



## **Manual of European Environmental Policy**

The following pages are a section from the Manual of European Environmental Policy written by the Institute for European Environmental Policy.

The Manual was published by Earthscan/Routledge from 2010 to 2012. It was designed as an on-line interactive reference work and annual printed versions were also produced.

This section is the text of the Manual as published in 2012. It is therefore important to note the following:

- The contents have not been updated since 2012 and no guarantee is given of the accuracy of the contents given potential subsequent developments.
- The sections include links to external websites (e.g. to legal texts). These links continue to work as long as those links are not broken by those websites.
- The sections also include the original links that enabled interactivity within the published on-line version of the Manual. These links no longer work.

© Copyright IEEP 2014

The Manual should be cited as follows:

Farmer, A.M. (2012) (Editor). Manual of European Environmental Policy. 1043pp. Routledge, London.



# European Fisheries Fund

Note: Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 repeals Regulation (EC) No 1263/1999 (on the Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance) and Regulation (EC) No 498/2007 repeals Regulation (EC) No 2792/1999 (laying down detailed rules and arrangements regarding EU structural assistance).

<b>Formal references</b>	
Regulation (EC) No <a href="#">1198/2006</a> (OJ L223 15.8.2006)	Regulation on the <a href="#">European Fisheries Fund</a>
Proposed 14.7.2004 - ( <a href="#">COM(2004)497</a> )	
<b>Legal base</b>	Article 42 TFEU (originally Art. 42 EEC Treaty) Article 43 (originally Art. 43 EEC Treaty)
<b>Binding dates</b>	
Entry into force	4 September 2006
Applies to Community support policies from	1 January 2007
Regulation (EC) No <a href="#">498/2007</a> (OJ L120 10.5.2007)	Regulation laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No <a href="#">1198/2006</a> on the <a href="#">European Fisheries Fund</a>
Commission Regulation (EU) No <a href="#">1249/2010</a> (OJ L341 23.12.2010)	Amending Regulation (EC) No 498/2007 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 on the European Fisheries Fund
<b>Binding dates</b>	
National strategic plans to be submitted	At latest when submitting national operational programmes
Member State programme progress reports	For the first time in 2008, by 30 June each year
Final programme implementation report	By 31 March 2017
Commission implementation report	For the first time in 2008, by 31 December each year
Programme interim evaluation	In advance of strategic debate
Commission strategic debate with	By 31 December 2011
Member States on plans	
End of programmes period	31 December 2013
Council review of Regulation	By 31 December 2013
<i>Ex post</i> evaluation	By 31 December 2015

## Purpose of the Regulations

The European Fisheries Fund (EFF) sets the framework for the provision of public financial aid to the fisheries sector during the period 2007–2013. It is established by Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006. The Regulation defines what Member States may provide aid for and the levels of co-funding that may be provided. The measures include restructuring support to the

fishing industry, the processing and marketing of fish products, training activities and fisheries management initiatives.

Regulation (EC) No 498/2007 is known as the ‘Implementing Regulation’ and sets out the administrative framework and specifies the individual responsibilities of the Commission and the Member States.

The EFF is a central element of the CFP structural policy. In this sense it complements the CFP rules on national fishing fleet sizes and vessel entry/exit rules (laid out in Regulation (EC) No [2371/2002](#), Chapter III, and Regulation (EC) No [1438/2003](#)). Since the EFF is a key implementing instrument of the CFP, it aims to contribute to attaining the objectives of the CFP, that is, to ‘ensure exploitation of living aquatic resources that provides sustainable economic, environmental and social conditions’ (Article 2, Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002). More specifically, assistance under the EFF should:

- Promote a sustainable balance between fish stocks and the Community fishing fleet.
- Promote sustainable development of inland fishing.
- Strengthen the competitiveness of the fisheries sector.
- Foster the protection and the enhancement of the environment and natural resources where related to the fisheries sector.
- Encourage sustainable development and the improvement of the quality of life in areas with fisheries activities.
- Promote equality between men and women in the fisheries sector and areas.

