



2017/2052(INI)

24.10.2017

AMENDMENTS

1 - 71

Draft opinion

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García

(PE610.677v02-00)

The next MFF: Preparing the Parliament's position on the MFF post-2020
(2017/2052(INI))

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1

Francisco José Millán Mon, Gabriel Mato, Carlos Iturgaiz, Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Highlights that a substantial and accessible fisheries fund is necessary in order to implement the common fisheries policy (CFP), to ensure the sustainability of European aquaculture and fisheries, including through implementation of the discard ban and landing obligation and achieving the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) objective, and to help the sector carry out the necessary restructuring process;

Amendment

1. Highlights that a substantial and accessible fisheries fund is necessary in order to implement the common fisheries policy (CFP), to ensure the sustainability of European aquaculture and fisheries, including through implementation of the discard ban and landing obligation and achieving the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) objective, and to help the sector carry out the necessary restructuring process; ***rejects any attempt to dispense with a specific fund for the fisheries sector in view of the socioeconomic importance of this activity in the coastal regions of the European Union (EU);***

Or. es

Amendment 2

Isabelle Thomas

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Highlights that a substantial and accessible fisheries fund is necessary in order to implement the common fisheries policy (CFP), ***to*** ensure the sustainability of ***European*** aquaculture and fisheries, ***including through implementation of the discard ban and landing obligation and***

Amendment

1. Highlights ***the fact*** that a substantial and accessible fisheries fund is necessary in order to implement the common fisheries policy (CFP), ensure the sustainability of aquaculture and ***European*** fisheries, ***introduce a selectivity plan so as to prevent discards and make the*** landing

achieving the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) objective, and *to* help the sector carry out the necessary restructuring process;

obligation *less restrictive, achieve* the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) objective, and help the sector carry out the necessary restructuring process, *in particular by providing support for handling the financial burden created by the landing obligation*;

Or. fr

Amendment 3
Rosa D'Amato, Marco Valli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Highlights that a substantial and accessible fisheries fund is necessary in order to implement the common fisheries policy (CFP), to ensure the sustainability of European aquaculture and fisheries, including through implementation of the discard ban and landing obligation and achieving the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) objective, and to help the sector carry out the necessary restructuring process;

Amendment

1. Highlights that a substantial and accessible fisheries fund is necessary in order to implement the common fisheries policy (CFP), to ensure the sustainability of European aquaculture and fisheries, including through implementation of the discard ban and landing obligation and achieving the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) objective, and to help the sector carry out the necessary restructuring process *by using sustainable gear and replacing 'dirty' old engines*;

Or. it

Amendment 4
Marco Affronte, Linnéa Engström

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Highlights that a substantial and accessible fisheries fund is necessary in order to implement the common fisheries policy (CFP), to ensure the sustainability of

Amendment

1. Highlights that a substantial and accessible fisheries fund is necessary in order to implement the common fisheries policy (CFP), to ensure the sustainability of

European aquaculture and fisheries, including through implementation of the discard ban and landing obligation and achieving the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) *objective*, and to help the sector carry out the necessary restructuring process;

European aquaculture and fisheries, including through implementation of the discard ban and landing obligation and achieving the ***CFP objective of ensuring that fish stocks are maintained at levels above those capable of producing*** maximum sustainable yield (MSY), and to help the sector carry out the necessary restructuring process;

Or. en

Amendment 5

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Highlights that a substantial and accessible fisheries fund is necessary in order to implement the common fisheries policy (CFP), to ensure the sustainability of European ***aquaculture and*** fisheries, including through implementation of the discard ban and landing obligation and achieving the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) objective, ***and to help the sector carry out the necessary restructuring process;***

Amendment

1. Highlights that a substantial and accessible fisheries fund is necessary in order to implement the common fisheries policy (CFP), to ensure the sustainability of European fisheries, including through implementation of the discard ban and landing obligation and achieving the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) objective, ***including support to improve gear selectivity to allow the landing obligation to be fulfilled.***

Or. es

Amendment 6

Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Highlights that a substantial and accessible fisheries fund is necessary in order to implement the common fisheries

Amendment

1. Highlights that a substantial and accessible fisheries fund is necessary in order to implement the common fisheries

policy (CFP), to ensure the sustainability of European aquaculture and fisheries, including through implementation of the discard ban and landing obligation and achieving the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) objective, and to **help** the sector **carry** out the necessary restructuring process;

policy (CFP), to ensure the sustainability of European aquaculture and fisheries, including through implementation of the discard ban and landing obligation and achieving the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) objective, and to **provide** the sector **with financial support for carrying** out the necessary restructuring process;

Or. fr

Amendment 7

Francisco José Millán Mon, Gabriel Mato, Carlos Iturgaiz, Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Stresses that the CFP is an exclusive EU competence and that the financial funds made available to the EU for this policy should therefore be sufficient in order to achieve the goals laid down in the Basic Regulation; recalls, however, that the current European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) accounts for only 0.6 % of the total 2014-2020 MFF;

