly the Ministry of Environment and Waters and its structures and environmental NGO are implementing projects for biodiversity and the protection of habitats. The scope of eligible expenditures is broader than EMFF and their projects are considered much more effective.
CY	LIFE Nature/Biodiversity, Interreg, OP 'Competitiveness and Sustainable Development'	Two projects concerning marine species, habitats, Natura 2000 sites and IAS, 2 Interreg projects, Reconnect and Meltemi. Operations concerning marine turtles in marine Natura 2000 areas, including the construction and operation of information kiosks for the protection of marine turtles and their nesting grounds and beaches, etc.
DE	Federal state budget and revenue from water charges	Support addressed to environmental organisations for aqua-environmental measures similar to those under EMFF Art. 54. Measures for stream restoration for fish passage – relevant to the Water Framework Directive (WFD)
ES	Life+, ERDF, EAFRD, ESF, Horizon 2020	Various projects with different foci, e.g. EU LIFE 2009-2014 on 'sites selection', 'stakeholder involvement', 'strategies definition', 'studies, data collection and monitoring/evaluation', 'management measures and plans', 'protection of birds and mammals', EAFRD 2017 on 'awareness', ERDF on 'studies, data collection and monitoring/evaluation' and 'conservation', LIFE Blue Natura 2015-2019, LIFE Posidonia 2011-2015, LIFE IBA Marinas 2004-2009 on 'protection of birds and mammals', etc.
HR	IPA 2007-2013	IPA funds were extensively used to support the designation of both terrestrial and marine Natura 2000 areas, as well as to improve data collection, monitoring and protected area management. Beneficiaries were national agencies and to some extent regional/local authorities. IPA funds focused

MS	Source	Content
		mainly on capacity building and providing adequate infrastructure, e.g. ICT, use of the Geographic Information System (GIS) and databases.
IE	National funding	Management of 4 sites by the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The sites are outside the Irish exclusive economic zone. The focus was on site selection, management measures and plans, studies, data collection and monitoring/evaluation, management measures and plans, and stakeholder involvement.
RO	Horizon 2020 and national funding	Various projects like COFASP – GOFORIT: IntelliGent Oceanographically-based short-term fishery FORecasting applicaTions (2015-2018), COFASP – ECOAST: New methodologies for an ecosystem approach to spatial and temporal management of fisheries and aquaculture in coastal areas (2016-2019), Integrated approach to the Natura 2000 network of Marine Protected Areas / marine sites in Romania on structural and functional connectivity and resilience at the Black Sea ecosystem Level (2016-2017).
SE	National funding	The Swedish Government has allocated SEK 50 million in 2018 for work with MPAs. This includes funding to County Administrative Boards for developing marine Natura 2000 management plans, a monitoring programme for assessing the effects of fisheries conservation measures in MPAs and the analysis of connectivity in networks of MPAs.

Source: MA interviews, FAME 2018.

The **LIFE Programme** is a special funding instrument for action on the environment and climate. It had different components in different programming periods, but it always had the 'nature' component, which supported projects focused on the conservation of specific species and/or habitats listed in the Annexes of the two directives that are the basis of Natura 2000. Among these are 9 marine habitat types and 16 species from the Habitats Directive and 60 bird species whose conservation requires marine site designation. Successful projects are promoted by the annual European Natura 2000 Award, the annual selection of Best LIFE Projects for each programme component and various publications.

A search in the LIFE Projects Database¹² for projects funded in the 2000-2018 period¹³ showed that 14 projects dealt with human activities such as fishing that have an impact on selected habitats and/or species. Eight of these projects focused on marine fisheries and issues such as protecting nesting grounds and reducing the mortality of sea turtles, and reducing the impact on dolphins, monk seals, etc., while 6 projects focused on the conservation of freshwater species and habitats by reducing illegal fishing, restoring habitat or introducing

¹² <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/project/Projects/index.cfm>

¹³ Themes of marine and coastal habitats and keywords such as fishing industry, marine conservation area, marine ecosystem and marine reserve were used in the search.

sustainable fishing. These projects bear similarities to provisions in Art. 40.1 of Regulation (EU) No 508/2014, especially 40.1.b, d, g and i, and Art. 80.1b.

Table 27: Number and budget of projects funded by the LIFE Programme in the 2000-2018 period that focused specifically on fisheries in Natura 2000 sites

Type of projects	Number	Value (EUR)	
		Total	EU contribution
Projects targeting marine fisheries in Natura 2000 sites	8	22 982 944.00	12 585 668.00
Projects targeting freshwater fisheries in Natura 2000 sites	6	15 027 369.00	8 773 612.00
Total sum of projects targeting fisheries in Natura 2000 sites	14	38 010 313.00	21 359 280.00

Source: FAME 2018.

Overall, in the 2000-2018 period, 55 projects were funded by the LIFE Programme that focus on marine Natura 2000 and relevant marine habitats and species; the total value of these projects was EUR 130 478 260.00, of which the EU contributed EUR 71 638 528.00.

Table 28: Number and budget of projects funded by LIFE Programme in the 2000-2018 period that focused specifically on Natura 2000 in marine environment

Type of projects	Number	Value (EUR)	
		Total	EU contribution
All projects focusing on marine habitats and species of Natura 2000	55	143 825 561.00	78 312 177.00
Of these, projects for management of marine Natura 2000	13	58 118 351.00	29 637 379.00
Of these, projects targeting cetaceans, turtles and sharks	22	49 240 390.00	28 288 858.00
Of these, projects targeting seabirds	15	17 127 463.00	10 214 099.00
Of these, projects targeting invasive species	2	3 359 272.00	1 814 347.00

Source: FAME 2018.

Of these projects, 13 supported research, designation and management planning of marine Natura 2000 in ES, FI, FR, IT, LT, LV, MT and PT. Seven of these projects were approved in the period 2007-2010, most likely as a result of the work done by Marine Expert Group (MEG) on evaluation of sufficiency of marine Natura 2000 sites, as well as the publishing of 'Guidelines for the establishment of the Natura 2000 network in the marine environment. Application of the Habitats and Birds Directives' in 2007. Six projects in 6 MS focused on seabirds and these were mostly (4 out of 6) implemented by NGOs. The other 7 projects bear similarities to provisions of Art. 40.1 of Regulation (EU) No 508/2014, in particular 40.1.b, d and e, and Art. 80.1b.

The largest number – 22 of the supported projects – dealt with the conservation of cetaceans, turtles and sharks, often targeting several species. While some focused on the research of conservation status and designation of adequate Natura 2000 sites (e.g. MIGRATE¹⁴,

¹⁴ Project MIGRATE – Conservation status and potential sites of community interest for *Tursiops truncatus* and *Caretta caretta* in Malta, <http://lifeprojectmigrate.com/>

CETACEOSMADEIRA II¹⁵), others focused on improved management, the reduced impact of fishing activities (TARTALIFE, MOFI) and other human activities (LIFE WHALESAFE, LINDA) and monitoring (SAMBAH).

