

# Consultation on the reform of the Common Fisheries Policy

## QUESTIONNAIRE:

- The core objective of the CFP is to promote responsible and sustainable fisheries. Is there any reason why the external dimension of the CFP should be driven by different objectives?
- How could the EU strengthen its role on the international stage to promote better global governance of the sea and in particular of fisheries?
- How can the EU cooperate with its partners to make RFMOs more effective?
- Contrary to the current free access principle in international waters, should fishermen pay for the right to fish in the high seas under the governance provided by RFMOs?
- How can objectives such as investment promotion (creation of joint-ventures, transfer of know-how and technologies, investments and capacity management for the fishing industry ...), creation of jobs (on vessels, in ports, in the processing industry) or promoting good maritime governance be pursued in the framework of future international fisheries agreements?
- Are the FPAs the best instrument to achieve sustainability beyond EU waters or should they be replaced by other forms of cooperation? Should the regional perspective be explored and either substitute or complement a streamlined bilateral one?
- How could we make scientific research to assess the sustainability of fish stocks and the control of the fishing activity more transparent and efficient?
- How can we assure better cooperation and compliance with new regulations in developing countries?
- Should EU operators cover all the costs of their fishing activities in third country waters or should the Community budget continue to support part of these costs?
- How could we contribute to increasing the fisheries management capabilities of developing countries, e.g. through targeted assistance?
- Should the integration of European fishing fleets and interests in third countries be actively pursued as an objective of the external dimension of the CFP with a view, in particular, to support the development of the concerned partner countries?
- How can we reinforce the synergies between the different forms of support and the different partners in the fisheries sector reinforced and the development strategies of coastal states?
- Should aquaculture be included in future partnership agreements?

A number of incoherencies can be found in the practice of processing and exporting fish and fisheries products from the ACP to the European market. These incoherencies result in

impediments to trade in fisheries products for ACP countries. Therefore following requirements should be met in the future:

- The EU should respect the surplus principle as concluded in the UNCLOS; the EU should not fish in countries where a surplus is not proved and the prevention of overexploitation cannot be guaranteed.
- The European Union has to make more of an effort to let local processing industry develop in developing countries.
- Priority access should be reserved for the national fleet of poor coastal states, especially to small scale and artisan fishermen.
- The EU should step up efforts to help ACP countries develop effective national management systems, with supporting policies and institutions, in order to prevent overexploitation. At present, effective control is often lacking in poor countries.
- The EU should step up efforts to help ACP countries develop effective national management systems, with supporting policies and institutions, in order to prevent overexploitation. At present, effective control is often lacking in poor countries.
- The EU should raise the price of fishing licences to its fleet, in order to abort a hidden subsidy that hurts poor fishermen.