Amendment

2. Stresses that the CFP is an exclusive EU competence and that the financial funds made available to the EU for this policy should therefore be sufficient in order to achieve the **demanding** goals laid down in the Basic Regulation; recalls, however, that the current European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) accounts for only 0.6 % of the total 2014-2020 MFF; **emphasises that EMFF financial funds should be kept at least at the same level in view of the socioeconomic importance of this activity in the coastal regions of the European Union (EU);**

Or. es

Amendment 8

Isabelle Thomas

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Stresses that the CFP is an exclusive EU competence and that the financial funds made available to the EU for this policy should therefore be sufficient in order to achieve the goals laid down in the Basic Regulation; recalls, however, that the current European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) accounts for only 0.6 % of the total 2014-2020 MFF;

Amendment

2. Stresses that the CFP is an exclusive EU competence and that the financial funds made available to the EU for this policy should therefore be sufficient in order to achieve the goals laid down in the Basic Regulation; recalls, however, that the current European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) accounts for only 0.6 % of the total 2014-2020 MFF ***and has been cut under the 2018 budget; points out that the funding volume is not sufficient to realise CFP objectives and must be increased;***

Or. fr

Amendment 9

Rosa D'Amato, Marco Valli

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

urges the Commission to propose a larger financial allocation for the next EMFF programming period, higher funding percentages, and different rules on co-financing and the allowances paid to fishermen during the closed season, in order to provide means of meeting the needs of small-scale non-industrial fisheries, which are often hampered by administrative delays caused by Member States;

Or. it

Amendment 10

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, José Blanco López, Renata Briano, Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. *Notes that support measures for the temporary cessation of fishing activities should be maintained in certain cases; notes, furthermore, that they should be targeted at those fleets that have to cease their activity owing to an external cause such as the closure of a fishery; calls, moreover, for support measures for the permanent cessation of fishing activities to be maintained under the same conditions that currently apply with, where necessary, an economic audit of the repercussions of the dismantling of vessels on the fleet's equilibrium and on the real fishing capacity.*

Or. es

Amendment 11
Isabelle Thomas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Notes that Brexit must not be used as an excuse to reduce future funding; the EU should find a way to ensure that a possible decline in the post-2020 MFF does not automatically translate into lower allocations to the EMFF;

3. Notes that Brexit must not be used as an excuse to reduce future funding; ***takes the view that*** the EU should find a way to ensure that a possible decline in the post-2020 MFF does not automatically translate into lower allocations to the EMFF ***and that on the contrary, because of the risks of an impact on fisheries from Brexit, there needs to be a separate budget heading;***

Or. fr

Amendment 12

Francisco José Millán Mon, Gabriel Mato, Carlos Iturgaiz, Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Notes that Brexit must not be used as an excuse to reduce future funding; the EU should find a way to ensure that a possible decline in the post-2020 MFF does not automatically translate into lower allocations to the EMFF;

Amendment

3. Notes that Brexit must not be used as an excuse to reduce future funding; the EU should find a way to ensure that a possible decline in the post-2020 MFF does not automatically translate into lower allocations to the EMFF, ***in view of the already diminished budget allocated to the fisheries sector in the EU;***

Or. es

Amendment 13

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Notes that Brexit must not be used as an excuse to reduce future funding; the EU should ***find a way to ensure that a possible decline in the post-2020 MFF does not automatically translate into lower allocations to the EMFF;***

Amendment

3. Notes that Brexit must not be used as an excuse to reduce future funding; the EU should ***ensure that EMFF funds are under no circumstances cut for low-impact fisheries, artisanal fisheries and small-scale fisheries which should be prioritised in the allocation of funds.***

Or. es

Amendment 14

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, José Blanco López, Renata Briano

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. *Proposes that financing be enhanced by means of other financial instruments in addition to non-repayable aid; proposes, moreover, access to a loan scheme allowing greater financing possibilities for the sector so as to enhance the economic development of enterprises and to continue working to mitigate the environmental impact of the extractive activities.*

Or. es

Amendment 15
Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. *Points out that it is essential for the EMFF to be simplified and sufficiently well endowed to pay compensation to fishermen if they were to lose access to United Kingdom waters to some extent;*

Or. fr

Amendment 16
Nicola Caputo, Renata Briano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. *Emphasises the need to provide the EMFF with a sufficient level of funds to enable it to invest in the sustainability, selectivity and competitiveness of the*

fishing fleet;

Or. en

Amendment 17

Francisco José Millán Mon, Gabriel Mato, Carlos Iturgaiz, Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Stresses that the level of implementation of the 2014-2020 EMFF three years after its adoption on 15 May 2014 remains unsatisfactory, as by September 2017 only 1.4 % of the EUR 6.4 billion fund had been used; hopes that the level of implementation of the EMFF and other EU structural and investment programmes will eventually improve;