Fifteen supported projects (more than one quarter) have focused on marine Natura 2000 sites designated for the protection of seabird species. These might bring useful experience in terms of managing the potential conflicts between fishing activities, aquaculture and seabird populations. Another interesting aspect of the LIFE Programme is that it supports activities to limit the spread of invasive species, for example lionfish (RELIONMED-LIFE¹⁶).

Some of the most relevant projects are presented in the table below.

Table 29: Overview of selected projects funded by the LIFE Programme in the 2000-2018 period that focused specifically on Natura 2000 in marine environments

Name of the project	Short description	Website
TARTALIFE – Reduction of sea turtle mortality in commercial fisheries	TartaLife project aims at reducing sea turtle mortality by reducing by-catches caused by pelagic longline, bottom trawl and fixed nets disseminating circle hooks and TEDs (turtle excluder devices) and testing UV lamps as deterrent for sea turtle and a new type of pot. The second goal is to reduce post-capture mortality, by training fishermen and strengthening the marine turtles first aid/rescue centres.	http://www.tartalife.eu/
Caretta – Reduction of mortality of <i>Caretta caretta</i> in the Greek seas	The aim of this project was to reduce intentional and accidental injuries and deaths among loggerhead sea turtles (<i>Caretta caretta</i>) due to their capture in fishermen's nets. This was to be achieved by two parallel means: reducing both intentional killing/injury and fatal accidents. In order to reduce intentional killing/injury, an intensive programme of cooperation was implemented with fishermen's associations, aiming to raise fishermen's awareness. To reduce fatal incidents, the existing rehabilitation system (rescue centre and sea turtle rescue network) was improved and complemented with the opening of two first aid centres in areas where most captures are recorded ('hot spots').	http://www.archelon.gr/eng/pro_life.php?row=row4
LIFE WHALESAFE – WHALE protection from	The project developed an interference avoidance system aimed at detecting and tracking sperm whales using underwater acoustical monitoring and tracking. The project identified threats to them, and prevented	http://www.whalesafe.eu

¹⁵ CETACEOSMADEIRA II – Identifying critical marine areas for bottlenose dolphin and surveillance of the cetaceans' conservation status in the Madeira archipelago.

¹⁶ RELIONMED-LIFE – Preventing a LIONfish invasion in the MEDiterranean through early response and targeted removal, <http://www.relionmed.eu/>

<p>Strike by Active cetaceans detection and alarm issue to ships and FERries in Pelagos sanctuary</p>	<p>collisions and other risks by issuing warning messages in real time to ships in the area. A protocol for reducing the disturbance and impact risks was prepared, drafted in cooperation with the local coast guard and agreed by all the stakeholders involved.</p>	
<p>LINDA – Limitation to the negative interactions between dolphins and human activities</p>	<p>The LINDA project has improved knowledge about the ecology of the bottlenose dolphin in Natura 2000 sites in Corsica. The research and fieldwork has led to proposals for a bottlenose dolphin action plan. Good communication and the full involvement of local fishermen from the start of the project has to some extent calmed the growing tensions between the Corsican fishing community and the bottlenose dolphin. The degree of interaction between dolphins and local fishing was quantified objectively. The impact of the interaction on fishing revenues (the catch, the damage done to nets) was assessed and practical fishing solutions (change of mesh sizes, hauls, equipment, use of longlines) to limit this interaction were defined.</p>	<p>http://www.lifelinda.org/accueil/</p>
<p>MOFI – Monk seal and fisheries: Mitigating the conflict in Greek seas</p>	<p>The MOFI project’s main objective focused on improving the monk seal’s conservation status in Greece by mitigating negative consequences of conflicts between monk seals and fishermen. Win-win goals were set to decrease monk seal mortality rates and reduce the loss of income in the fishery sector induced by seals. Actions to achieve these objectives were implemented over 15 000 km of coastline which encompassed 3 000 islands. Results were good and LIFE’s involvement contributed to a noticeable decrease in human-related mortality of the species. These outcomes were supported by the project’s training of local fishermen and local communities from the seven hot spot areas.</p>	<p>http://mofi.mom.gr</p>
<p>SHARKLIFE – Urgent actions for the conservation of cartilaginous fish in Italy</p>	<p>The project aimed to contribute to the conservation of cartilaginous fishes, particularly basking sharks and pelagic stingrays, in Italian seas by reducing the mortality rate caused by commercial and leisure fishing. The project promoted the use of low-impact fishing devices for pelagic stingrays (circle hooks), developed a system to reduce accidental capture of basking sharks, implemented a ‘tag and release’ policy for fishing tournaments, and carried out tailored training for fishermen, veterinarians and coast guard personnel who oversee controls on fishing.</p>	<p>http://www.sharklife.it/</p>
<p>SAMBAH – Static</p>	<p>The overall aim of the project was to apply a best-</p>	<p>http://www.sambah.org</p>

Acoustic Monitoring of the Baltic Sea Harbour porpoise	practice methodology to provide data for the reliable assessment of the distribution and habitat use of the Baltic Sea subpopulation of harbour porpoise (<i>Phocoena phocoena</i>). This should enable the designation of Sites of Community Importance (SCIs) for the critically endangered Baltic Sea harbour porpoise within the Natura 2000 network, and also provide necessary data for other relevant mitigation measures.	
--	---	--

Source: FAME 2018.

In addition to the projects listed above, the 'Nature' component of the LIFE Programme supported a number of projects for the conservation of coastal Natura 2000 sites, such as lagoons, estuaries, salt pans, etc.. In the period 2000-2018, 39 such projects¹⁷ with a total value EUR 76 084 194.00 were backed with EUR 41 679 653.00 support from the EU.

The LIFE Programme funded several projects in the framework of other components (biodiversity, environment) that indirectly contribute to the conservation of marine Natura 2000 sites through sustainable fishing and aquaculture practices. Some examples are:

- ECO-COMPATÍVEL – Communicating for the sustainability of socio-economic activities, human use and biodiversity in Natura 2000 network sites in the Madeira archipelago.
- THALASSA – Thalassa Campaign: Learn, act, protect/awareness, educational and participation campaign for marine mammals in Greece.
- FISH SCALE – Food Information and Safeguard of Habitat – a Sustainable Consumption Approach in Local Environment.
- LIFE Ghost – Techniques to reduce the impacts of ghost fishing gears and to improve biodiversity in north Adriatic coastal areas.
- LIFE+ EfficientShip – Demonstration of an innovative ORC module to improve the efficiency of European fishing vessels.
- LIFE-AQUASEF – Eco-efficient technology development for environmental improvement of aquaculture.
- LIFE iSEAS Knowledge-based innovative solutions to enhance adding-value mechanisms towards healthy and sustainable EU fisheries.