These aims reflect the shift away from expanding the fisheries sector towards its sustainable development. Rather than focusing on the construction and modernization of fishing vessels, and aquaculture and processing facilities, the EFF supports activities such as vessel decommissioning, fishing effort management plans, fisheries management plans, reducing the impact of fishing gear, environmentally sensitive aquaculture and the development of fishing communities.

## **Summary of the Regulations (EC) No 1198/2006**

The measures that are eligible for funding under the EFF fall under five priorities.

### **Priority axis 1 – adapting the Community fleet**

Under this axis, aid is linked explicitly to the range of EU measures designed to manage the EU's fishing fleets, including: national effort adjustment plans associated with recovery plans and management plans; emergency measures; national decommissioning plans; and the non-renewal of third-country access agreements. Aid can be used for permanent cessation and, in the case of recovery, management and emergency measures, potentially also for temporary cessation.

Funding may be made available for certain investments on board fishing vessels of five years of age or more so long as they do not increase vessel's ability to catch fish. Aid for vessel construction or increasing fishholds is explicitly ruled out. Engine replacement may be supported under certain conditions intended to ensure fishing effort is not increased.

Support may be provided for equipment for reducing the impact of fishing on habitats and the sea bottom and on non-commercial species. Under certain conditions aid may be made available for more selective gears and selectivity projects provided that the new gear 'is more selective and meets recognised environmental criteria and practices which go beyond existing regulatory obligations'.

Small-scale coastal fishing, defined as fishing by vessels under 12 metres and not using towed gear, are afforded a higher (more favourable) rate of public financing for investments on board vessels and concerning selectivity. Provisions are made for people both to leave and enter the fishing industry. This includes support for diversification, retraining, retirement and aid for first time vessel buyers.

## **Priority axis 2 – aquaculture, inland fishing, processing and marketing of products**

A range of aquaculture investments are provided for, as long as these are related to hygiene, human or animal health, product quality or environmental improvement. Support is not to be made available for products that do not find 'normal market outlets' or that could have adverse effects on the policy for the conservation of fishing resources. Finally, aid would not be available for projects failing to comply with the EIA Directive [85/337/EEC](#).

The specific measures eligible under this axis include implementing new methods that substantially reduce environmental impacts or enhance positive environmental impacts, support for traditional activities important for preserving the economic and social fabric and the environment. A significant innovation of the EFF is a provision to support 'aqua-environmental' grants or payments for the use of methods that help to protect and improve the environment and conserve nature. These are broadly equivalent to agri-environment measures, and should support ongoing management activities associated with:

- The protection and enhancement of the environment, natural resources, genetic diversity, and the management of landscape and traditional features of aquaculture zones.
- Participation in the EU's [Eco-Management and Audit Scheme – EMAS](#).
- Organic aquaculture production.
- Operating within restrictions resulting from the designation of Natura 2000 sites.

The EFF increases the scope of the EU fisheries subsidy regime compared to the earlier Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance (FIFG) with the inclusion of an Article on inland fishing, which includes lakes, ponds and river estuaries. Steps must be taken to ensure that inland vessels receiving financial assistance do not shift to marine fisheries. Finally, this axis covers investments in processing and marketing aimed at improving animal and human health, product quality, or environmental improvement.

## **Priority axis 3 – measures of common interest**

The EFF may support actions that aim to contribute to better management of resources or transparency in the marketing of products, by supporting projects that are of interest to groups of people rather than individuals. Specific measures that will be eligible include those designed to protect and develop aquatic fauna, apart from direct restocking. Actions should

contribute to environmental enhancement (that is not just fisheries enhancement) and should involve installations to protect, develop fauna or rehabilitate waterways, including spawning grounds and migration routes. An important provision is for the protection and enhancement of Natura 2000 sites that directly relate to fishing activities.

Other areas eligible for aid under this Axis include: the labelling and promotion of products obtained using low impact or environmentally friendly fishing methods; and pilot projects aimed at disseminating new technical knowledge, testing alternative management techniques and developing and testing methods to improve gear selectivity, reduce by-catches, discards or the impact on the environment.