Amendment

4. Stresses that the level of implementation of the 2014-2020 EMFF three years after its adoption on 15 May 2014 remains unsatisfactory, as by September 2017 only 1.4 % of the EUR 6.4 billion fund had been used; hopes that the level of implementation of the EMFF and other EU structural and investment programmes will eventually improve; ***highlights that the low level of implementation is largely due to the delay in adopting the rules for this European fund following the reform of the CFP and, in many cases, the lack of clarity in the administrative procedures regarding the aid measures under the fund, for which reason it advocates greater precision and simplification;***

Or. es

Amendment 18

Isabelle Thomas

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Stresses that the level of implementation of the 2014-2020 EMFF three years after its adoption on 15 May 2014 remains unsatisfactory, as by

Amendment

4. Stresses that the level of implementation of the 2014-2020 EMFF three years after its adoption on 15 May 2014 remains unsatisfactory, as by

September 2017 only 1.4 % of the EUR 6.4 billion fund had been used; hopes that the level of implementation of the EMFF and other EU structural and investment programmes will eventually improve;

September 2017 only 1.4 % of the EUR 6.4 billion fund had been used; hopes that the level of implementation of the EMFF and other EU structural and investment programmes will eventually improve; ***calls for greater flexibility in allocating appropriations and, in particular, for data-related funding not used by Member States to be transferable to research institutes and, for control purposes, to the European Fisheries Control Agency;***

Or. fr

Amendment 19
Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Stresses, in addition, that costs in connection with the landing obligation should be covered by the EMFF, which presupposes that the fund has been simplified and is sufficiently well endowed;

Or. fr

Amendment 20
Rosa D'Amato, Marco Valli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Is of the opinion that steps need to be taken in order to ensure that the post-2020 EU fisheries fund is implemented in a swifter and more flexible manner, without the delays that continue to plague the 2014-2020 EMFF;

5. Is of the opinion that steps need to be taken in order to ensure that the post-2020 EU fisheries fund is implemented in a swifter and more flexible manner, without the delays that continue to plague the 2014-2020 EMFF; ***points out that the weight of***

regulation imposed on European businesses has no equivalent in countries outside the EU, near neighbours and otherwise;

Or. it

Amendment 21
Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Is of the opinion that steps need to be taken in order to ensure that the post-2020 EU fisheries fund is implemented in a swifter and ***more flexible*** manner, without the delays that continue to plague the 2014-2020 EMFF;

Amendment

5. Is of the opinion that steps need to be taken in order to ensure that the post-2020 EU fisheries fund is implemented in a swifter, ***more flexible*** and ***less bureaucratic*** manner, without the delays that continue to plague the 2014-2020 EMFF;

Or. fr

Amendment 22
Francisco José Millán Mon, Gabriel Mato, Carlos Iturgaiz, Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Is of the opinion that steps need to be taken in order to ensure that the post-2020 EU fisheries fund is implemented in a swifter and more flexible manner, ***without the delays that continue to plague the 2014-2020 EMFF;***

Amendment

5. Is of the opinion that steps need to be taken in order to ensure that the post-2020 EU fisheries fund is implemented in a swifter and more flexible manner, ***in order to try to avoid a repetition of the current situation;***

Or. es

Amendment 23
Rosa D'Amato, Marco Valli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

(1) considers that a greater effort needs to be made to create a level playing field for fishery products and that imports should be checked more thoroughly, whether EU or non-EU producers are concerned;

Or. it

Amendment 24
Rosa D'Amato, Marco Valli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – point 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

(1) Calls on the Commission to revise the investment clause so as to enable regional and national investment co-financed under the EMFF to be excluded from national deficit calculation for the purposes of the European Semester;

Or. it

Amendment 25
Isabelle Thomas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. Supports the view widely held by the industry and Member State administrations that the current financing

6. Supports the view widely held by the industry and Member State administrations that the current financing

rules are too complicated and could be less cumbersome;

rules are too complicated and could be ***made*** less cumbersome ***overall, but particularly so for projects involving low levels of funding; points out that, as the report on the omnibus regulation to simplify the Financial Regulation did not cover the EMFF, the EMFF Regulation must be simplified;***

Or. fr

Amendment 26
Rolandas Paksas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Supports the view widely held by the industry and Member State administrations that the current financing rules are too complicated and could be less cumbersome;

Amendment

6. Supports the view widely held by the industry and Member State administrations that the current financing rules are too complicated and could be less cumbersome, ***and that the administrative burden could be reduced;***

Or. lt

Amendment 27
Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Supports the view widely held by the industry and Member State administrations that the current financing rules are too complicated and ***could*** be less cumbersome;

Amendment

6. Supports the view widely held by the industry and Member State administrations that the current financing rules are too complicated and ***must*** be ***made*** less cumbersome ***as quickly as possible;***

