# EUSAIR Action Plan revision

# Thematic consultation questionnaire for Pillar 1 TSG

This document was developed by the EUSAIR Facility Point Lead Partner in cooperation with external experts as a starting point for thematic consultation on EUSAIR Action Plan revision in TSGs and with relevant policy owners in the EUSAIR countries. It is to be used with the Initial policy paper for thematic consultation and is intended to collect feedback from country policy owners.

The overall process and context in which these documents will be used is described in the Background document with Roadmap on the EUSAIR Action Plan revision v3 presented to the National Coordinators at the 18th Governing Board in Sarajevo.

This questionnaire shall be addressed to blue growth/blue economy governance structures. We propose for the TSG members to gather all relevant inputs from their country so that **only one questionnaire** is submitted from one country. The best way would be to organise a meeting or a workshop with relevant representatives of the sector to discuss and agree on the country’s input. Facility Point project partners shall technically support the process upon request from TSG members or National Coordinators.

As described in the Background document each country has the national consultation organised differently and involving different sectors and governance levels.

**The completed questionnaire shall be returned to Pillar 1 Coordinators, Pillar 1 thematic expert(s), EC representative and Facility Point Lead Partner with external experts by 16 December.**

The Pillar Coordinators, Pillar thematic experts, EC representative supported by Facility point LP with external experts will organise the gathered information and prepare proposals to be discussed by the National coordinators presumably in January 2023 and by respective TSG members at the next meeting planned for February or March. At this next meeting agreements on the content shall be made by the TSG members.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to structure and organise the gathering of country inputs using the same methodology for all 4 Pillars, however the respondents should not feel limited by the questionnaire. Any other information deemed important and not encompassed in the given questions is welcome as well.

Suggestion on how to use the questionnaire: the questionnaire is not meant to be circulated to the possible participants of the workshop or meeting organised to collect the country inputs. We propose to share the Initial policy paper with participants, while the questionnaire is to be used by the organiser to lead the discussion at the workshop/meeting using the prepared questions or their simplification. The questionnaire should be completed by the organiser at the end of the workshop/meeting to summarise the information provided and agreed by the participants.

Disclaimer: The gathered information will be used for further consultation on the level of TSGs and National Coordinators. The gathered elements from this questionnaire will be reflected in the final Action Plan. However, the decision regarding the inclusion of thematic elements in the revised Action Plan lies in the hands of the EUSAIR Governing Board.

## Topic 1: Marine technologies and blue biotechnologies

### Challenges

* + 1. Please **prioritise** **the challenges/opportunities** provided in the initial policy paper to reflect how relevant they are as regards the added value of being tackled by EUSAIR. *(1 being the most important, other follow in the numerical order).*

I*n the Adriatic Ionian Region it is noted:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Increasing disparities in innovation performance between EU and non-EU countries* |
|  | *Capitalising on EUSAIR regions, which are EU fastest growing innovation performers* |
|  | *Lagging regions underrepresented in competitive programmes such as Horizon*  |
|  | *Collaboration of lagging regions with more developed regions can improve and facilitate knowledge transfer, technological upgrading and entrepreneurship* |

* + 1. Is there another challenge concerning the thematic field of *Topic 1:* *Marine technologies and blue biotechnologies*, for which you see an added value of being addressed at EUSAIR level? The challenge should be specific to the EUSAIR territory and scope.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Objectives

The **objective** of the 2014 Action Plan was updated in the initial policy paper:

*To promote research, innovation and business opportunities in marine technologies and blue biotechnology, by strengthening quadruple helix ties in the region.*

* + 1. Are there any suggestions for its reformulation/specification? Please, consider also the different trends in blue growth/blue economy policy accompanying the main objective.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* + 1. See proposed additional challenges under point 1.1.3. Additional objectives can be added accordingly.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Key stakeholders

* + 1. Which are the **most relevant national/regional** (e.g. national/regional institutions, agencies, others) **and international** (e.g. networks, associations, organisations, partnerships) **stakeholders** to be involved in order to reach most efficiently the objectives of the Topic 1. (objectives provided in point 1.2.1)?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Relevant policies

* + 1. The following **policies, regulations, directives, initiatives**  etc. were identified as relevant for the *Topic 1:* *Marine technologies and blue biotechnologies*. Please also think about the funding opportunities related to these policies. Which are the most relevant?

