

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

1999



2004

---

*Session document*

FINAL  
**A5-0315/2001**

9 October 2001

**\***

## **REPORT**

on the proposal for a Council regulation on the conclusion of a Protocol setting out the fishing opportunities and financial contribution provided for in the Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Democratic Republic of Madagascar on fishing off Madagascar for the period from 21 May 2001 to 20 May 2004  
(COM(2001) 409 – C5-0406/2001 – 2001/0161(CNS))

Committee on Fisheries

Rapporteur: Carmen Fraga Estévez

### ***Symbols for procedures***

- \* Consultation procedure  
*majority of the votes cast*
- \*\*I Cooperation procedure (first reading)  
*majority of the votes cast*
- \*\*II Cooperation procedure (second reading)  
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position  
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend  
the common position*
- \*\*\* Assent procedure  
*majority of Parliament's component Members except in cases  
covered by Articles 105, 107, 161 and 300 of the EC Treaty and  
Article 7 of the EU Treaty*
- \*\*\*I Codecision procedure (first reading)  
*majority of the votes cast*
- \*\*\*II Codecision procedure (second reading)  
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position  
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend  
the common position*
- \*\*\*III Codecision procedure (third reading)  
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the joint text*

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the Commission)

### ***Amendments to a legislative text***

In amendments by Parliament, amended text is highlighted in ***bold italics***. Highlighting in *normal italics* is an indication for the relevant departments showing parts of the legislative text for which a correction is proposed, to assist preparation of the final text (for instance, obvious errors or omissions in a given language version). These suggested corrections are subject to the agreement of the departments concerned.

## CONTENTS

	Page
PROCEDURAL PAGE .....	4
LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL .....	5
DRAFT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION.....	7
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	8
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUDGETS .....	12
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION .....	17

## PROCEDURAL PAGE

By letter of 10 September 2001 the Council consulted Parliament, pursuant to Article 37 in conjunction with Article 300, paragraph 2 and 3, first subparagraph of the EC Treaty, on the proposal for a Council regulation on the conclusion of a Protocol setting out the fishing opportunities and financial contribution provided for in the Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Democratic Republic of Madagascar on fishing off Madagascar for the period from 21 May 2001 to 20 May 2004 (COM(2001) 409 - 2001/0161 (CNS)).

At the sitting of 19 September 2001 the President of Parliament announced that she had referred this proposal to the Committee on Fisheries as the committee responsible and the Committee on Budgets and the Committee for Development and COoperation... for their opinion(s) (C5-0406/2001).

The Committee on Fisheries had appointed Carmen Fraga Estévez rapporteur at its meeting of 24 April 2001.

The committee considered the Commission proposal and draft report at its meetings of 29 May, 12 September and 9 October 2001.

At the last meeting it adopted the draft legislative resolution by 9 votes to 1, with 0 abstention.

The following were present for the vote: Daniel Varela Suanzes-Carpegna, chairman; Rosa Miguélez Ramos, vice-chairman; Carmen Fraga Estévez, rapporteur; Niels Busk, Arlindo Cunha, Ian Stewart Hudghton, Salvador Jové Peres (for Mihail Papayannakis), Heinz Kindermann, Brigitte Langenhagen, Patricia McKenna, James Nicholson and Dominique F.C. Souchet.

The opinions of the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Development and Cooperation are attached.

The report was tabled on 9 October 2001.

The deadline for tabling amendments will be indicated in the draft agenda for the relevant part-session.

## LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL

**Proposal for a Council regulation on the conclusion of a Protocol setting out the fishing opportunities and financial contribution provided for in the Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Democratic Republic of Madagascar on fishing off Madagascar for the period from 21 May 2001 to 20 May 2004 (COM(2001) 409 – C5-0406/2001 – 2001/0161(CNS))**

The proposal is amended as follows:

Text proposed by the Commission<sup>1</sup>

---

Amendments by Parliament

---

Amendment 1  
Article 3a (new)

***During the final year of the Protocol's validity and before any agreement on its renewal is concluded, the Commission shall submit to Parliament and the Council a report on the application of the Agreement and the conditions under which it has been implemented.***

