

Fisheries Omnibus MAP

Response to the Call for Evidence

Contents

Focus on the solutions, not the distractions: Implementation, enforcement, investment..	2
On the Multiannual Plans	3
1) On the Western Mediterranean MAP	3
2) On the Northern MAPs	5
3) Strengthening implementation and enforcement of fisheries and environmental laws and policies.....	7
Supporting implementation of MAPs through Ocean Act and MFF	8
About ClientEarth	10

Focus on the solutions, not the distractions: Implementation, enforcement, investment

The recent State of EU fisheries report is unequivocal: “Minimising negative impacts of fishing on the marine environment, its habitats and species must continue in order to safeguard the very basis of fisheries prosperity.”¹

This imperative must lead any discussion on a potential Fisheries Omnibus on Multiannual Plans (MAPs). Safeguarding the foundations of fisheries cannot be achieved by deleting or weakening key safeguards within the MAPs – such as the provisions on most vulnerable stocks (MVS) in the Western Mediterranean MAP and the 5% rule in the Northern MAPs². Undermining these measures risks further deteriorating the state of fish stocks, and with that, as acknowledged by the European Commission, “the prospects of the future generation of fishers”.³ Instead, all evidence points to the fact that we need full focus on delivery: **effective implementation of existing tools, consistent enforcement of under-applied laws, and substantial investments in low-impact fishing practices and marine protection.**

It’s a matter of European strategy: Today’s unstable supply chains and tense geopolitical context demand strong action to ensure Europe’s strategic autonomy, resilience and prosperity. The World Economic Forum declares biodiversity loss and ecosystem collapse – including the marine ecosystem – as one of the most severe risks in the next decade⁴. And yet, Europe’s seas are “generally in poor condition due to increasing pressures from human activities”, with more than “93% of Europe’s marine areas (...) already under pressure from human activities⁵. It is estimated that 40% of fish and shellfish populations in Europe’s seas are “still not in good status or fished sustainably”⁶. Climate change may also “account for up to half of the combined impacts on marine ecosystems”⁷. While EU’s Member States have not achieved the goal of Good Environmental Status of marine waters by 2020, overfishing is still happening despite the legal deadline to end it by 2020, and we are still far away from having enough effectively managed Marine Protected Areas by 2030. Without fish, there is no fishing, no value chain, and no thriving coastal economy.

At the same time, case law from the world’s top courts – the International Tribunal of the Law of the Sea and the International Court of Justice⁸ – point to the legal pathway to take. These principles are directly relevant to fisheries governance: The EU and all EU Member States need to follow a “stringent” due diligence standard when fulfilling their international obligations to protect the marine environment and fight climate change⁹. It results from it that the room for discretion is limited, measures taken must be based on

¹ European Commission, [Sustainable fishing in the EU: state of play and orientations for 2027](#), COM(2026) 271 final.

² As the focus of the European Commission’s Call for Evidence for an Impact Assessment, [Fisheries management rules revision – Omnibus](#), Ares(2026)5273261, May 2026.

³ European Commission, [Sustainable fishing in the EU: state of play and orientations for 2027](#), COM(2026) 271 final.

⁴ World Economic Forum, [Global Risks Report 2025](#).

⁵ EEA Report, [“Healthy Seas, thriving fisheries: transitioning to an environmentally sustainable sector”](#), August 2024.

⁶ EEA Report, [“Healthy Seas, thriving fisheries: transitioning to an environmentally sustainable sector”](#), August 2024.

⁷ EEA, [“How climate change impacts marine life”](#), November 2023.

⁸ See recent landmark advisory opinions: International Tribunal of the Law of the Sea (ITLOS), [Request for an Advisory Opinion Submitted by the Commission of Small Island States on Climate Change and International Law, Advisory Opinion](#), No. 31, 21 of May 2024 (**ITLOS, AO 2024**); International Court of Justice (ICJ), [Obligations of States in Respect of Climate Change, Advisory Opinion](#), I.C.J. Reports 2025, 21 of July 2025 (**ICJ, AO 2025**). Another breakthrough advisory opinion has been issued by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACtHR), [The Climate Emergency and Human Rights. Advisory Opinion OC-32/25](#), 29 April 2025, (**IACtHR, AO 2025**).

