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EMFF OP reporting requirements

• **Infosys** – *only quantitative data*

EMFF MAs provide COM with relevant cumulative data on operations selected including key characteristics of the beneficiary and the operation itself (Art. 97(1)(a))

• **AIR** – *combination of quantitative data and qualitative analysis*

Overview of the implementation as of 31 December 2018

- Total number of operations: 34,000
- EMFF committed: EUR 2.4 billion
- EMFF spent: EUR 1.0 billion
Infosys and AIR are complementary

- **Infosys** database allows *in-depth quantitative analysis* of EMFF implementation

  Various combinations of data, contribution to specific topics and policies at regional, MS, sea basin and EU levels, split by types of operations, etc.

- **AIR** complements this by *examining quality factors* affecting EMFF implementation

  Findings from evaluations, actions taken in cases of serious infringements, assessment of progress made towards achieving the objectives of the OP, information on partnership, etc.
Issues affecting the performance of the programme and corrective measures taken

Issues affecting performance

- **Complex** public and **administrative procedures**
- **No interest** in certain measures from **potential beneficiaries**
- **Lack of private co-financing**
- Implementation of the new IMP-related measures
- Brexit

Corrective measures taken

- **OP modification** (the most often mentioned)
- **Reallocation** of funding **between measures**
- **Adaptation of selection criteria**
- Amendments to national laws and regulations
- Communication strategy and campaigns
- Increased use of simplified cost options
Activities in relation to the evaluation plan and synthesis of the evaluations

- Most of the MSs provided information in AIR about their performed evaluations

- Evaluations most often addressed:
  - Process evaluation
  - Assessment of the OP progress
  - Reprogramming of the OP
  - Assessment of OP indicators and their achievement
  - Other specific issues
Conclusions of evaluation activities

- **Conclusions often target the practical side of OP implementation:**
  - Reduce the administrative burden
  - Simplify the verification, certification and audit processes
  - Modify the OP (re-allocate funds)
  - Improve the design of RIs

- **Several general observations:**
  - The best long-term value comes from diversification projects (for example, creating a local market or processing)
  - EMFF support in general has a positive effect in the aquaculture and processing sectors, but the proportion of unsuccessful operations remains high
  - The commercial marine fishing, aquaculture and processing sectors are small and economically weak with respect to key indicators like number of employees and added value
  - Decreased interest from beneficiaries due to the fear of sanctions for failing to achieve the required level of the RI
Issues affecting the performance of the programme: performance framework

Achievement of performance framework milestones by MS per UP
Issues affecting the performance of the programme: demand-driven issues

• **Lack of interest from applicants** for certain measures

• *Low demand resulting from a poor image related to the EFF experience* and weak support (animation, advice on project preparation)

• **Lack of the necessary private co-funding**
Issues affecting the performance of the programme — *supply-driven issues*

- Lack of administrative capacity
- Overestimation of needs for permanent cessation, *improperly set target values* for some measures
- Complicated double selection process for CLLD
- Beneficiaries became less active due to *stricter requirements for applicants* to achieve certain indicators and the related sanctions
- Late announcement of calls for proposals
- Difficulties over land ownership / land concession
- *Long evaluation process* and *inadequate quality of proposals*
Issues affecting the performance of the programme: *context factors* (1)

- **Late adoption of legislation** causing delays in the OP implementation
- **Complex designation procedure**
- **Complexity of common result indicators**
- **Novelty of UP6** and lack of experience in this area: breadth of the UP complicates setting priorities and objectives
- **Complex** legal environment to obtain the necessary *permits* in aquaculture
- **Complexity of administrative procedures** at national level
Issues affecting the performance of the programme: context factors (2)

- **Socio-economic changes** impacting the original strategies of the beneficiaries
- **Saturation of funding** from the previous 2007-13 period
- **Increased damage by predators** (e.g. otters, cormorants) and severe **drought**
- **Favourable context** leading to less need for assistance: rebuilding fish stocks and overall stability of landed volumes, increase in fish prices and relatively low fuel prices
- Conditions offered by the **private support instrument** are more flexible and **attractive** compared to the EMFF
- **Upturn in market prices** has increased overall interest in aquaculture investment and associated EMFF support
Issues affecting the performance of the programme: *remedy measures*

- **OP modification**
- **Review of performance framework**
- **Reallocation of funding**
- **Action plan to overcome the delays in OP implementation**
- **Amendments in national legislation** related to the acquisition of the necessary *aquaculture permits*
- **Reducing time needed for the project selection process**
- **Information campaigns** to potential beneficiaries
- **Brexit** may require redeployment of funding towards compensation for temporary cessation of fishing
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