### *Justification*

*Before any new agreement is concluded, the Commission should ask the authorities of the State with which it is to open negotiations to provide information that will enable it to submit a general assessment report to Parliament and the Council.*

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ not yet published

Amendment 2  
Article 3b (new)

***On the basis of this report, and after consulting the European Parliament, the Council shall, if appropriate, grant the Commission a negotiating mandate with a view to the adoption of a new Protocol.***

*Justification*

*The European Parliament and the Council can only meet their respective obligations if they are able to use as a basis the assessment report on implementation of the fisheries agreement.*

Amendment 3  
Article 3c (new)

***The Commission shall forward to the Council and Parliament a copy of the report assessing compliance with the Agreement, including the measures adopted under the Agreement to promote the conservation of resources and strengthen the local fisheries sector.***

*Justification*

*Targeted measures are becoming increasingly important under fisheries agreements. Accordingly, the report provided for in the Protocol and submitted to the Commission should be forwarded to the European Parliament and the Council.*

## DRAFT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

**European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a Council regulation on the conclusion of a Protocol setting out the fishing opportunities and financial contribution provided for in the Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Democratic Republic of Madagascar on fishing off Madagascar for the period from 21 May 2001 to 20 May 2004 (COM(2001) 409 – C5-0406/2001 – 2001/0161(CNS))**

**(Consultation procedure)**

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(2001) 409<sup>1</sup>),
  - having been consulted by the Council pursuant to Article 37 in conjunction with Article 300, paragraph 2 and 3, first subparagraph of the EC Treaty (C5-0406/2001),
  - having regard to Rule 67 and 97(7) of its Rules of Procedure,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Fisheries and the opinions of the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Development and Cooperation (A5-0315/2001),
1. Approves the Commission proposal as amended;
  2. Calls on the Commission to alter its proposal accordingly, pursuant to Article 250(2) of the EC Treaty;
  3. Calls on the Council to notify Parliament should it intend to depart from the text approved by Parliament;
  4. Calls for the conciliation procedure to be initiated should the Council intend to depart from the text approved by Parliament;
  5. Asks to be consulted again if the Council intends to amend the Commission proposal substantially;
  6. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council and Commission.

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ not yet published

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The Commission proposal sets out the content of the seventh Protocol to the fisheries Agreement between the European Union and the Republic of Madagascar for a further period of three years from 21 May 2001 to 20 May 2004. Like all previous protocols, with the exception of the first two, it deals only with fishing opportunities for the Community tuna fleet.

<b>Duration</b>	21.5.1992 to 20.5.1995	21.5.1995 to 20.5.1998	21.5.1998 to 20.5.2001	21.5.2001 to 20.5.2004
<b>Vessels</b>	42 freezer tuna seiners, 8 surface longliners	42 freezer tuna seiners, 16 surface longliners	45 freezer tuna seiners, 30 surface longliners	40 freezer tuna seiners, 40 surface longliners
<b>Financial contribution</b>	ECU 2 175 000	ECU 2 175 000	ECU 2 280 000	€ 2 475 000
<b>Authorised catch</b>	9 000 tonnes	9 000 tonnes	9 500 tonnes	11 000 tonnes
<b>Licence fees for shipowners</b>	ECU 20 per tonne of tuna caught	ECU 20 per tonne of tuna caught	ECU 20 per tonne of tuna caught	€ 25 per tonne of tuna caught
<b>Observers</b>	Possible	Possible	Possible	Possible. If necessary, restricted to one per vessel and 30% of the fleet
<b>Malagasy seamen</b>	Two for whole fleet	Two for whole fleet	Six for whole fleet	40 for whole fleet
<b>Fishing zone</b>	Exclusive economic zone from two miles	Exclusive economic zone from two miles	Exclusive economic zone from ten miles	Exclusive economic zone from twelve miles
<b>Specific measures</b>				
<b>Scientific programme</b>	ECU 375 000	ECU 375 000	ECU 168 000	€ 240 000
<b>Monitoring programme</b>			ECU 600 000	€ 801 000
<b>Coastal fishing</b>			ECU 125 000	€ 210 000
<b>Training programme</b>	ECU 450 000	ECU 450 000	ECU 475 000	€ 300 000
<b>Target % for measures</b>	38%	38%	60%	62.6%

The table provides a detailed overview of the main contents of the Agreement, making it possible to compare it with previous Protocols. Its main features are as follows:

### 1. Fishing opportunities

The current Protocol deals solely with tuna fishing, although it does express the intention that future fishing opportunities for other species could be negotiated, particularly shrimp, an opportunity not available since the Protocol which expired in 1989.

