



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

Committee on Fisheries

2012/2009(DEC)

4.6.2012

AMENDMENTS

1 - 59

Draft opinion
Guido Milana
(PE486.054v01-00)

Special Report No 12/2011 (2011 Discharge – Have EU measures contributed to adapting the capacity of the fishing fleets to available fishing opportunities? (2012/2009(DEC))

AM\904036EN.doc

PE491.084v01-00

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1
Carl Haglund

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – introductory part

Motion for a resolution

1. Notes that, in its report, the Court of Auditors:

Amendment

1. ***Welcomes the special*** report ***by*** the Court of Auditors ***that scrutinizes the economical and ecological impact the implementation of the CFP and the EFF has had on the Union fishing sector.***
Notes that, in its report, the Court of Auditors:

Or. en

Amendment 2
Isabella Lövin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – points -a to -ae (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(-a) found that the CFP does not have adequate rules for key issues related to overcapacity of the fishing fleet;
(-ab) found that the Member States have not fulfilled their obligation under the CFP of putting in place effective measures to match fishing capacity to fishing opportunities, and the Commission's monitoring and supervision of the Member States did not prevent significant implementation problems;
(-ac) found that the investments on board fishing vessels funded by the European Fisheries Fund (EFF) could increase the ability of individual vessels to catch fish;
-ad) found that the Union fishing fleet register was not correctly updated with details of fishing vessels scrapped with

public aid;

(-ae) found that the reporting of efforts to reduce fishing overcapacity was inadequate.

Or. en

Amendment 3
Pat the Cope Gallagher

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point a

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(a) considers that transferable fishing concessions are the only possible solution to the problem of overcapacity, for which there is as yet no precise definition;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 4
Guido Milana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point a

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(a) considers that transferable fishing concessions are the only possible solution to the problem of overcapacity, for which there is as yet no precise definition;

deleted

Or. it

Amendment 5
Carl Haglund

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point a

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(a) considers that transferable fishing concessions are the only possible solution to the problem of overcapacity, for which there is as yet no precise definition;

deleted

Or. en

**Amendment 6
Isabella Lövin**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point a**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(a) considers that transferable fishing concessions are the only possible solution to the problem of overcapacity, for which there is as yet no precise definition;

deleted

Or. en

**Amendment 7
Alain Cadec**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point a**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(a) considers that transferable fishing concessions are the only possible solution to the problem of overcapacity, for which there is as yet no precise definition;

(a) suggests that transferable fishing concessions could be one conceivable solution to overcapacity if the latter was truly quantifiable and had been quantified, which is not currently the case;

Or. fr

Amendment 8
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point a

Motion for a resolution

(a) considers that transferable fishing concessions are the only possible solution to the problem of overcapacity, for which there is as yet no precise definition;

Amendment

(a) considers that transferable fishing concessions are **not** the only possible solution to the problem of overcapacity, for which there is as yet no precise definition;

Or. es

Amendment 9
Carl Haglund

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point a a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(aa) states that a very significant number of jobs has been lost in the European fishing industry over the past decade because of the poor state of fish stocks and technological advances have increased fishing capacity;

Or. en

Amendment 10
Guido Milana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point a a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(aa) indicates other instruments of the common fisheries policy as possible ways of reducing fishing capacity and, purely by way of example, analyses transferable

*fishing concessions without identifying
beneficial effects in them;*

Or. it

Amendment 11

Alain Cadec

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 – point a a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

*(aa) indicates clearly that withdrawing the
licence or capacity of a vessel does not
affect the fishing quotas, nor therefore the
preservation of the resource (paragraph
27);*

Or. fr

Amendment 12

Alain Cadec

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 – point a b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

*(ab) states that there is no clear link
between fishing capacity and fishing
opportunities and that this therefore
'complicates the identification of suitable
policies to reduce fishing overcapacity'
and 'makes it difficult to assess the
performance of those policies' (paragraph
73);*

Or. fr

Amendment 13

Alain Cadec

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point a c (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(ac) expresses scepticism about a fishing rights transfer scheme and calls on the Commission to explain what role transferable fishing rights could have in reducing capacity (paragraph 77);