#### **Priority axis 4 – sustainable development of fisheries areas**

In contrast to the earlier FIFG, the EFF introduces a territorial dimension that seeks to promote ‘sustainable development and improvement of the quality of life of coastal fishing areas’. In other words, some assistance is to be targeted at communities in and around the fisheries sector, and not just fishermen, fish farmers and secondary industries.

Funding should maintain economic and social prosperity of the area, maintain and develop jobs and maintain the value of fisheries and aquaculture products. The quality of the coastal environment is to be promoted, as is cooperation between fishing areas. More specifically, support may be given for: eco-tourism; increasing part-time jobs outside the sector; the local use of catches; protecting the environment to maintain its attractiveness; regenerating and developing coastal hamlets and villages; and protecting and capitalizing on natural and architectural heritage.

Member States are to identify the coastal areas eligible for support. These will normally be smaller than a NUTS III region, have a low population density, fishing should be in decline, or be a small fishing community.

Groups are to be established for each area, consisting of local private and public partners set up to assist the sustainable development of given coastal areas. Groups would be responsible for executing local development actions, based on a bottom-up approach. Their advantage is that they devolve project development, selection and implementation at the local level, and are therefore particularly valuable for small or micro-projects which are frequently overlooked by the central or regional approach applied to most EU funding.

#### **Priority axis 5 – technical assistance**

Member States can use up to 5 per cent of their national allocations to support the preparation, management, monitoring, evaluation, publicity, etc. of the National Operational programme (see Principles and approaches to funding below). In addition to measures delivered at the national level, the Commission would have access to 0.8 per cent of the EFF, to support a range of technical projects.

### **Summary of Regulation (EC) No 498/2007**

Regulation (EC) No 498/2007 was adopted as a complement to the EFF Regulation and is known as the ‘Implementing Regulation’. It sets out the administrative framework and

specifies the individual responsibilities of the Commission and the Member State in relation to the implementation and management of the EFF. The EFF Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 defines the five priority axes for funding and the ‘Implementing Regulation’ details the activities under those axes which Member States fund and include in their National Operational Programmes (see details below about National Strategic Plans and Operational Programmes). The implementing Regulation also provides details about the *ex ante* evaluation to be submitted as annexes to the Operational Programmes. Commission Regulation (EU) No 1249/2010 amended Regulation (EC) No 498/2007 slightly to include greater clarification to Member States with respect to their reporting requirements vis-à-vis their responsibilities to prevent, detect, and in particular, correct irregularities and recover amounts unduly paid.

## Funding allocations and rates

The budget for the EFF is just below €3.8 billion for the 2007–2013 period. Of this, €2.9 billion is for the Convergence areas and €0.9 billion for the non-Convergence areas. EFF budget allocations for Bulgaria and Romania are €70 million and €204 million, respectively.

It is up to the Member States to decide on the proportion of funding to allocate to the different axes. They are not obliged to allocate funds to any specific axis or activity. However, clear ceilings are given for the financing rates, depending on the nature of the measure and the region concerned. EU contributions may be anything up to as much as 100 per cent.

## Principles and approaches to funding

Unlike its predecessor the FIFG, the EFF is not a Structural Fund. Nonetheless, it is subject to similar basic management principles. These include the following:

- *Complementarity, consistency and compliance*: the EFF should be complementary with national, regional and local measures, consistent with EU policies, priorities and activities and compliant with other EU legislation. The Fund is not to contribute to an increase in fishing effort.
- *Partnership*: to cover the national preparation, monitoring and implementation of the Fund. The partnership is to include competent authorities, economic and social partners and ‘any other appropriate body’. The partners are also to be members of the programme Monitoring Committee. While environmental partners are not required, Member States ‘shall establish a broad and effective involvement of all the appropriate bodies ... taking into account ... sustainable development through the integration of environmental protection and enhancement’.

