

Intermediate evaluation of the Advisory Committee on Fisheries and Aquaculture (ACFA)

Presentation to the Plenary Committee 02.10.2008

COWI A/S (DK) (Malene Sand Jespersen)

Framian (NL) (Pavel Salz)

Nautilus Consultants (UK)

Contents of this presentation

Assignment

Evaluators and process

Study phases

Structure of the report

Options for the future

Conclusions

Recommendations

Assignment

The study is an intermediate evaluation that provides the Commission the necessary information for preparing the preliminary reflections on the future of ACFA.

- representativeness of the fisheries organisations and other stakeholders concerned by the CFP in the EU;
- extent to which ACFA meets its objectives, i.e. effectiveness and efficiency
- Included comparison to similar structures, e.g. RACs

Study commenced in December 2007

Study completed in July 2008 (information and data collection in Spring 2008)

Evaluators and evaluation process

COWI in collaboration with Framian and Nautilus Consultants

Steering Group in DG-MARE - regular consultations - meetings and through phone and e-mail

Short calendar time - scope, approach and progress regularly discussed

Regular reporting: Inception, Interim, Draft final, Final report

Complex assignment:

- Specific evaluation questions - effectiveness, efficiency and representativeness
- Case studies, desk study, interviews, e-survey, similar structures
- Analysis, conclusions and recommendations

Large team with a core analysis team of Pavel Salz, Crick Carlton, Birgitte Martens, Tine V Gundersen and Malene S Jespersen

Study phases

Structuring - scope and information needs

- Intervention logic, interpretation of evaluation questions, breaking down into e-survey questions/interview guides/design of case studies and analyses of similar structures

Information gathering

- Desk study (legislation, other evaluations, financial reports, meeting reports, studies on the sector etc.)
- Interviews, e-survey, case studies, studies on similar structure

Analysis phase

- Answering the evaluation questions through joint combination of results from information gathering

Conclusions and recommendations

Information gathering

Desk study

- documents received from the ACFA Secretariat and Internet based information

E-survey

- Sent to 240 stakeholders, response rate 30%

Interviews:

- 47 with Commission representatives and stakeholders

Participation in Working Group meetings

- Meeting attended of WG II and IV

6 Case studies

- IUU, EFF, WG II, Interface with RACs and two comparisons with similar structures

Main observations

Representativeness

European representation is the target - representing local constituencies throughout relevant MS

Representativeness

- Core interests well represented

- Small scale fisheries

- New Member States

- Retailers

- "Derived interests"

- Banks

- Employees

- Consumers

Main observations

Performance

Impact on Commission proposals difficult to trace

Different perceptions between stakeholders

- Sound technical advice
- Channel of political influence

Networking and dialogue

- Vis-à-vis the Commission
- Across commercial and non-commercial interests
- Between sectors/interests

Consultation processes

WG II (narrowly defined and a single entry point for aquaculture interests)

Areas for improvement

Precise formulation of questions posed to ACFA

Ensure that overlaps between RACs and ACFA agenda items only occur when relevant

Four permanent working groups is inflexible

Transfer information issues to written communication

Secretariat to enhance use of Intranet for circulation of material

Report structure

Final report

- Short description of ACFA
- Key findings on representation and performance
- Conclusions
- recommendations

Technical Annex Report

- Detailed findings on representation and performance
- Documents on ACFA and its functioning
- Case studies
- E-survey

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE

OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Brussels 2.10.2008

PRESENT SITUATION



- Platform - EC - stakeholders dialogue
- Membership - Different backgrounds
- Organization - Bureau, Plenary, WGs
- Procedures - Agenda, meetings, etc.

Satisfaction - reality of dialogue

Dissatisfaction - caused by unjustified expectations

Members: impact is not visible / no decision making powers

EC: Representativeness, commitment to policy

Highly dependent on individual

Lack of clear objective

MEMBERSHIP



Core members

Fleet, processing/trade, aquaculture, NGOs, auctions

Non-core members

Consumers, banks, unions, SSSDC, STECF

New members

Retailers, recreational fishermen (?), ad hoc members

Criteria for membership?

ORGANIZATION



Bureau and Secretariat

Operate well

Some critical remarks from ACFA members

Plenary

Political and technical discussions

Working groups

Many people participating in many topics

CHANGING CONTEXT



Economic

- Size of the sector decreasing

- Role of the market is rising

 - Globalization

 - Retailers and eco-labeling

 - COM policies

Institutional

- Regionalisation – RACs

- Enlargement

- Broadening perspective of CFP and DG Mare

 - Environment, marine-related activities

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Define role and objectives
2. Formulate consultation questions
3. Increase flexibility and rationalize
4. Adapt representation
5. Criteria for membership
6. Electronic exchange of information
7. Exploit industry knowledge
8. Translation of documents
9. Financial support
10. Evaluation and feedback
11. Involve new Member States
12. Outsource support functions
13. Clarify tasks and procedures

IMPLEMENTATION SCALE



Aspect	Type of choice	
Communication	Information	Opinion
Topics	Narrower	Broader
Stakeholders	Less	More
Other DGs	Fewer	More
Timing	Regular	Ad hoc
Detail of output	More detail	Less detail
Positions	Consensus	Separate opinions

SCENARIOS



1. RAC Coordinating Committee
2. Smaller ACFA
3. Larger ACFA – focus on fisheries
4. Maritime Consultative group

THESE ARE NOT BLUEPRINTS!

Advantages

- Formalization of the relation to RACs
- Platform for horizontal issues
- Stress on political discussion
- Consistency with structure of DG Mare

Disadvantages

- EU industry organizations weakened
- Return to 'national interests'
- Regional approach is not relevant for all stakeholders

SMALLER ACFA



Advantages

Suitable for technical advice

Focus, efficiency, quality and clarity strengthened

Disadvantages

Less room for political discussion

Potential loss of interest by stakeholders

LARGER ACFA – CFP FOCUS



Advantages

- Open forum with many interested groups participating
- No need for consensus – sharp formulation of opinions
- 'Political compromise' achieved elsewhere

Disadvantages

- Complexity
- Criteria for participation

Advantages

- Reflect needs of DG Mare
- Limited overlap with RACs

Disadvantages

- Fisheries and CFP lose their central position