The Agreement provides for fishing opportunities of 11 000 tonnes/year for tuna, a figure which is used as a reference for the payment of the financial contribution. Provision is made for a total of 40 seiners, five fewer than under the previous Protocol, and 40 surface longliners, 10 fewer than previously.

The use of the opportunities offered under the previous Protocol has been highly satisfactory, with a 91% rate of utilisation for tuna seiners and 73% for surface longliners.

### 2. Financial contribution under the Agreement

The annual financial contribution is € 825 000, broken down into € 308 000 of financial compensation in the strict sense, to be paid each year by 30 November, and € 517 000, which is intended to cover the 'targeted measures', in other words measures to promote Malagasy fisheries, including development of the sector itself, as well as the infrastructures, workers and equipment needed for more effective protection of resources. Under the current Protocol, the budget for these 'specific measures' is 62.6% of the total cost.

There have been changes as regards the cost per tonne, as result of an increase in the contribution by shipowners to the payment for fishing opportunities, which has gone up from € 20/tonne of tuna caught to € 25/tonne, as is now becoming customary for agreements with the countries of the south.

Other costs for shipowners which are not strictly financial in nature have also increased, with a very sharp rise in the number of Malagasy seamen to be employed and an increase in the advances for licences to be paid by shipowners (€ 2000 to 2500 for tuna seiners and € 1100 to 1500 for surface longliners over 150 GRT). The amounts to be paid for longliners with a GRT lower than 150 has also been increased from € 800 to 1100.

### 3. Fishing zone

There have also been changes concerning the fishing zone within which Community vessels may operate, with the exclusive zone extended from 10 to 12 miles, in line with the criteria used in agreements with other countries in the region.

#### 4. Targeted measures

As mentioned above, funding for this type of cooperation measures continues to increase and is now as high as 62.6%.

The amount earmarked for monitoring activities has increased substantially, from ECU 600 000 to € 801 000, while the budget allocated for the local fisheries sector is also one of the main priorities of the Protocol and has almost doubled since the previous Protocol, rising from ECU 125 000 to € 210 000. The allocation for scientific programmes has increased from ECU 168 000 to € 240 000.

The following table shows the rate of utilisation by the Malagasy authorities of the allocations for 'targeted measures' under the previous Protocol:

Targeted measure	Rate of utilisation
Scientific programmes	90%
Local fisheries	68%
Support for the Ecole Nationale d'Enseignement Maritime (ENEM)	100%
Training	88%
Surveillance	85%

Although support for local fisheries was the measure with the lowest rate of utilisation, the funding for it is substantially increased in the current Protocol (from ECU 125 000 to € 210 000 per year). However, the measure with the highest rate of utilisation (100%), support for the ENEM, is no longer included in the current Protocol.

#### 5. Other fleets present in Madagascar waters

In addition to its agreement with the European Union, Madagascar also signed an agreement last year with a private company from Taiwan giving access to tuna fishing in Malagasy waters for 20 vessels for a period of three years.

It also has an agreement with a Japanese fishermen's federation granting access to 20 longliners, although little use has so far been made of this. There is also an agreement co-signed with Mauritius for 30 Thai longliners, a tuna-fishing agreement with a Mauritian shipowner for two seiners and, lastly, an agreement granting fishing rights to two seiners flying flags of convenience.

Except for the agreement with the Taiwanese company, which seems to be more rigorous, especially as regards surveillance, information on the other agreements is very vague and it can be said with some certainty that the agreement with the European Union is the one which offers greater transparency and monitoring of activities.