Or. fr

Amendment 28
Rosa D’Amato, Marco Valli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 – point 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

(1) Given the delays in implementing the Fund, due primarily to administrative reasons, calls on the Commission and the Member States to submit a tentative schedule setting out the stages following the approval of a programme and specifying the maximum period allowed between approval and publication of the individual notices;

Or. it

Amendment 29
Rosa D’Amato, Marco Valli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Criticises the fact that, under EMFF procedures, if an infringement is committed in the five years after financial support has been granted, the support has to be paid back; also notes that the system rules out access to EMFF financial support when infringements have already been committed;

Or. it

Amendment 30
Alain Cadec

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. *Points up the importance of fisheries control and of scientific-data collection control, those activities being pillars of the CFP; takes the view that they must continue to receive EU funding and that Member States must step up their efforts to make use of the resources concerned;*

Or. fr

Amendment 31
Werner Kuhn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. *Is of the opinion that, for a new EU fisheries fund, proportionality rules must be introduced under which less red tape has to be put up with for small projects than for large projects; suggests in this connection that there should be a sort of ‘de minimis’ rule for low-level financial support under a new EU fisheries fund;*

Or. de

Amendment 32
Alain Cadec

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6b. *Stresses the importance of small-*

scale coastal fishing for the vitality of coastal areas; points up the need for specific EU support for that type of fishing and for coastal communities;

Or. fr

Amendment 33
Isabelle Thomas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Stresses that, even though the EU remains a net seafood importer, European fisheries continue to be a very important source of healthy food for the European market; underlines that the EU should continue to prevent *substandard* products *from entering the EU market*;

Amendment

7. Stresses that, even though the EU remains a net seafood importer, European fisheries continue to be a very important source of healthy food for the European market *and ensure EU food autonomy*; underlines *the fact* that the EU should continue to prevent *EU market entry for products that do not comply with food-related, environmental and social standards deriving from International Labour Organisation Convention No 188, or with provisions to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, and that those requirements must be incorporated into free-trade agreements*;

Or. fr

Amendment 34
Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Stresses that, even though the EU remains a net seafood importer, European fisheries continue to be a very important source of healthy food for the European

Amendment

7. Stresses that, even though the EU remains a net seafood importer, European fisheries continue to be a very important source of healthy food for the European

market; underlines that the EU should continue to prevent substandard products from entering the EU market;

market; underlines that the EU should continue to prevent substandard products from entering the EU market ***and should promote the use of fish from local fisheries in the canteens of public entities such as educational establishments, hospitals, retirement homes, public institutions, etc.***

Or. es

Amendment 35

Francisco José Millán Mon, Gabriel Mato, Carlos Iturgaiz, Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Stresses that, even though the EU remains a net seafood importer, European fisheries continue to be a very important source of healthy food for the European market; underlines that the EU should ***continue*** to prevent ***substandard products*** from entering the EU market;

Amendment

7. Stresses that, even though the EU remains a net seafood importer, European fisheries continue to be a very important source of healthy food for the European market; underlines that the EU should ***strengthen and harmonise controls and inspections of third country imports*** to prevent ***products that do not meet the legal requirements*** from entering the EU market;

Or. es

Amendment 36

Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Stresses that, even though the EU remains a net seafood importer, European fisheries continue to be a very important source of healthy food for the European market; underlines that the EU should

Amendment

7. Stresses that, even though the EU remains a net seafood importer, European fisheries continue to be a very important source of healthy ***and traceable*** food for the European market; underlines ***the fact***

continue to prevent *substandard* products *from entering the EU market*;

that the EU should continue to prevent *EU market entry for* products *failing to meet standards imposed on European fishermen that they comply with*;

Or. fr

Amendment 37

Rosa D'Amato, Marco Valli

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Stresses that, even though the EU remains a net seafood importer, European fisheries continue to be a very important source of healthy food for the European market; underlines that the EU should continue to prevent substandard products from entering the EU market;

Amendment

7. Stresses that, even though the EU remains a net seafood importer, European fisheries continue to be a very important source of healthy food for the European market; underlines that the EU should continue to prevent substandard products *from non-EU countries* from entering the EU market;

Or. it

Amendment 38

Rolandas Paksas

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Stresses that European added value in fisheries management has to date been largely associated with a reduction in the capacity of fishing fleets; is of the opinion that in the post-2020 MFF a balance between the fisheries resources available and fleet capacity will have to be taken into account; highlights, *however*, that other elements with a non-quantifiable added value should be considered as well, such as the role the fishing sector plays in

