



WP4 task 4.1: scheduled activities

Rome 15-16 February 2017

Rosaria Sabatella - Nisea



This project has been funded with support from the European Commission

Deliverable D4.1 Good practices for MMAs network governance

Deadline: month 20 (August 2017)

Lead: Rosaria Sabatella (NISEA)

Participants: CNR-IAMC, CNR- ISMAR, WWF, MSDEC, IOF, OCEANA

Task 4.1: Identify good practices and governance strategies for the identified networks of MMAs in each case study areas which take into account technical, administrative and legal barriers in implementing coherent networks of MMAs to enhance fisheries towards the MSY goal.

Duration: 8 months (January – August 2017)

Template for deliverable 4.1

1. Literature review (technical, administrative and legal barriers in MMAs)
 - 1.1 Examples from Natura 2000 and other MPA networks
 - 1.2 Examples from MMAs in the two case studies (Adriatic Sea and Strait of Sicily)

2. Identification of the most appropriate procedures and tools to assess the establishment of MMAs:
 - 2.1 critical review of relevant projects MAREFRAME – ECOFISHMAN – SOCIOEC)
 - 2.2 Definition of best practices for Impact Assessment in fishery management
 - 2.3 Description of the “Responsive Fisheries Management System” (RFMS)

Template for deliverable 4.1

3. Stakeholder involvements in WP1

Analysis of the questionnaires on stakeholders' perceptions collected during the two introductory meetings with reference to opinion and suggestions about fisheries management and comment on the level of involvement in decision-making

4. Identification and evaluation of potential costs in the establishment, maintenance, monitoring and governance of a network of MMAs

4.1 Definition of the budget and financial planning

5. Potential socio-economic benefits deriving from the implementation of the MMAs network

Definition of the budget associated to a network of MMAs
to assess potential costs in the establishment, maintenance, monitoring
and governance of a network of MMAs

Methodology based on:

Toolbox of the Better Regulation Guidelines, in particular regard to Tool
#53: "The standard cost model for estimating administrative costs"

[http://ec.europa.eu/smart-
regulation/guidelines/tool_53_en.htm#bookmark61](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/tool_53_en.htm#bookmark61)

Other reference:

OECD Regulatory Compliance Cost Assessment Guidance

(The guidance focuses on the analysis of administrative costs and provides
practical and specific guidance, suitable for use by officials responsible for
estimating regulatory compliance costs)

Ref.: OECD (2014), OECD Regulatory Compliance Cost Assessment Guidance,
OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264209657-en>

The estimation of the budget could be included in Deliverable 4.4 «Overall
conclusions and recommendations» (December 2018)



Better Regulation

European
Commission

European Commission > Better Regulation > Guidelines

TOOL #53: THE STANDARD COST MODEL FOR ESTIMATING ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

1. The "Standard Cost Model" (Assessing administrative costs imposed by EU legislation)

Whenever a measure is likely to impose **significant administrative costs** on business, the voluntary sector or public authorities, the **EU Standard Cost Model** presented below must be applied⁴⁵⁹. The main aim of the model is to assess the **net cost of information obligations** imposed by EU legislation (net costs = costs introduced by a proposal if adopted, minus the costs it would eliminate at EU and/or national level). Services are also invited to apply the model on a tentative basis for assessing costs imposed on citizens. The possibility and need for monetisation in this case is left to their discretion.

In principle it is sufficient to measure the administrative burden only for the preferred option. However, if information obligations are at the core of the proposal (e.g. changing labelling or reporting requirements) then the administrative burden should be assessed for all policy options considered.

Implementation will of course be subject to the principle of proportionate analysis. The degree of detail in the assessment will depend on the expected order of magnitude of the costs, their impact, and the availability of reliable and representative data.

2. Outline of the model 2.1. Definition of administrative costs and administrative burden

Administrative costs are defined as the **costs incurred** by enterprises, the voluntary sector, public authorities and citizens in **meeting legal obligations to provide information** on their action or production, either to public authorities or to private parties. **Information is to be construed in a broad sense**, i.e. including labelling, reporting, registration, monitoring and assessment needed to provide the information. In some cases, the information has to be transferred to public authorities or private parties. In others, it only has to be available for inspection or supply on request.

Example. A regulation on air quality puts an obligation to keep a register pollutant emissions and an obligation to meet an air pollution threshold. Keeping a register of pollutant emissions is an administrative cost, while action taken to meet an air pollution threshold is not. That type of compliance cost is sometimes referred to as 'substantive cost' because the obligation affects the essence of the (industry) activity. Keeping a register does not entail in itself any obligation to change the production process, the nature of the end-products or the treatment of emissions. Meeting the pollution threshold will require a substantive change at these levels (for instance the installation of new filters).

Recurring administrative costs and, where significant, **one-off administrative costs** have to be taken into account.

The administrative costs consist of two different cost components: the **business-as-usual costs** and **administrative burdens**. While the business-as-usual costs correspond to the costs resulting from collecting and processing information which would be done by an entity even in the absence of the legislation, the **administrative burdens** stem from the part of the process which is done solely because of a legal obligation⁴⁶⁰

Box 1. Components of administrative costs

Socio – economic benefits
to address the potential socio-economic benefits deriving from the
implementation of the MMA network

1. description of the “effectiveness evaluation” based on the identification of target and limit indicators
2. specify the socio-economic objectives and translate them into specific targets;
3. selecting the most appropriate socio-economic indicators and reference points to measure the targets identified in the previous step;
4. carry out socio-economic analysis for each case studies on the basis of the simulations of WP 3 – task 3.3 (SMART model) to be included in Deliverable 3.3 «Application of the models to the case of study: assessment of present situation and analysis of future scenarios» (December 2018) and Deliverable 4.4

Draft of D.4.1	Partner involved
1. Literature review (technical, administrative and legal barriers in MMAs)	Nisea
1.1 Examples from Natura 2000 and other MPA networks	Oceana
1.2 Examples from MMAs in the two case studies (Adriatic Sea and Strait of Sicily)	MSDEC IOF Nisea
2. Identification of the most appropriate procedures and tools to assess the establishment of MMAs	Nisea
3. Stakeholder involvements in WP1	WWF
4. Definition of the budget and financial planning	Nisea
5. Potential socio-economic benefits deriving from the implementation of the MMAs network	Nisea