⁹ Cf. ITLOS, [AO 2024](#), para. 239; ICJ, [AO 2025](#), paras. 138 and 343.

best available science and the precautionary approach.¹⁰ And most importantly: State action is not limited to promises on paper – the EU and all EU Member States need to ensure that laws are applied, including through monitoring and enforcement, which requires a “certain level of vigilance in their enforcement and the exercise of administrative control”¹¹.

All of this leads to a clear conclusion for the ongoing Call for Evidence for a potential Fisheries Omnibus on the Multiannual Plans¹²: The priority must now be on delivering the transition to sustainable fisheries in practice, including through the implementation and enforcement of the Multiannual Plans across the sea basins.

On the Multiannual Plans

Multiannual Plans (MAPs) are a key tool for fisheries management to achieve the objectives of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP). They include roadmaps to ensure the sustainable exploitation of important fish stocks, including rules on fishing efforts, control rules and technical measures.

There are four EU Multiannual Plans adopted:

- Regulation 2016/1139 (Baltic Sea MAP)
- Regulation 2018/973 (North Sea MAP)
- Regulation 2019/472 (Western Waters MAP)
- Regulation 2019/1022 (Western Mediterranean MAP).

1) On the Western Mediterranean MAP

In its Call for Evidence for an Impact Assessment, the European Commission suggests focussing on mixed fisheries and most vulnerable stocks (MVS) in the Western Mediterranean MAP “while ensuring that stocks are maintained at levels consistent with maximum sustainable yield”.¹³

Evidence points to the fact that better implementation of the MAP, including on most vulnerable stocks and mixed fisheries is needed, not weakening essential safeguards that guarantee fish prosperity.

The Commission itself confirms that the Western Mediterranean MAP has proven to be beneficial to implement the CFP, especially due to the “combination of measures, the plan has made it possible to keep all demersal fisheries open” and most demersal stocks are now on the path to recovery. The plan particularly “provides **greater certainty, transparency and predictability** and it creates the basis for the long-term **profitability of the fishing industry and ancillary sectors**.”¹⁴ (*emphasis added*)

Yet, the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) has not been overall achieved, fish stocks recovery remains incomplete, and several stocks are still in poor condition – especially for the Western Mediterranean

¹⁰ The precautionary approach is an “integral part of the general obligation of due diligence” under the duty to prevent significant harm to the environment, [ICJ, AO 2025](#), para. 242, quoting from para. 131 of ITLOS, [Responsibilities and obligations of States with respect to activities in the Area](#), Advisory Opinion, 1 February 2011, ITLOS Reports 2011, p. 10, at p. 47, para. 135.

¹¹ Cf. ICJ, [AO 2025](#), para 281; ITLOS, [AO 2024](#), para 235.

¹² European Commission, Call for Evidence for an Impact Assessment, [Fisheries management rules revision – Omnibus](#), Ares(2026)5273261, May 2026.

¹³ European Commission, Website [Fisheries management rules revision – Omnibus](#), June 2026.

¹⁴ European Commission, [First report on the implementation of the Multiannual Plan for the fisheries exploiting demersal stocks in the Western Mediterranean Sea](#), COM(2024) 322 final, July 2024.

waters, certain stocks such as European hake and one stock of Norway lobster “remain severely overfished, in an overall context of many years of overfishing and environmental change”.¹⁵

It should be noted that, according to the CFP Basic Regulation, the maximum sustainable yield exploitation rate shall have been achieved by 2015 where possible, and, on a progressive, incremental basis at the latest by 2020 for all stocks. The Western Mediterranean MAP has added another transitional phase to gradually moving towards achieving MSY, according to which the target fishing mortality – in line of ranges of F_{msy} – shall be achieved on a progressive, incremental basis by 2020 where possible, and by 1 January 2025 at the latest. Hence, the CFP and the MAP already provide for several transitional periods to allow fleets to adapt based on socio-economic considerations.