*(Please tick the boxes before the selected policies)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *New approach for a sustainable blue economy in the EU Transforming the EU's Blue Economy for a Sustainable Future* |
|  | *Circular Economy Action Plan* |
|  | *European Cluster Partnerships* |
|  | *Smart Specialisation Strategy* |
|  | *Green Agenda for the Western Balkans Action Plan* |
|  | *European Research Area*  |
|  | *Digitising European Industry and Digital Innovation Hubs* |

* + 1. Is there another policy, or initiative, to be mentioned?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Actions

There are three Actions foreseen in the initial policy paper:

***Action 1.1: Building AIR innovation ecosystem in marine technologies and blue biotechnologies:***

* *Building AIR Innovation communities (EIT) (increasing participation in EU competitive programmes, possibilities for innovation up-scalling, better match of innovative sustainable services and products with demand…)*
* *Interregional RIS cooperation (Thematic partnerships, I3 match-making partnerships, mapping RIS matching potentials, cooperation between regional RIS platforms…)*
* *Building value chains (value chain mapping, needs/gaps identification, networking, match-making opportunities)*

 ***Action 1.2: AIR blue (bio)technologies research and science networks:***

* *cooperation of science and research policies to create a common research and innovation area*
* *promotion of researchers’ mobility,*
* *initiatives for sharing research infrastructure for common projects i.e. shared (bio)technology testing facilities …*

***Action 1.3: Digital innovation and rollout*** *(not just linked to blue technologies – to be moved somewhere else?)*

* *Development (in countries/regions where they do not yet exist and mutual learning and exchange leading to better service in countries/regions where they already exist) & cooperation between digital innovation hubs– DIH network of national/regional hubs functioning as a junction of research/academia, industry, policy actors and civil society.*
	+ 1. Please **prioritise the actions** provided in the initial policy paper to reflect how important you find them for your country's cooperation in EUSAIR. *(1 being the most important, 3 the least important).*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Action title** |
|  | *Action 1.1: Building AIR innovation ecosystem in marine technologies and blue biotechnologies*  |
|  | *Action 1.2: AIR blue (bio)technologies research and science networks*  |
|  | *Action 1.3: Digital innovation and rollout* |

* + 1. Are there any suggestions for reformulation/specification of the Actions provided in the initial policy paper?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* + 1. Are there any additional ideas how the listed challenges could be addressed by the EUSAIR concerning the thematic field of Topic 1? Please remain within the parameters of macro-regional relevance, EU policies compliance and EUSAIR territory and scope.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## Topic 2: Fisheries and aquaculture

### Challenges

* + 1. Please **prioritise the challenges/opportunities** provided in the initial policy paper to reflect how relevant they are as regards the added value of being tackled by EUSAIR. *(1 being the most important, other follow in the numerical order)*

*In the Adriatic-Ionian Region there is:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Adriatic-Ionian Seas suffer from overfishing. In the Mediterranean the proportion of overfished stocks decreased from 88 % in 2014 to 75 % in 2018, which shows results from joined efforts as well as the need for such efforts to continue. The situation of many stocks remains critical as in 2018 more than 80 % of scientifically assessed stocks are exploited above maximum sustainable yield (MSY) levels, according to the STECF. As a result of countries efforts and GFCM a first Fisheries Restricted Area (FRA) was established in 2017 in Adriatic Sea and an EU driven multiannual plan covering certain pelagic fisheries in the Adriatic Sea is under negotiation.*  |
|  | *There is a need to improve fishing fleets and gear efficiency and sustainability.*  |
|  | *There is still a problem of data collection and missing data concerning the fish stock assessment. The culture of compliance, and the monitoring, control and surveillance capacity have to be improved in many Adriatic-Ionian countries.*  |
|  | *There is need to address socio-economic challenges related to increasing fishing quotas and reduction of overfishing also through combining fishing activities with tourism.*  |
|  | *As experiences from other sea basins demonstrate, the economic performance of the primary fishery production increases as fish stocks recover. In that regard and with growing demand and market prices, the Adriatic-Ionian basin has economic potential.*  |
|  | *On the other hand, aquaculture production continues to grow, making the overall sustainability of the sector even more important.*  |
|  | *The compliance of non-EU countries with EU Acquis is of strategic importance.* |

* + 1. Is there another challenge concerning the thematic field of *Topic 2: Fisheries and aquaculture* for which you see an added value of being addressed at EUSAIR level? The challenge should be specific to the EUSAIR territory and scope.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Objectives

