

**Question for oral answer O-000113/2013
to the Commission**

Rule 115

Pat the Cope Gallagher, Alain Cadec, Gabriel Mato Adrover
on behalf of the Committee on Fisheries

Subject: The status of the North-East Atlantic mackerel fishery

On 10 July 2013, Commissioner Damanaki informed the Committee on Fisheries that she would bring a recommendation to the College of Commissioners before the summer recess to impose trade sanctions, on the basis of Regulation (EU) No 1026/2012, against Iceland and the Faroe Islands due to their overfishing of mackerel in the North-East Atlantic, as they have increased their overall share of mackerel from 5 % in 2005 to 52 % in 2013. To date, she has not brought any recommendation to the College of Commissioners and, due to other commitments, she is not available to meet with the Committee on Fisheries to outline her position until 27 November at the latest. New scientific advice from ICES concerning mackerel in the North-East Atlantic was issued on 4 October. The advice recommends a large increase (64 %) in the mackerel TAC for next year. This may lead to the possibility of a negotiated settlement to the long-running dispute.

1. The heads of delegation from the coastal states met on 7 and 8 September in Reykjavik, Iceland. At this meeting, did the Commission make an offer on future sharing arrangements to one or all of the parties? If so, what was the offer made by the Commission, and to which parties was it made?
2. In 2010, the European Union and Norway concluded a long-term agreement on mackerel management in the North-East Atlantic. It is widely reported that the Commission is offering a deal to Iceland and the Faroe Islands. Is the Commission acting alone here? Has it consulted Norway and sought its agreement before offering any agreement on future sharing arrangements for mackerel in the NE Atlantic?
3. Why is the Commission party to rewarding the reckless policies of Iceland, the Faroe Islands and Greenland? How is the approach of the Commission consistent with the sustainable management of our shared fishery resources? Why is the Commission not protecting the interests of the EU's pelagic sector? Does the Commission not accept that the EU and Norway should reap the vast majority of the rewards from the increase in the mackerel TAC as they have both acted in a responsible manner?

Tabled: 16.10.2013

Forwarded: 18.10.2013

Deadline for reply: 25.10.2013