Or. fr

Amendment 14
Alain Cadec

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point a d (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(ad) recommends that Member States should fulfil their obligation to keep the fishing fleet registers up to date so that the Commission may find a balance between fleet capacity and fishing opportunities, which is currently impossible (paragraph 77);

Or. fr

Amendment 15
Carl Haglund

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point b

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(b) fails to consider the features specific to each area and types of fishing, e.g. the difference between small-scale and industrial fishing;

deleted

Amendment 16
Isabella Lövin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point b

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(b) fails to consider the features specific to each area and types of fishing, e.g. the difference between small-scale and industrial fishing; *deleted*

Or. en

Amendment 17
Carl Haglund

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point b a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(ba) Notes that the total catches in the Union have decreased with over 1 million tonnes over the last decade;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Guido Milana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point c

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(c) has ignored the fact that a multi-species fishing system, like that in the Mediterranean, cannot be founded on *deleted*

catch quotas.

Or. it

Amendment 19

Carl Haglund

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 – point c

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(c) has ignored the fact that a multi-species fishing system, like that in the Mediterranean, cannot be founded on catch quotas.

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 20

Isabella Lövin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 – point c

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(c) has ignored the fact that a multi-species fishing system, like that in the Mediterranean, cannot be founded on catch quotas.

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 21

Antolín Sánchez Presedo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 – point c

Motion for a resolution

(c) has ignored the fact that a multi-species fishing system, like that in the Mediterranean, cannot be founded on catch quotas.

Amendment

(c) has ignored the fact that a multi-species fishing system, like that in the Mediterranean **and Sole Bank**, cannot be founded on catch quotas.

Or. es

Amendment 22

Carl Haglund

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 – point c a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(ca) considers that overcapacity continues to be one of the main reasons of the failure of the CFP aiming at assuring sustainable fisheries;

Or. en

Amendment 23

Guido Milana

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 – point c a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(ca) denounces the inadequacy of the information supplied by Member States and the consequent difficulties in identifying policies which can reduce fishing over-capacity and in assessing the results of such policies.

Or. it

Amendment 24
Carl Haglund

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

1a. Considers that the data available on the actual capacity of the Union fishing fleet are not reliable, because technological development has not been taken into account and the Member States failed to accurately report on the fleet capacities.

Or. en

Amendment 25
Carl Haglund

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

1b. Considers that the fleet capacity ceilings don't reflect the fishing effort and have become irrelevant since the fleet is well below the ceiling due to the decreased amount of gross tonnage and engine size. At the same time, points out that, due to the technological advances, the fishing capacity of the fleets has increased with an average of 3 % per year during the last decade.

Or. en

Amendment 26
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

1a. Believes that it is essential that the Commission urgently draft a report containing the data on existing overcapacity in the Union, broken down by fishery and country.

Or. es

Amendment 27
Carl Haglund

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

2. Takes the view that a multi-species fishing system should be combined with the notion of fishing effort.

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 28
Isabella Lövin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

2. Takes the view that a multi-species fishing system should be combined with the notion of fishing effort.

2. Recommends that the Commission:

- (a) take the initiative to develop actions to effectively reduce overcapacity of the fishing fleet, to address the above weaknesses, including better defining fishing capacity, setting effective limits for fishing fleets capacity;***
- (b) establish whether the scheme of public***

aid for on-board investments needs to be reconsidered in light of the difficulties in avoiding investments which increase fishing ability.

Or. en

Amendment 29
Isabella Lövin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

2a. Recommends that the Member States:

(a) design and implement measures to adapt their fleet to fishing opportunities and ensure that the fleet register is correctly updated, and that reports on their efforts to balance fishing capacity with fishing opportunities provide the required information and are of suitable quality;

(b) ensure that any measures to aid investments on board are strictly applied and do not increase fishing ability;

(c) ensure that selection criteria for fishing vessel decommissioning schemes are designed to have a positive impact on the sustainability of the targeted fish stocks and avoid providing public aid for decommissioning in-active fishing vessels.