Amendment

8. Stresses that European added value in fisheries management has to date been largely associated with a reduction in the capacity of fishing fleets; is of the opinion that in the post-2020 MFF a balance between the fisheries resources available and fleet capacity will have to be taken into account; highlights that *when reducing fishing opportunities, support should be allocated to withdrawal from fishing activities and increased funding should be*

communities highly dependent on this activity in terms of employment and local growth; underlines, therefore, that fisheries must remain independent in order to support these communities;

allocated to cutting the number of fishing vessels; feels that other elements with a non-quantifiable added value should be considered as well, such as the role the fishing sector plays in communities highly dependent on this activity in terms of employment and local growth; underlines, therefore, that fisheries must remain independent in order to support these communities;

Or. It

Amendment 39
Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. *Stresses that European added value in fisheries management has to date been largely associated with a reduction in the capacity of fishing fleets; is* of the opinion that in the post-2020 MFF a balance between the fisheries resources available and fleet capacity will have to be taken into account; highlights, however, that other elements with *a non-quantifiable* added value should be considered as well, such as the role the fishing sector plays in communities highly dependent on this activity in terms of employment and local growth; underlines, therefore, that fisheries must remain independent in order to support these communities;

Amendment

8. *Is* of the opinion that in the post-2020 MFF a balance between the fisheries resources available and fleet capacity will have to be taken into account; highlights *the fact*, however, that other elements with added value *that is not easily quantifiable* should be considered as well, such as the role the *European* fishing sector plays *in improving selectivity and* in communities highly dependent on this activity in terms of employment and local growth; underlines, therefore, that fisheries must remain independent in order to support these communities;

Or. fr

Amendment 40
Rosa D'Amato, Marco Valli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Stresses that European added value in fisheries management has to date been largely associated with a reduction in the capacity of fishing fleets; is of the opinion that in the post-2020 MFF a balance between the fisheries resources available and fleet capacity will have to be taken into account; highlights, however, that other elements with a non-quantifiable added value should be considered as well, such as the role the fishing sector plays in communities highly dependent on this activity in terms of employment and local growth; underlines, therefore, that fisheries must remain independent in order to support these communities;

Amendment

8. Stresses that European added value in fisheries management has to date been largely associated with a reduction in the capacity of fishing fleets; is of the opinion that in the post-2020 MFF a balance between the fisheries resources available and fleet capacity will have to be taken into account; highlights, however, that other elements with a non-quantifiable added value should be considered as well, such as the role the fishing sector plays in communities highly dependent on this activity in terms of ***direct and indirect*** employment and local growth; underlines, therefore, that fisheries must remain independent in order to support these communities ***and guarantee greater territorial cohesion***;

Or. it

Amendment 41
Isabelle Thomas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Stresses that European added value in fisheries management has to date been largely associated with ***a reduction in the capacity of fishing fleets***; is of the opinion that in the post-2020 MFF a balance between the fisheries resources available and fleet capacity will have to be taken into account; highlights, however, that other elements with a non-quantifiable added value should be considered as well, such as the role the fishing sector plays in communities highly dependent on this activity in terms of employment and local

Amendment

8. Stresses that European added value in fisheries management has to date been largely associated with ***sound resource management, product quality and product processing***; is of the opinion that in the post-2020 MFF a balance between the fisheries resources available and fleet capacity will have to be taken into account; highlights, however, that other elements with a non-quantifiable added value should be considered as well, such as the role the fishing sector plays in communities highly dependent on this activity in terms of

growth; underlines, therefore, that fisheries must remain independent in order to support these communities;

employment and local growth; underlines, therefore, that fisheries must remain independent in order to support these communities;

Or. fr

Amendment 42

Francisco José Millán Mon, Gabriel Mato, Carlos Iturgaiz, Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Stresses that European added value in fisheries management has to date been largely associated with a reduction in the capacity of fishing fleets; is of the opinion that in the post-2020 MFF a balance between the fisheries resources available and fleet capacity will have to be taken into account; highlights, however, that other elements with a non-quantifiable added value should be considered as well, such as the role the fishing sector plays in communities highly dependent on this activity in terms of employment and local growth; underlines, therefore, that fisheries must ***remain independent*** in order to support these communities;

Amendment

8. Stresses that European added value in fisheries management has to date been largely associated with a reduction in the capacity of fishing fleets; is of the opinion that in the post-2020 MFF a balance between the fisheries resources available and fleet capacity will have to be taken into account; highlights, however, that other elements with a non-quantifiable added value should be considered as well, such as the role the fishing sector plays in communities highly dependent on this activity in terms of employment and local growth; underlines, therefore, that ***an independent fisheries fund must continue to exist*** in order to support these communities;

Or. es

Amendment 43

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Stresses that coastal communities that depend on artisanal fisheries should

be a priority in the future EMFF given the importance of artisanal fisheries in such localities in terms of the environment and employment, this sector accounting for 80% of the European fleet and for 40% of employment in the primary sector as a whole, in addition to the jobs created indirectly in local distribution, the manufacture of nets or ship repair; stresses, moreover, that coastal communities that depend on artisanal fisheries should be a priority in the future EMFF to ensure growth and provide income and employment; notes that this was the message of the reform of the common fisheries policy and that this message was heeded when the new policy was formulated.