Now, after more than a decade of “extra”, additional adaptation time, policy- and decision-makers should not think about weakening standards and provisions that are exactly there to improve the fish prosperity, but rather think about how to strengthen their implementation. This is re-affirmed by the Commission itself in the recent EU State of fisheries report: “Even if factors other than fishing are affecting fish stocks, fishing is a major contributor to the state of fish stocks. Efforts must therefore continue - **and even accelerate** - to improve the sustainability of stocks not yet fished within MSY target levels.”, as “[w]ithout a healthy marine environment and healthy fish stocks, there can be no fisheries for future generations.” (*emphasis added*)

This also applies for MVS and Articles 2(3) and 4(3) of the Western Mediterranean MAP. The provisions ensure that, in mixed fisheries, the fishing effort is established within the range of the F_{msy} of the most vulnerable stock – hence, for the stock that suffers the most. It prevents that fish stocks like e.g. European hake collapse ‘just’ because it has been caught in mixed fisheries.

Articles 2(3) and 4(3) establish a “safeguard” – being defined in Article 4(1) No. 19 of the CFP Basic Regulation as “a precautionary measure designed to avoid something undesirable occurring”. The **precautionary approach** – aiming in this context to ensure fisheries prosperity and with that, economic prosperity – is required not only under Article 3(1) of the Western Mediterranean MAP and Article 2(2) of the CFP Basic Regulation, but is already stemming from Article 191 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union – fully in line with the recent international case law stressing the relevance of the precautionary principle.¹⁶

Articles 2(3) and 4(3) of the Western Mediterranean MAP translate the precautionary principle into a **legally certain and predictable tool**, doing so within an already compromise-based balance. The Western Mediterranean MAP is the regional concretisation of European wide norms and entails adapted provisions reflecting the realities of the sea basin. Next to the overall 10 years of additional adaptation time (see above) and other tools within the MAP, this MVS safeguarding mechanism still provides for exemptions (see esp. Article 4(5) point c) preventing too high variations in fishing efforts between consecutive years).

To allow higher fishing efforts also in mixed fisheries, it is therefore key to accelerate action on the most vulnerable species – instead of risking their collapse, which is of particular relevance from a socio-economic point of view. Business as usual (of overfishing already depleted stocks for the sake of choke avoidance) is the reason for the need for further measures in the first place; a continuation of business as usual merely perpetuates the dire state these depleted stocks are in and the eternal choke risks they pose.

¹⁵ European Commission, First report on the implementation of the Multiannual Plan for the fisheries exploiting demersal stocks in the Western Mediterranean Sea, COM(2024) 322 final, July 2024.

¹⁶ The precautionary approach is an “integral part of the general obligation of due diligence” under the duty to prevent significant harm to the environment, ICJ, AO 2025, para. 242, quoting from para. 131 of ITLOS, Responsibilities and obligations of States with respect to activities in the Area, Advisory Opinion, 1 February 2011, ITLOS Reports 2011, p. 10, at p. 47, para. 135.

In other words: The only sustainable solution for choke issues (also for the future of fishers that depend on a healthy, resilient and productive ocean) is to prioritise the recovery of stocks that are below sustainable levels so they no longer pose a choke risk.

Interestingly, also the latest Implementation Report, as well as the recent CFP evaluation report¹⁷ and the newest State of EU fisheries, **identify the lack of implementation and enforcement as the major issue for achieving the environmental and socio-economic objectives:**

“[M]ixed trends in demersal stocks and the profitability of these fisheries also results from delays and limited ownership by Member States such as increase in catches of juvenile fish, structural overcapacity, increase of twin trawler use as well as shortcomings in control and enforcement in some Member States. **The Commission is of the view that the imbalance between fishing opportunities and fleet capacity has undermined the positive impacts of the plan and delayed stocks’ recovery at a severe cost to fishers’ livelihood.** Nevertheless, the Commission acknowledges the ongoing effort of the fishing sector and stakeholders to reduce pressure on fish stocks based on scientific advice. The Commission has frequently encouraged Member States to collect quality data and to ensure scientists from the three Member States concerned (Spain, France, and Italy) are involved in providing scientific input to the plan.”¹⁸