#### Remarks

1. Fisheries relations between the European Union and Madagascar go back as far as 1986 and have undoubtedly been fruitful for both parties. Your rapporteur can only express

satisfaction that they are being extended, bearing in mind also the high rate of exploitation of Community fishing opportunities. Since the previous Protocol, two further Community Member States, Italy and Portugal, have secured fishing opportunities. From a cost-benefit point of view, therefore, the Agreement appears more than satisfactory, since the European Union has a substantial deficit in tuna, and it is highly important for it to maintain supplies through its own fleets.

2. Nevertheless, your rapporteur feels bound to express concern that under this Protocol more than 60% of the costs are allocated to measures not strictly related to the presence of the Community fleet in the waters of a third country under a trade agreement. Your rapporteur believes that priority must be given to the European Union's commitment to the development of the least-developed countries, but considers it highly debatable, from the point of view of budget transparency, whether the costs of development measures should increasingly be borne by fisheries agreements.

This creates, for example, the paradox whereby some Member States and some sectors of public opinion constantly criticise the high cost to the Community budget of fisheries agreements (€ 240 m), without taking into account the fact that less than € 100 m is actually used to fund fishing opportunities, with the rest being a *hidden* contribution to the budget of the Directorate-General for Development. This situation needs to be clarified as soon as possible.

3. The question must also be asked whether the measures selected for cooperation with third countries are always the most appropriate. Recently, the Directorate-General for Development informed the Committee on Fisheries that its funding contributions were always made ***at the request of*** the third country concerned, which wanted Union aid for specific purposes. However, the fisheries DG recently confirmed to this committee that in the case of fisheries it was the Commission which selected the objectives, openly admitting that '***pressure***' (sic) was brought to bear by the fisheries DG to ensure that third countries agreed to accept 'targeted measures' instead of straight financial compensation, against their clearly expressed wishes, and to ensure that the targeted measures were the ones chosen by the Commission. Is this reasonable?

The fact that Madagascar was able to spend only 68% of the budget allocated to assist local fisheries seems to suggest that its capacity to absorb aid is limited, at least at the pace which the Commission is seeking to impose. As part of efforts to ensure greater cooperation between policy areas, there is a need for a comprehensive review of the role played by development aid under fisheries agreements.

13 September 2001

## **OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUDGETS**

for the Committee on Fisheries

on the proposal for a Council regulation on the conclusion of a Protocol setting out the fishing opportunities and financial contribution provided for in the Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Democratic Republic of Madagascar on fishing off Madagascar for the period from 21 May 2001 to 20 May 2004  
(COM(2001) 409 – C5-0406 – 2001/0161(CNS))

Draftsman: Bárbara Dührkop Dührkop

## **PROCEDURE**

The Committee on Budgets appointed Bárbara Dührkop Dührkop draftsman at its meeting of 22 September 1999.

It considered the draft opinion at its meeting of 13 September 2001.

At the last meeting it adopted the following amendments unanimously.

The following were present for the vote: Terence Wynn, chairman; Reimer Böge, vice-chairman; Gordon J. Adam (for Joan Colom i Naval, pursuant to Rule 153(2)), Ioannis Averoff, Jean-Louis Boursanges, Kathalijne Maria Buitenweg, Paulo Casaca, Carlos Costa Neves, Den Dover, James E.M. Elles, Göran Färm, Markus Ferber, Salvador Garriga Polledo, Neena Gill, Catherine Guy-Quint, John Joseph McCartin, Jan Mulder, Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar, Giovanni Pittella, Elly Plooi-j-van Gorsel (for Anne Elisabet Jensen), Bartho Pronk (for Armin Laschet), Encarnación Redondo Jiménez (for Alain Madelin), Esko Olavi Seppänen (for Chantal Cauquil), Per Stenmarck, Francesco Turchi, Kyösti Tapio Virrankoski and Ralf Walter.

