## Public Consultation - CFP Regulation Evaluation

|--|

#### Introduction

#### About this consultation

The purpose of this public consultation is to gather your input and views about the functioning of the common fisheries policy (CFP) Regulation (Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013) in order to support the evaluation of this Regulation.

This evaluation will consider how the existing CFP Regulation is performing to date and assess how the legal framework allows its current objectives to be met and address emerging challenges. It will cover all action within the EU and the external action of the CFP Regulation.

The evaluation will take stock of the CFP Regulation's impact in the conservation of marine biological resources and the management of fisheries and fleets exploiting such resources, the supply chain, consumers and public authorities in all EU Member States over the past 10 years of implementation (2014-2024), building on earlier consultations and input provided as preparation for the Commission Communication on the common fisheries policy today and tomorrow (COM/2023/103)

The questions are organised around four of the five standard evaluation criteria used by the European Commission in order to assess the extent to which the CFP Regulation:

- is effective in fulfilling expectations and meeting its objectives;
- is efficient in terms of cost-effectiveness and proportionality of actual costs to benefits;
- is relevant to current and emerging needs;
- is coherent (internally and externally with other EU interventions or international agreements)

These criteria are <u>a set of principles</u> used by the European Commission to assess the quality and impact of policies and regulations to ensure that EU policies are well-designed, and that they deliver real benefits to citizens and businesses across the EU.

Please comment on any or all topics (you can skip questions if you have nothing to say) and provide any other information you think relevant.

At the end of the survey, you can upload a document or position paper (maximum size 3 MB) or link if your contribution is in html format. You can also provide additional comments or information.

## About you

Bulgarian

Croatian

Czech

Danish

Dutch

English

\*Language of my contribution

	_
	Estonian
0	Finnish
	French
	German
	Greek
0	Hungarian
	Irish
	Italian
0	Latvian
0	Lithuanian
	Maltese
	Polish
	Portuguese
	Romanian
0	Slovak
0	Slovenian
0	Spanish
0	Swedish
*I am	giving my contribution as
	Academic/research institution
	Business association
	Company/business
	Consumer organisation
	EU citizen
	Environmental organisation

	Non-governmenta	al o	rganisation (NGO)	)			
	Public authority						
	Trade union						
	Other						
* <b>C</b> ir	st name						
- 11							
	Justine						
*Su	rname						
	Marrot						
*Fn	nail (this won't be pu	blis	shed)				
	justine.marrot@aac-europ		,				
			-				
*Co	untry of origin						
Ple	ase add your country of orig	gin, d	or that of your organisatio	n.			
Th	is list does not represent the	offi	cial position of the Europe	ean	institutions with regard	to th	e legal status or policy
of	the entities mentioned. It is a	a ha		gen	•		0
	Afghanistan		Djibouti		Libya		Saint Martin
	Aland Islands		Dominica		Liechtenstein		Saint Pierre and
	Ω Albania	0	Deminison		Lithuania	0	Miquelon
	Albania				Lithuania		Saint Vincent
			Republic				and the Grenadines
	O Algoria	0	Ecuador	0	Luxembourg	0	Samoa
	<ul> <li>Algeria</li> <li>American Samoa</li> </ul>	0		0	Macau	0	San Marino
	Andorra	0	Egypt El Salvador	0		0	São Tomé and
	Andona		Li Salvauoi		Madagascar		Príncipe
	Angola	0	Equatorial Guinea	0	Malawi		Saudi Arabia
	Anguilla	0	Eritrea	0	Malaysia		Senegal
	Antarctica	0	Estonia	0	Maldives		Serbia
	Antigua and		Eswatini	0	Mali		Seychelles
	Barbuda						•
	Argentina	0	Ethiopia	0	Malta	0	Sierra Leone