Or. es

Amendment 44
Nicola Caputo, Renata Briano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Stresses the importance of the social and economic dimension of fishing for local communities and some maritime and coastal regions; recognises the need to maintain enough financial provisions for enabling coastal, artisanal and small scale fleet sectors to obtain funding;

Or. en

Amendment 45
Werner Kuhn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

8a. Highlights the fact that traditional coastal fishing is a major source of attractiveness for tourists and, as such, also has a considerable indirect impact on other sectors of the economy;

Or. de

Amendment 46
Isabelle Thomas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Highlights that European coastal communities are, and will remain, ***highly dependent on the fisheries sector, even though its contribution to local economies is constantly declining***; stresses, therefore, that community-led local development (CLLD) and fisheries local action groups (FLAGs) should remain a focus and their funding must be increased, as they serve to enable local fisheries communities to address these challenges at grass-roots level, using the knowledge of local stakeholders to tackle local issues; underlines, in this regard, the importance of keeping the financing structure of fishermen's producer organisations intact;

Amendment

9. Highlights ***the fact*** that European coastal communities are ***highly dependent on the fisheries sector***, and will remain ***so, both in connection with seafood product processing, tourism and catering and, upstream, as regards shipyard, maintenance and repair work, safety and new technologies***; stresses, therefore, that community-led local development (CLLD) and fisheries local action groups (FLAGs) should remain a focus and their funding must be increased, as they serve to enable local fisheries communities to address these challenges at grass-roots level, using the knowledge of local stakeholders to tackle local issues; underlines, in this regard, the importance of keeping the financing structure of fishermen's producer organisations intact ***and of making contributions to representative professional bodies***;

Or. fr

Amendment 47
Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Highlights that European coastal communities are, and will remain, highly dependent on the fisheries sector, even though its contribution to local economies is constantly declining; stresses, therefore, that **community-led local development (CLLD)** and fisheries local action groups (FLAGs) should remain a focus and their funding must be increased, as they serve to enable local fisheries communities to address these challenges at grass-roots level, using the knowledge of local stakeholders to tackle local issues; underlines, in this regard, the importance of keeping the financing structure of fishermen's producer organisations intact;

Amendment

9. Highlights that European coastal communities are, and will remain, highly dependent on the fisheries sector, even though its contribution to local economies is constantly declining; stresses, therefore, that **the involvement of the coastal communities concerned** and fisheries local action groups (FLAGs) should remain a focus and their funding must be increased, as they serve to enable local fisheries communities to address these challenges at grass-roots level, using the knowledge of local stakeholders to tackle local issues; underlines, in this regard, the importance of keeping the financing structure of fishermen's producer organisations intact;

Or. fr

Amendment 48
Ruža Tomašić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Highlights that European coastal communities are, and will remain, highly dependent on the fisheries sector, even though its contribution to local economies is constantly declining; stresses, therefore, that community-led local development (CLLD) and fisheries local action groups (FLAGs) should remain a focus and their funding must be increased, as they serve to enable local fisheries communities to address these challenges at grass-roots level, using the knowledge of local stakeholders to tackle local issues; underlines, in this regard, the importance of keeping the financing structure of

Amendment

9. Highlights that European coastal **and island** communities are, and will remain, highly dependent on the fisheries sector, even though its contribution to local economies is constantly declining; stresses, therefore, that community-led local development (CLLD) and fisheries local action groups (FLAGs) should remain a focus and their funding must be increased, as they serve to enable local fisheries communities to address these challenges at grass-roots level, using the knowledge of local stakeholders to tackle local issues; underlines, in this regard, the importance of keeping the financing structure of

fishermen's producer organisations intact;

fishermen's producer organisations intact;

Or. hr

Amendment 49

Marco Affronte, Linnéa Engström

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. Believes that control measures are a fundamental and essential component of the CFP in order to ensure a level playing field and that sufficient economic and other resources need to be dedicated to control activities, both by the Commission and the Member States; considers, thus, that the future fund must ensure sufficient support in this regard;

Or. en

Amendment 50

Francisco José Millán Mon, Gabriel Mato, Carlos Iturgaiz, Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. Stresses the need to maintain the financing structure for the two collective support instruments for the fisheries sector, local action groups and producer organisations in the fisheries sector, in view of the fact that they constitute core elements for the development of fisheries in regions that depend on this activity;

Or. es

Amendment 51

Francisco José Millán Mon, Gabriel Mato, Carlos Iturgaiz, Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9b. Considers that the EMFF should continue to prioritise financial support to coastal and artisanal fisheries given the socioeconomic role they play in regions that are highly dependent on fisheries, but without jeopardising the financial support to other fleets necessary for the supply of healthy foodstuffs to EU markets;