In the same vein, the State of EU fisheries report stresses once more the need to accelerate action in practice: “Action must continue to reduce fishing mortality and reach the MSY objective, in particular through the Western Mediterranean multiannual management plan (‘West Med MAP’) and the 2030 strategy of the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM).”¹⁹

2) On the Northern MAPs

In its Call for Evidence for an Impact Assessment, the European Commission suggests focussing on the 5% rule in the Northern MAPs.²⁰

Evidence points to the fact that better implementation of the 5% rule and provisions on fish stock recovery is needed, not weakening essential safeguards that guarantee fish prosperity.

The Commission itself concludes in the Baltic Sea MAP in its 2024 Implementation Report that this MAP provides a stable long-term instrument to implement the CFP, as it “(i) offers **less uncertainty for quota setting**; (ii) allows the adoption of **remedial measures for stocks under pressure** (including in the case of a fishing closure); (iii) makes the **quota-setting process more transparent** for stakeholders and Member States; and (iv) **allows the fishing industry to better plan its fisheries.**”²¹

Yet, “[b]oth the Baltic Sea marine environment and the fish stocks of the Baltic Sea have continued to deteriorate since the first report.”²²

¹⁷ See below, section 3).

¹⁸ European Commission, [First report on the implementation of the Multiannual Plan for the fisheries exploiting demersal stocks in the Western Mediterranean Sea](#), COM(2024) 322 final, July 2024.

¹⁹ European Commission, [Sustainable fishing in the EU: state of play and orientations for 2027](#), COM(2026) 271 final.

²⁰ European Commission, [Website Fisheries management rules revision – Omnibus](#), June 2026.

²¹ European Commission, [Second report on the implementation of the Multiannual Plan for the stocks of cod, herring and sprat in the Baltic Sea and the fisheries exploiting those stocks, and on the delegation of powers conferred to the Commission by this Mutliannual Plan](#), COM(2024) 703 final, September 2024.

²² European Commission, [Second report on the implementation of the Multiannual Plan for the stocks of cod, herring and sprat in the Baltic Sea and the fisheries exploiting those stocks, and on the delegation of powers conferred to the Commission by this Mutliannual Plan](#), COM(2024) 703 final, September 2024.

Similar observations have been made by the European Commission for the North Sea MAP and the Western Waters MAP: “The Commission concludes that the **MAPs provide a stable long-term instrument to implement the CFP** in the North Sea and Western Waters since they offer **less uncertainty when setting TACs**, ensure the adoption of **remedial measures for stocks under pressure** (including in the case of a fishing closure), make the **TAC-setting process more transparent** for stakeholders and EU Member States, and **allow the fishing industry to better plan their fisheries**.”²³

A major reason why the MAPs have not fully succeeded is the lack of the full implementation and enforcement of the MAPs and its related laws and policies. By way of example, the Commission expressed its concerns about some elements of the Council agreement for the 2026 fishing opportunities for the Baltic Sea that “are less likely to contribute to the rebuilding of the fisheries that rely on the recovery of certain stocks for their economic activities”; and adds once again: “Overall, the dire environmental state of the Baltic Sea leads to the pressing **need to fully implement the EU legislation** at all levels in an effective manner and to allow a rebuilding trajectory.”²⁴

One of the key safeguards to prevent fish stocks from collapsing is Article 4(6) of the Baltic and of the North Sea MAPs, and Article 4(7) of the Western Waters MAP. They provide that fishing opportunities shall in any event be fixed in such a way as to ensure that there is less than a 5 % probability of the fish stocks falling below the limit level that endangers their ability to replenish (called ‘Blim’).