Non-EU citizen

	Armenia	0	Falkland Islands		Marshall Islands		Singapore
0	Aruba	0	Faroe Islands		Martinique		Sint Maarten
0	Australia	0	Fiji		Mauritania		Slovakia
	Austria		Finland	0	Mauritius		Slovenia
	Azerbaijan		France	0	Mayotte		Solomon Islands
	Bahamas		French Guiana	0	Mexico		Somalia
	Bahrain		French Polynesia	0	Micronesia		South Africa
0	Bangladesh		French Southern		Moldova		South Georgia
			and Antarctic				and the South
			Lands				Sandwich
							Islands
	Barbados		Gabon	0	Monaco		South Korea
	Belarus		Georgia	0	Mongolia		South Sudan
	Belgium		Germany	0	Montenegro		Spain
	Belize	0	Ghana	0	Montserrat		Sri Lanka
	Benin	0	Gibraltar		Morocco		Sudan
0	Bermuda	0	Greece		Mozambique		Suriname
0	Bhutan	0	Greenland		Myanmar/Burma		Svalbard and
							Jan Mayen
	Bolivia		Grenada	0	Namibia		Sweden
	Bonaire Saint		Guadeloupe	0	Nauru		Switzerland
	Eustatius and						
	Saba						
0	Bosnia and	0	Guam	0	Nepal	0	Syria
	Herzegovina						
0	Botswana	0	Guatemala	0	Netherlands	0	Taiwan
(O)	Bouvet Island	0	Guernsey	0	New Caledonia	0	Tajikistan
0	Brazil	0	Guinea	0	New Zealand	0	Tanzania
0	British Indian	0	Guinea-Bissau	0	Nicaragua	0	Thailand
	Ocean Territory						
	British Virgin	0	Guyana		Niger	0	The Gambia
6	Islands			6			
	Brunei	0	Haiti	0	Nigeria	0	Timor-Leste
	Bulgaria		Heard Island and		Niue		Togo
			McDonald Islands	3			

	Burkina Faso		Honduras		Norfolk Island		Tokelau
	Burundi		Hong Kong		Northern	0	Tonga
					Mariana Islands		
	Cambodia		Hungary		North Korea		Trinidad and
							Tobago
	Cameroon		Iceland		North Macedonia	0	Tunisia
	Canada		India		Norway		Türkiye
	Cape Verde		Indonesia		Oman		Turkmenistan
	Cayman Islands		Iran		Pakistan	0	Turks and
							Caicos Islands
	Central African		Iraq		Palau		Tuvalu
	Republic						
0	Chad		Ireland	0	Palestine		Uganda
	Chile		Isle of Man		Panama	0	Ukraine
	China		Israel		Papua New		United Arab
					Guinea		Emirates
	Christmas Island		Italy		Paraguay	0	United Kingdom
	Clipperton		Jamaica		Peru	0	United States
	Cocos (Keeling)		Japan		Philippines		United States
	Islands						Minor Outlying
							Islands
	Colombia		Jersey		Pitcairn Islands		Uruguay
	Comoros		Jordan		Poland	0	US Virgin Islands
	Congo		Kazakhstan		Portugal	0	Uzbekistan
	Cook Islands		Kenya		Puerto Rico	0	Vanuatu
	Costa Rica		Kiribati		Qatar		Vatican City
	Côte d'Ivoire		Kosovo		Réunion		Venezuela
	Croatia		Kuwait		Romania	0	Vietnam
	Cuba		Kyrgyzstan		Russia	0	Wallis and
							Futuna
	Curaçao		Laos		Rwanda	0	Western Sahara
	Cyprus	0	Latvia		Saint Barthélemy	0	Yemen
	Czechia		Lebanon		Saint Helena	0	Zambia
					Ascension and		
					Tristan da Cunha	ı	

Democratic	Lesotho	Saint Kitts and	Zimbabwe
Republic of the		Nevis	
Congo			
Denmark	Liberia	Saint Lucia	

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. Fo r the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association, 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published. Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

I agree with the personal data protection provisions

### Effectiveness of the CFP Regulation

1. What impact do you think the CFP Regulation has had to?

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion /No answer
The contribution to the environmental sustainability and conservation of marine resources	0	0	0	•	0	0
The contribution to the economic sustainability of people active in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors and consumers	0	0	•	0	0	•
Contributing to the social conditions (fair standard of living; training) of people active in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors and of consumers	0	0	0	0	0	•

1a. What impact do you think the CFP Regulation has had on the contribution to the environmental sustainability and conservation of marine resources

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very Negative	No opinion /no answer
--	------------------	----------	---------	----------	------------------	--------------------------------

Helping to keep fish stocks at healthy levels or bring them back to those levels	0	©	0	©	•	0
Contributing to healthy marine ecosystems (protecting young fish, the seabed, sensitive species such as marine mammals and seabirds and Natura 2000 sites and other marine protected areas and)	•	•	•	•	•	•
Contributing to international ocean governance in support of environmental sustainability	0	•	0	•	•	0
Supporting animal health and welfare	0	0	0	0	0	0

PI	ease	add an	y specific	points you	u want to	raise c	larifying	your abo	ove ranki	ing