In **EAFRD**, the main funding opportunities are the Natura 2000 payments, Forest Natura 2000 payments and Agri-environment payments. However, these measures are dedicated to agricultural practices and thus affect terrestrial habitats. In the 2007-2013 programming period, the measure 'Support for non-productive investments' (measure 216) included, among others, on-farm investments to enhance the public amenity value of agricultural land of a Natura 2000 area. In Denmark, for example, one type of action funded was the re-establishment of natural hydrological conditions.

In addition, projects funded through the LEADER approach may have included actions for conservation of, amongst others, freshwater habitats in Natura 2000 sites. Though

¹⁷ This includes only the projects in coastal areas, i.e. in areas with potential impact on marine environments, thus excluding the projects dealing with continental salt marshes, etc.

theoretically possible, it was unlikely to include coastal and marine Natura 2000 sites in such projects as such activities were more likely included in projects of local FLAGs and funded from the EFF. However, in the 2014-2020 period, such projects are more likely as they can be funded through the CLLD, thus combining the activities with FLAGs and support from EMFF.

The **use of the ERDF** is focused on economic development and innovation in most MS. As a result, only a small amount of funds is allocated for activities related to Natura 2000, although there are three priority themes supporting nature conservation¹⁸ through various operational programmes, including INTERREG. The amount of funds spent for these three priority themes varies greatly between countries. For example, in BG, an entire Priority Axis 'Preservation and restoration of biodiversity' of the operational programme 'Environment 2007-2013' was dedicated to biodiversity conservation, including Natura 2000 management planning, committing EUR 145 011 544.50 to support 91 projects. Similarly in Greece, the Priority Axis 9 of the operational programme 'Environment and sustainable development' supported the implementation of Natura 2000 Management Plans, the operation of management bodies and the implementation of the study 'Monitoring and assessment of the conservation status of habitats and species of community interest in Greece'. Sweden, on the other hand, granted only EUR 10.64 m from the ERDF for Natura 2000, mainly for visitors/information infrastructure at Natura 2000 sites.

The amount of funding that was actually spent on supporting projects involving marine Natura 2000 or freshwater Natura 2000 in each MS was not available, thus no assessment on the actual level of support can be made. Often the available funds for Natura 2000 were not used as planned (Flanders, DK, GR, SI), largely due to lack of capacity, experience, institutional structure and tradition. The following situations were identified:

- Stakeholders in the management of Natura 2000 lack the capacity to identify possibilities and raise the necessary funds (Flanders, BG), and prepare projects of good quality (BG);
- The public agencies in charge of the management of Natura 2000 lack the capacity to optimise the use of the ERDF for nature conservation (Flanders, BG, GR, SI) and in some cases the skills for assessment, monitoring and implementation of Natura 2000.

Seventh Framework Programme for Research (FP7) and Horizon 2020: Little information is available on the use of FP7 for Natura 2000. Interviews showed that Spain and Romania are successfully using Horizon 2020. The PAF for Flanders mentions lack of capacity, institutional structure and tradition as a reason for low funding of projects relevant for Natura 2000. This goes hand in hand with findings about the implementation of ERDF for this purpose in several countries (see above).

Not much information is available on the **use of innovative financing**. Natural Capital Financial Facility (NCFF) is a new financial instrument that was established in 2015 by combining funding from the European Investment Bank (EIB) with EU funds from the budget of the LIFE programme. It is expected to allow financing of some 9 to 12 projects

¹⁸ Commission Regulation (EC) No 1828/2006 lists the following priority themes (with codes) in Annex II: Promotion of biodiversity and nature protection (including Natura 2000) (51), Promotion of natural assets (55), Protection and development of natural heritage (56).

over the 2015-2017 period and it may support projects involving Natura 2000 sites under the following themes: Payments for Ecosystem Services; Green Infrastructure; Innovative pro-biodiversity and adaptation investments. One of the approved projects that started in March 2018 is Natural Capital investments for Croatia, which consists of a ‘multi beneficiary investment loan’ of EUR 15 m to the Croatian Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which will provide smaller loans to projects investing into the area of conservation, restoration and nature-based adaptation, such as eco-tourism, sustainable agriculture and forestry or green infrastructure for cities. As Croatia has a very extensive marine Natura 2000 network it is likely that some projects will be implemented in marine Natura 2000 sites.

For new MS, additional sources beyond EU funding are available, such as:

- EEA Financial Mechanism (BG, HR, CY, CZ, EE, GR, HU, LT, LV, MT, PL, PT, RO, SK, SI, ES),
- Norwegian Financial Mechanism (BG, HR, CY, CZ, EE, HU, LT, LV, MT, PL, RO, SK, SI),
- Swiss Contribution (BG, HR, CY, CZ, EE, HU, LT, LV, MT, PL, RO, SK, SI),
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) was available in BG, HR and RO.

5.2 National support

National support most often takes the form of a top-up to EU funds; for example, the EAFRD in Flanders and all EU funds (including LIFE+) in BG and GR. However, specific funds were established in some countries and regions. Greece, for example, has established its own Green Fund that constitutes a key funding resource especially for the management structures of Natura sites in the form of:

- funding of conservation actions,
- support of Protected Areas Management Bodies,
- co-financing of European programmes, e.g. LIFE+,
- environmental research, innovation, demonstrative actions and international cooperation.

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is an approach that could support Natura 2000. Of the reviewed PAF, only GR mentions this as a funding mechanism, although it is likely that CSR is more widespread in the form of occasional donations.

Public/private partnership financing schemes: information on this approach being implemented in Natura 2000 sites is scarce. Two examples are presented:

- According to the PAF for Flanders, the Flemish port authorities and a number of private companies pay for nature development and the management of valuable nature above and beyond the legal requirements related to land use and licensing. Depending on the approach and type of support, the funded activities could improve marine Natura 2000.
- Sečoveljske soline Landscape Park in Slovenia is a coastal Natura 2000 site that consists of saltpans. It is managed by Soline d.o.o. (part of Telekom d.d.) through a concession granted by the Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning.

NGOs and foundations are very active in Natura 2000 protection and management, especially in relation to the Birds Directive. Resources are pooled from various sources, including donations, national funding for NGOs, etc. PAF for Lombardia, for example, lists the World Wide Fund for Nature and the Cariplo Foundation as sources of funding.