The failure to prioritise the rapid recovery of depleted and struggling fish populations only perpetuates their dire state and traps fisheries in an undesirable situation that is eternally overshadowed by choke risks. Not the 5% rule risks leading to abrupt or drastic curtailments of fishing opportunities to ensure some fish will be there at all in future – but the habit to overfish and failure to rebuild depleted stocks. Hence, the only solution to avoid choke situations can be to accelerate, not slow down nor block progress on fish stock recovery.

ClientEarth and other stakeholders have continuously produced recommendations and briefings for the assistance of the responsible decision-makers in the European Union as well as the United Kingdom. The joint TAC Briefing Series “Recommendations to the EU and the UK on fishing opportunities”²⁵ highlights **that fully recovery-focused, precautionary and ecosystem-based scientific advice is needed** to form the bedrock of a healthy, resilient and productive ocean that can support thriving, sustainable fisheries and coastal communities – and that the current advice requested from ICES on fishing opportunities do not fully reflect all relevant legal requirements and policy objectives. Among others, this relates to the lack of precaution in the current advisory approach which is of particular relevance why the 5% rule must be kept. For more detail, we refer to the series’ Briefing 3 on TAC-setting in an ecosystem context²⁶ and Briefing 9 on depleted stocks and rebuilding²⁷.

The 5% rule provides for a **legally certain and predictable tool**, doing so within an already **compromise-based balance**. The same arguments are valid for its necessity as a safeguard mechanism, effectuating the legally required **precautionary approach**, as for the Western Mediterranean MAP safeguards outlined in the section above.

²³ European Commission, [First report on the implementation of the multiannual plans for the North Sea and Western Waters and the fisheries exploiting those stocks and on the delegation of powers conferred to the Commission by these multiannual plans and by the Deep-Sea Access Regulation](#), COM(2024) 406 final, September 2024.

²⁴ European Commission, [Agreement reached on 2026 fishing opportunities for the Baltic Sea](#), October 2025.

²⁵ ClientEarth and others, [Joint Briefing Series: Recommendations to the EU and the UK on fishing opportunities](#), July 2025.

²⁶ ClientEarth and others, [Briefing 3: “Best available” is not good enough - addressing shortcomings in the current scientific advice](#), July 2025.

²⁷ ClientEarth and others, [Briefing 9: Depleted stocks with zero or very low catch advice](#), July 2025.

Finally, deleting or weakening the 5% rule would also have major adverse implications for the EU politics and beyond, as **refraining from fishing below Blim is considered around the world as one of the basic elements of sustainable management**. This has been stressed by ClientEarth and others in a letter to the European Commission following its – unsuccessful – attempt to delete the 5% rule in 2023:

“Maintaining fish populations within safe biological limits by refraining from fishing below Blim is considered by fisheries managers around the world to be one of the basic elements of sustainable management. This is also a precondition for making MSY possible, as highlighted by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, which uses the Blim rule as a basis for its advice on fishing opportunities. Deviating from this fundamental principle would damage the credibility of the EU as a leader in international fisheries and ocean governance, and would also mean a degradation of sustainability standards for the European industry on the seafood market.”²⁸

Remarkably, the 2023 proposal of the Commission to remove the safeguards has been **rejected by the European Parliament’s Committee on Fisheries** in September 2024.²⁹ In addition, the **European Parliament** has recently adopted the INI Report on the Baltic Sea³⁰, not asking for the revision of the 5% rule. Instead, it stresses once more the relevance to “fully implement all relevant EU legislation in the Baltic and improve implementation of the regional sea convention HELCOM’s Action Plan in order to tackle the ecosystem failure in the Baltic Sea”³¹; and “(...) non-compliance are ongoing issues in Baltic fisheries and should be addressed accordingly through the implementation of the revised Fisheries Control Regulation”³².

The European Parliament specifically stresses that the “insufficient application of a precautionary approach when setting quotas have undermined progress”³³ – hence, it is clear that the 5% rule is one of the core provisions of the Northern MAPs to implement, instead of weakening them. As a way forward, the European Parliament calls, among others, for urgent actions from the Commission and the Council “to ensure the effective use of all existing available legal and management tools, including targeted measures, using a science-based approach as well as effective stakeholder consultation, to prevent any further decline in the Baltic Sea fish stocks”³⁴.