1b. What impact do you think the CFP Regulation has had on the contribution to the economic sustainability of people active in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors (owners, workers, employers, operators) and consumers

### specifically on contributing to profitable activities:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion /No answer
in the fisheries catching sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
in the fisheries processing sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
In the fisheries marketing sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
in the aquaculture sector	0	0	0	0	0	0

## What impact do you think the CFP Regulation has had on supporting modernisation and innovation:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion /No answer
in the fisheries catching sector	0	0	0	0	0	0

in the fisheries processing sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
In the fisheries marketing sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
in the aquaculture sector	0	0	0	0	0	0

#### What impact do you think the CFP Regulation has had on the contribution to:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion /No answer
Ensuring availability of food supplies at reasonable prices for consumers	0	©	0	0	0	0
Supplying aquatic food to processors and consumers with adequate level of information	0	0	0	•	•	0
Improving stability of the fishery and aquaculture market	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ensuring fair competition conditions, between stakeholders of the fishery and aquaculture sector on the EU market	0	•	•	•	•	•

Please	add any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking	

1c. What impact do you think the CFP Regulation has had on contributing to the social conditions of people active in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors

Specifically, on ensuring a fair standard of living for the people active in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors (owners, workers, employers, employees, operators), including through a fair and stable income and decent working conditions

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion /No answer
in the fisheries catching sector	0	0	0	0	0	0

in the aquatic food processing sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
In the aquatic food marketing sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
in the aquaculture sector	0	0	0	0	0	0

# What impact do you think the CFP Regulation has had on the following social aspects?

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion /No answer
Ensuring a fair allocation of fishing opportunities to fishers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supporting small-scale fishers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supporting small- scale aquaculture farmers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supporting coastal communities dependent on fishing and aquaculture	0	0	0	0	0	0
Taking into account the interests of consumers by ensuring the availability of food supplies at reasonable prices, enabling informed choices and promoting responsible consumption	0	•	0	•	•	0

Ple	ase ado	l any	specific	points	you w	vant to	raise (	clarifyir	ng your	above	rank	ing

### Efficiency of the CFP Regulation

#### A reminder:

#### The CFP regulation's objectives

"Long-term environmental sustainability" includes the sustainable exploitation of marine biological resources (through the use of maximum sustainable yield) as well as preserving marine habitats and sensitive species.

"Economic benefits" includes increased productivity, stable markets, availability of food supplies, reducing the Union market's dependence on food imports, reasonable prices for consumers, economic development

in coastal areas and overall smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

"Social and employment benefits" includes a fair standard of living for the fisheries sector including small-scale fisheries, improvement of safety and working conditions for fishing operators, direct and indirect job creation, as well as preservation of traditional fishing activities in dependent coastal communities.

2. How you would rate the contribution of the following elements of the CFP Regulation to achieving its objectives?

#### Contribution of **Maximum sustainable yield** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

#### Contribution of the landing obligation on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	•
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Contribution of Fleet capacity limits on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Contribution of the multiannual plans on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	•
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	©

# Contribution of regional cooperation on conservation measures via joint recommendations by the Member States on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

# Contribution of adopting conservation measures necessary for compliance with obligations under EU environmental legislation on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	•
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

# Contribution of adopting Commission (conservation) measures in case of a serious threat to marine biological resources on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	•
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Contribution of **Member State emergency measures** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	•
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Contribution of professional organisations, incl. producer organisations on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	•
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Contribution of allocation of fishing opportunities on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	•
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Contribution of Sustainable Fisheries Partnership Agreements on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

# Contribution of the **international and regional Fisheries management agreements** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Contribution of the **management of stocks shared with third countries** on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
--	------------------	----------	---------	----------	------------------	-------------------------

Environmental objectives	0	0	0	©	0	•
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Contribution of the Commission strategic guidelines and Member States' multiannual national strategic plans on aquaculture on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	•
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

# Contribution of the open method of coordination of Member States on aquaculture on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	•
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Contribution of the marketing standards on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	©
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Contribution of consumer information/ labelling rules on:

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No opinion/No answer
Environmental objectives	0	0	0	0	0	•
Economic objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0

