

# Perspectives on the future of the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund

Timo Halonen

Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry

# Finnish priorities for EMFF2

1. Simplification of structure and administration
2. Focus on the main impact objectives
  - Profitability of the entire fisheries value chain
  - Improving the conditions of aquatic resources
3. Continuity of fisheries control, data collecting and IMP financing at national level
4. Finnish special characteristics are taken into account

# Simplification

- Administration of the EMFF must not be rocket science...
  - Proposals for simplification
    1. Remove Partnership Agreement (now double programming)
    2. The level of micro-management and the number of legislative acts (now over 40) in the EU legislation have to be minimized. EU legislation should not go to the level of details, only set the general legal framework.
    3. Simplified cost options and financial instruments should stay and be further developed
    4. The structure of the fund have to be simplified
      - 6 Union priorities, 4 thematic objective, **xx** specific objective and over 50 measures. In practise, funding has to be allocated to all these objectives and measures and they have to be implemented individually.
- => Nightmare from the point of view of programming and implementation

# Focus on the main impact objectives

- Current focus of the implementation is mainly in technical issues and avoiding errors. EMFF2 should shift the focus more to the result-based management. In this respect the following steps could be taken.
- EU legislation should define clear impact objectives in line with the CFP and Blue Growth objectives, e.g. as follows:
  1. **Competitive fisheries value chain**
  2. **Healthy aquatic ecosystems**
  3. **Sustainable blue growth**
  4. **Efficient implementation of the CFP**
- EU legislation should define a general list of non-eligible costs, but it should not go in details at measure level.
- Member States should be able to set national impact objectives and build intervention logic based on their own national circumstances and strategic choices, respecting the EU impact objectives and monitoring logic.
- The dialogue and co-operation between MS and the COM should concentrate on the impacts and causalities behind the development additionally of technical issues.
- Additionally, the performance framework could stay but it should be further developed towards the current model of structural funds.

# Monitoring and evaluation

- Monitoring and evaluation are in key role to demonstrate the effectiveness of the fund. They give information on the causalities behind the development of the fisheries and blue economy sectors. Therefore it should be seen as a strategic element of the implementation both at national and EU level.
- Focus of the EU level monitoring should be on the EU objectives. Quantitative EU indicators should be set to follow the impact of the fund on the main EU objectives.
- A comprehensive impact assessment requires always also qualitative analysis. It can be carried out in the context of the annual implementation report.
- The effect of the EMFF funding under shared and direct management should be monitored following the same logic.
- The attached excel sheet demonstrates a possible structure and monitoring logic for the fund.

# Community-led local development

- The implementation of CLLD should remain voluntary for Member States
- CLLD under EMFF should focus on the CFP and the blue growth objectives at local level.
- CLLD should be seen as a delivery mechanism, not as a measure. This would allow to monitor the effects of CLLD in a same manner as other types of interventions (see excel sheet)

# The possible new structure of the fund

## **Objective/priority 1:** Competitive fisheries value chain

1. Collective actions
2. Investments in sustainable production

## **Objective/priority 2:** Healthy aquatic ecosystems

1. Environmental measures

## **Objective/priority 3:** Sustainable blue growth

1. Creating the preconditions for blue growth

## **Objective/priority 4:** Efficient implementation of the CFP

1. Control and management of fisheries
2. Data collection
3. Technical assistance

## **Advantages:**

- ⇒ The number of the measures reduces from over 50 to 7
- ⇒ Possibility to finance larger thematic projects for the whole value chain
- ⇒ Simpler programming, implementation and monitoring

# Effective implementation calls for more freedom and flexibility

- The world is changing more rapidly than ever. For example enabling technologies (digitalisation, automatisisation, robotisation, big data etc.) will have a significant effect to every sector, even to primary production in the next coming 10 years
- It is crucial that the EMFF2 should have a modern toolbox for fisheries and blue economy actors to be successful in the future opportunities.
- Especially innovation and development measures should be broad and future orientated. Administrative measures should safeguard ecological sustainability while enabling new innovations.
- Legislative micro-management in the investment measures is a real killer. EMFF should enable piloting and testing as well as wide introduction of modern technology and new solutions. Especially in aquaculture the technologies and solutions will develop rapidly.
- The same principles concern also the actions carried out by national public administration (especially fisheries control and data collection)



# Fisheries control and data collection

- The financing to be kept on current level under shared management
- Operational costs should be widely eligible in control measures (especially IT systems and inspectors)
- EMFF support should aim to ensure that MS have enough resources to develop fisheries control
- compare: DC financing ensures full resources for implementation of Data Collection Programmes
- Responsibility to use the funds efficiently and reasonably should lie at every Member State without detailed limitations

# Continuity of the national integrated maritime policy financing

- Integrated maritime policy is one the priority areas in the Finnish EMFF programme 2014-2020
  - It has been used as a strategic instrument to create preconditions for sustainable blue growth at national level
  - Finland has increased IMP budget by using higher national co-financing rate (4 x higher than the minimum)
  - Six focus areas in the Finnish programme
    - Joint surveillance facilities and actions
    - Marine spatial planning
    - Marine knowledge and common database
    - Healthy marine environment
    - Increasing the competence in the maritime sector
    - Strengthening the coordination in national maritime policy
- IMP should remain under shared management
  - Focus on creating national preconditions for Blue Growth

# Cooperation/synergies between funds and direct management of the EMFF

- Taken into account limited budget the EMFF2 should focus on the CFP priorities and boosting blue growth.
- It is important to further develop synergies and cooperation between other ESI funds. For example, the possibility to finance aquatic environmental measures, fish processing and the blue economy sectors from the ERDF and other funds should be very clearly communicated by the Commission.
- Stronger cooperation is also needed in financing measures under shared and direct management. More attention should be paid to increase synergies between national and international actions especially under the Blue Growth and research/development activities in fisheries.
- At the moment financing of coordinated international actions under shared management is almost impossible (different periods for calls, selection criteria etc).
- A new option could be that part of the EMFF financing is allocated to macro-regional areas. This envelop could be delivered for example EASME or Interreg bodies. Member States could boost international cooperation projects by funding integrated national projects (a model similar to integrated Life projects).

# Finnish special characteristics

- **Inland fishing**
  - Value of the inland professional fishing is equal to small-scale coastal fishing
  - Inland fishing use similar gear as coastal fisheries (incl. small trawlers)
  - Important that inland fishing has equal treatment as small-scale coastal fisheries
- **Fishing on ice**
  - Lakes and the whole marine coastal area are covered by ice during winter time
  - Professional fishing requires special equipment and facilities for ice-fishing
  - Ice-fishing takes place without fishing vessel
- **Damages to catches and gear caused by seals and cormorants**
  - One of the main problems in the coastal area and in Lake Saimaa
  - Compensation mechanism is important but only temporary solution
  - Need to develop solutions to protect gear and catches as well as to ensure coexistence of fishermen and seals