3) Strengthening implementation and enforcement of fisheries and environmental laws and policies

The findings on the Western Mediterranean MAP and the Northern MAPs outlined in section 1) and 2) are supported by the latest evidence from the CFP evaluation report³⁵. This report highlights significant shortcomings concerning the “**control, enforcement and implementation** of essential EU rules which jeopardised the long-term objectives of the CFP”. At the same time, it points to the socio-economic need to ensure healthy fish stocks and healthy marine ecosystems and concludes: the “CFP Regulation provides a coherent mechanism to reconcile its three core objectives (environmental, economic and social sustainability): when stocks are healthy, the fleet has the opportunity to make a profit which can then be translated into employment and/or wage benefits. Perceptions of incoherence are linked to uneven

²⁸ ClientEarth and others, Call to European Commissioner Sinkevicius: Preserve EU seas from overfishing - do not delete the last remaining safeguards, December 2023.

²⁹ FishSec, PECH rejects attempt to remove safeguards in management plans, September 2024.

³⁰ European Parliament, The multiannual plan for the Baltic Sea and ways forward, P10_TA(2026)0189, May 2026.

³¹ European Parliament, The multiannual plan for the Baltic Sea and ways forward, P10_TA(2026)0189, May 2026 (Recital R).

³² European Parliament, The multiannual plan for the Baltic Sea and ways forward, P10_TA(2026)0189, May 2026 (Recital V).

³³ European Parliament, The multiannual plan for the Baltic Sea and ways forward, P10_TA(2026)0189, May 2026 (Recital AC).

³⁴ European Parliament, The multiannual plan for the Baltic Sea and ways forward, P10_TA(2026)0189, May 2026 (1.).

³⁵ European Commission, Evaluation of the Common Fisheries Policy, SWD(2026) 120 final, April 2026.

implementation that break the links in this logical chain: if healthy stocks are not achieved, there can be no socio-economic viability.”³⁶

In the same vein, the latest State of EU fisheries report confirms: “Insufficient adjustment of fishing capacity to fish stocks in certain fleet segments combined with reduced landings in several sea basins, continues to weigh on incomes and undermines long-term profitability. This is being further aggravated by volatile fuel prices, with the decarbonisation ambitions of fleet business models still lagging behind. Additionally, the slower recovery of fish stocks is hampering the medium- and long-term profitability of the fishing sector. Minimising negative impacts of fishing on the marine environment, its habitats and species must continue in order to safeguard the very basis of fisheries prosperity.”; and adds “Member States must also look beyond fisheries to ensure the recovery of fish stocks by fully implementing the relevant EU legislation. Without a healthy marine environment and healthy fish stocks, there can be no fisheries for future generations.”³⁷

To conclude, full focus should lay on fixing the actual lack of implementation and, where appropriate, enforcement of existing tools and commitments, as the most straightforward way to reap the environmental, social and economic benefits of the fisheries and environmental framework and securing the foundation for the wellbeing of coastal communities.

Based on the Commission’s findings, as well as on our own experience in practice, this includes, but is not limited to:

- determining the fishing opportunities fully in line with the rules on the MSY based on scientific advice, the precautionary principle and the ecosystem-based approach
- allocating quotas in a way that set the right incentives to support and transition to low-impact fisheries
- ending discards and monitor and control the landing obligation
- align with environmental policies through the measures above, as well as through dedicated conservation measures
- stick to capacity ceilings and enable transition through adequate funding
- make full use of the tools under the new Fisheries Control Regulation.

A more detailed list of actions to take under the current CFP framework can be found in **ClientEarth’s “CFP Implementation and Enforcement Plan – The ‘Simple Plan’”**.³⁸

Supporting implementation of MAPs through Ocean Act and MFF

The MAPs are not working in siloes – they are embedded in ongoing legislative procedures preparing for the new EU Ocean Act and the next Multiannual Financial Framework of the EU. Hence, these ongoing files should support the implementation of and build synergies with the MAPs and any other fisheries and environmental laws and policies. In this regard, we reiterate what we have already outlined in the joint NGO paper “Don’t sink the Common Fisheries Policy – fulfil its potential”³⁹:

³⁶ European Commission, Evaluation of the Common Fisheries Policy, SWD(2026) 120 final, April 2026.