## BACKGROUND/GENERAL COMMENTS

1. The previous Protocol to the Fisheries Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Madagascar setting out the fishing opportunities and financial contribution expired on 20 May 2001. On 12 March 2001, the two parties initialled a protocol for a period of three years (21 May 2001 to 20 May 2004). A draft Council Decision concerning the provisional application of the new protocol pending its final entry into force is subject to a separate procedure (without consultation of the Parliament).
2. The Commission informed the Parliament's Committee on Fisheries immediately about the new protocol as initialled and transmitted the text of the protocol, but no draft financial statement. On 18 July 2001, Commission adopted the Proposal for a Council Regulation on the Conclusion of the Protocol.
3. The protocol foresees the following financial contributions through the EU budget:

in €

	2001	2002	2003	Total
Commitment appropriations				
Financial compensation	308 000	308 000	308 000	924 000
Scientific programmes to improve the knowledge of maritime resources (incl. Participation in internat. meetings)	80 000	80 000	80 000	240 000
Monitoring, control and surveillance	267 000	267 000	267 000	801 000
Assistance for small-scale fisheries	70 000	70 000	70 000	210 000
Study grants and practical training concerning fisheries	100 000	100 000	100 000	300 000
<b>Total Commitments</b>	<b>825 000</b>	<b>825 000</b>	<b>825 000</b>	<b>2 475 000</b>
<b>Payment appropriations</b>	<b>825 000</b>	<b>825 000</b>	<b>825 000</b>	<b>2 475 000</b>

4. The present protocol provides for higher fishing opportunities (authorised catches of 11 000 tonnes annually) compared to its predecessor (authorised catches of 9 500 tonnes per year). This increase was negotiated by the Commission, though the average amount of catches in the 1998 to 2000 was only 7 360 tonnes per year.
5. According to the increased reference amount, the total annual costs for the EU budget are increasing from annually € 760 000 for the previous protocol to € 825 000 for the protocol now initialled (increase of 8.6%). The contribution from the EU budget per tonne authorised catches is adjusted to the average contained in most fisheries agreements with ACP states. It equals € 75 per tonne in the new protocol, compared to € 80 in the previous protocols. Consequently, the share of the ship-owners has been increased from € 20 to € 25 per tonne.
6. The financing for targeted actions constitute 62.6% of the total EU financing (€ 517 000 per year), which is also comparable to other fisheries agreements with ACP countries. The main

part of the targeted measures is foreseen for monitoring, control and surveillance measures (€ 267 000 annually). Smaller amounts are foreseen for the Scientific programmes to improve the knowledge of maritime resources to assure sustainable resources management, support for small-scale fisheries and study grants and training dealing with fisheries.

7. The Commission proposal contains a new Article 3 which takes account of Commission Regulation (EC) No 500/2001 of 14 March 2001<sup>1</sup> and states that the Member States are obliged to notify Commission of the quantities of the catches taken in the fishing zone of Madagascar. This provision can help to achieve a more realistic picture of the actual catches of the EU shipping fleet. It could be useful in both directions, to identify more exactly the under-utilisation of fishing opportunities, and to discover if catches are not declared properly.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. The Committee on Budgets deplores that the European Commission has presented its proposal for a Council regulation on the conclusion of the present protocol more than 4 months after initialling the protocol. The committee welcomes the fact that the protocol provides for the financial compensation to be paid before 30 November each year. This will leave the necessary time for the consultation of Parliament before the first payment to Madagascar has to be effected.
2. The Committee on Budgets welcomes the increase of the share provided for targeted measures. In particular, the provision of a considerable amount for control and surveillance could support the sustainable management of maritime resources.
3. The committee welcomes the inclusion of an article in the proposal for a regulation (Article 3) which states the obligation of Member States to notify the Commission of the quantity of stocks taken in the Malagasy fishing zone.
4. The Committee on Budgets welcomes the inclusion of a suspension clause in the protocol, which gives the possibility to suspend the fishing agreement either in the case that the Community fails to make the payments provide for in the protocol (Article 4) or in the case that the circumstances prevent fishing activities in the fishing zone of Madagascar (Article 5). Such clauses will help to avoid the difficulties which occurred in the context of other fisheries agreements when the fishing could not be carried through as provided for in the respective protocols and agreements (for example in the case of Guinea-Bissau or Greenland).
5. The average amount of declared catches in the period 1998 to 2000 was 7 360 tonnes. Therefore, it can be questioned, if it is necessary to increase the reference amount from 9 500 to 11 000 tonnes in the new protocol accompanied by an increase of the financial contribution, especially as the protocol provides always for the possibility to increase the amount agreed in the protocol and to pay additional compensation to Madagascar

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 73, 15.3.2001, p.8.

proportional to the additional catches.