Ple	Please add any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking										
Gc	vernance										
The	eminder: Governand CFP regulation state ernance, including pr	es that the m	_	isheries sh	ould be guided	by principles	of good				
reco	Decision-making by Broad stakeholder process; Taking into accour Transparency and The clear definition visory Councils are submendations on fish wironmental, soci	r involvement regional specified coherence In of responsitate takeholder-leading managethe government of the government	t, in particular and pecificities through the interest of the United at the United organisation gement matters and pance systemance systemance.	advisory con ugh a region ernal and endion, region s that proving.	uncils*, in all standard approach; external dimensional, national and de the Commissional CFP Regula	on of the CFF d local levels; sion and EU o	o. countries with				
CIIV	vironinientai, soci	Very effective	somewhat effective	Neutral	Somewhat ineffective	Not effective at all	No opinion /No answer				
	Environmental sustainability	0	©	0	©	0	0				
	social sustainability	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	Economic sustainability	0	©	0	©	0	0				
Ple	ease add any spe	ecific poin	ts you want	to raise	clarifying yo	ur above ra	anking				

Social objectives

## 4. How effective is the CFP Regulation's governance system in achieving the following:

	Very effective	somewhat effective	Neutral	Somewhat ineffective	Not effective at all	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
In collecting scientific advice	0	0	0	0	0	0
In using scientific advice to inform its policy decisions	0	0	0	0	0	0
In involving stakeholders at all stages of the policy-making process	0	0	0	0	0	0
In empowering stakeholders through professional organisations, in particular producer organisations, to implement the CFP	0	0	0	0	0	0
In managing EU fish stocks in a sustainable way	0	0	0	0	0	0
In managing shared fish stocks in a sustainable way	0	0	0	0	0	0
In managing fish stocks at international level in a sustainable way contributing to international ocean governance	0	0	0	0	0	0
In managing aquaculture in a sustainable way	0	0	0	0	0	0
In contributing to healthy marine ecosystems (protecting young fish, the seabed, Natura 2000 sites and other marine protected areas, sensitive species such as marine mammals and seabirds)	0	0	0	0	0	0
In providing sufficient flexibility to adapt to regional differences: in the European sea basins (Baltic Sea, North Sea, North Western Waters, South Western Waters, Mediterranean Sea, Black Sea)	©	©	0	0	©	0
In providing sufficient flexibility to adapt to regional differences: in the outermost regions	0	0	0	0	0	0
In ensuring transparency in decision making?	0	0	0	0	0	0

Please and any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking
5. To what extent has legal enforcement action at EU level (EU Pilots and
infringements) contributed to ensuring compliance with the CFP Regulation?
Very effective
Effective
Neutral
not very effective
ineffective
No opinion/ unfamiliar with the topic
Please add any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking
Effectiveness and Efficiency

6. How would you rate the following elements that could challenge the successfulness of the CFP Regulation (i.e. achieving objectives)?

	Very important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Not important at all	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
Complexity of CFP legal requirements	0	0	0	0	0	0
Inconsistent or lack of control and enforcement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of flexibility of the legal framework at EU level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of flexibility of the legal framework at regional sea-basin level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of flexibility of the legal framework at national level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difficulties in implementing new technology and innovation to meet CFP objectives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deviation from scientific advice when adopting fisheries conservation measures	0	0	0	0	0	0
Challenges in implementing regionalisation for fisheries measures to contribute to environmental obligations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exemptions to the landing obligation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of attractiveness of the sector: for workers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of attractiveness of the sectorfor fishers and aquaculture producers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of attractiveness of the sector: for investors	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unfair competition	0	0	0	0	0	0
Regional disparities within the EU	0	0	0	0	0	0

Contribution to food security	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of predictability for: Availability of fishing opportunities	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of predictability for: Climate change and weather conditions	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of predictability for: Market conditions	0	0	0	0	0	0

7a. To what extent do you consider the compliance costs generated by the CFP Regulation, including administrative burden, as:

Compliance cost (all direct cost):	High	Somewhat high	Acceptable	Somewhat low	Low	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
in the catching sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
in the processing sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
in the aquaculture sect	0	0	0	0	0	0
for national public authorities	0	0	0	0	0	0
For EU public authorities	0	0	0	0	0	0

Administrative burden (reporting, registration, labelling etc.)