Funding is allocated using multi-annual programmes, as under the FIFG, but the steps involved in developing the programming have changed quite radically, involving the following two main steps:

- *National Strategic Plan (NSP)*: as their names suggest, NSPs are national plans that present an overall strategic vision with regard to the medium-term development policy of the fisheries and aquaculture sector in the Member States. They are developed by the Member States and should contain a summary description of all

aspects of the CFP, set out the priorities, objectives, estimated public funding and deadlines for implementation. Among several areas to be covered, the management of fishing effort and capacity is an area that should receive particular attention. Member States are required to organize a consultation on the NSP and they are to be ‘the subject of a dialogue between the Member State and the Commission’. A strategic debate is due to be held by the end of 2011 by the Commission on the implementation of the NSPs.

- *National Operational Programme (OP)*: OPs set the framework for expenditure. Each Member State should submit to the Commission an OP, setting out the priorities, objectives and indicators, and the principal measures to be funded in order to meet the priorities. Once again, these are to be produced in close consultation with the partners. An *ex ante* evaluation is to be undertaken for each OP, to ensure it is consistent with the national plan and to determine impacts. Within two months of being submitted, the Commission is to evaluate the OPs, although there is no explicit basis on which the Commission can reject an OP.

## Development of the Regulations

### History of EU fisheries subsidies

The EFF is the current framework for the long-established EU fisheries aid policy. Discussion of EU fisheries subsidies goes back to the origins of the CFP. Fisheries subsidies were established in response to demands from some of the original Member States, Italy and France, for assistance to modernize their fleets and infrastructure, and so to improve their relative competitive positions both within the EU and outside it. From 1970 onwards, financial assistance has primarily been delivered through one of the EU's ‘Structural Funds’, the main EU financial instruments to promote ‘structural adjustment’ of the fisheries sector. Initially this was the European Agriculture Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF). Then, since 1993 the FIFG - established by Regulation (EC) No [1260/1999](#) – was the main fisheries structural fund. This was succeeded by the EFF in the 2007–2013 Financial Perspective.

The primary aim of the EAGGF was to increase fish production by supporting capital investment. The aims of the FIFG evolved towards achieving a sustainable balance between resources and their exploitation. This included provisions for the adjustment of fishing effort; reducing the excess capacity of the fishing fleet; early retirement schemes and individual compensatory payments for fishers made redundant as a result of vessel decommissioning; and development of marine protected areas. Vessel modernization and rebuild support still remained however until the latter was phased out in 2002 as part of the CFP reform (with the exception of the EU outermost regions (French overseas departments, the Azores, Madeira and the Canary Islands)). The EFF objectives do not deviate greatly from those of the FIFG, although they are certainly ‘greener’. Aid for vessel construction or increasing fishholds is explicitly ruled out but vessel modernization is still eligible under some conditions, the rigour of which will prove critical in meeting the EFF and CFP objectives.

The FIFG was established in order to simplify and consolidate the various financial mechanisms available to the sector, and thus enable a more strategic approach to be applied to EU funding for fisheries. Placing fisheries funding within the programming framework also provides greater potential for integrated social and economic development in remote

coastal regions of the Member States. The EFF developed the programming framework further through the NSP and OP processes.

EU allocations for FIFG totalled €3.2 billion, of which Spain received nearly half. Member State contributions brought the total allocation of FIFG funding to €4.9 billion<sup>1</sup>. The official ex-post evaluation of the FIFG concluded that the measures aiming to reduce fleet capacity were not sufficient to ensure the reductions in effort needed as the measures taken to limit fishing effort were offset by productivity gain enabled by newly built vessels<sup>1</sup>.

## **EFF development**

The EFF Regulation was originally proposed by the Commission on 14 July 2004 (COM(2004)497). It was not adopted by the Council, however, until two years later, on 19 June 2006. This long period and the drawn-out political negotiations that ensued represent the highly contentious nature of fisheries subsidies and the evolving political context during the 2004–2006 period.

At the time of the proposal the Commission, the then Fisheries Commissioner, Franz Fischler, and a critical mass of Member States were pro-reform. They sought to maintain and build upon the phasing out of vessel building subsidies that was secured as part of the 2002 CFP reform package (see section on [Fisheries](#)). In the same vein, a number of environmental non-government organizations (NGOs) were also campaigning heavily for EU subsidy reform. While many parts of the fishing industry were still lobbying for subsidies, some parts supported the reduction of modernization subsidies in search of a level playing field, knowing that their governments would not make such support available to them.