Or. es

Amendment 52

Francisco José Millán Mon, Gabriel Mato, Carlos Iturgaiz, Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9c. Considers it necessary, with a view to the upcoming reform of the MFF, to launch a debate on the possible funding of measures to modernise certain fleets that are obsolete and that pose safety risks at sea, as is the case with some fleets in the outermost regions, provided this does not lead to an increase in fishing capacity;

Or. es

Amendment 53

Francisco José Millán Mon, Gabriel Mato, Carlos Iturgaiz, Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9d. *Considers it very important to enhance financial support for innovation and technological development to help meet the objectives of the CFP, taking into account the need to improve the selectivity of fishing gear, notably in the context of the landing obligation and the fulfilment of the MSY;*

Or. es

Amendment 54
Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. *Stresses the increasingly important role of the so-called ‘blue economy’; is of the opinion that the priorities of the Blue Growth strategy should be aligned with those of the EMFF, i.e. environmental sustainability, resource efficiency, competitiveness, creation of high-quality employment opportunities and territorial cohesion; calls on the Commission to reassess the financial allocations for Blue Growth in the MFF and stresses that a fisheries fund should play an important role in this regard;*

Amendment

10. *Stresses that under no circumstances should financing be provided for ‘blue economy’ activities that directly or indirectly jeopardise fishing activities or cause damage to fishery resources through pollution, altered currents, etc.;*

Or. es

Amendment 55
Isabelle Thomas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Stresses the increasingly important role of the so-called ‘blue economy’; is of the opinion that the priorities of the Blue Growth strategy should be aligned with those of the EMFF, i.e. environmental sustainability, resource efficiency, competitiveness, creation of high-quality employment opportunities and territorial cohesion; calls on the Commission to reassess the financial allocations for Blue Growth in the MFF and stresses that a fisheries fund should play an important role in this regard;

Amendment

10. Stresses the increasingly important role of the so-called ‘blue economy’; is of the opinion that the priorities of the Blue Growth strategy should be aligned with those of the EMFF, ***with a specific budget heading being assigned accordingly***, i.e. environmental sustainability, resource efficiency, competitiveness, creation of high-quality employment opportunities, ***academic and vocational training***, and territorial cohesion; calls on the Commission to reassess the financial allocations for Blue Growth in the MFF and stresses that a fisheries fund should play an important role in this regard;

Or. fr

Amendment 56
Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Stresses the increasingly important role of the so-called ‘blue economy’; is of the opinion that the priorities of the Blue Growth strategy should be aligned with those of the EMFF, i.e. environmental sustainability, resource efficiency, competitiveness, creation of high-quality employment opportunities and territorial cohesion; calls on the Commission to reassess the financial allocations for Blue Growth in the MFF and stresses that ***a fisheries fund should play*** an important role in this regard;

Amendment

10. Stresses the increasingly important role of the so-called ‘blue economy’; is of the opinion that the priorities of the Blue Growth strategy should be aligned with those of the EMFF, i.e. environmental sustainability, resource efficiency, competitiveness, creation of high-quality employment opportunities and territorial cohesion; calls on the Commission to reassess the financial allocations for Blue Growth in the MFF and stresses that ***fishing already plays*** an important role in this regard ***in many regions***;

Or. fr

Amendment 57

Francisco José Millán Mon, Gabriel Mato, Carlos Iturgaiz, Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion

Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10a. Welcomes the desire to boost the aquaculture sector under the European strategy for the ‘blue economy’ – to which 20 % of the EMFF is allocated – but regrets the administrative obstacles to the development of aquaculture and, hence, calls for thought to be given to ways of reducing red tape in the Member States;

Or. es

Amendment 58

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, José Blanco López, Renata Briano, Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

Amendment

11. Highlights the need for supporting measures to facilitate social dialogue and to use the EMFF to help train skilled professionals for the maritime and fisheries sector; stresses the importance of modernising the maritime and fisheries sector and notes the role that innovation plays in this;

11. Highlights the need for supporting measures to facilitate social dialogue and to use the EMFF to help train skilled professionals for the maritime and fisheries sector; stresses the importance of modernising the maritime and fisheries sector and notes the role that innovation plays in this; ***calls, thus, for investment in technological development and innovation to be enhanced; calls for enterprises in other sectors that develop proposals for the fisheries sector to be given access to the funds and for greater financing possibilities to encourage improvements in the economic and environmental performance of the sector;***

Or. es

Amendment 59
Isabelle Thomas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

11. Highlights the need for supporting measures to facilitate social dialogue and to use the EMFF to help train skilled professionals for the maritime and fisheries sector; stresses the importance of modernising the maritime and fisheries sector *and notes the role that innovation plays in this*;

Amendment

11. Highlights the need for supporting measures to facilitate social dialogue and to use the EMFF to help train skilled professionals for the maritime and fisheries sector; stresses the importance of modernising the maritime and fisheries sector; ***calls for greater innovation, in particular as regards selectivity, energy efficiency of vessels, alterations that need to be made to them because of the landing obligation, and crew comfort and safety***;