6. The Committee on Budgets maintains its amendments on the evaluation report and the consultation of the Parliament prior to the initialling of a new protocol, and calls, therefore, on the Committee on Fisheries, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:

Text proposed by the Commission<sup>1</sup>

---

Amendments by Parliament

---

Amendment 1  
Article 3a (1) (new)

***1. In the course of the Protocol's application, and before the start of negotiations on its possible renewal, the Commission shall submit to the Council and European Parliament a general assessment report including a cost benefit analysis.***

*Justification*

*Before the expiry of the previous protocol, the European Commission presented to Parliament an evaluation report on the previous protocol after initialling the new protocol. The Commission did not provide the European Parliament with information allowing a serious assessment and the presentation of an opinion by the Parliament before the start of negotiations.*

Amendment 2  
Article 3a (2) (new)

***2. The Council shall, on the basis of that report and taking account of the European Parliament's opinion thereon, authorise the Commission, where appropriate, to start negotiations with a view to the adoption of a new Protocol.***

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ C (not yet published).

### *Justification*

*The Committee on Budgets reiterates the demand for the general assessment report to be presented by the Commission before the beginning of negotiations on a new or renewed agreement or protocol. The Council shall only give the authorisation to the Commission to start negotiations on the basis of the assessment report and the opinion of the European Parliament. This position is in line with the conclusion N° D of the Working Document on European Community Fisheries Agreements (PE 289.538) approved by the Committee on Budgets on 23 May 2000. It is also in line with the position taken by the Parliament on other fisheries agreements.*

21 June 2001

## **OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION**

for the Committee on Fisheries

on the proposal for a Council regulation relating to the conclusion of the Protocol defining, for the period 21 May 2001 to 20 May 2004, the fishing opportunities and the financial compensation provided for by the Agreement between the European Community and the Government of Madagascar  
(COM(2001)0000 – C5-0406/2001 – 0000/2001 (CNS))

Draftsman: Joaquim Miranda

### **PROCEDURE**

The Committee on Development and Cooperation appointed Joaquim Miranda draftsman at its meeting of 10 April 2001.

It considered the draft opinion at its meeting of 29 May 2001.

At its meeting of 21 June 2001, it adopted the following conclusions unanimously.

The following were present for the vote: Joaquim Miranda chairman and draftsman; Lone Dybkjær, vice-chair; Margrietus J. van den Berg, vice-chairman; John Bowis (for Pier Ferdinando Casini), María Carrilho, John Alexander Corrie, Nirj Deva, Concepció Ferrer (for Generoso Andria), Michael Gahler (for Karsten Knolle), Richard Howitt, Renzo Imbeni, Bashir Khanbhai, Wolfgang Kreissl-Dörfler, Miguel Angel Martínez Martínez, Hans Modrow, Didier Rod, Ulla Margrethe Sandbæk.

## SHORT JUSTIFICATION

The Committee on Development and Cooperation, referring to its past reports and opinions on other fisheries agreements concluded with various ACP countries, to Parliament and Joint Assembly resolutions on fisheries agreements and ACP-EU cooperation in this area<sup>1</sup>, and also to the Development Council resolution (Luxembourg, 5 June 1997) on the consistency of Community development cooperation policy with other policies, in particular fisheries policy, wishes to emphasise once again the need for a more ambitious development component to be incorporated into the fisheries agreements concluded with the ACP countries, so as to ensure that they are of mutual benefit to the countries concerned and to the EU countries.

### **The new fisheries protocol EU-Madagascar**

The European Union and Madagascar have renewed for a three-year period (21 May 2001 - 20 May 2004) their fisheries protocol.

This Agreement concerns tuna fisheries and will provide fishing opportunities for 80 vessels, 5 more than under the current Protocol. Financial compensation has been increased from €760,000 to €825,000 to reflect the increase in the annual level of captures available to Community vessels from 9,500 tonnes to 11,000 tonnes.

The 80 tuna vessels will be made up to 40 seiners and 40 long-liners. Vessels from Spain and France, in particular, and a small number from Italy and Portugal will benefit from this Agreement.

