



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
IMPACT ASSESSMENT BOARD

Brussels,
D(2011)

08 AVR. 2011

Opinion

Title **DG MARE - Impact Assessment on a proposal on market policy for fisheries and aquaculture products.**

(resubmitted draft version of 24 March 2011)

(A) Context

The first component of the Common Fisheries Policies (CFP) to be put in place back in 1970, the Common Market Organisation (CMO) for fisheries and aquaculture products is currently implemented through a regulatory framework that includes 4 Council regulations and 23 Commission regulations. Building upon the results of various evaluations and studies of the key Council Regulation (EC) No 104/2000, the Commission is planning to accompany its foreseen comprehensive reform of the overall CFP with a separate legislative proposal on a revised market policy for fishery and aquaculture products.

(B) Overall assessment

While the report has been improved along the lines of some of the recommendations issued by the Board in its first opinion, several important aspects should be further strengthened. The report should more clearly explain the enhanced role of producers' organisations (POs) vis-à-vis key CFP reform measures and clarify how POs would be strengthened accordingly. It should also more clearly justify and describe measures concerning market interventions, international trade and information requirements. Finally, the report should further strengthen the analysis of impacts which remains very general.

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

(1) Discuss in greater detail the interactions with CFP reform. The revised report sets the analysis more firmly within the wider context of CFP reform. Nevertheless, it should more clearly explain the role of producers' organisations (POs) vis-à-vis discards policy, landing obligations (see p.32 and p.45) and collective management of transferable fishing shares (p.45). More generally, the report should provide a more explicit argumentation of the reasons why modified CMO instruments would play a relevant role in a reformed CFP despite their limited impact so far.

(2) Further justify and clarify some of the proposed measures. The revised report has substantially clarified the proposed intervention logic and the differences among policy options. However, it should present more clearly the justification, scope and exact content of the following measures. First, limiting market intervention to products re-introduced on the market (§5.3, p.32: Which problems would this solve? Would market interventions become more efficient than is currently the case?). Second, providing a framework for voluntary labelling and extending mandatory information requirements to restaurants and catering (§5.4, p.33: What would this imply for these businesses? Do similar provisions exist for other food products and, if not, why is a specific approach needed? What would a framework for voluntary labelling imply in practice and how would it interact with the mandatory requirements?). Third, introducing fishery governance conditions in every trade agreement (§5.1, p.32: Is this needed given that - p.13 - the current CMO autonomous tariff policy has "not significantly affected the balance and prices of the main EU markets"? How can a sectoral initiative envisage a measure cutting across all trade instruments?). In addition, the report should better explain how exactly POs would be strengthened (and whether increased financial incentives would be necessary and if they will be made available to the required extent). Finally, the report should present options by policy tools rather than specific objectives (§5) to increase transparency.

(3) Further strengthen the analysis of impacts and the comparison of options. While the revised report has somewhat clarified the analysis of impacts, added a broad discussion of differential impacts on sectors, regions and stakeholders, and explicitly addressed the coherence of the preferred option with CFP reform, the analysis of impacts still remains very general. The report therefore should provide a more in-depth discussion and quantification of impacts on the EU budget, trade for the EU and third countries, and implementation costs (for instance from the extension of mandatory information requirements). It should also quantify simplification gains and administrative burden reductions, whenever potentially significant. Finally, the report should explicitly compare the options in terms of their efficiency.

(D) Procedure and presentation.

The report should avoid the exclusive use of tables for the textual presentation of the impact analysis to facilitate reading. It should also discuss the selection of operational objectives in the main text (and not only present this graphically via the 'intervention logic' graph on page 30). Acronyms should be explained when first introduced in the main text.

(E) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2011/MARE/004
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	Written procedure The present opinion concerns a resubmitted draft IA report. The first opinion was issued on 11 March 2011



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
IMPACT ASSESSMENT BOARD

Chair

08 AVR. 2011

Brussels,
SG-C2/RM/sq

**NOTE FOR THE ATTENTION OF MS EVANS
DIRECTOR GENERAL, DG MARE**

Subject: Opinion of the Impact Assessment Board on the resubmitted impact assessment report on a proposal on market policy for fisheries and aquaculture products.

Please find in annex the opinion of the Impact Assessment Board on the draft impact assessment report (resubmission) on the above mentioned subject. I hope you find the recommendations useful, and suggest that you include a paragraph in the final version of the impact assessment report referring to the Board's examination and briefly explaining if and how the Board's recommendations have led to changes compared with the two earlier drafts. Such a cross-reference will contribute to the coherence of the file as it goes into the inter-service consultation and is presented to the College.

Let me recall that it is the responsibility of your service to ensure that this second Board's opinion is uploaded in CIS-Net alongside the first opinion, and that they are submitted to the Registry together with the corresponding initiative, the impact assessment and the executive summary when they are introduced for adoption by the College. More detailed instructions are available on the SG Manual of Operating Procedures.

Please note that once the College has adopted the corresponding initiative, the Board's opinion will be published on the Europa website, unless you inform us of the reasons - in accordance with Regulation 2001/1049 - why this should not be done in this particular case prior to the date of adoption. Please send (a copy of) such a request to the Impact Assessment Board to the Ares address ve_sg.IAB and to its functional mailbox: IMPACT ASSESSMENT BOARD.

Marianne Klingbeil

Encl. Opinion of the Impact Assessment Board

Copies A. Vannini (President's cabinet), C. Day, M. Servoz, F. Genisson,
L. Tholoniati (SG), Board members and alternates