6 Conclusions and recommendations

The present chapter summarises the lessons learnt and the conclusions extracted from the task. The following are the overall conclusions:

- The main aim of the EMFF is to support the implementation of the CFP. Natura 2000 is not explicitly mentioned in the CFP basic regulation 1380/2013. However the EMFF contains, under shared management, a series of measures, directly related or potentially supporting the implementation of the Natura 2000 network. The set-up of measures is considered to be over-detailed and does not always allow for a clear focus on Natura 2000.
- In most MS the legal framework for the Natura 2000 network is complete but the overall implementation (site designation, definition of sites' conservation objectives, formulation of management plans and schemes) varies a great deal. This situation has implications on what the EMFF can do in a given MS.
- In most MS, Natura 2000 implementation is carried by other European Structural and Investment Funds such as the ERDF. The EMFF is carrying out a niche function in collecting data related to the marine environment or in effectively managing the protected areas and ensuring compatibility with fisheries and aquaculture. Equally important in this context is the role of the EMFF as an advocate of the fishers and as a coordinator of stakeholders.
- Twenty-five MS implement measures directly related or potentially supporting the implementation of the Natura 2000 network. The total EMFF contribution is EUR 647 million, with EUR 376 m for measures that are directly related. The overall commitment rate is 22.35 % and the expenditure rate is 5.74 %, which can be considered as satisfactory taking into account the late start by the EMFF. This rate is expected to raise rapidly in 2018 and 2019 as more operations will be selected and as operations under implementation mature and submit more payment requests.
- One of the most significant measures in the EMFF is Article 40.1b-g and i. It has been programmed by 20 MS and 14 have already selected and implemented operations. In total 1 101 operations were selected. However 1 000 of them are outside Natura 2000 areas (taking in account the Infosys convention for distinguishing if an operation is within an area), which means they are contributing to biodiversity in the broader context. This means that only 9% of the operations are directly related to a specific Natura 2000 site. Budget-wise the numbers are 10 and 45 million EUR respectively.
- Last but not least operations under the EMFF do not emphasize on publicity and dissemination, for example in the manner LIFE projects do; this leads to many good practices going unnoticed.

Regarding the **overall lessons learnt**, most MS mentioned that due to the early stage of implementation little can be reported. However some MS pointed out the following:

- Natura 2000 implementation support under EMFF can only be seen as complementary to other EU funds, notably the ERDF and the Cohesion Fund, which directly support the Natura 2000 sites. While this division of roles is also dictated by the availability of funds, a more strategic and holistic approach across agencies and schemes and more active integration of the PAF may have delivered better outcomes. However, the

EMFF is closing an important gap, namely concerning the collection of data as a base for the designation of more marine areas as Natura 2000 sites.

- Implementation of actions under the EMFF is held up due to delays in actions by other authorities, notably the environment ministries, which are in charge of designating Natura 2000 areas and supervising management plans.
- The EMFF in many cases acts as an advocate of the sector's operators. Early engagement with stakeholders, most especially fishers, is essential to the success of management measures. The EMFF can assist with such networking, awareness and engagement structures on the one hand, and with improved compensation schemes, e.g. for aquaculture farms, on the other.
- This involvement of stakeholders and the accommodation of their needs and concerns can lead to increased awareness, knowledge of the principles and aims of Natura 2000, and skills acquisition for the management and conservation competences of the marine biodiversity. This will lead ultimately to a conciliation of the diverging interests and a more positive attitude of fishers and fish farmers towards environmental measures in general and to Natura 2000 in particular. A regular exchange throughout the process with the environmental administration, and other stakeholders where relevant, in order to agree and achieve a common understanding on the measures, is to be supported.
- Last but not least, Natura 2000's actions are scattered across various measures for example under Union Priority 1, 2 and 6 due to the set-up of the EMFF. It would be clearer if there was a specific measure for these actions.

Regarding **particular constraints encountered and solutions found**, MS mentioned that numerous problems arose due to a variety of reasons. Apart from the overall complexity and diversity of the measures, the EMFF work was also affected by administrative changes, and a lack of personnel with the necessary skills at the MA and the environmental authorities, especially during the OP planning. The required skills were not confined to biodiversity and nature protection measures but also included communication, mediation and managing stakeholder relations.

The **specific EMFF constraints mentioned** were:

- EMFF measures as defined in the Regulations 508/2014 and 531/2014 are overly detailed; assigning an operation to a single measure is difficult, especially when an operation has a broader scope. This also has implications for planning the EMFF financial contribution across measures.
- Higher administrative support is needed, especially in relation to compensation and the difficulty of conciliating administrative requests with fishers' operational reality. Environmental agencies were also not very eager to apply for support, for example due to the complexity of the EMFF and the mismatch between the EMFF operation's duration and the entire duration of the projects.
- The inappropriateness of the monitoring system to capture the effects, especially of soft measures, was mentioned. It was also not clear how to define, for example, the area affected or how to plan the timing of implementation and inspection of management measures.

- The design of specific methodologies for risk assessment and the development of harmonised methodologies, as well as the collection of scientific evidence to identify the most appropriate management measures, were also initial constraints.

Regarding **recommendations to the European Commission in defining the legal framework**, the MS emphasised the need for the EMFF to focus on a smaller number of measures (or even a single measure) that relates directly to fisheries and aquaculture and their management in relation to Natura 2000 requirements, and not to cover additional topics on environmental protection, Natura 2000 site management, MSFD implementation, etc., which are better implemented under other funds. Such an approach would also lessen the need for aligning the EMFF with the PAF. An important contribution by the EMFF can be the closure of gaps in data collection and innovative environmental monitoring in order to serve the needs of other requirements, for example under the MSFD.

While the legal framework overall is clear and straightforward, coordination between different legal frameworks (e.g. Natura 2000, MSFD, Water Framework Directive, etc.) is not always very obvious. The cross-cutting role of the EMFF needs to be better outlined.

The MS also underlined the need for a simpler legal framework containing only the objectives and restrictions of the conditional description of the measures. This need has been acknowledged in the current EMFF proposal (June 2018). It was also mentioned that an area-based/vessel-capacity compensation approach (or even a lump sum in specific cases) and simple steps for ex-post verification would simplify implementation. The monitoring system should be adapted accordingly.

The EMFF could, however, divert more funds towards control and surveillance, especially for the implementation of environmental legislation (Birds and Habitats Directives as well as the MSFD), in order to ensure that conservation measures will be effectively applied.

Regarding **recommendations the MAs have expressed for themselves and for their peer MAs** in programming the next OP, MS underlined the need for simplicity at the level of the OP with a very small number of measures and flexibility at the level of single operations. Operations should be allowed to set a flexible focus on, for example, technical measures, management of fishery zones, compensation, round tables between scientific bodies and fishers, etc. so long as the operations contribute to the OP objectives. Such an objective-driven approach also requires adequate personnel at the MA, who can monitor and assess the effect of the operation rather than its conditional compliance and funds absorption rate. The result indicators could be improved to deliver more detailed information on project implementation data (focus, type of actions, beneficiaries, methods used, etc.), as the quantitative results are very difficult, if not impossible, to demonstrate in this kind of operation.

