



WP3 Ensuring future operation and funding

Questionnaire to the NCs for the situation about long-term funding of the RCGs Secretariat

A flat rate scenario (presented in the table below) seems to be the most likely scenario to keep long-term funding simple and transparent. The reasoning behind it is that it is the only approach for a common responsibility about data collection. Keeping it simple is important, at the end it is for the overarching goal of the DCF.

The scenario is based on the very preliminary estimated annual budget/cost of 150 000 euro for the RCGs Secretariat and EMFAF annual budgets of the MSs. Therefore the amount might change. Since land-locked countries are presented in one RCG only and their EMFAF budgets are much lower than budgets of the other countries the proposed annual contribution for them is twice lower.

Flat rate scenario for long-term founding of the RCGs Secretariat			
	TOTAL EMFAF budget		
	for 2021-2027	Distribution of the annual budget for the RCGs Secretariat cost	
MS	5311000000	Flat rate annual contribution by MS (<mark>LLC</mark>)	% of the average annual budget for the period 2021-2027 (LLC)
BE	40266171	6250	0.109%
BG	84944698	6250	0.052%
CZ	30005249	3125	0.073%
DK	200969309	6250	0.022%
DE	211811682	6250	0.021%
EE	97391060	6250	0.045%
IE	142369552	6250	0.031%
EL	374995903	6250	0.012%
ES	1120441924	6250	0.004%
FR	567136526	6250	0.008%
HR	243687047	6250	0.018%
IT	518216830	6250	0.008%
CY	38307322	6250	0.114%
LV	134876696	6250	0.032%
LT	61183577	6250	0.072%
LU	-	0	0.000%
HU	37710346	3125	0.058%
MT	21825290	6250	0.200%
NL	97924288	6250	0.045%
AT	6718094	3125	0.326%
PL	512387953	6250	0.009%
РТ	378572022	6250	0.012%
RO	162450905	6250	0.027%
SI	23929641	6250	0.183%
SK	15225428	3125	0.144%
FI	71755962	6250	0.061%
SE	115896525	6250	0.038%

Regional Coordination Group

Regional Coordination Group Long Distance Fisheries









WP3 Ensuring future operation and funding

For the execution of the Secretariat activities, outsourcing may occur, and an external organisation such as a public foundation, NGO, etc. could be selected.

Since MS might have difficulties with the administrative/legal implications of this cost-sharing there is a need for further discussion through the following questions:

- Is it acceptable for your MS to apply the proposed flat rate scenario? Y/N

 If no please provide your concerns.
 What scenario is acceptable for your MS and why? Please describe.
- 2. Is it possible for you to allocate the proposed amount from your national EMFAF Operational programme? Y/N
 - 2.1. If no please mark one or more from the options bellow and provide explanation on the obstacles.
 - □ Public procurement
 - □ Other legal aspects
 - □ Insufficient budget
 - □ Other (explain).....
- 3. Is it possible for your MS to include this activity in your WP and allocate the amount for cost on yearly basis starting from 2023? Y/N
 - 3.1. If no please provide your concerns.
- 4. Is it acceptable for your MS and your EMFAF managing authority to have an invoice from an external (outside of your MS) body? Y/N

4.1. If no please provide your concerns.

5. Please provide acceptable procedure for the election of responsible organisation. More information on the procedures is accessible on the following web link - <u>https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/informat/2014/guidance_public_proc_en.pdf.</u>

Regional Coordination Group Ballion Group Beneficiation Group Large Pelagies Regional Coordination Group Large Pelagies Regional Coordination Group Large Pelagies

□ Open – Call for tenders

□ Restricted - selection and shortlisting on the basis of a Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) with a minimum of five candidates.





WP3 Ensuring future operation and funding

□ Negotiated Procedure with publication of contract notice (CN)

□ Competitive Dialogue

6. Do you think that it is needed to have a common (multilateral) agreement between all MS for the funding of the RCG Secretariat? Y/N

6.1. Please provide your comments.

7. Any other comments or suggestions?