Or. en

Amendment 30
Carl Haglund

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

3a. Notes that although there is no official definition of overcapacity, declined catches and lost jobs caused by overfished fish stocks demonstrates a de facto overcapacity. Therefore, calls on the Commission to define overcapacity and consider more relevant and robust measures to facilitate actions to balance fishing capacity with fishing opportunities.

Or. en

Amendment 31

Alain Cadec

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 – introductory part

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

3. *Considers* that:

3. *Takes the view* that:

Or. fr

Amendment 32

Isabella Lövin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

3a. Considers that *the recommendations of the Court of Auditors should be acted upon urgently, in particular:*

(a) the definition and accurate measurement of fishing capacity based on the FAO Technical Consultation on the Measurement of Fishing Capacity; and

(b) the adoption of a set of qualitative environmental criteria guiding the fleets capacity management programmes.

Or. en

Amendment 33
Isabella Lövin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 – point a

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(a) the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund makes no provision for compensation to fishermen who lose their jobs owing to the scrapping of vessels; *deleted*

Or. en

Amendment 34
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 – point a

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(a) the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund makes no provision for compensation to fishermen who lose their jobs owing to the scrapping of vessels;

(a) the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund makes no provision for compensation to fishermen who lose their jobs owing to the scrapping of vessels, *or to women who are affected by a stoppage of fishing activity*;

Or. es

Amendment 35
Alain Cadec

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 – points a a and a b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(aa) the report by the Court of Auditors should not pass political judgment nor prejudge the methods for distributing fishing opportunities or fleet management tools that would be used to achieve the CFP objectives, which should be decided by the legislator;

(ab) the recommendations based on the concept of overcapacity, which is not defined, are contradictory;

Or. fr

Amendment 36
Alain Cadec

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 – point b

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(b) in the interest of reducing fleet size, it is essential to allow for an adequate transitional period before the final withdrawal of public funds for scrappage, by providing support measures for crews;

deleted

Or. fr

Amendment 37
Isabella Lövin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 – point b

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(b) in the interest of reducing fleet size, it is essential to allow for an adequate

deleted

transitional period before the final withdrawal of public funds for scrappage, by providing support measures for crews;

Or. en

Amendment 38
Pat the Cope Gallagher

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 – point b

Motion for a resolution

(b) in the interest of reducing fleet size, it is essential to *allow* for *an adequate transitional period before the final withdrawal* of public funds for scrappage, by providing support measures for crews;

Amendment

(b) in the interest of reducing fleet size, it is essential to *ensure that selection criteria for fishing vessel decommissioning schemes are designed to have a positive impact on the sustainability of the targeted fish stocks and avoid providing public aid for decommissioning inactive fishing vessels;*

Or. en

Amendment 39
Carl Haglund

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 – point b

Motion for a resolution

(b) *in the interest of reducing fleet size, it is essential to allow* for *an adequate transitional period before the final withdrawal* of public funds for scrappage, by providing support measures for crews;

Amendment

(b) *the scrapping schemes have partially been badly implemented, with examples of tax payers money used for scrapping of already inactive vessels or even for rebuilding new vessels; while at the same time other Member States have had scrapping schemes that have fulfilled their purpose; stresses therefore the need for strict safeguards when using scrapping schemes as a way of reducing overcapacity in order to avoid abuse;*

Amendment 40
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 – point b

Motion for a resolution

(b) in the interest of reducing fleet size, it is essential to allow for an adequate transitional period before the final withdrawal of public funds for scrappage, by providing support measures for crews;

Amendment

(b) in the interest of reducing fleet size, it is essential to allow for an adequate transitional period before the final withdrawal of public funds for scrappage, by providing support measures for crews ***and for those women whose jobs are linked to the activity of each vessel;***

Or. es

Amendment 41
Isabella Lövin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 – point c

Motion for a resolution

(c) reducing fishing capacity is only one of the parameters for a genuine reduction in fishing effort.

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 42
Pat the Cope Gallagher

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 – point c

Motion for a resolution

(c) **reducing** fishing **capacity** is **only one** of the **parameters for a genuine reduction in fishing effort**.

