

**European Parliament report on
the state of play in the implementation of the CFP
and perspectives after 2020 - Rapporteur: Gabriel Mato**

Questionnaire

1. Objectives of the EU fisheries policy

1.1. Two ambitious objectives of the CFP introduced in 2013: the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) and the landing obligation.

1.1.1. Maximum Sustainable Yield

Questions

- Is achieving MSY for all stocks an achievable / science-based / realistic / proportional objective or is it a utopia?
- Should the terms of the MSY objective be clarified?
- How to apply the MSY objective in multi-species fisheries?
- Should the MSY objective be adapted to the new requirements of the multiannual plans? If yes, how?

1.1.2. Landing obligation

Questions

- Is the landing obligation a relevant / realistic / useful / achievable / science-based / proportional objective / tool?
- Should the terms of the landing obligation be clarified?
- Should the focus be in better documenting catches?
- Should the list of species and stocks to which the landing obligation applies be restrained so that the choke species problems are limited?
- Should some species, where science indicates that have high survivability, or certain gears with very few by-catches be exempted?
- Should the maximum level of the flexibilities foreseen in Article 15 of the basic CFP regulation be adapted to each fishery?
- How can the landing obligation become more attractive and useful for operators?

1.2. The forgotten ones: social and economic considerations and food security

1.2.1. Social aspects:

Questions

- Are socio-economic considerations sufficiently taken into account by the CFP? Is the information on the socio-economic impact of EU policies thorough and available? If not, how to improve the situation and policy-making?
- Do capacity limits in the CFP allow for the improvement of working and living conditions on board fishing vessels?

- How can the EU ensure that the imports from third countries are subject to similar social standards than those applied in the EU? Which tools should the EU use to block seafood products produced by forced labour?

1.2.2. Economic considerations

Questions

- Should economic analysis be done systematically before policy decisions are taken?

1.2.3. Food security

Questions

- How to make the food security consideration more explicit in policy-making?
- Should gear and space restrictions be considered also against food production in Europe?
- How can the EU achieve a reduction of the EU market's dependence on food imports?

1.3. Other general issues to consider about the CFP objectives

General questions on the CFP objectives

- Is the present implementation of the CFP objectives in line with the Treaty?
- Without opposing one another, should we seek a better balance among the various objectives of the CFP, starting by focusing on the “forgotten” ones?
- Are the current CFP objectives realistic / achievable / over-ambitious?
- Should the objectives related to MSY and to the landing obligation be seen as binding law or as orientations / ultimate objectives?
- How to simplify the CFP?

2. Management measures (other than the landing obligation)

2.1. TACs and quotas

Questions

- Is the number of concerned stocks that need to be managed through TACs relevant / efficient / operational?
- Is topping-up a relevant useful tool? Are there other alternatives?

2.2. Multiannual plans

Questions

- Should multiannual plans be maintained as main frameworks for fisheries management?
- Should other sea basins and fish species be covered?

3. Governance

3.1. Organisation within the Commission

Questions

- How can fisheries gain the place it deserves within the Commission, especially given its strategic importance in the recent negotiations following Brexit and during the Covid pandemic?
- How to bridge the distance between the sectors and the Commission?

3.2. Regionalisation

Questions

- Is the procedure, including the required unanimity by Member States, cumbersome?
- What could be done to improve the functioning of this tool?

3.3. Stakeholders' involvement and Advisory Councils

Questions

- Are the composition rules fair / useful?
- How to make sure that everyone's voice is heard / reflected in the advice?
- How to better inform the European Parliament about the ACs' work?
- How can the ACs' advice be valued and sufficiently taken into account by the Commission and Member States, given that sometimes it is largely ignored?
- Should ACs have their own scientists, so that recommendations are based on science?
- Should / could the ACs be delegated co-management powers, allowing thus for a bottom-up approach that would make stakeholders feel more responsible and legislation more flexible and adapted to specific realities?
- In the same vein, can ACs develop a results-based management or co-management, given that a true change of culture can be achieved through incentives and effective participation in the decision-making at early stage and throughout its implementation?

3.4. Decisions based on science and impact assessments

Questions

- How to ensure an independent/reliable scientific advice and systematic impact assessments?
- Should co-legislators / ACs be given the possibility to directly consult ICES and STECF?

3.5. The integration of fisheries into a wider policy context: the fishing sector squeezed between "Scylla" and "Charybdis": Brexit, offshore windmills, Green Deal and biodiversity strategy, climate change, etc.

Questions:

- How to ensure that fisheries and aquaculture are in a fair place with regard to other sectors in policy design or in spatial planning?

4. External aspects

IUU - level playing field - competitiveness of EU sectors

Questions

- Should high sustainability standards be imposed to imported products, aiming at restricting access to the EU market of unsustainable products?
- Should sufficient consideration be given to the impact of any EU measure globally / in third countries?

5. Current challenges

Climate change

Questions

- Considering that the MSY and Good Environmental Status objectives are already integrated in the CFP, does the policy need any further target / tool?
- Which tools / funding opportunities should the EU provide to the sectors affected by climate change?
- How can science help fishermen to adapt to fish distribution shifts and provide fish-forecasts? How will the CFP regulate emerging and declining species? Should a separate funding system be allocated for these purposes?
- How can the EU use science to mitigate uncertainty and potential conflicts?
- How to ensure flexible, adaptive and quick management decisions?
- Do you see the need to adapt EU policies such as the landing obligation to avoid “chokes” of fish movers?
- In order to decarbonize the fishing industry and introduce new propulsion systems such as hydrogen or gas engines, do you see a need to revise legislative limitations such as the capacity ceilings?

6. Outermost regions

Questions

- How to reinforce Article 349 of the Treaty?
- Is the renewal of the artisanal fleets relevant / desirable?
- How to better take into account in a holistic manner issues related to fisheries in the outermost regions? Is a fisheries-POSEI pertinent / desirable?

7. General questions

- What was achieved since the 2013 CFP reform and where are further efforts needed?
- Is it relevant to have a Commission Green Book, like in 2009, envisioning the CFP in the future?
- Is the current CFP a relevant framework for fisheries management?
- Do we need a CFP reform (meaning a legislative amendment of the CFP basic regulation) / review / clarification / interpretation?
- Any other recommendation on the above questions or themes or on any other question or theme is most welcome!