Administrative burden (reporting obligations, registration, labelling etc.)	High	Somewhat high	Acceptable	Somewhat low	Low	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
in the catching sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
in the processing sector	0	0	0	0	0	0
in the aquaculture sect	0	0	0	0	0	0
for national public authorities	0	0	0	0	0	0
For EU public authorities	0	0	0	0	0	0

Please justify your answer, in particular if you considered these costs high (or
unreasonably) by specifying them.
7b. According to your view, which areas of the CFP Regulation have potential for
simplification and cost reduction?
Measures for the conservation and sustainable exploitation of marine
biological resources
Common market organisation
Aquaculture
Control and enforcement

	P Regula	ation				
o what extent do yo ained relevant over	_	_			•	have
	Fully relevant	Somewhat relevant	Neutral	Somewhat irrelevant	Fully irrelevant	No opinion unfamilia with top
Fostering "Long-term environmental sustainability of fishing and aquaculture activities"	0	•	•	•	•	0
Ensuring "Economic benefits"	0	©	0	0	0	0
Ensuring "Social and employment benefits"	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contributing to the availability of food supplies	0	0	0	©	©	0
Pursue the objectives at international level	0	©	0	0	0	0
Contributing to the availability of food supplies  Pursue the objectives	o noints v	© Ou want to		© Cifving your	above ran	kind

10. To what extent do you consider that the following challenges, raised in different stakeholder fora or recommendations, are sufficiently addressed today by the CFP Regulation

	Sufficiently addressed	Somewhat addressed	Neutral	Somewhat not addressed	Not addressed at all	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
Brexit and its effect on the implementation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Governance of commonly shared or managed stocks	0	0	0	0	0	0
Impact of climate change / mitigation and adaptation (e.g. stock migration, natural disasters, invasive species, acidification, heatwaves)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Impact of biodiversity loss including loss of ecosystem services	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pollution, including eutrophication of waters leading to oxygen-deprived marine areas ('dead zones')	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unstable geopolitical context	0	0	0	0	0	0
International competition (eg. economic, market, technological, access to resources)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Inflation and rising operational costs including energy costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Investment capacity, including for the energy transition and modernisation of vessels and equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unstable markets and price volatility	0	0	0	0	0	0
Digital transition	0	0	0	0	0	0
Behavioural changes and shift in consumption patterns	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labour shortage	0	0	0	0	0	0

Recreational fisheries	©	0	0	©	0	0
Competition for space	0	0	0	0	0	0
Management of inland waters	0	0	0	0	0	0
Challenges of small-scale coastal fishing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prevention of food loss and food waste	0	0	0	0	0	0
Animal welfare	0	0	0	0	0	0

Ple	ase add any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking

11. To what extent are the objectives of the current CFP Regulation coherent with the following policies?

### A. In relation to other EU fisheries law:

	Very coherent	Coherent	Neutral	Rather incoherent	Incoherent	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
Control and monitoring	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fight against Illegal unreported and unregulated fishing	0	0	0	0	0	•
Rules on the external fleet	0	0	0	0	0	•
Scientific data collection	0	0	0	0	0	0
Common market organisation	0	0	0	0	0	0

## B. In relation to other EU policies and laws:

	Very coherent	Coherent	Neutral	Rather incoherent	Incoherent	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
Habitats and Birds Directives	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nature restoration law	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water Framework Directive	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marine Strategy Framework Directive	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marine and inland waters	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maritime spatial planning	0	0	0	0	0	0
EU biodiversity strategy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Food loss and waste prevention	0	0	0	0	0	0
Food safety and Health	0	0	0	0	0	0
Common Agricultural Policy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Working conditions and labour standards	0	0	0	0	0	0

### C. In relation to international action:

	Very coherent	Coherent	Neutral	Rather incoherent	Incoherent	No opinion / unfamiliar with topic
Synergy with development policy and recognition of developing countries' needs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sustainable and fair trade	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protection of biodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Promoting international ocean governance	0	0	0	0	0	0
On climate change	0	0	0	0	0	0
UN Agreement on Marine Biodiversity of Areas beyond national jurisdiction	0	0	0	0	0	0
UN Sustainable Development Goals	0	0	0	0	0	0
FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries	0	0	0	0	0	0
FAO Guidelines for Sustainable Aquaculture	0	0	0	0	0	0

Please add any specific points you want to raise clarifying your above ranking, or
add any missing policies or themes you want to raise.
Any further comments?
12. Would you like to be contacted for a more in-depth interview if certain elements
are not covered by this consultation - if so, please elaborate on which topic(s) and
why.
If you are open for a possible interview with DG MARE please leave you email
address in the textbox below:
Have you any further comments on these questions? Or was there a topic
regarding the CFP not yet covered?
Please upload your file(s) you want to share
Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed
Thank you for taking the time to fill in this questionnaire. Your input is much appreciated.

Contact

MARE-D3@ec.europa.eu