Amendment

(c) fishing **overcapacity needs to be defined and quantified in the CFP and EMFF regulations. Suggests a possible definition of fishing overcapacity in terms of economic overcapacity where each individual or group of fishing vessels is assessed as to whether or not it is economically viable with the available fishing opportunities. This will lead to properly determining the extent of the fishing overcapacity problem in the different fisheries and fleets.**

Or. en

Amendment 43

Alain Cadec

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 – point c

Motion for a resolution

(c) reducing fishing capacity is only one of the parameters for a genuine reduction in fishing effort.

Amendment

(c) **fishing effort and fishing capacity are two distinct concepts; for this reason,** reducing fishing capacity is only one of the parameters for **achieving** a genuine reduction in fishing effort.

Or. fr

Amendment 44

Carl Haglund

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 – introductory part

Motion for a resolution

4. **Takes the view that, in order to achieve the objective of a real** reduction in fishing

Amendment

4. **Considers that a reduction in fishing effort is needed to reach maximum**

effort, *provision should be made for the following additional measures:*

sustainable yield.

Or. en

Amendment 45

Alain Cadec

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 – introductory part

Motion for a resolution

4. Takes the view that, in order to achieve the objective of a real reduction in fishing effort, provision should be made for the following ***additional*** measures:

Amendment

4. Takes the view that, in order to achieve the objective of a real reduction in fishing effort, provision should be made for the following measures:

Or. fr

Amendment 46

Antolín Sánchez Presedo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 – point -a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(-a) making available the funding needed for the proper implementation of the multiannual management plans and the achievement of the MSY;

Or. es

Amendment 47

Isabella Lövin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 – point b

Motion for a resolution

(b) stepping up ***self-regulation for*** fishermen ***by*** implementing local management plans, ***while pursuing regionalisation*** objectives;

Amendment

(b) stepping up fishermen's ***participation in developing and*** implementing local ***fleet*** management plans, ***in line with the CFP*** objectives;

Or. en

Amendment 48

Isabella Lövin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 – point c

Motion for a resolution

(c) encouraging additional, complementary sources of income for fishermen;

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 49

Barbara Matera

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 – point c

Draft opinion

(c) encouraging additional, complementary sources of income for fishermen;

Amendment

(c) encouraging additional, complementary sources of income for fishermen ***in order to improve their living and working conditions while ensuring the sustainability of resources;***

Or. it

Amendment 50

Antolín Sánchez Presedo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 – point d

Motion for a resolution

(d) encouraging specific funding for the use of more selective and environmentally friendly fishing equipment.

Amendment

(d) encouraging specific funding for the use of more selective and environmentally friendly fishing equipment, ***in particular under the framework of specific programmes supporting artisanal fishing, traditional aquaculture and small-scale fishing, including shellfish gathering and mussel breeding in the natural environment.***

Or. es

Amendment 51
Andreas Mölzer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 – point d a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(da) reducing industrial fishing and increasing small-scale fishing.

Or. de

Amendment 52
Guido Milana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 – point d a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(da) collecting data, for which purpose it is desirable to increase the rate of EU cofinancing;

Or. it

Amendment 53
Alain Cadec

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 – point d a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

***(da) ensuring widespread application of
multiannual management plans;***

Or. fr

Amendment 54
Guido Milana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 – point d b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

(db) planning targeted scrapping per area.

Or. it

Amendment 55
Alain Cadec

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 – point d b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

***(db) improving the checks and respecting
the capacity ceilings that are in place;***

Or. fr

Amendment 56
Carl Haglund

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

4a. Calls on the Commission to set effective fishing fleet capacity ceilings.

Or. en

Amendment 57
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

4a. Considers that a reform of the CFP is needed to regionalise its implementation and the management of its programmes and measures.

Or. es

Amendment 58
Carl Haglund

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

4b. Calls on the Commission to clarify how fishing concessions should be treated if fishing vessels are decommissioned with public aid.

Or. en

Amendment 59
Carl Haglund

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 c (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

4c. Calls on the Commission to enforce Member State's obligation to correctly update their fleet register and to establish the obligation to report on their efforts to balance fishing capacity with fishing opportunities;

Or. en