The EFF proposal was the first fisheries subsidy regime to be subject to a Commission impact assessment. This process received little profile and resource allocation from the Commission, however. Instead it focused on defending and building upon the 2002 subsidy reform package<sup>2</sup>. Nonetheless, in advance of the release of the Commission's proposal, consultations were conducted through the Advisory Committee for Fisheries and Aquaculture (ACFA) and a series of dedicated EU-level stakeholder conferences, involving industry, NGOs and governments. The outcome was an EFF proposal that reflected the reform agenda, with vessel construction not allowed and relatively little modernization support.

In the year of the proposal the EU political scene shifted significantly, having a major impact on the EFF negotiations. The ten new Member States that joined the EU in May 2004 were poorer than the existing EU15 and had high expectations of support for their fisheries sectors. This shifted the balance of power within the Council. The 'Friends of Fishing' coalition that resisted subsidy reform during the 2002 CFP reform process expanded to include Estonia, France, Greece, Italy, Poland, Portugal and Spain, bringing significant weight to calls to soften modernization aid and vessel entry/exit rules when using public aid for scrapping vessels. Lobbying from some sectors of industry for subsidies also increased with rising oil prices and falling revenues from stock decline. Crudely speaking, this further polarized the negotiations against those Member States supporting subsidy reform, often labelled the 'Friends of Fish'.

Several compromise proposals were tabled during the two-year period of negotiations. Towards the end of this period it became apparent that there was enough resistance in the Council and from the Commission to ensure that vessel construction would not be permitted.



Rather, the question became at what cost this would be achieved. The main outcome was provisions for engine replacement. This was advocated by some parts of the industry, and justified by the Commission, on the basis that new engines will harmlessly increase incomes by reducing fuel consumption without any increases in fishing effort because of associated conditions. In practice, the rules are of questionable rigour and engine power is notoriously difficult to monitor. Concessions were also made on State Aid rules.

While the EFF follows most of the principles and approaches of the Structural Funds (such as NSPs and NOPS), it deviates in the area of Community strategic guidelines. Under the original EFF proposal the Commission was to propose Community strategic guidelines for adoption by the Council. These are not required under the final EFF Regulation however. They would have established a framework for the preparation and the implementation of the Fund and defined the priorities for assistance. Instead, a Commission services working document was developed to guide Member States in drafting the NSP. This paper was written on the basis of conference discussions on the future programming of the EFF in Ouranopoulis, Greece, on 27 and 28 May 2005. As the paper was not adopted by the Commission College, it has not been published.

The ‘Implementing Regulation’ (EC) No 498/2007 was adopted almost six months after the adoption and publication of the EFF Regulation. The implementation Regulation is most important since it gives more details on where money can be spent, but it also defines the respective roles of Commission and the Member States. The implementing Regulation refers directly to the Articles of the EFF Regulation and the priority axes outlined there.

## **Implementation of the Regulations**

It took some time for the Member States to finalize their NSPs and OPs. At the end of 2007, it was very unclear which Member States had finalized their NSPs and OPs and dissimilarities have been observed among Member States regarding the degree of consultation with stakeholders and the environmental integration. Many argued that the EFF Regulation has not included enough compulsory elements, which might have led to different degrees of implementation by Member States. This appears to be the case with *ex ante* assessment including Strategic Environmental Assessments for instance. However, OPs for 26 Member States (Luxembourg – the only landlocked Member State – does not have an OP) were eventually published during 2008 and are available on the Commission's website<sup>3</sup>.

The implementation of these OPs is now underway. Each year the managing authorities must send the Commission an annual report. The Commission summarizes these reports in its own annual report which it sends to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions. The Member States must also send a final report on the implementation of the Operational Programme before 31 March 2017. However, these are retrospective and the content of the First Annual Report from the Commission for 2007 ([COM\(2009\)6](#)) was limited as, by the end of 2007, only 19 (out of 26) OPs were adopted. The remaining seven OPs were adopted in the second half of 2008. Due to the late adoption of OPs, by the end of 2008 only a very small number of Management and Control Systems (MCS) and Audit Strategies had been accepted by the Commission. As a result of the low rate of implementation the Second Annual Report on the Implementation of the EFF ([COM\(2009\)696](#)) concentrates more on the way the OPs are programmed than on the actual execution, which remained limited at that stage.