The share allocated to specific measures has gone up from 60 to 63% of the financial compensation. It will amount to €517,000 annually compared to the current €456,000. These funds will be used to strengthen fisheries management and the artisanal fisheries sector in Madagascar through support for surveillance and monitoring of fisheries activities, scientific research, training and measures to promote the development of small-scale fisheries.

The cost of fishing licences, which will be paid by vessel owners operating under this Agreement, will increase from €20 to €25 per tonne of tuna caught. The cost of annual licences for the two categories of vessels involved will also increase from €2,000 to €2,500 for tuna seiners. For long-liners the cost will go up from €1,100 to €1,500 for vessels over 150GRT and from €800 to €1,100 for those under 150GRT.

An important innovation is the fact that the exclusion zone for the Community fleet has been increased from the present 10 miles to 12 miles, thereby protecting small-scale fishing which figures in the Agreement and the last Protocol, with €210,000.

the fisheries surveillance provisions had been substantially strengthened in the last Protocol.

---

<sup>1</sup> See in particular: Crampton report (A4-0149/97, OJ C358, 24.11.1997); Joint Assembly resolution on fisheries in the context of ACP-EEC cooperation (OJ C14, 17.1.1994); Joint Assembly resolution on ACP-EU cooperation in the fisheries sector beyond the year 2000 (ACP-EU 2187/97, OJ C96, 30.3.1998)

Additionally, in the framework of the new protocol, a satellite VMS will be introduced.

Fisheries surveillance is one of the political priorities of the Fisheries Ministers in Madagascar and is the most important envelope in terms of financial support (€801,000). The size of the EEZ in Madagascar and the extent of the coastal zone requires considerable financing for a minimum surveillance system, the cost of which is estimated at at least €1 million year.

Under the new Protocol the EU fleet as a whole is required to employ a minimum of 40 Malagasy seamen (6 under the previous Protocol). It could nevertheless be stipulated that two Malagasy seamen per vessel should be employed, as is the case with other agreements.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The Committee on Development and Cooperation:

1. Welcomes the fact that, under the new Protocol with Madagascar, 63% of the total financial contribution is intended to assist the development of the Malagasy fisheries sector, with €210.000 being specifically provided for traditional fishing. As has been pointed out, local fishing is an effective means of ensuring sustainable social and economic development. Calls for these funds to be allocated in a transparent and responsible fashion, with the required consultation to be held with Malagasy fishermen's organisations;
2. Welcomes furthermore the extension of the exclusion zone for the Community fleet from the present 10 miles to 12 miles, thereby protecting small-scale coastal fishing;
3. Welcomes recognition of the importance of the traditional fishing sector in the agreement, in particular that the budgetary envelope dedicated for the development of the sector has been almost doubled. However, it is also important that arrangements and budgetary provisions under EU Development Cooperation be made coherent with the new provisions of the fishery agreement in this regard;
4. Considers the strengthening of provisions for the surveillance and monitoring of fisheries activities as progress; it will help to ensure that resources are managed and exploited in a sustainable way;
5. Regrets the fact that the new Protocol does not cover regional aspects relating to, inter alia, research, regional management and exploitation of resources, the financing of regional fisheries training centres, the exchange of information, monitoring and surveillance, etc., and calls on the Commission to consider the possibility of concluding regional fisheries agreements with countries in the area;
6. Recognises the damage done to dolphins by seine nets, and to seabirds, in particular albatrosses, by long-lines; calls, consequently, on the Commission and national and international fishing organisations to undertake research and apply already existing technology whereby marine mammals and birds can be protected from such fishing

practices;

7. Calls on the Commission to ensure that each and every contractual clause of the agreement is observed by vessels flying a Community flag; in this connection, draws attention to the requirements concerning the employment of Malagasy seamen and, in particular, the working and salary conditions corresponding to the political desire for local training and development. A Social Clause should be included in the text of all fisheries agreements concerning the status of seafarers embarked on EU vessels. The pertinent standards of the ILO should be the point of reference for the development of these rights and the parties should ensure their strict implementation of fishing vessels covered by the agreements;
8. Calls for the relevant parliamentary committee to be informed of the progress of the negotiations, so that it can make its views known to the Commission;
9. Recommends the Committee on Fisheries to approve the proposal.