The **objective** of the 2014 Action Plan was updated in the initial policy paper:

*Strengthening* ***fisheries*** *in the region through:*

* *Better management and sustainable exploitation of fish stocks. Improvement of data collection and fish stock assessment. Harmonization with EU regulations & international organizations. More efficient and sustainable fishing fleets and gear.*
* *Compliance & implementation of measures to combat illegal, unreported, unregulated fisheries and elimination of destructive fishing practices.*
* *Utilization of Unwanted and Unavoidable catches and discards.*
* *Improvement of professional skills of fishermen.*

*Strengthening* ***aquaculture*** *in the region through:*

* *Increase of aquaculture production. Improvement of productivity, quality, environmental sustainability and diversification in aquaculture.*
* *Introduction of new species, use of alternative raw materials for feed production, new farming technologies, use of advanced processing technologies and innovative actions on traceability.*
* *Improvement of the image and competitiveness of farmed products including the promotion of initiatives on marketing standards and healthy nutritional habits*
* *Acquisition and improvement of professional skills.*

 *sound use of the rich high-quality renewable energy resources (wind, solar PV, bioenergy, geothermal, hydro) in the region and improve energy efficiency to comply with Paris Agreement and the Union 2030 energy and climate framework.*

* + 1. Are there any suggestions for their reformulation/specification? Please, consider also the different trends in blue growth/blue economy policy accompanying the objectives.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 1.2.2 See proposed additional challenges under point 1.1.3. Additional objectives can be added accordingly.

### Key stakeholders

* + 1. Which are the most **relevant national/regional** (e.g. national/regional institutions, agencies, others) **and international** (e.g. networks, associations, organisations, partnerships) **stakeholders** to be involved in order to reach most efficiently the objectives of the Topic 2. (objectives provided in point 2.2.1)?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Relevant policies

## The following **policies, regulations, directives, initiatives** etc. were identified as relevant for *Topic 2: Fisheries and aquaculture*. Please also think about the funding opportunities related to these policies. Which are the most relevant?

## *(Please tick the boxes before the selected policies)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Common Fisheries Policy and revised fisheries control system* |
|  | *GFCM 2030 Strategy for sustainable fisheries and aquaculture in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea* |
|  | *Strategic Guidelines for the sustainable development of EU aquaculture* |
|  | *EU Water Framework Directive* |
|  | *Marine Strategy Framework Directive* |
|  | *EU Nitrates Directive (Council Directive 91/676/EEC)*  |
|  | *EU Biodiversity Strategy 2030* |
|  | *Farm to fork Strategy* |

## Is there another policy, or initiative, to be mentioned?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Actions

There are two **Actions** foreseen in the initial policy paper:

***Action 2.1: Sustainable and resilient fisheries***

* *Support for harmonisation of integrated management and monitoring efforts to comply with regional GFCM schemes and EU acquis (including scientific cooperation) addressing sustainability, vessel and equipment compliance, alien species management and illegal practices.*
* *AI inter-branch organisation bringing together fish producers, processors and marketers to improve the coordination of marketing activities and to develop measures of interest for the whole sector. Encouragement for creation of producer organisations and associations of producer organisations on national/regional level.*
* *AI small-scale fisheries strategy to encourage networking of fishing associations; development of cooperatives; foster efficient value chains; implement capacity building in sustainability, new technology and practices as well as funding opportunities; explore and improve possibilities for joint marketing, logistics and infrastructure.*

***Action 2.2: Sustainable and resilient aquaculture***

* *Cooperation on enabling legal and administrative frameworks, which includes licencing procedures, monitoring of the activity, data exchange, harmonisation efforts.*
* *Networking and clustering initiatives so as to further unlock innovation potential, improve knowledge exchange, introduce innovative practices and technology (up-scaling) to the sector to improve sustainability, efficiency, competitiveness, including the introduction of additional species and purposes (pharmacy, cosmetics)marketing and logistics efficiency*
* *Promotion of certification as a sustainability driver, building awareness on production and consumption side, improving marketing activities and cooperate on introduction into legal framework.*

## Please indicate the relevance of each Action to reflect how important it is for your country's cooperation in EUSAIR. *(Please tick the relevant box before each Action)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * **Relevant**
 | **Fairly relevant** | **Not relevant** | **Action** |
|  |  |  | *Action 2.1: Sustainable and resilient fisheries*  |
|  |  |  | *Action 2.1: Sustainable and resilient aquaculture* |