Last but not least, early communication and coordination with agencies in charge of nature protection, as well as research institutions and sectoral organisations, is the key to more efficient and targeted planning.

Regarding **recommendations to national bodies in designing other actions**, the main messages are the need for available prerequisites, such as management plans and the explicit delineation of what is and is not contained in the EMFF OPs. Environmental restrictions should also respect the interests and realities of fisheries, offer alternative incentives and refrain from bans. To that end, environmental agencies should get involved in early and regular communication and consultation with fisheries and aquaculture sectoral stakeholders so as to increase their awareness of nature conservation issues and get them more involved.

7 Bibliography/sources provided by the Member States

Legislation:

- Resolución de 13 de noviembre de 2012: Objetivos medioambientales de las estrategias marinas españolas. BOE No 285, pg. 82340, 2012.
www.boe.es/boe/dias/2012/11/27/pdf/BOE-A-2012-14545.pdf
- Resolución de 13 de noviembre de 2012: Objetivos medioambientales de las estrategias marinas españolas. BOE No 285, pg. 82340, 2012.
www.boe.es/boe/dias/2012/11/27/pdf/BOE-A-2012-14545.pdf
- Declaration of Marine Protection Areas. Government Gazette; 25 November 2016.
<https://era.org.mt/en/Documents/GN%201311%20of%202016.pdf>

Government reports, working papers, promotional material, etc.:

- SEC(2011) 1573 final: Commission Staff Working Paper: FINANCING NATURA 2000 – Investing in Natura 2000: Delivering benefits for nature and people. Brussels, 12 December 2011.
- Innovative Use of EU Funds to Finance Management Measures & Activities in Natura 2000 Sites – A collection of good practice examples. Final report. WWF, RSPB and IEEP, August 2009, Output of the EC project, Contract No: 070307/2007/484403/MAR/B2.
- Integration of Natura 2000 and biodiversity into EU funding (EARDF, ERDF, CF, EMFF, ESF). Analysis of a selection of operational programmes approved for 2014-2020. European Commission, 2016. Prepared by N2K Group and IEEP.
- Kettunen, M., Torkler, P. and Rayment, M. (2014). Financing Natura 2000 Guidance Handbook. Part I – EU funding opportunities in 2014-2020, a publication commissioned by the European Commission DG Environment (June 2014).
- Prioritised Action Framework (PAF) For Natura 2000 For the EU Multiannual Financing Period 2014-2020. FLANDERS, 2013.
- Prioritised Action Framework (PAF) For Natura 2000 For the EU Multiannual Financing Period 2014-2020. DENMARK, 2013.
- Prioritised Action Framework (PAF) For Natura 2000 For the EU Multiannual Financing Period 2014-2020. BULGARIA, 2013.
- Prioritised Action Framework (PAF) For Natura 2000 For the EU Multiannual Financing Period 2014-2020. GREECE, 2013.
- Prioritised Action Framework (PAF) For Natura 2000 For the EU Multiannual Financing Period 2014-2020. SWEDEN, 2013.
- Prioritised Action Framework (PAF) For Natura 2000 For the EU Multiannual Financing Period 2014-2020. REGIONE LOMBARDIA, 2016.
- Prioritised Action Framework (PAF) For Natura 2000 For the EU Multiannual Financing Period 2014-2020. IRELAND, 2014.
- Folleto divulgativo Estrategias Marinas de España – Protegiendo el mar de todos. MAPAMA, 2017, www.mapama.gob.es/es/costas/talleres-divulgativos-EEMM.aspx
- Identificación de regiones naturales en España para el desarrollo de la Red Natura 2000. MAPAMA, 2014.
www.mapama.gob.es/es/biodiversidad/publicaciones/pbl_m_reg_naturales_2014_tcm30-197152.pdf
- Caracterización socioeconómica de la Red Natura en España. MAPAMA, 2013.
www.mapama.gob.es/biodiversidad/publicaciones/H108493_tcm-101128.pdf

- Hábitat marinos de interés comunitario. MAPAMA.
www.mapama.gob.es/es/costas/tema/proteccion-medio-marino/biodiversodad-marina/habitats-especie-marinos/habitats-marinos/habitats-marinos
- Guía de buenas prácticas en las ZEC de ámbito marino de Canarias. MAPAMA, 2013.
www.mapama.gob.es/es/costas/temas/proteccion-medio-marino/201311_guia_bhpp_web_tcm30-162654.pdf
- About Natura 2000. The Environment and Resources Authority of Malta (ERA).
<http://www.natura2000malta.org.mt/index.php/about-natura-2000/>
- Natura 2000 in Malta. The Environment and Resources Authority of Malta (ERA).
<https://era.org.mt/en/Pages/Natura-2000-Malta.aspx>
- Prioritised Action Framework (PAF) For Natura 2000 For the EU Multiannual Financing Period 2014-2020. SLOVENIA, 2013.
http://www.natura2000.si/fileadmin/user_upload/LIFE_Upravljanje/PAFSlovenijaVerFin al2.pdf
- Contexte national et européen de l'encadrement des activités de pêche professionnelle maritime pour les besoins des gestionnaires d'aires marines protégées, 2018.
<http://www.aires-marines.fr/Documentation/Rapport-Contexte-national-et-europeen-de-l-encadrement-des-activites-de-peche-professionnelle-maritime-pour-les-besoins-des-gestionnaires-d-aires-marines-protgees>
- Capitalisation sur les mesures de gestion au sein des aires marines protégées de Méditerranée, 2010. <http://www.natura2000.fr/documentation/references-bibliographiques/capitalisation-sur-mesures-gestion-au-sein-aires-marines>
- Fanica Kljaković Gašpić: Natura 2000 (PowerPoint presentation).
http://biologija.unios.hr/webbio/wp-content/uploads/2012/materijali/zpio/NATURA_2000.pdf
- Ecological Network Natura 2000. Croatian Environment and Nature Agency.
<http://www.haop.hr/hr/tematska-podrucja/odrzivo-koristenje-prirodnih-dobara-i-ekoloska-mreza/ekoloska-mreza>
- Natura 2000 in Croatia. Brochure of the PHARE PROJECT: Institutional Building and Implementation of NATURA 2000 in Croatia, National Institute for Nature Protection.
- Référentiel pêche professionnelle, 2010.
<http://www.natura2000.fr/documentation/references-bibliographiques/referentiel-peche-professionnelle>
- National Parks and Wildlife Service site designation process report, 2017.
<https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/publications/pdf/Site%20Designation%20Process%20%28October%202017%29.pdf>
- El Programa de participación y sensibilización ambiental en los espacios andaluces de Red Natura 2000. Junta de Andalucía, 2017.
www.juntadeandalucia.es/medioambiente/portal_web/web/temas_ambientales/educacion_ambiental_y_formacion_nuevo/voluntariado_ambiental/red_voluntarios_ambie
- Natura 2000 una oportunidad para todos. Junta de Extremadura, 2017.
www.infonatur.es/images/infonatur/Libro_Complero_RN2000.pdf
- Natura 2000 Management Planning for Marine Sites in Malta & Gozo, The Environment and Resources Authority (ERA). <https://era.org.mt/en/Pages/Natura-2000-Management-Planning-for-marine-sites-in-Malta--Gozo.aspx>
- National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) website, Ireland, 2018.
<https://www.npws.ie/about-npws>
- España presenta su intención de adherirse a la Asociación para la Financiación Sostenible de Áreas Marinas Protegidas en el Mediterráneo. Monaco Ocean Week 2018, 2018.