Or. fr

Amendment 60
Ruža Tomašić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

11a. Stresses the importance of promoting and investing in the diversification of fisheries through developing complementary activities;

Amendment

Or. hr

Amendment 61
Ruža Tomašić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11b. Stresses the importance of aquaculture, which can contribute to maintaining the capacity to produce food sustainably;

Or. hr

Amendment 62

Rosa D'Amato, Marco Valli

Draft opinion

Paragraph 12

Draft opinion

12. Recalls the need to improve the gathering of scientific data and ensure better access to it, and to foster cooperation between the maritime and fisheries sector on the one hand and the scientific community, NGOs and *other entities* on the other;

Amendment

12. Recalls the need to improve the gathering of scientific data and ensure better access to it, and to foster cooperation between the maritime and fisheries sector on the one hand and the scientific community, NGOs and *stakeholders* on the other; ***points to the need to set up a system for continuous updating of these data, a high proportion of which serve as the basis for legislative proposals;***

Or. it

Amendment 63

Rolandas Paksas

Draft opinion

Paragraph 12

Draft opinion

12. Recalls the need to improve the gathering of scientific data and ensure better access to it, and to foster cooperation between the maritime and fisheries sector on the one hand and the scientific community, NGOs and other entities on the other;

Amendment

12. Recalls the need to improve the gathering of scientific data and ensure better access to it, and to foster cooperation between the maritime and fisheries sector on the one hand and the scientific community, NGOs and other entities on the other, ***as well as to work on new scientific***

research and to develop new fisheries sectors, such as aquaponics;

Or. It

Amendment 64
Ruža Tomašić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 12

Draft opinion

12. Recalls the need to improve the gathering of scientific data and ensure better access to it, and to foster cooperation between the maritime and fisheries sector on the one hand and the scientific community, NGOs and other entities on the other;

Amendment

12. Recalls the need to improve the gathering of scientific data and ensure better access to it, and to foster cooperation ***and the exchange of scientific data*** between the maritime and fisheries sector on the one hand and the scientific community, NGOs and other entities on the other;

Or. hr

Amendment 65
Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 12

Draft opinion

12. Recalls the need to improve the gathering of scientific data and ensure better access to it, and to foster cooperation between the maritime and fisheries sector on the one hand and the scientific community, NGOs and other entities on the other;

Amendment

12. Recalls the need to improve the gathering of scientific data and ensure better access to it, and to foster cooperation between the maritime and fisheries sector on the one hand and the scientific community, NGOs and other ***private- and public-sector*** entities on the other;

Or. fr

Amendment 66
Nicola Caputo, Renata Briano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 12 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

12a. Reiterates the importance of drawing on rigorous and independent scientific opinions when assessing the state of fishery resources, so that management decisions can be taken which make it possible to achieve maximum sustainable yields (MSY); is of the opinion that in the post-2020 EMFF sufficient funding should be foreseen for the purpose of scientific data collection;

Or. en

Amendment 67
Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 13

Draft opinion

Amendment

13. Stresses the importance of maintaining the same level of financing for the European Fisheries Control Agency.

13. Stresses the importance of maintaining the same level of financing for the European Fisheries Control Agency ***solely in respect of its control, inspection and surveillance tasks in the fisheries sector; notes, furthermore, that it is opposed to European Fisheries Control Agency funds being used to finance or indirectly strengthen other activities such as those of Frontex;***

Or. es

Amendment 68
Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, José Blanco López, Renata Briano, Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 13

Draft opinion

13. Stresses the importance of maintaining the same level of financing for the European Fisheries Control Agency.

Amendment

13. Stresses the importance of maintaining ***at least*** the same level of financing for the European Fisheries Control Agency ***and of strengthening its role in the future in order to be able to attain the objectives set in the CFP.***

Or. es

Amendment 69
Marco Affronte, Linnéa Engström

Draft opinion
Paragraph 13

Draft opinion

13. Stresses the importance of ***maintaining the same level of financing for*** the European Fisheries Control Agency.

Amendment

13. Stresses the importance of ***ensuring that*** the European Fisheries Control Agency ***has sufficient funding in order to fulfil its mission, and that this may well require an increase in the relevant budget line.***

Or. en

Amendment 70
Isabelle Thomas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 13

Draft opinion

13. Stresses the importance of ***maintaining*** the ***same*** level of financing for the European Fisheries Control Agency.

Amendment

13. Stresses the importance of ***increasing*** the level of financing for the European Fisheries Control Agency.

Or. fr

Amendment 71
Nicola Caputo, Renata Briano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 13 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

13a. Emphasises the importance of the role of the European Fisheries Control Agency (EFCA) as regards the governance of fishing fleets and the supervision of monitoring procedures; calls for the EFCA to be given the funds it needs to do its job;

Or. en