³⁷ European Commission, Sustainable fishing in the EU: state of play and orientations for 2027, COM(2026) 271 final.

³⁸ ClientEarth, CFP Implementation and Enforcement – The Simple Plan, April 2025.

³⁹ Seas at Risk, ClientEarth and others, Don’t sink the Common Fisheries Policy - fulfil its potential, October 2025.

“By focusing efforts on effective implementation and targeted improvement of supporting instruments, policymakers can make a real and timely difference “in the water”:

a. The upcoming EU Ocean Act can strengthen coherence across EU ocean policies, reinforcing the implementation of ecosystem-based fisheries management, marine protection, and restoration - both domestically and internationally - through the EU’s ocean diplomacy and the sustainable management of the EU fleet operating within and beyond EU waters. The Ocean Act should also support the fishing sector’s transition toward more sustainable fishing practices in the long term, addressing fish stock management as well as economic and social dimensions.

b. The current evaluation and potential revision of the Common Market Organisation (CMO) can help enhance the competitiveness of the EU fisheries industry by promoting fair competition and a level playing field for all products marketed within it. It can also improve market transparency and provide consumers with accurate product information - and, in the end, to boost consumer appetite for responsibly sourced EU products.

c. The revision of the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) can help to correct structural imbalances in the sector, as well as support the diversification and resilience of fishing communities. It must direct future investments towards climate and biodiversity targets and redirect harmful subsidies. Member States should also fully leverage available EU funds to support a sustainable seafood supply to EU consumers. This includes investing in the recovery of fish stocks, improved marketing of fishery products to encourage a diverse and sustainable consumption of EU seafood (including species that are readily available but less in demand), adopting cost-effective technology for monitoring and controlling fisheries, and raising public awareness of the health and environmental benefits of responsibly sourced EU seafood.”

About ClientEarth

ClientEarth is a non-profit organisation that uses the law to create systemic change that protects the Earth for – and with – its inhabitants. We are tackling climate change, protecting nature and stopping pollution, with partners and citizens around the globe. We hold industry and governments to account, and defend everyone’s right to a healthy world. From our offices in Europe, Asia and the USA we shape, implement and enforce the law, to build a future for our planet in which people and nature can thrive together.

Bellinda Bartolucci

Senior Legal Expert, Marine Ecosystems

bbartolucci@clientearth.org

www.clientearth.org

This document was written for general information and does not constitute legal, professional, financial or investment advice. Specialist advice should be taken in relation to specific circumstances. Action should not be taken on the basis of this document alone. ClientEarth endeavours to ensure that the information it provides is correct, but no warranty, express or implied, is given as to its accuracy and ClientEarth does not accept responsibility for any decisions made in reliance on this document.

Beijing Berlin Brussels London Los Angeles Luxembourg Madrid Warsaw

ClientEarth is an environmental law charity, a company limited by guarantee, registered in England and Wales, company number 02863827, registered charity number 1053988, registered office 10 Queen Street Place, London EC4R 1BE, a registered international non-profit organisation in Belgium, ClientEarth AISBL, enterprise number 0714.925.038, a registered company in Germany, ClientEarth gGmbH, HRB 202487 B, a registered non-profit organisation in Luxembourg, ClientEarth ASBL, registered number F11366, a registered foundation in Poland, Fundacja ClientEarth Poland, KRS 0000364218, NIP 701025 4208, a registered 501(c)(3) organisation in the US, ClientEarth US, EIN 81-0722756, a registered subsidiary in China, ClientEarth Beijing Representative Office, Registration No. G1110000MA0095H836. ClientEarth is registered on the EU Transparency register number: 96645517357-19. Our goal is to use the power of the law to develop legal strategies and tools to address environmental issues.