Marina 78S, April 2014, 95-101, Barcelona (Spain), ISSN-L: 0214-8358.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3989/scimar.04028.25B>. In: Leonart, J. and Maynou, F. (eds). The Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries in the Mediterranean and Black Seas.

- Begun, T., Velikova, V., Muresan, M., Zaharia, T., Dencheva, K., Sezgin, M. and Bat, L. Conservation and Protection of the Black Sea Biodiversity. Review of the existing and planned protected areas in the Black Sea (Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey) with a special focus on possible deficiencies regarding law enforcement and implementation of management plans, EC DG Env. MISIS Project Deliverables, 110, 2014, ISBN: 978-606-598-363-2.
- Zaharia, T. (coordinator): Synthetic monitoring guide for marine species and coastal and marine habitats of community interest in Romania, Boldas Publishing House, 149 pp., 2013, ISBN 978-606-8066-45-5.
- Olsen, E.M., Johnson, D., Weaver, P., Goñi, R., Ribeiro, M.C., Rabaut, M., Macpherson, E., Pelletier, D., Fonseca, L., Katsanevakis, S. and Zaharia, T. Achieving Ecologically Coherent MPA Networks in Europe: Science Needs and Priorities. Marine Board Position Paper 18. In: Larkin, K.E. and McDonough, N. (Eds.), European Marine Board, Ostend, Belgium, 2013.

Government databases and information systems:

- ISUN – electronic system for structural funds in Bulgaria
- EFF database at the website of the National Agency of Bulgaria for Fisheries and Aquaculture (former MA)
- Bioportal – web portal of the nature conservation system in Croatia, Croatian Environment and Nature Agency. <http://www.bioportal.hr/>
- Information on the implemented operations until 31 December 2017 for Cyprus EMFF (in Greek).
http://www.moa.gov.cy/moa/opf/opf2014.nsf/page26_gr/page26_gr?OpenDocument
- Information on the implemented operations until 31 December 2015 for Cyprus EFF.
http://www.moa.gov.cy/moa/opf/opf.nsf/DMLlist_gr/DMLlist_gr?OpenDocument
- Interactive web-mapping service for protected areas in Germany, interactive map.
<http://www.geodienste.bfn.de/schutzgebiete/#?centerX=3786876.500?centerY=5669060.000?scale=5000000?layers=515>
- The Irish Government's Commercial Sea Fishing Network Portal. www.fishingnet.ie
- Ecological Network Natura 2000 in Croatia. Ministry of Environment and Energy.
<http://www.mzoip.hr/hr/priroda/ekoloska-mreza-natura-2000.html>
- Nature Conservation Atlas of Slovenia, Ministry of Environment and Energy.
<http://www.naravovarstveni-atlas.si/web/>

Management Plans and Action Plans:

- Plan for combating the silver-cheeked toadfish (*Lagocephalus scleratus*) in the waters of Cyprus (in Greek).
[http://www.moa.gov.cy/moa/opf/opf2014.nsf/All/196756204B42FCFCC2257FD1002DC29C/\\$file/%CE%A3%CF%87%CE%B5%CE%B4%CE%B9%CE%BF%20%CE%9A%CE%B1%CF%84%CE%B1%CF%80%CE%BF%CE%BB%CE%AD%CE%BC%CE%B7%CF%83%CE%B7%CF%82%20%CE%9B%CE%B1%CE%B3%CE%BF%CE%BA%CE%AD%CF%86%CE%B1%CE%BB%CE%BF%CF%85.pdf](http://www.moa.gov.cy/moa/opf/opf2014.nsf/All/196756204B42FCFCC2257FD1002DC29C/$file/%CE%A3%CF%87%CE%B5%CE%B4%CE%B9%CE%BF%20%CE%9A%CE%B1%CF%84%CE%B1%CF%80%CE%BF%CE%BB%CE%AD%CE%BC%CE%B7%CF%83%CE%B7%CF%82%20%CE%9B%CE%B1%CE%B3%CE%BF%CE%BA%CE%AD%CF%86%CE%B1%CE%BB%CE%BF%CF%85.pdf)
- Plan for compensating fishermen in Cyprus holding coastal and polyvalent permits for the damages caused by marine mammals in catches and fishing gear (in Greek).
[http://www.moa.gov.cy/moa/opf/opf2014.nsf/All/E7701AFAA4D03116C225803500314DAA/\\$file/%CE%A3%CF%87%CE%B5%CE%B4%CE%B9%CE%BF%20%CE%91%CF%80%CE%BF%CE%B6%CE%B7%CE%BC%CE%B9%CF%89%CF%83%CE%B5%CE%B9%CF%82%20%CE%94%CE%B5%CE%BB%CF%86%CE%B9%CE%BD%CE](http://www.moa.gov.cy/moa/opf/opf2014.nsf/All/E7701AFAA4D03116C225803500314DAA/$file/%CE%A3%CF%87%CE%B5%CE%B4%CE%B9%CE%BF%20%CE%91%CF%80%CE%BF%CE%B6%CE%B7%CE%BC%CE%B9%CF%89%CF%83%CE%B5%CE%B9%CF%82%20%CE%94%CE%B5%CE%BB%CF%86%CE%B9%CE%BD%CE)

[E%B9%CE%B1%201%CE%B7%20CF%84%CF%81%CE%BF%CF%80 %CE%99%CE%BF%CF%85%CE%BD%CE%B9%CE%BF%CF%822017.pdf](https://www.schleswig-holstein.de/DE/Fachinhalte/F/fischerei/Downloads/vereinbarungSchweinswale.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=2)