## Are there any suggestions for reformulation/specification of the Actions provided in the initial policy paper.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## Are there any additional ideas how the listed challenges could be addressed on the EUSAIR level concerning the thematic field of Topic 2? Please remain within the parameters of macro-regional relevance, EU policies compliance and EUSAIR territory and scope.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## Topic 3: Maritime and marine governance and services

### Challenges

## Please indicate the relevance of each **challenge** provided in the initial policy paper to reflect how relevant they are as regards the added value of being tackled by EUSAIR. *(Please tick the relevant box before each Action)*

*In the Adriatic-Ionian Region there is:*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * **Relevant**
 | **Fairly relevant** | **Not relevant** | **Action** |
|  |  |  | *Fishing, aquaculture, shipping, renewable energy, nature conservation and other uses compete for maritime space. The maritime spatial plans were developed to reduce conflicts and create synergies between different activities. The coherence of MSP implementation across borders is needed, even though MSP is not a priority in accession negotiation of WB* |
|  |  |  | *Many blue economy sectors have difficulties finding suitably skilled employees, which hampers their growth.*  |

## Is there another challenge concerning the thematic field of *Topic 3: Maritime and marine governance and services* for which you see an added value of being addressed at EUSAIR level? The challenge should be specific to the EUSAIR territory and scope.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Objectives

The **objective** of the 2014 Action Plan was updated in the initial policy paper:

* *Improved Governance of maritime space.*
* *Improved Skills and career development in blue economy and strengthening of networks of academics, training organisations and professional organisations of maritime sectors in the macro-region.*

## Are there any suggestions for its reformulation/specification? Please, consider also the different trends in blue growth/blue economy policy accompanying the main objective.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## See proposed additional challenges under point 1.1.3. Additional objectives can be added accordingly.

### Key stakeholders

## Which are the most **relevant national/regional** (e.g. national/regional institutions, agencies, others) and **international** (e.g. networks, associations, organisations, partnerships) **stakeholders** to be involved in order to reach most efficiently the objectives of the Topic 3. (objectives provided in point 3.2.1 and additional ones derived from challenges added under point 3.1.3, if relevant)? Indicative international key stakeholders are already listed in the initial policy paper.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

###  Relevant policies

## The following **policies, regulations, directives, initiatives** etc. were identified as relevant for *Topic 3: Maritime and marine governance and services*. Please also think about the funding opportunities related to these policies. Which are the most relevant?

## *(Please tick the boxes before the selected policies)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Directive 2014/89/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 2014 establishing a framework for maritime spatial planning* |
|  | *Integrated Coastal Zone Management Protocol and Common Regional Framework for ICZM* |
|  | *Territorial agenda 2030 of the European Union: A future for all places* |
|  | *European Education Area* |
|  | *European Research Area* |

## Is there another policy, or initiative, to be mentioned?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Actions

There is one **Action** foreseen in the initial policy paper:

***Action 3.1: Governance of maritime space for a sustainable and transparent use of maritime and marine resources***

* *cooperation in implementation of adopted Maritime Spatial Plans to achieve coherent practices across borders*
* *promotion of MSP principles in accession countries*
* *cooperation in adopting clearer legal frameworks for development of Allocated Zones for Aquaculture (AZAs), marine protected areas (MPAs), exploiting deep-sea water and marine mineral resources.*

***Action 3.2 and Action 3.3: Already part of other activities, but in a more specific and focused way. Since these topics did not find their way into the flagships, we propose to skip it from the revised AP.***

## Are there any suggestions for reformulation/specification of the Action provided in the initial policy paper.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## Are there any additional ideas how the listed challenges could be addressed on the EUSAIR level concerning the thematic field of Topic 3? Please remain within the parameters of macro-regional relevance, EU policies compliance and EUSAIR territory and scope.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## Other challenges and Actions

## Do you have any additional ideas for **Challenges or Actions** to be addressed by EUSAIR concerning the Pillar 1, not already included under the above-mentioned Topics? Please remain within the parameters of macro-regional relevance, EU policies compliance and EUSAIR territory and scope.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## EUSAIR governance

## Please comment on your experience of engaging with the TSG1 or with EUSAIR in general in terms of its effectiveness.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## Do you have something to suggest in terms of improving the functioning of the TSG 1 or EUSAIR in general?

|  |
| --- |
|  |