The Third Annual Report on the Implementation of the EFF ([COM\(2011\)37](#)) covered the implementation of the EFF in 2009, by which time most Member States had at last begun to implement the Regulation. The overall EFF execution at the end of this third year was 18.4 per cent (€793,894,729) in terms of commitments and 4.1 per cent (€175,029,780) in terms of payments. Out of 4.1 per cent paid, interim payments reached € 66,208,380, the rest was due to the pre-financing payments. Member States reports on EFF implementation for 2007-2009 showed that the mid-term targets of reducing EU fleet gross tonnage (GT) by 7 per cent by 2010 and reducing kilowatt power (kW) by 15 per cent for 2007-2013 had been reached. However, only half of the overall reduction occurred due to EU assistance. Rather, it seems that economic problems and overexploited fishery resources led to significant numbers of vessels being withdrawn without public aid. With respect to axis 4 in particular (sustainable development of fisheries areas), a review of the progress of implementation reveals that there is a huge amount of potential for interesting work to be undertaken in Europe's fisheries areas<sup>4</sup>. The report highlights delays experienced in implementing Axis 4, which indicate just how much support and resources are needed at all levels (EU, national and local) to put in place a system so radically different from the previous funding programme.

On 18 May 2011 the Commission published the interim evaluation of the European Fisheries Fund (EFF) prepared by Ernst and Young.<sup>5</sup> The study, commissioned by DG Mare, aimed to provide an up-to-date evaluation of the implementation of the EFF to date; to assess the uptake and impact of the EFF measures implemented by Member States; and to assess the level of achievement by each axis of the objectives of the EFF regulation. The findings supported those in the Third Annual Report on the Implementation of the EFF ([COM\(2011\)37](#)). It concluded that the National Strategic Plans (which preceded the NOPs) provided for a better strategic view on the development of the sector, but were time consuming only to be disregarded once the NOP was adopted. The report suggested this be revised to reduce the time and effort burden. Similarly, the management and control system introduced in the EFF was also a lengthy and costly process for both the Commission and Member States. Furthermore, as some Member States were focused on wrapping up FIGG, the establishment of the new system was delayed further. The report also highlighted that there was confusion of overlap between measures under different axes, which resulted in difficulties for beneficiaries applying for the funds, and hence delays in setting up projects. Another finding was that monitoring and evaluation of the OPs was made difficult because of inconsistent and unsystematic use of indicators (the report therefore called for a reduction and standardisation of indicators).

In 2011 the Commission published its fourth Annual Report ([COM\(2011\)927](#)) on the Implementation of the EFF during 2010. The report indicated that implementation of the EFF started to accelerate in 2010, after the delays in implementation in previous years. By the end of the year 36.13 per cent of the overall EFF allocation was committed to concrete projects, almost twice the amount committed at the end of 2009. Furthermore, the allocation by axis provided evidence of progress not only for Axis 1, in which the financial absorption is facilitated by the high intensity of the aid, but also to aid relative to Axes 2 and 3. However, only 0.7 per cent of the total EFF allocation was put towards Axis 4. Nevertheless, the report gave particular attention to the role of then European Fisheries Areas Network (FARNET) Support Unit in providing tailored support to Member States and local actors for Axis 4 funding. Implementation had accelerated with 170 Fisheries Local Action Groups (FLAGs) selected by the end of 2010.

Another report published in 2011 by the European Court of Auditors ([2011/C 364/07](#)) provided useful insights relating to the impacts of EFF measures, with respect to their ability to adapt the capacity of the fleet to available resources. The audit was carried out at the Commission and in seven Member States (Denmark, Spain, France, Italy, Poland, Portugal and the United Kingdom) selected on the basis of the size of their fleets and the resources available for adapting their fleets under the EFF. The Court of Auditors found weaknesses in the framework for measures to bring fleet capacity in line with available resources and numerous flaws in the design and implementation of fleet reduction measures. It concluded that measures taken so far to adapt fleet capacity to resources had been unsuccessful. It made a series of recommendations based on its findings to the Commission, which fed into the reform of the EFF.