- Freiwillige Vereinbarung zum Schutz von Schweinswalen und tauchenden Meeressäugern, Zwischenbericht Stand Mai 2015. (Voluntary agreement for the protection of harbour porpoise and diving ducks: progress report). Ostsee Info – Center Eckernförde (OIC), 2015. https://www.schleswig-holstein.de/DE/Fachinhalte/F/fischerei/Downloads/vereinbarungSchweinswale.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=2
- Le plan de gestion 2017-2032 du Parc naturel marin du Bassin d'Arcachon, 2018. <http://www.aires-marines.fr/L-Agence/Organisation/Parcs-naturels-marins/Parc-naturel-marin-du-Bassin-d-Arcachon/Documentation/Plan-de-gestion-2017-2032-du-Parc-naturel-marin-du-Bassin-d-Arcachon>
- National action plan for MPAs in Sweden, 2016.
- Program upravljanja območij Natura 2000 (2015-2020) (Natura 2000 Sites Management Programme 2015-2020, in Slovene). http://www.natura2000.si/fileadmin/user_upload/LIFE_Upravljanje/PUN_ProgramNatura.pdf

EU funding programmes, related operational programmes and funded projects:

- LIFE Programme website: <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/>
- Duurzaam vissen voor de markt – Operationeel Programma EFMZV van Nederland (in Dutch), 2015. https://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/sites/fisheries/files/docs/body/op-netherlands_nl.pdf
- Europees Fonds voor Maritieme Zaken en Visserij – Jaarverslag 2014 en 2015, annual report (in Dutch), 2016. <https://www.rvo.nl/sites/default/files/2016/11/Jaarverslag-EFMZV-2014-en-2015.pdf>
- Europees Fonds voor Maritieme Zaken en Visserij – Jaarverslag 2016, annual report (in Dutch), 2017. <https://www.rvo.nl/sites/default/files/2017/06/Jaarverslag-EFMZV-2016.pdf>
- Operational Programme for EMFF 2014-2020 in Slovenia, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food. https://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/sites/fisheries/files/docs/body/op-slovenia_sl.pdf
- Operational Programme for EMFF 2014-2020 in Slovenia. Current situation 30 April 2018, PowerPoint presentation, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food.
- EFF interim evaluation, evaluation report, 2012. <https://www.agriculture.gov.ie/media/migration/seafood/marineagenciesandprogrammes/seafooddevelopmentinireland/InterimEvaluationSeafoodDev180612.pdf>
- Optimierte Netz-Steerte für eine ökologisch und ökonomisch nachhaltige Garnelenfischerei in der Nordsee (CRANNET), Projektabschlussbericht, 2015. (Crannet project, final report). Johann Heinrich von Thünen-Institut, 2015. http://schleswig-holstein.de/DE/Fachinhalte/F/fischerei/Downloads/crannetAbschlussbericht.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=1
- Propuesta del proyecto integrado 'Gestión Integrada, innovadora y participativa de la Red Natura 2000 en el medio marino'. LIFE Integrated projects 2014. Fundación Biodiversidad, 2014. www.fundacion-biodiversidad.es/sites/default/files/PI_Nota%Conceptual_FINAL-ESP.pdf
- Inventario y Designación de la Red Natura 2000 en Áreas Marinas del Estado Español. LIFE+ INDEMARES. Fundación Biodiversidad, 2012. www.indemares.es/sites/default/files/informe_layman_2.pdf

- Folleto sobre la red de ZEPA marinas en España. INDEMARES. SEO/BirdLife, 2015. www.activarednatura2000.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Folleto-ZEPA-marinas_castellano_web.pdf
- Fundación Biodiversidad Proyecto LIFE IP INTEMARES. Fundación Biodiversidad, 2017. www.fundacion-biodiversidad.es/es/biodiversidad-marina-y-litoral/proyectos-propios/lif-ip-paf-intemares
- Project TARTALIFE – Reduction of sea turtle mortality in commercial fisheries. <http://www.tartalife.eu/>
- Project Caretta – Reduction of mortality of *Caretta caretta* in the Greek seas. http://www.archelon.gr/eng/pro_life.php?row=row4
- Project LIFE WHALESafe – WHALE protection from Strike by Active cetaceans detection and alarm issue to ships and ferries in Pelagos sanctuary. <http://www.whalesafe.eu>
- Project LINDA – Limitation to the negative interactions between dolphins and human activities. <http://www.lifelinda.org/accueil/>
- Project MOFI – Monk seal & fisheries: Mitigating the conflict in Greek seas. <http://mofi.mom.gr>
- Project SHARKLIFE – Urgent actions for the conservation of cartilaginous fish in Italy. <http://www.sharklife.it>
- Project SAMBAH - Static Acoustic Monitoring of the Baltic Sea Harbour porpoise, <http://www.sambah.org>
- Project MIGRATE – Conservation Status and potential Sites of Community Interest for *Tursiops truncatus* and *Caretta caretta* in Malta. <http://lifeprojectmigrate.com/>
- Project CETACEOSMADEIRA II – Identifying critical marine areas for bottlenose dolphin and surveillance of the cetaceans' conservation status in Madeira archipelago.
- Project RELIONMED-LIFE – Preventing a LIONfish invasion in the MEDiterranean through early response and targeted Removal. <http://www.relionmed.eu/>

Media articles:

- España candidata a los Premios Natura 2000 que entrega la Comisión Europea por su trabajo en materia de conservación marina en el proyecto LIFE+INDEMARES. *La Voz de Galicia*, 2018. www.lavozdegalicia.es/noticia/biodiversidad/2018/03/26/espana-candidata-premios-natura-2000-comision-europea-proyecto-conservacion-marina/000
- España a por la ampliación de su Red Natura 2000 marina. *eldiario.es*, 2017. www.eldiario.es/sociedad/Espana-ampliacion-Red-Natura-Marina
- La Red Natura más marina que nunca. *ELDIA.es*, 2018. www.eldia.es/sociedad/2018-02-17/11-Red-Natura-marina.htm
- España candidata a los Premios Natura 2000 de conservación marina. *Europa Azul*, 2018. www.europa-azul.es/espana-candidata-a-los-premios-natura-2000-de-conservacion-marina
- Las áreas marinas de Natura 2000 necesitan planes de gestión. *Activa Red Natura 2000*. Activa Red Natura 2000, 2016. www.activarednatura.es/seobirdlif-reclama-planes-gestion-los-espacios-natura-2000-del-mar/
- Red Natura 2000. 2014-2020: Las Ayudas para natura 2000 se multiplican. *Junta de Extremadura*, 2017. www.infonatur.es/es/noticias-de-inter%25C3%25A9s/noticias-infonatur-2000/216
- Once proyectos LIFE españoles entre los 60 mejores de la UE. *EFE:Verde*, 2018. www.efeverde.com/noticias/proyectos-life

