



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

030178/EU XXVIII.GP  
Eingelangt am 30/07/25

Brussels, 4.6.2021  
SEC(2025) 224 final

REGULATORY SCRUTINY BOARD OPINION

Proposal for a  
REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL  
on European fisheries and aquaculture statistics and repealing Regulations (EC)  
No 1921/2006, (EC) No 762/2008, (EC) No 216/2009, (EC) No 217/2009 and (EC)  
No 218/2009

{COM(2025) 435 final}

{SWD(2025)232 final }

{SWD(2025)233 final }



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
Regulatory Scrutiny Board

Brussels,  
RSB

## **Opinion**

**Title: Impact assessment / European fishery statistics**

**Overall opinion: POSITIVE**

### **(A) Policy context**

Eurostat, the statistical office of the European Union, produces fishery statistics. They cover data on catches of fish species, landings of fishery products, the EU fishing fleet, and aquaculture production and structure.

The core legislation governing these statistics dates from the 1990s. There have been concerns that it does not fully meet user needs anymore. An evaluation in 2018-2019 found a decreasing added value to managing the Common Fisheries Policy. Other fisheries data sources (such as data collection under the Control Regulation and Data Collection Framework) better meet management and analysis needs.

This impact assessment discusses the policy options to inform a proposal to streamline and simplify the data collection needed to produce European fishery statistics.

### **(B) Summary of findings**

**The Board notes the useful additional information provided in advance of the meeting and the commitments to make changes to the report.**

**The Board gives a positive opinion. The Board also considers that the report should further improve with respect to the following aspects:**

- (1) The impact analysis and the comparison of options are not presented clearly.**
- (2) Stakeholder views, including dissenting ones, are not fully integrated into the report.**

### **(C) What to improve**

**(1) The problem description should present a more coherent view on the level of the administrative costs of producing the fishery statistics. It should clarify what costs are included in the estimates and, where relevant, include costs for data producers.**

**(2) The intervention logic should better describe how the identified options would deliver**

\_\_\_\_\_  
This opinion concerns a draft impact assessment which may differ from the final version.

Commission européenne, B-1049 Bruxelles - Belgium. Office: BERL 08/010. E-mail: [regulatory-scrutiny-board@ec.europa.eu](mailto:regulatory-scrutiny-board@ec.europa.eu)

on the specific objectives and ultimately tackle the problem drivers. A visual presentation covering the full intervention logic would provide additional clarity.

(3) The impact analysis should be restructured. It should cover the assessment of costs and benefits for all relevant stakeholders (data producers, data providers and data users) in a balanced way. It should specifically discuss the effects on SMEs and micro-enterprises. It should clarify to what extent the different options have the potential to reduce the administrative burden.

(4) The comparison of options should analyse the performance of each option against the standard impact assessment criteria (effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, proportionality). This should include a clear analysis of costs. The options should be compared against the baseline and, therefore, the baseline should not be scored.

(5) The report should clarify the main challenges the Member States will face in the short and long term, when implementing the options. Where relevant, it should distinguish between Member States that are more or less affected.

(6) The report should present the views of the main stakeholder categories, including any dissenting views. It should refer consistently to the stakeholders' opinions when presenting the options.

The Board notes the estimated costs and benefits of the preferred option in this initiative, as summarised in the attached quantification tables.

*Some more technical comments have been sent directly to the author DG.*

#### **(D) Conclusion**

**The DG may proceed with the initiative.**

**The DG must take these recommendations into account before launching the interservice consultation.**

**If there are any changes in the choice or design of the preferred option in the final version of the report, the DG may need to further adjust the attached quantification tables to reflect this.**

Full title	European fishery statistics
Reference number	PLAN/2020/6889
Submitted to RSB on	07 May 2021
Date of RSB meeting	02 June 2021

## **ANNEX – Quantification tables extracted from the draft impact assessment report**

*The following tables contain information on the costs and benefits of the initiative on which the Board has given its opinion, as presented above.*

*If the draft report has been revised in line with the Board's recommendations, the content of these tables may be different from those in the final version of the impact assessment report, as published by the Commission.*

<b><i>I. Overview of Benefits – Preferred Option</i></b>		
<b><i>Description</i></b>	<b><i>Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Comments</i></b>
<b><i>Direct benefits</i></b>		
<b>Catch data collection:</b> Reduction of burden and costs: Cutting double data collections for <b>catches</b>	Saving for direct costs linked to the catch data collection estimated to be approximately 1,2 M€ if compared to baseline	It is planned to produce the catch statistics from an EU-level administrative data source. The Member States would not need to collect catch statistics any more. Direct and indirect cost savings to data producers (national statistical institutes and other national authorities). The cost savings are based on the figures provided by the Member States and they stem mostly from indirect costs and survey costs. The change is estimated to be cost neutral to Eurostat.
Use of the same data by international organisations	Slight reduction in burden at Member State level administrations and international organisations	National statistical institutes, other statistical authorities and international organisations
<b><i>Indirect benefits</i></b>		
Improving effectiveness: Reduction of confidential data	About 20% more data will be accessible to data users	This saving is produced by simplifying the data structure of aquaculture and thus making more data available to users with a slightly reduced cost.  Effectiveness improvement as more data becomes available with the same cost and burden
Simplification of the collected data	Slight reduction in administrative burden and burden on respondents. Time savings value is marginal.	National statistical institutes and other statistical authorities Fishers and aquaculture plant managers

<i><b>II. Overview of costs – Preferred option</b></i>							
		Citizens/Consumers		Businesses		Administrations	
		One-off	Recurrent	One-off	Recurrent	One-off	Recurrent
<b>Adjusting data collection</b>	Direct costs	None	None	None	None	Small	None
	Indirect costs	None	None	None	None	Small	None