## **Enforcement and court cases**

No relevant cases have reached the European Court of Justice.

## **Further developments**

On 22 April 2009, the European Commission adopted a Green Paper on the future of the EU's CFP ([COM\(2009\)163](#)). The paper analyses the shortcomings of the CFP and launches a broad public consultation on the reform of the CFP which runs until 31 December 2009. This consultation process is a first step in bringing about what is anticipated to be a radical reform of the CFP (see section on [Fisheries](#)). This reform is likely to have significant implications on the future of the EFF. Among the shortcomings of the EFF mentioned in the Green Paper are the continuation of financial support that contributes directly to overcapacity and the lack of conditionality in the way Member States can spend their fisheries funds.

In the responses to the Green Paper consultation there was an agreement amongst contributors that any future public funding for the fisheries sector should accompany the transition under the CFP reform process and ease adjustment of the industry, aiming at long-term economic and social sustainability. In particular, EU support should be better defined and targeted focusing on research and innovation, enhancing marine protection, and supporting fisher's organisations and local development (Axis 4, sustainable development of fisheries areas) ([SEC\(2010\)428](#)). Increased conditionality between EU financing and reaching CFP objectives also received broad support.

On 29 June 2011, the European Commission formally tabled its proposals for the next Multi-annual Financial Framework (MFF) 2014-2020 ([COM\(2011\)500](#)). The Commission proposals followed extensive internal discussions and set out the strategic direction of the next seven year budget period. It contained a fiche on fisheries policy announcing the priorities for the new fund for the EU's fisheries and maritime policies, the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF). The draft Regulation ([COM \(2011\)804](#)) and impact assessment ([SEC\(2011\) 1416](#), [SEC\(2011\) 1417](#)) were published in December 2011. The new fund will replace the existing EFF and a number of other instruments, and establish a financial framework for the CFP and the IMP for the period 2014 to 2020. The proposed EMFF budget amounts to €6.5 billion for the seven year period, to which €916 million will be added to finance external fisheries agreements and the compulsory contributions to regional fisheries management organizations. Of the €6.5 billion, €1 billion will be

earmarked for the IMP, which leaves fisheries with a marginally greater budget at fixed value than what is available under the EFF (€4.3 billion).

## Related legislation

There are a number of other Directives and Regulations which relate to the EFF. It could (potentially) be used to implement marine aspects of the Habitats Directive [92/43/EEC](#). In addition, projects funded by the EFF must comply with the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive [85/337/EEC](#).

## References

1 Ernst & Young, 2010. *Ex post* evaluation of the Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance (FIFG) 2000-2006. Executive summary (16pp.), Vol. 1 (194pp.) and 2 (332pp.), March 2010.

[http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/fifg\\_evaluation/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/fifg_evaluation/index_en.htm)

2 Brown, J (2006) *Evolution of the EU Fisheries Subsidy Regime: Drivers and Approaches*, Paper presented to OECD Workshop on Subsidy Reform and Sustainable Development, Helsinki, Finland, 20–1 June 2006. IEEP, London,

<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/22/22/36992206.pdf>

3 CEC (2008) Operational Programme adopted by Member States for the period 2007–2013, Commission website,

[http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/cfp/structural\\_measures/operational\\_programmes\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/cfp/structural_measures/operational_programmes_en.htm)

4 Farnet, 2010. State of Play of Axis 4 in the Member States. May 2010.

[https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/cms/farnet/sites/default/files/documents/Axis4\\_stateofplay\\_Y1\\_overview.pdf](https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/cms/farnet/sites/default/files/documents/Axis4_stateofplay_Y1_overview.pdf)

5 Ernst & Young (2011), [Interim Evaluation of the European Fisheries Fund](#) (2007-2013) Final report, 115pp