8 Annex

Questionnaire on the use of EMFF for Natura 2000 and marine biodiversity

Section 1	Overview of the Natura 2000 implementation under EMFF shared management in the MS (based on Infosys, FAME assessment and MA comments/corrections)	
Question 1.1 <i>Overall implementation</i>	1.1.1 Overall implementation of the Natura 2000 network in marine areas	Single choice: None/Starting/Intermediate/Advanced/Completed Open comment
	1.1.2 Progress in site designation	Single choice: None/Starting/Intermediate/Advanced/Completed Open comment
	1.1.3 Progress in definition of sites' conservation objectives	As above
	1.1.4 Progress in management plans and schemes	As above
	1.1.5 Progress on other issues	Open comment
	1.1.6 Significance of EMFF in Natura 2000 implementation in marine areas	Single choice: Marginal/Significant/Decisive Open comment
Question 1.2 <i>Stakeholders</i>	1.2.1 Type of stakeholders involved in EMFF implementation	Multiple choices: ministries, environmental agencies, port authorities, NGOs, regional/local authorities, producer organisations, other professional associations, private operator/fisher, private operator/other, general public, other Open comment
	1.2.2 Role of stakeholders	Based on the choices of 1.2.1 indication of role (decision-maker, implementer, follower) Open comment
Question 1.3 <i>Other aspects relevant to the national context</i>	1.3.1 Legal framework	Single choice: None/Starting/Intermediate/Advanced/Completed Open comment
	1.3.2 Capacity and resources of competent authorities/bodies	Single choice: None/Starting/Intermediate/Advanced/Completed Open comment

	1.3.3 Procedures for public participation	Single choice: None/Starting/Intermediate/Advanced/Completed Open comment
	1.3.4 Data collection and monitoring	Single choice: None/Starting/Intermediate/Advanced/Completed Open comment
	1.3.5 Other issues	Open comment
Section 2	Overview of the Natura 2000 implementation under EMFF shared management in the MS	
<i>Question 2.1 Preparatory steps</i>	2.1.1 Preparatory steps for OP programming, review of the process	Open comment
	2.1.2 Consistency of measures in the OP with the priorities identified in the PAF ¹⁹	Single choice: None/Poor/Good/Complete Open comment
	2.1.3 Consideration of regulation 2015/531 in forming the support	Single choice: Informative/Formative/Decisive Open comment
<i>Question 2.2 Focus of operations selected</i>	2.2.1 Focus of operations per measure	Multiple choices: 'awareness', 'cooperation/networking and partnership agreements', 'sites selection', 'stakeholder involvement', 'strategies definition', 'studies, data collection and monitoring/evaluation', 'management measures and plans', 'construction or modernisation of facilities', 'conservation, restoration and reproduction activities', 'operation schemes and standards', 'compensation schemes', 'fishing equipment and techniques', 'collection of waste', 'protection of birds and mammals', 'other' Open comment
	2.2.2 Main type of operations under the measure	Infosys data Open comment
	2.2.3 Main type of beneficiaries	Multiple choices: ministries, environmental agencies, port authorities, NGOs,

¹⁹ Prioritised Action Framework for Natura 2000 – a strategic multiannual planning tool that provides an overview of the measures that are needed to implement the Natura 2000 network and the financing needs for these measures, linking them to the corresponding EU funding programmes.

		per measure	regional/local authorities, producer organisations, other professional associations, private operator/fisher, private operator/other, general public, other Open comment
		2.2.4 Climate change aspects (mitigation and especially adaptation) per measure	Mitigation: Single choice: Starting/Intermediate/Advanced Adaptation: Single choice: Starting/Intermediate/Advanced Open comment
		2.2.5 Lessons learnt	Multiple choices: as in 2.2.1 Open comment List of operations
		2.2.6 List of targeted sites	Site code/name, surface area
Question 2.3 <i>Focus of operations planned</i>	2.3	2.3.1 Focus of operations per measure	Multiple choices: as in 2.2.1 Open comment
		2.3.2 Main type of beneficiaries per measure	Multiple choices: as in 2.2.3 Open comment
		2.3.3 Funds to be allocated (EUR) per measure	Open comment (structured in total, public and EMFF)
		2.3.4 Climate change aspects (mitigation and especially adaptation) per measure	Mitigation: Single choice: Starting/Intermediate/Advanced Adaptation: Single choice: Starting/Intermediate/Advanced Open comment
		2.3.5 List of targeted sites	Site code/name, surface area
Section 3		Overview of the Natura 2000 implementation under EFF	
Question 3.1 <i>Focus of operations implemented</i>	3.1	3.1.1 Measures in OP EFF 2007-2013	Open comment
		3.1.2 Consideration of the PAF when drafting the OP EFF 2007-2013	Single choice: None/Poor/Good/Complete Open comment
		3.1.3 Focus of operations per measure	Multiple choices: as in 2.2.1 Open comment

	3.1.4 Main type of beneficiaries per measure	Multiple choices: as in 2.2.3 Open comment
	3.1.5 Eligible expenditure certified and actually paid by beneficiaries (EUR) per measure	Open comment (structured in total, public and EFF)
	3.1.6 Lessons learnt	Multiple choices: as in 2.2.1 Open comment List of operations
	3.1.7 List of targeted sites	Site code/name, surface area
Section 4	Overview about activities/operations to support Natura 2000 implementation in marine areas funded through other sources	
<i>Question 4.1 Focus of other actions</i>	4.1.1 Other funding sources, per source (EU/national)	Name, funds, funding source, duration Open comment
	4.1.2 Focus of operations per funding source	Multiple choices: as in 2.2.1 Open comment
	4.1.3 Main type of beneficiaries per funding source	Multiple choices: as in 2.2.3 Open comment
Section 5	References for secondary/published information	
<i>Question 5.1 References</i>	5.1.1 Name, per reference	Open comment
	5.1.2 Type of reference	Single choice: scientific paper/study/article/legislation/other Open comment
	5.1.3 Publisher/year	Open comment
	5.1.4 Source, website	Open comment
	5.1.5 Comments of the GE	Open comment
Section 6	Overall lessons learnt and recommendations	
<i>Question 6.1 Lessons learnt</i>	6.1.1 Overall lessons learnt related to the use of EMFF for Natura 2000 implementation	Open comment
	6.1.2 Particular constraints	Open comment

	encountered and solutions found	
Question 6.2 Recommendations	6.2.1 Recommendations to the European Commission in defining the legal framework	Open comment
	6.2.2 Recommendations to the MA in programming the next OP	Open comment
	6.2.3 Recommendations to national bodies in designing other actions	Open comment